

SSIP

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN



APRIL 2020

 DEPARTMENT of
EDUCATION
Louisiana Believes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
SUMMARY OF PHASE III (A)	6
THEORY OF ACTION OR LOGIC MODEL FOR THE SSIP, INCLUDING THE SIMR (A.1)	6
THE COHERENT IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES OR PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES EMPLOYED DURING THE YEAR, INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2)	6
COHERENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES (A.2.A)	6
INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2.B)	8
THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES THAT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED TO DATE (A.3)	12
BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR’S EVALUATION ACTIVITIES, MEASURES, AND OUTCOMES (A.4)	16
HIGHLIGHTS OF CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.5)	19
PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP (B)	21
DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE’S SSIP IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (B.1)	21
DESCRIPTION OF EXTENT TO WHICH THE STATE HAS CARRIED OUT ITS PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH FIDELITY—WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, WHAT MILESTONES HAVE BEEN MET, AND WHETHER THE INTENDED TIMELINE HAS BEEN FOLLOWED (B.1.A)	21
INTENDED OUTPUTS ACCOMPLISHED AS A RESULT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES (B.1.B)	24
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (B.2)	26
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.A)	26
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.B)	27
DATA ON IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES (C)	28
HOW THE STATE MONITORED AND MEASURED OUTPUTS (STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES) TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (C.1)	28
HOW EVALUATION MEASURES ALIGN WITH THE THEORY OF ACTION (C.1.A)	28
DATA SOURCES FOR EACH KEY MEASURE (C.1.B)	28
DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.1.C)	31
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED TIMELINES (C.1.D)	32
[IF APPLICABLE] SAMPLING PROCEDURES (C.1.E)	34
[IF APPROPRIATE] PLANNED DATA COMPARISONS (C.1.F)	34
HOW DATA MANAGEMENT AND DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES ALLOW FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (C.1.G)	34
HOW THE STATE HAS DEMONSTRATED PROGRESS AND MADE MODIFICATIONS TO THE SSIP AS NECESSARY (C.2)	35

HOW THE STATE HAS REVIEWED KEY DATA THAT PROVIDE EVIDENCE REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE SIMR (C.2.A)	36
EVIDENCE OF CHANGE TO BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.2.B)	37
HOW DATA SUPPORT CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (C.2.C)	37
HOW DATA ARE INFORMING NEXT STEPS IN THE SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (C.2.D)	38
HOW DATA SUPPORT PLANNED MODIFICATIONS TO INTENDED OUTCOMES (INCLUDING THE SIMR)—RATIONALE OR JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHANGES OR HOW DATA SUPPORT THAT THE SSIP IS ON THE RIGHT PATH (C.2.E)	38
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SSIP EVALUATION (C.3)	38
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.A)	38
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.B)	38
DATA QUALITY ISSUES (D)	39
DATA LIMITATIONS THAT AFFECTED REPORTS OF PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP AND ACHIEVING THE SIMR DUE TO QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION DATA (D.1)	39
CONCERN OR LIMITATIONS RELATED TO THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF THE DATA USED TO REPORT PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.A)	39
IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.B)	39
PLANS FOR IMPROVING DATA QUALITY (D.1.C)	39
PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E)	40
ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E.1)	40
INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES THAT SUPPORT SSIP INITIATIVES, INCLUDING HOW SYSTEM CHANGES SUPPORT ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SIMR, SUSTAINABILITY, AND SCALE-UP (E.1.A)	40
EVIDENCE THAT SSIP’S EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES ARE BEING CARRIED OUT WITH FIDELITY AND HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS (E.1.B)	41
OUTCOMES REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM OBJECTIVES THAT ARE NECESSARY STEPS TOWARD ACHIEVING THE SIMR (E.1.C)	42
MEASURABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SIMR IN RELATION TO TARGETS (E.1.D)	42
PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR (F)	43
ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED NEXT YEAR, WITH TIMELINE (F.1)	43
PLANNED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION, MEASURES, AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES (F.2)	43
ANTICIPATED BARRIERS AND STEPS TO ADDRESS THOSE BARRIERS (F.3)	43
THE STATE DESCRIBES ANY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AND/OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (F.4)	43
APPENDIX A – SSIP CONTRIBUTORS	44

ACRONYMS AND KEY TERMS

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LOUISIANA'S SiMR FOCUSES ON IMPROVING STUDENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES. Louisiana Believes starts with the premise that all children can achieve high expectations and should be prepared for college or career. The challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, begin early. When Louisiana improved the LEAP assessment, the gap between students with disabilities and their general education peers was shown to be larger than previously understood. For these reasons, Louisiana is focusing on literacy—a foundational skill necessary for success in all subjects and grades. Louisiana's SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in eight school systems (SSIP cohort¹) across the state.

LOUISIANA'S SSIP SHOWS PROMISE DURING INITIAL SCALE-OUT. The Louisiana SSIP is grounded in a theory of action that, when implemented with fidelity, will improve literacy outcomes for students with disabilities first in the SSIP cohort and later across the state as the scale-up plan is executed. For example, the following trends emerged across SSIP schools in FFY 2018:

- The implementation fidelity of high-quality ELA curriculum across SSIP classrooms, as measured by the Curriculum Implementation Observation Tool, increased from 54% to 86%.
- The average implementation score of evidence-based literacy practices for SSIP school sites, as measured by the Evidence-Based Literacy Practices Matrix, increased from 77% to 81% scoring a level 2 or higher within a 0-3 scaled score.
- The implementation of evidence-based professional development practices, as measured by the Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric, increased from 81% to 86%.

These short term measures indicate that the SSIP cohort is continuing to make progress toward its target SiMR. In addition to creating positive change in outcomes within the SSIP cohort, our SSIP work is beginning to improve outcomes for students with disabilities statewide as it is scaled out. For example, during FFY 2016 and FFY 2017, SSIP participating schools implemented evidence-based, curriculum embedded literacy practices with the intention of scaling across Louisiana schools in FY 2018. Upon statewide scale-up of SSIP evidence-based practices, proficiency rates for students with disabilities on statewide ELA assessments increased by over 5%, from 34.03% in FFY 2017 to 39.43% in FFY 2018. This increase demonstrates that the SSIP theory of action has improved outcomes for students within the SSIP cohort and shows promise during statewide scale-up to improve outcomes for students statewide. This report focuses on the progress and additional actions Louisiana is undertaking to ensure that the SSIP theory of action continues to improve literacy outcomes for students with disabilities throughout Louisiana.

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



STRATEGIES

IF...

THEN...

A

**DATA-INFORMED
DECISION MAKING**



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



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

B

**EVIDENCE-BASED
LITERACY PRACTICES**



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



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



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



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



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

If...



A + **B** + *

are implemented with fidelity...



Then...



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

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

SUMMARY OF PHASE III (A)

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

Louisiana's theory of action is driven by three interconnected improvement strategies: data-informed decision-making, evidence-based literacy practices, and continuous leadership development. This theory of action is grounded in the assumption that teachers are successful at improving outcomes for students when equipped with a high-quality standards-based curriculum that includes evidence-based strategies, ongoing professional development to implement such curriculum with fidelity, and data from standards aligned assessments to inform how students are performing towards grade-level standards. These strategies, when implemented with fidelity, will result in increased ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades three through five. This increase will occur first in the SSIP cohort and then across the state as the scale-up plan is executed.

Louisiana believes that the theory of action, logic model, and evaluation plan exist as interconnected components of the SSIP to provide a strategic framework for its implementation. LDOE's logic model begins on page 28.

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

COHERENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES (A.2.A)

The LDOE has utilized a layered approach to implement the SSIP's improvement strategies. The LDOE began with foundational professional development in data-informed decision-making and then added evidence-based literacy practices with continuous leadership development activities embedded throughout. Each school year, the LDOE builds upon the foundational knowledge and skills with additional targeted professional development to improve implementation. Below is a summary of each coherent improvement strategy.

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

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

To that end, Louisiana implements a free, high-quality assessment system that provides educators with a complete picture of student learning at the beginning, middle and end of the school year called [LEAP 360](#). LEAP 360 delivers streamlined assessments through a comprehensive system for classrooms, schools and school systems.

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

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

Louisiana's SSIP also utilizes tools such as the [Curriculum Implementation Observation Tool](#) and the [Common Planning Time Tool](#) to support educators and school site leadership teams in making real-time changes to implementation efforts to increase implementation fidelity quickly and effectively. School system and school site leadership teams are provided support to effectively utilize these tools to reach implementation fidelity throughout the year.

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

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

The final coherent improvement strategy, **continuous leadership development**, is intended to directly support sustainable implementation of data-informed decision-making and evidence-based literacy practices. The LDOE has developed a list of high-quality Tier 1 curricula, including ELA Guidebooks. Educators need professional development that focuses on helping them navigate and use this curriculum effectively. SSIP professional development is focused on providing educational leaders with the support they need to ensure evidence-based literacy practices and data-based decision-making strategies are implemented with fidelity. Throughout Phase III of the SSIP educators have participated in the Content Leader and Intervention Content Leader Initiative.

The Content Leader initiative is a nine-day training that focuses on developing deep knowledge of ELA content and pedagogy, the skills educational leaders need to effectively use and help others use the ELA

Guidebooks, and adult learning theory and skills to facilitate high-quality learning experiences for fellow educators. In FFY 2017, the LDOE began planning to expand this initiative to include Intervention Content Leader, which seeks to equip additional educational leaders with pedagogy and strategies aimed at effectively implementing small group instruction and intervention for students who need it most. Both the Content Leader and Intervention Content Leader initiatives will continue throughout Phase III of the SSIP. In FFY 2018 the LDOE took additional steps to ensure participants in these initiatives were able to 1) successfully complete assessments that lead to credential distinction; and 2) successfully redeliver content modules across their school systems.

In addition to building instructional leaders, the LDOE recognizes the critical role that school leadership teams serve in supporting educators in making data informed decisions and in supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices. In FFY 2018 the LDOE facilitated [School Support Institutes](#) to provide additional training to school system leadership teams in synthesizing data and supporting educators in the implementation of high-quality standards aligned with evidence-based curriculum. School Support Institutes met quarterly with school site leadership teams with a focus around one of three key areas of support: effective common planning time, observation & feedback, and building leadership. The Content Leader and Intervention Content Leader initiatives work together with the School Support Institutes to develop leaders at multiple levels of the school system who can enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. Continuous leadership development improves teaching and facilitates and promotes lifelong learning.

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2.B)

During Phase I and II, the LDOE identified strengths and opportunities to improve six infrastructure areas—governance, fiscal/funding, quality standards, PD/TA, data, and accountability/monitoring—and reported on specific activities to improve the state’s infrastructure. Now, in Phase III, LDOE has focused on key activities that directly align with the SSIP, leveraging infrastructure improvements to implement a sound plan to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort and scale-up best practices. To that end, LDOE is carrying out four infrastructure improvement strategies: 1) aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s SPDG, 2) expanding the Academic Content Team’s portfolio of special education work, 3) integrating special education into the state’s plan to develop educators, and 4) aligning the SSIP with the state’s ESSA plan. Each of these priorities is discussed in detail below.

Table A.1: Cross-walk of Infrastructure Elements to SSIP Infrastructure Improvement Activities

	Alignment with SPDG	Expanding Academic Content	Developing Educators	Aligning with ESSA
Governance	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fiscal / Funding	✓	✓	✓	

Quality Standards	✓	✓	✓	✓
PD / TA	✓	✓	✓	✓
Data	✓	✓	✓	✓
Accountability / Monitoring		✓		✓

Infrastructure Improvements: Aligning with SPDG and School System Planning to Advance Implementation Efforts

Louisiana’s SSIP leverages the SPDG to program resources to carry out the coherent improvement strategies. During FFY 2017, the LDOE continued to align SPDG with the SSIP as well as Louisiana’s ESSA plan. Louisiana has worked hard to raise expectations for students and students are performing at higher levels than ever before. Yet, there is still much work to do to deliver on the promise of higher achievement for students with disabilities. This infrastructure improvement has been used to accelerate the state’s progress in developing, piloting, refining, and scaling up specific evidence-based tools and resources for educators of students with disabilities in grades three through five through activities such as the Diverse Learners Pilot.

In Fall 2018, significant infrastructure improvements were implemented into the [school system planning](#) process for all school systems. This process requires school systems to utilize data in planning, budgeting and implementation in alignment with key priorities. Louisiana launched the [Super App](#), a comprehensive planning tool that guides school systems through aligning key priorities and funding sources. This streamlined planning and budgeting process has leveraged the planning of our SSIP and SPDG cohort by guiding school system leadership teams through aligning evidence-based professional development with high quality curriculum for all students. The school system planning process and Super App provide an ideal avenue for statewide implementation of the SSIP theory of action. As evidence-based practices and leadership development are implemented with fidelity within the SSIP cohort, they are then scaled out and funded through the Super App to improve outcomes within schools that are identified as requiring intervention for students with disabilities under ESSA.

To further ensure that the LDOE engages in a coherent cycle of planning, reflection, and implementation, an agency wide operating cycle was adopted in January 2020. The LDOE operating cycle includes key phases in planning for key initiatives and innovative approaches. The operating cycle focuses on two key phases to move work forward: school system planning priority development and school system planning implementation and field support. These two key phases encompass periods of reflection, data analysis, and continuous improvement checks. The operating cycle is a critical infrastructure improvement as it allows for strategic planning and implementation across teams for projects such as SPDG and the SSIP.

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

Throughout Phase III, the LDOE has continued to build on efforts to integrate special education more fully into LDOE's Academic Content portfolio of work. The LDOE has focused on three primary activities: 1) developing a vision to expand ELA Guidebooks to reach all students, including students with disabilities; 2) deepening ELA expertise within the LDOE to develop content-specific tools, resources, and technical assistance, including professional development; and 3) realigning and expanding the Academic Content team's special education portfolio of work.

The LDOE has scaled up the SSIP's evidence-based practices through the refinement and expansion of ELA Guidebooks to give educators the tools to effectively specialize instruction for students with disabilities. The LDOE has leveraged the SSIP to pilot evidence-based literacy practices that support diverse learners, including students with disabilities, in achieving grade-level outcomes embedded within the lessons of ELA Guidebooks.

As part of the SPDG realignment, the Academic Content team brought on two additional staff members whose primary responsibility is to deliver the components of the SPDG and SSIP evidence-based literacy practices framework. During this SSIP reporting period, this team piloted a suite of resources embedded into the ELA Guidebooks to support diverse learners. They conducted site visits, held focus groups, and utilized other evaluation tools to identify the most promising results. Those results have been integrated into the ELA Guidebooks to scale-up these supports statewide. The LDOE provides professional development sessions annually for educators across the state to access and implement these supports.

In addition to the Diverse Learner Supports described above, the Academic Content team utilizes our Teacher Leader Initiative to build out curriculum specific evidence-based foundational literacy resources to support the development of foundational reading skills that are necessary for students to read and understand complex text. The building out of foundational literacy components added an additional layer of support to the ELA Guidebooks, and built the pedagogical knowledge of Teacher Leaders to deliver such supports. In FFY 2019 the SSIP cohort piloted these resources to inform statewide implementation. The Foundational Reading Supports Pilot assisted the LDOE in understanding the lack of expertise in teaching reading for teachers in grades three through five, the need for additional materials to support building foundational reading skills for students with persistent gaps, and a clearer understanding of the guidance necessary to ensure such supports are implemented following best practices. As a result of this pilot, the LDOE will conduct the following activities in FFY 2019:

- 1) Redesign sessions at Teacher Leader Summit to build knowledge and understanding of evidence-based approaches to teaching reading to students in grades three through five
- 2) Continue to review and pilot Intensive Intervention Programs to provide additional resources and guidance to school systems in addressing persistent gaps in foundational reading skills for students
- 3) Redesign Intervention Content Leader trainings to support best practices and informed decision-making in delivering evidence-based interventions and supports to students

The SSIP cohort will be used as the primary scale-up tool for revisions and implementation of such materials and resources.

Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Developing Educators

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

For these reasons, Louisiana's SSIP is integrating with the Content Leader and Teacher Leader initiatives. Louisiana's Content Leader initiative is addressing these challenges by growing local leadership pipelines for schools and school systems by developing talented teachers within the system and equipping a cadre of talented educators with the knowledge and skills to coach and support other teachers within their schools and school systems. SSIP educators are participating in Content Leader's nine-day training that focuses on developing 1) deep knowledge of ELA content and content pedagogy, 2) the knowledge and skills they need to effectively use and help others use the ELA Guidebooks, and 3) the knowledge of adult learning theory and the skills to facilitate high-quality learning experiences for fellow educators.

As Louisiana's Content Leader initiative has grown and shown promising results in supporting high-quality core instruction, more guidance and professional development is necessary to build capacity in planning and implementing interventions that meet the needs of individual students. Specifically, a lack of expertise from school administrators in creating schedules and structures that allow for interventions that support core instruction and teachers lacking expertise in identifying appropriate interventions for specific students and in connecting interventions to high-quality curricula were identified as key barriers to supporting struggling students. In response to this need, Louisiana is expanding the Content Leader Initiative to include an additional cadre of educators to serve as Intervention Content Leaders. Intervention Content Leader is currently under development and seeks to develop a cohort of educators and administrators equipped to support schools and other educators in providing appropriate high-quality interventions. The expansion of this initiative will continue to develop educator leaders who enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. Continuous leadership development recognizes that there is no point when a leader is fully developed. Instead, leaders continuously identify ways to improve their practice.

In addition to Content Leader, the Louisiana Teacher Leader initiative brings together 6,500 educators and content experts who are focused on creating meaningful growth for every student, every day. Teacher Leaders are a corps of highly effective teachers with a record of accomplishment of improved student outcomes who provide training and support to peers, model strategies, and facilitate grade-level meetings on data. The SSIP is aligned with Teacher Leader to build a cohort of Teacher Leaders with the tools and resources schools can use to reach diverse learners. The LDOE continues to utilize data gathered from SSIP evaluation tools to establish more customized courses of professional development provided through the Teacher Leader initiative each summer.

Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Aligning the SSIP with ESSA

Passed by Congress in 2015, [ESSA](#) is a federal law that requires states to articulate a cohesive plan for measuring the skills students learn, reporting information to parents and the public, supporting students in making academic progress, and spending federal funds. ESSA largely focuses on the needs of historically disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities. Louisiana's [ESSA plan](#) was approved in August 2017. Under the approved plan, LDOE has launched [School Finder](#), which provides each school and the public with new and transparent information on each ESSA subgroup, including students with disabilities, to provide easy-to-understand, easily comparable data to guide planning and intervention. With this focused attention on subgroups, especially students with disabilities, the LDOE launched the School Redesign process, which helps school systems create strong plans to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups.

In fall 2018, as the implementation of Louisiana's approved ESSA plan continued, many schools statewide were labeled as Urgent Intervention Required (UIR) due to consistently low performance for students with disabilities. Anticipating these changes, the SSIP began taking school systems through the subgroup data analysis and planning process. Working in concert, the SSIP has leveraged statewide ESSA changes to expedite literacy gains for students with disabilities. To build upon this success and to further the implementation of Louisiana's ESSA plan, a [suite](#) of resources designed to assist school systems in planning was developed. In fall 2018, Louisiana launched the [Super App](#), which requires school systems to utilize data in planning, budgeting and implementation in alignment with key priorities. The Super App focuses school improvement strategies around integrating four key domains: Core Academics, Students with Diverse Needs, Workforce Talent, and LEA systems. This new process for school system planning requires school systems to align resources and funding for evidence-based professional development connected to high-quality curriculum for supporting students with disabilities.

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

Below is a timeline of key activities that support the implementation of each coherent improvement strategy, including its status: planning, begun, ongoing, or completed. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Evidence-based Literacy Practices

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The LDOE builds out intervention components of ELA Guidebook curriculum for implementation by SSIP cohort in the 2019-2020 school year. The LDOE plans to review intensive intervention programs during

the 2019-2020 school year for adoption and implementation by the SSIP cohort in the 2020-2021 school year.

- The LDOE builds out foundational literacy components of the ELA Guidebook curriculum. (Completed 2018-2019 school year)
- SSIP school systems / schools pilot foundation literacy materials for the ELA Guidebook curriculum. (Completed 2019-2020 school year)
- SSIP cohort educators and administrators participate in 9 day Intervention Content Leader Training. (2019-2020 school year; ongoing)
- LDOE Academic Content staff evaluate the effectiveness of ELA Guidebook foundational literacy materials. (Completed February 2020)
- The LDOE develops intensive intervention program review rubric. (Completed 2018-2019)
- The LDOE conducts intensive intervention program reviews through the online [instructional materials review process](#) to determine the highest quality programs. (Ongoing)
- SSIP cohort teachers are trained on high-quality intervention programs, with an emphasis on how intensive interventions can be integrated into an overall ELA structure at the school and in the classroom. (Begins Summer 2020)
- SSIP school systems / schools use allocated funds to purchase high-quality intervention programs reviewed by LDOE. (Planned 2020-2021 school year)
- SSIP cohort implements high-quality intensive intervention programs. (Planned 2020-2021 school year)
- The LDOE gathers quantifiable information on implementation and student outcomes. (Spring 2021)
- Based on evaluation results, the LDOE provides additional guidance and next steps, and potentially builds out additional resources. (Spring 2021)
- Vendors train teachers across the state on intervention programs and how these can be integrated into an overall ELA structure at the school / classroom. (Begins Summer 2021)

Data-based Decision-Making

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

Key Activities:

- SSIP cohort school systems and school participate in a series of in person and virtual professional development session to lay the foundation for a structured data inquiry process. (Completed during the 2015-2016 and 2016 – 2017 school years)
- LDOE personnel guide school systems and schools through a structured data inquiry using student results from formative assessments and evaluate the efficacy of existing formative assessments. (Completed 2016-2017 school year)

- LDOE personnel support the SSIP cohort as they adopt and implement the [LEAP 360](#) diagnostic and interim assessments. The LDOE supports educators in using assessment results to make better instructional decisions for students with disabilities. (Begun Fall 2017)
- LDOE personnel support school system planning and school redesign, which help school systems create strong plans to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups. (Begun Fall 2017)
- LDOE personnel track the pilot implementation of evidence-based literacy practices in SSIP schools. The LDOE evaluates the pilot, including focus groups, to plan additional resources and support, and/or adapt existing resources to support educators. This includes the pilot of new diverse learners' supports including the [diverse learners guide](#) and the diverse learners' [supports flow chart](#). These supports provide direct reinforcement to the evidence-based literacy practices. (Completed Fall 2018)
- LDOE personnel conduct school system and school observations and data gathering on ELA Guidebook implementation and student outcomes. (Completed Fall 2018)
- In response to the implementation of the Diverse Learners Pilot, and to provide additional evidence-based literacy resources, the LDOE will build out additional foundational reading supports embedded in the Guidebook curriculum. (Completed Spring 2019)
- The LDOE will build out additional support in utilizing formative curriculum embedded assessments to further the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices and inform in the moment classroom decision-making. (Completed Summer 2019)

Continuous Leadership Development

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

Key Activities:

- Identify and support excellent special education teachers to serve as Teacher Leaders. (Begun during the 2017-2018 school year.)
- Identify special education content leaders who will participate in trainings on Content Modules and Content Leader Modules, an ELA Guidebook professional development initiative. (Begun in the 2017-2018 school year.)
- Identify educators and administrators to participate in Intervention Content Leader. This professional development will equip teachers and administrators to successfully design and implement high-quality literacy interventions. (Begun in 2019-2020 school year.)
- Support high quality coaching that builds teachers' 1) understanding of the supports structure and process for diverse learners in ELA, 2) ability to use data, including student work, to diagnose which students should receive various supports, 3) ability to use various supports during whole-class and small-group instruction, and 4) ability to determine the effectiveness of the supports process. (Begun in 2019-2020 school year.)

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

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

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

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Determine whether SSIP pilot schools have adopted a high-quality curriculum for all students with disabilities in grades 3-5.	Curriculum Implementation Scale	Across SSIP schools, 95% of classrooms were observed using high-quality curriculum daily. Additionally, 86% of SSIP classrooms were identified as implementing the curriculum as intended which indicates not only are schools using high-quality curriculum, but they are doing so with increasing levels of fidelity.
Determine implementation level of SSIP schools in appropriate use of evidence-based practices.	Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix (0-3 Scale)	According to the Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix, 81% of SSIP schools fall at a 2 or 3 level on a 0-3 Scale. This indicates there is strong evidence that most Evidence-based Literacy Practices are appropriately implemented.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that create a plan with a strong academic foundation including a plan for curriculum, assessment and teacher professional	ESSA School System Plan (connected to school system planning guide and school improvement grant)	All SSIP school systems are required to submit a plan through the new Super App. The LDOE is currently reviewing plans for approval and

development that addresses the unique needs of students with disabilities.		competitive funding opportunities.
--	--	------------------------------------

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

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Determine whether professional development provided to SSIP school systems demonstrated evidence-based professional development practices.	SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components Rubric (1-4 Scale)	The LDOE rates professional development sessions using sixteen evidence-based practices on a one to four scale. One indicates a lack of evidence-based practices, while a four indicates strong evidence-based practices. Fourteen of sixteen practices were rated a three or four, indicating that professional development for SSIP school systems uses strong evidence-based practices.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems and schools that participated in two-day in person training on SSIP coherent improvement strategies, called the Literacy Leadership Launch.	Professional Development Activity Tracker	All school systems and schools participated. LDOE measured the gain in knowledge and skills through a pre/post test. For specific results, please see section B.1.B.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that participated in Mentor Teacher or Content Leader training.	Professional Development Activity Tracker	In FFY 18 all SSIP school systems had at least one or more educators participate in either Mentor Teacher, Content Leader, or Intervention Content Leader. This will continue through FFY 19.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems with approved professional development	Statewide electronic grants management system	Each SSIP school system was allocated funds to provide ongoing, aligned professional

plans—specifically focused on grades 3-5 English language arts for students with disabilities—that deepens connections between professional development, high-quality curriculum and supports for students with disabilities.		development activities to deepen use of high-quality curriculum. All school systems have submitted their professional development plan for approval. All of the SSIP school systems have approved plans.
Determine whether the LDOE develops a track of professional development at Teacher Leader Summit for educators of students with disabilities in grades 3-5, focused on coherent improvement strategies.	LDOE’s Teacher Leader Summit Tracker	The LDOE will continue to host a track of professional development grounded in the coherent improvement strategies for the Teacher Leader Summit.
Number of SSIP school systems that included participation in Teacher Leader as part of their professional development plan.	Statewide electronic grants management system, registration logs	All SSIP school systems have include Teacher Leader as a component of their professional development plan.

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

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Measure the achievement of students on formative assessments through a school system-level and SSIP cohort-level analysis of progress.	Categorical analysis of formative assessments administered in SSIP schools	All SSIP schools administered formative assessments. Data were analyzed at the school, school system and state-level during the 2016-2017 school year. Results were used by school systems and schools to reflect on practice and at the state-level to inform needed adjustments. For specific results, please see section C.1.C. At the state-level, it was determined a more uniform

		system was needed. The SSIP is now aligned with the LEAP 360 assessment system.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that have adopted LEAP 360, Louisiana’s high-quality assessment system for diagnostic and interim assessments	Enrollment in LEAP 360	All SSIP school systems have adopted and continue to utilize the LEAP 360 assessment system.
Measure how SSIP schools are using data from formative assessments, including those in the evidence-based curriculum, to monitor student progress and make instructional decisions	Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix	All SSIP schools measure how they use universal screeners and formative assessments to monitor student progress and make instructional decisions on a 0-3 scale. Eighty-one percent, of SSIP schools rate a two or three on the 0-3 scale, indicating significant evidence that data informed decision-making practices are being implemented with fidelity in SSIP schools.

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

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

1. Evidence-based literacy practices need a more coherent connection to the high-quality curriculum teachers are using every day. From the first year of implementation, the LDOE learned that the evidence-based literacy practices have to be grounded in the high-quality curriculum to be implemented with fidelity. We initially focused on teaching stand-alone strategies, which left teachers without concrete practice in integrating them into the curriculum or an understanding of how to tackle implementation challenges in the classroom setting. To address these evaluation results, curricula-specific supports were built out rather than utilizing a separate set of evidence based practices. The buildout of such supports has shown much progress in the overall implementation of evidence-based literacy practices, though educators continue to need support to reach full implementation fidelity. The LDOE is continuing to

support educators by providing ongoing coaching and deeper training on curricula supports through the Teacher Leader, Content Leader, and Intervention Content Leader initiatives.

2. Providing educators with high-quality curriculum containing embedded evidence-based literacy practices along with professional development has proven to be critical to the work of the SSIP. However, teachers need additional, in-the-moment support to adjust planning to ensure implementation fidelity. For this reason, in FFY 2018 the LDOE launched the School Support Institutes to build the capacity of school building leadership teams to support implementation efforts by teachers. School principals and other instructional leaders attended quarterly trainings focused on measuring the implementation of high-quality curriculum, providing feedback, and supporting common planning time for educators. School Support Institutes are a key component of continuous leadership development equipping school leaders and educators to make data informed decisions to improve implementation of evidence-based literacy practices and will continue through FFY 2019.

3. School system level SSIP leadership teams that are unconnected to larger school-system planning teams can be isolated and may not create needed system-wide change. In FFY 2015 and 2016, the SSIP established an expectation that each school system would create a school system leadership team and each school a school leadership team that would lead implementation. While leadership teams at the school system and school level met regularly over the school year, their impact was limited and participants reported marginal utility. Changes the leadership team made did not always inform school system wide decisions. As a result, starting in FFY 2017, the LDOE is integrating the leadership teamwork with the existing School System Planning process, in which school systems engage in a process to 1) analyze results and prioritize needs, 2) plan for struggling schools and subgroups, and 3) align budgets to identified needs. These plans address components that include core academics, school system structures, and subgroups of diverse learners, including students with disabilities. This shift proved to be successful but school systems needed further support in aligning funding sources with these key priorities. To better integrate leadership teams into the School System Planning process, the LDOE launched the Super App, which streamlined the school system planning process around key priorities and allowed school systems to align budgets from all funding sources around those priorities. The Super App provides a unified planning process to focus activities and funding sources around our Theory of Action. For example, we believe that if we provide educational leaders with training that facilitates the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices we will see an improvement in the literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. The Super App guides school systems through identifying which high-quality evidence-based curriculum they are using to support all students along with which high quality professional development provider will align with the curriculum being implemented. School systems are then able to look across various federal and local funding sources to support this work. Facilitating this type of laser focused planning we believe will show promising results. This infrastructure change provides true leverage to our Theory of Action and focuses on addressing what most affects student outcomes. Ongoing support and monitoring of the implementation of such plans is provided by LDOE field support coaching networks.

4. In FFY 2017, the LDOE launched a new, free comprehensive assessment system including diagnostic and interim assessments of student learning that were fully aligned to student standards. These

assessments gave teachers a clear understanding as to how students were performing on student standards as well as the ability for school system leaders to monitor progress and create a strong system that reduces the amount of testing and focuses time on learning. In FFY 2017, as LEAP 360 was implemented across the state, the LDOE found that these assessments provided high quality information on student mastery of academic standards; however, these assessments did not provide the nuanced formative data educators needed to adjust instruction in real time. As a result, the LDOE is launched resources and supports on using curriculum embedded formative assessments to adjust instruction. During FFY 2018, the LDOE added curriculum-embedded formative assessments to the LEAP 360 assessment system to assist educators in using formative assessments to make real-time data-informed decisions to adjust instruction

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP (B)

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

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

The LDOE—with the input of stakeholders—developed a series of key activities starting in SY 2015 -2016 and continuing through the SSIP lifecycle that—in sum—would lead to improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. The table below describes the key activities planned and/or accomplished to date, including milestones met and whether the intended timeline was followed. Some activities that begin in one FFY will continue through the duration of the SSIP. See planned timeframe for more information.

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

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
Activities Begun in FFY 2015 (SY 2015 – 2016)				
Foundational PD (Data)	Spring 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating school systems attended in person training.
Online Learning Modules - School systems (Data)	Spring – Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	8 of 9 participating school systems completed modules.
Activities Begun in FFY 2016 (SY 2016 – 2017)				

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
Foundational PD (Data)	Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating schools attended in person training.
Online Learning Modules - Schools (Data)	Fall - Winter 2016	Yes	Yes	Online learning modules were created and distributed to SSIP schools. All SSIP schools participated.
DLT Meetings	Spring 2016 – Spring 2017	Yes	Yes	All DLTs met during FFY 2016
SLT Meetings	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Yes	Yes	All SLTs met during FFY 2016
Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website	Deferred	No	No	Evaluation results indicated that an SSIP-specific website was not an effective means of collaboration. Activity replaced with an integrated approach where tools and resources will be made available through existing LDOE web pages.
Activities Begun in FFY 2017 (SY 2017 – 2018)				
Literacy Leadership Launch	June 2017	Yes	Yes	All SSIP cohort school systems and schools participated. The LDOE used evaluation results to restructure and align this with the Teacher Leader initiative.
Mentor Teacher and Content Leader Trainings	Fall 2017 – Spring 2018; will repeat in future years	Yes	Yes	Two SSIP cohort school systems participated. Anticipate additional school systems will participate in future years.
LEAP 360 Adoption	Fall 2017	Yes	Yes	All SSIP cohort school systems adopted LEAP 360 during the 2017-2018 school year. This activity will continue in future years.
SSIP Aligned Professional Development Planning	Fall 2017	Yes	Yes	SSIP-specific funding plan. Each SSIP school system receives a supplemental allocation to support the implementation of evidence-based practices. SSIP cohort school systems

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
				submitted plans to address each coherent improvement strategy. The LDOE provided specific feedback to ensure plans aligned to strategies and deepened connections to existing school system planning processes.
ESSA School System Plan	Fall 2017 – Spring 2018	Yes	Yes	SSIP cohort system are required to submit a school system plan to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups, including students with disabilities. The plan must incorporate core academic components including high-quality curriculum while addressing unique populations like students with disabilities. Submission, review and approval are in process.
Activities Begun in FFY 2018 (SY 2018 – 2019)				
Teacher Leader Summit	June 2018; will repeat in future years.	Yes	Yes	In planning stages. SSIP / SPDG track with sessions on coherent improvement strategies planned.
Virtual Support	Fall 2018 – Spring 2019; will repeat in future years.	Yes	Yes	The LDOE hosted monthly virtual support calls for the SSIP cohort throughout FFY 2018.
Diverse Learner Supports Pilot	Fall 2018	Yes	Yes	The LDOE academic content team conducted the Diverse Learner Pilot in Fall 2018. The data collected from the pilot is being used to make necessary edits to the supports developed and to inform statewide scale-up planning.
Intensive Intervention Program Reviews	Spring 2018 – Winter 2019	Yes	Yes	The first phase of this work focuses on developing an intensive intervention program review rubric and defining what we want this work to look like in school systems. After soliciting feedback from various stakeholders a second draft of high-quality criteria for intensive intervention materials. Upon

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
				completion of the Intensive Intervention Review Rubric Teacher Leaders began to review various programs against established criteria. The LDOE expects to release the results of these reviews in Spring 2020.
Activities Begun in FFY 2019 (SY 2019 – 2020)				
Foundational Skills Support	Fall 2019; will repeat in future years	Yes	Yes	In FY 2019, the SSIP cohort piloted curriculum embedded foundational skills support materials to support students in grades three through five with persistent gaps in foundational reading skills. These materials provided valuable information to the level of training teachers need to identify and close gaps in foundational reading skills for students in grades three through five.
Intervention Content Leader Trainings	Summer 2019; will repeat in future years	Yes	Yes	In FY 2019, the LDOE launched the first year of Intervention Content Leader. Intervention Content Leader provided nine-days of training to pairs of school building leaders and teachers in the approaches and structures necessary to provide curriculum embedded supports and interventions. These trainings will be revised based on extensive feedback and continue through FY 2020.
Activities to Begin in FFY 2020 (SY 2020 – 2021)				
Intensive Intervention Pilot	Fall 2020	Yes	Yes	The SSIP cohort will pilot vetted Intensive Intervention materials to develop implementation guidance for state-wide scale-out.

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

Each of the coherent improvement strategies has a series of activities (some independent, some interconnected) with correlated outputs. Outputs are the direct products of program activities; they are the quantitative measurements and evidence that the SSIP was implemented as planned. These activities

and outputs will drive the short term and ultimately the long-term outcomes. The table below describes the key activities for FFY 2016 through the start of FFY 2018 and the intended outputs accomplished as a result. It does not include activities completed before FFY 2016.

Table B.2: FFY 2016-2018 Key Activities with Outputs Accomplished

Activity	Correlated Output from Logic Model
Foundational Professional Development (Data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of professional development activity reports produced. Activity reports capture the participant information, training hours, area of focus, cost, etc. During the reporting period, a professional development activity report was produced for each session. ● The percent of participants who agreed the in-person professional development increased their knowledge and skills. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the in-person professional development increased their knowledge and skills in data-informed decision-making to improve instruction for students with disabilities.
Online Learning Modules Schools (Data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Training materials. Vendor submitted five online learning modules. ● Evidence that SSIP school system schools attended trainings. Professional development activity reports show that all schools completed professional development sessions. ● The number of participants who agreed the online learning modules improved the implementation of the evidence-based practices. In FFY 2016, respondents indicated that the online learning modules provided were of moderate quality. The LDOE is adjusting frequency and content for future trainings.
DLT + SLT Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In previous years the LDOE identified that an isolated SSIP team planning process had limited impact. The LDOE adjusted in FFY 2017 to integrate and align with existing school system planning processes. Now, all SSIP planning is fully integrated into the larger school system wide planning process. This occurs through Super App, in which school systems develop and submit a single plan with an aligned budget for all key activities and funding sources. The LDOE reviews and approves those plans through a cross-functional review team, and approves competitive funding that further proven levers of change articulated in the school systems plan.

<p>Literacy Leadership Launch – Foundational PD for SSIP School Systems and Schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of PD activity reports produced. In FFY 2016, a PD activity report was produced for each session. ● The LDOE measured the gain in knowledge and skills through a pre/posttest. The percent of participants who answered knowledge questions correctly increased by 22.2 percentage points (from 52.9% to 74.1%) and 18.4 percentage points (from 56.3% to 74.7%), during the first and second round of training, respectively.
<p>Content Leader Training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By January 2020 all SSIP school sites have participated in the Content Leader and/or Intervention Content Leader Initiatives.
<p>LEAP 360 Adoption</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of SSIP systems that adopted LEAP 360. In the SSIP reporting period, all SSIP cohort school systems adopted LEAP 360. The number of SSIP school systems that participated in aligned, ongoing professional development focused on initial adoption and use. All SSIP cohort school systems participated in professional development.
<p>SSIP Aligned Professional Development Planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of school systems that submitted professional development plans aligned with high-quality curriculum and other coherent improvement strategies. All SSIP school systems have submitted professional development plans during the reporting period. ● The number of school systems that have approved plans. The LDOE does not approve plans unless they align to the coherent improvements strategies. All school systems continue to have an approved professional development plan throughout the SSIP reporting period.
<p>Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This activity has been replaced with an integrated approach where tools and resources will be made available through existing LDOE web pages, increasing alignment and scale-up potential.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (B.2)

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

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

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

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

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

As the SSIP moved from data review to development to implementation, needs have changed. During the plan's development, the LDOE brought together a group of stakeholders who could engage in the deep thinking and planning needed to develop the SSIP. Now, as implementation continues, the SSIP needs detailed, analytic feedback on specific tools and resources that are being piloted in the SSIP cohort before being scaled up throughout the state. For example, the [Diverse Learners Guide](#) and the [Intensive Intervention Materials Rubric](#) require expert feedback from English language arts and special education specialists. To achieve that, the LDOE has created a cohort of Teacher Leader Advisors from across the state who are developing specific tools and resources, including a build out of ELA Guidebooks for diverse learners, including students with disabilities. The LDOE has also continued the successful Institute of Higher Education (IHE) Advisory Partner program that brings together a team of higher education officials with expertise in English language arts and special education to advise LDOE in the development of the tools and resources for educators and the evaluation. Both the Teacher Leader Advisors and the IHE Advisory Partners come from across the state, ensuring that the tools and resources will reflect the diverse needs of all educators.

In addition to engaging experts in this work, the LDOE, through various partnerships, has sought literacy-focused input from parents of students with disabilities. We are collaborating with our Parent Training and Information Center, Exceptional Lives Louisiana, and Fast Talk to host focus groups to identify the needs families across our state might have in assisting with achieving the goals of our SSIP. These partnerships have been critical in advancing the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices and at building relationships that drive student outcomes. For example, Fast Talk has collaborated with our Academic Content team to design a sequence of curriculum specific text messages, available in many languages that are sent to parents throughout the course of a unit. These text messages provide specific activities, vocabulary support, and background knowledge to empower parents to support literacy instruction. Throughout FFY 2018, our SSIP cohort has continued to partner with Fast Talk to provide evidence-based literacy resources to parents that align to the high-quality instruction being delivered in classrooms each day. This work has continued to be invaluable resource to school systems statewide as it has been scaled beyond the SSIP cohort. This stakeholder engagement strategy is not only focused on

compliance with ESSA and advancing the work of the SSIP, but is also utilizing these opportunities to support the development, implementation, and achievement of Louisiana’s long-term education plan.

DATA ON IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES (C)

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

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

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

The LDOE thoughtfully developed a logic model to implement the SSIP and guide evaluation. The logic model is a visual representation of the SSIP’s strategies and objectives, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. Please see the logic model on the next page for additional information.

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

For the purposes of this report, key measures are the student-centered outcome measures outlined in the logic model. Louisiana has identified three key measures in the table below. They are ordered from the most immediate measure of improved literacy outcomes, followed by longer-term change in the SSIP cohort, and finally longer-term change across the state. Louisiana includes both short and long-term measures because, according to implementation science, it takes two to four years to establish a “fully implemented evidence-based program implementation in a new community.”² As a result, LDOE expects some change to take years. The LDOE cannot wait years to evaluate success; thus, earlier proof points to gauge effectiveness were established.

² [University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. National Implementation Research Network. “Full Implementation”.](#)

STRATEGY & OBJECTIVE

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

ACTIVITIES

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

OUTPUTS

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

SYSTEM-LEVEL OUTCOMES

STATE-LEVEL

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

DISTRICT-LEVEL

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

SCHOOL-LEVEL



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



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

TEACHER-LEVEL



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

- Teachers effectively use literacy strategies grounded in quality text.

*STUDENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES

SHORT TERM

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

MEDIUM TERM

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

LONG TERM

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

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

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

Student-Centered Outcome Measure	Data Source
Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3 rd – 5 th grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the immediate, short-term measure.	The SSIP utilizes LEAP 360 (a new statewide assessment system with diagnostic and interim assessments aligned to state standards) to measure student progress throughout the school year as well as curriculum imbedded formative assessments.
Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.	Each year, the LDOE analyzes statewide assessment results for the SSIP cohort of third, fourth and fifth grade students in nine school systems across the state.
Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.	The SSIP activities planned and completed will lay the foundation for eventual scale-up to improve literacy proficiency rates for students with disabilities in 3 rd – 5 th grades, across the state. When we begin to implement scale-up activities, we will expect to “move the needle” on state-level ELA proficiency results.

The table above outlines key measures for student-centered literacy outcomes. However, in order to measure progress effectively, the LDOE is evaluating progress in the fidelity of implementation. For example, if we do not see students with disabilities progress in interim assessments throughout the year, we must evaluate whether the process to implement evidence-based literacy practices was done with fidelity. If they were implemented with fidelity, the LDOE and SPDG must evaluate whether it is the most effective evidence-based practice. In our model, we will review whether educators are implementing evidence-based practices as intended, whether educators engage in opportunities for feedback and reflection, and whether school and school system leadership teams are effectively analyzing data to make decisions. All of these processes will impact the progress toward the student-centered outcome. See section A. 4 “A Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes”, for a description of each activity, with measures of process and outcome, and the resulting adjustments planned for FFY 2019.

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

Table C.2: FFY 2018 Student-Centered Outcome Measures with Results

Student-Centered Outcome Measure	Results
Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3 rd – 5 th grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the immediate, short-term measure.	In FFY 2018, all SSIP school system proficiency levels increased on LEAP 360 literacy assessments.

Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.	In FFY 2018, 32.72% of students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort achieved a proficient score on the statewide assessments.
Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.	Each year, the LDOE reports on the proficiency rates (basic and above) of all students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and high school. This is reported in the APR, under Indicator 3C. Results are as follows, FFY 2013: 36.98%; FFY 2014: 36.64%; FFY 2015: 38.21%. FFY 2016: 38.70%. FFY 2017: 34.03%. FFY 2018: 39.43%.

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

The LDOE has developed a data collection plan that will yield valid and reliable data applicable to the SiMR at regular intervals. Using the data collection plan, the LDOE will collect both implementation and outcome data. These pieces of data will be used to conduct the evaluation. To increase the fidelity of data collection and analysis, the LDOE partnered with the Center for Evaluation, Policy & Research (CEPR) at Indiana University beginning in FFY 17. CEPR has helped to strengthen the LDOE’s existing evaluation tools, increased the fidelity to which data is collected, and provided deeper analysis and meaning to data collected.

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

Implementation measures: the LDOE will collect implementation data from measurement tools including the SPDG Evidence-based PD Components Rubric; the LDOE developed Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix, the Curriculum Implementation Scale, PD Activity Tracker, the ESSA School System Plan Review Tool, and the SSIP Aligned PD Planning Review Tool.

Table C.3: Annual Data Collection Timeline

Measurement Tool	Description	Who Completes	Timeline
Formative Assessments	Measures student progress toward grade-level standards as well as student growth throughout the school year.	Students complete assessments; school systems and the LDOE review and analyze results.	Three times per year
Summative Assessments	Measures student achievement on statewide assessments	Students complete assessments; school systems and the LDOE	Annual

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

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

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

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

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

The LDOE will use student achievement results over time to demonstrate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies. The LDOE established a baseline and targets to measure improvements in literacy outcomes. The LDOE targeted increasing ELA results on statewide assessments in eight school systems, for grades three through five. The established targets will measure whether student achievement improved over time in the targeted grade levels in those school systems. In addition, formative assessments will monitor progress of targeted students over the course of the school year and can be used to monitor progress at the school and school system level. The evaluation plan uses this comparison methodology to link the coherent improvement strategies to both implementation (process) and outcomes measures.

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

In the SSIP framework, data management and data analysis are integrated at all levels of the system—state, school system, school and teacher—in order to assess progress toward achieving intended improvements and to adjust course as necessary. The LDOE has developed data collection procedures that hold all parties accountable for obtaining valid and reliable process and outcome data focused on 1)

high-quality evidence-based measurement tools, 2) accountability and consistency across school systems at the state-level, and 3) a culture of immediate and systematic feedback. Below are examples that illustrate how each of these components work in practice. However, it should be noted that the full system and scale of data management and data analysis procedures are more expansive than what can be included here.

- **High-quality evidence-based measurement tools.** At the state-level, the LDOE conducts all outcome measure analyses for formative and summative assessments. The LDOE has strong assessment protocols for school systems, schools, and teachers. This includes [assessment guidance](#), sample test items, practice tests, test coordinator support, and more. All other measurement tools, such as the Curriculum Implementation Observation Tool, are vetted and adjusted in collaboration with CEPR to ensure they are supported by moderate or strong evidence. This ensures that the tools measure their intended outcomes.
- **Accountability and consistency across school-systems and at the state-level.** Consistent with LDOE operating practices, the management process including data collection, validation, analysis and distribution, is planned out at the beginning of the school year. The LDOE utilizes our field facing network coaches to collect all necessary SSIP data. CEPR and the LDOE provide detailed, explicit directions on when and how data will be collected throughout the year for various SSIP tools.
- **Immediate and systematic feedback.** The LDOE reviews and verifies all results provided by school systems. LDOE's Strategic Research and Analysis (SRAA) team, staffed by statistical, data, and assessment experts, conducts all analytic research. The LDOE has built a system that progresses from data collection, to verification, to analysis, and finally to school system and state-level review of results. When connected to the structured data inquiry process, school systems have the information they need to measure progress and adjust course in a timely manner. The LDOE began working with school systems in FFY 2015, and schools in FFY 2016. Each year, protocols for data management and analysis are developed and refined based on practical experience in the field. To further the quality of data collection and management an external evaluation partner, The Center for Evaluation, Policy, & Research (CEPR) was brought on in FFY 2017 to assist in the evaluation of our SSIP work. CEPR has assisted by providing further vetting of our current evaluation tools, strategies for increasing the fidelity of collected data, as well as thoughtful data analysis that assists in future planning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Louisiana’s adjustments to SSIP implementation is responsive to data and continuous. The LDOE has an established process for frequent data reviews at the state, school system, and school levels. These reviews examine the effectiveness of implementation, assess progress toward achieving intended improvements, and inform modifications to the SSIP.

The LDOE reviewed both quantitative and qualitative data to gauge progress toward achieving intended improvement to infrastructure and SiMR. The LDOE continues to focus around four critical infrastructure improvement priorities:

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

Since infrastructure, improvements do not have an immediate, direct impact on the SiMR—assessing ELA proficiency of students with disabilities in third through fifth grades—LDOE has relied on qualitative results to gauge success. The LDOE reviewed a number of data points that reflected progress made and spurred further action. The LDOE defined clear goals for each of the infrastructure improvement priorities and then measured whether activities needed to achieve those goals were fully in place, partially in place, or not in place. Throughout Phase III of the SSIP, the LDOE continues to adjust planning to achieve key infrastructure changes as outlined above. Please see the “Infrastructure Improvement Strategies”, section A.2.B for detailed information on infrastructure changes in the four priority areas.

In the SSIP, every action or activity is designed and executed with one ultimate goal in mind: to drive improvement in ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades. ELA proficiency rates are a proxy for literacy--Louisiana’s ultimate goal is to educate learners who can read, understand and express understanding of complex grade-level texts. In FFY 2017, the LDOE continued to support educators in utilizing databased decision-making to support the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices through our Diverse Learners Pilot. This work has yielded promising results for students with disabilities and helped to inform the statewide scale-up of such practices.

Throughout implementation, the LDOE and SSIP participants have both reviewed a number of quantitative data points including formative assessment results and summative assessment results. The LDOE reviewed these data points to understand the large-scale needs of the SSIP cohort. SSIP participants reviewed the data points to understand their specific strengths and needs, conduct root cause analysis, and develop a plan to address their needs. School systems have submitted their plans through the School

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

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

Throughout Phase III of the SSIP, our cohort needs have changed in ways that were not anticipated. Due to the changing needs within school systems, four of the original nine school systems have decided to discontinue participation in the SSIP cohort. Because of these changes, FFY 2018 is the first year that results from the new redesigned cohort are reported. The change in participating school systems reflects the FFY 2016 alignment of the SSIP with Louisiana’s SPDG and ESSA. Louisiana selected school systems with ESSA designations that indicated significant gaps between students with disabilities and their grade-level peers. The SSIP leadership team, along with stakeholders, agreed that aligning the work of the SSIP and ESSA would ensure that the SSIP accurately captured and supported the efforts necessary to improve outcomes for students with disabilities across Louisiana. Due to these changes, SiMR data for FY 2018 did not meet established targets. For this reason, the LDOE is relying on more immediate measures of progress such as the Curriculum Implementation Tool, and the Evidence-Based Literacy Practices Matrix to ensure SSIP activities are leading to improvements in the SiMR overtime. These components of data combined provides powerful insight to the work necessary to improve literacy rates for students with disabilities across Louisiana.

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

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Targets	36%	36%	36%	37%	39%	42%
SSIP Cohort Results <i>*Indicates new cohort</i>	34.68%	34.97%	33.98%	39.81%	39.12%	*32.27%
Statewide Students with Disabilities	36.98%	36.64%	38.21%	38.70%	34.03%	39.43%

Other sections of this report contain additional information on evidence of change to baseline data for key measures. Please see C.1.B “Data Sources for Each Key Measure” for additional information on baseline data on the student-centered outcome measures, and A.4 “A Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes” for a description of each activity, with measures of process and outcomes, and adjustments to plans for FFY 2019.

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

The LDOE considers all evaluation data, including fidelity and outcomes measures, to identify needed changes. The LDOE will continue to utilize the SSIP cohort to identify best practices tools, resources and supports for school systems across the state, including the continued implementation of Diverse Learners supports, foundational literacy resources, and expanding our Content Leader initiative to include capacity

for implementing literacy Interventions. For more information on the data and these changes, please see section A.4 “Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes” and B.2.B “How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP”.

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

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

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

For information on how data support planned modification to intended outcomes, rationale or justification for the changes, or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path, please note that section C.2.C “How Data Support Changes to Implementation and Improvement Strategies” includes an example of how the data show the SSIP is on the right path. While progress has been made, the evaluation results indicate room for improvement. Please see section A.4, “Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes” and B.2.B, “How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making Regarding the Ongoing Implementation of the SSIP” for additional information.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SSIP EVALUATION (C.3)

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

Please see section B.2.B, “How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making Regarding the Ongoing Implementation of the SSIP” for additional information on how stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP.

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

Please see section B.2.B, “How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making Regarding the Ongoing Implementation of the SSIP” for additional information on how stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES (D)

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

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

The LDOE has developed an evaluation plan to measure progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR—with outcome and process measures. All evaluations must contend with data limitations, such as collecting valid and reliable data or collecting data that does not accurately reflect results achieved. As implementation continues, some data limitations have become known related to changes within the SSIP cohort and changes to school system infrastructure.

Changes within the SSIP cohort over time. Due to the long-term commitment of the SSIP, work and changing personnel and priorities within school systems our SSIP cohort has changed overtime. Three of the original nine school systems have decided to discontinue their participation in the SSIP cohort. To stabilize the cohort and maintain the integrity of data collection, three new school systems were identified, through the school redesign process, to participate in the SSIP cohort. These new members of the cohort are school systems that have been identified as having low performance for particular sub-group student populations, specifically students with disabilities. These three new school systems are exceptionally eager to engage in the work of our SSIP. Because of these changes, any comparison of the cohort over time will be challenging.

Challenges resulting from changing conditions at the state-level. In 2017, the LDOE reorganized the SPDG grant to improve the state’s capacity to implement the coherent improvement strategies with fidelity to achieve the SiMR. This reorganization lead to the implementation of new evaluation tools that best capture the data needed to demonstrate intended outcomes. As these new tools were implemented and our evaluation partner was added to our team, evaluation tools have been further refined to ensure higher fidelity. While increasing the quality and fidelity of measurement tools is a valuable change it does create limitations on data comparison, making it harder to compare previous progress to current progress. However, the benefit of improving an instrument that efficiently and accurately measures the intended outcomes outweighs the disadvantages. The LDOE expects to encounter changing conditions throughout the SSIP implementation period, and plans to apply the same focused decision-making to determine the best way to adjust course.

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

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

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

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

PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E)

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

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

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

- 1) Aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s SPDG grant.
- 2) Expanding the portfolio of ELA academic content work to target improvements for students with disabilities.
- 3) Developing educators.
- 4) Aligning the SSIP with the state’s ESSA plan.

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

The SSIP is deeply aligned with the Academic Content Team to achieve these outcomes. Louisiana has emphasized high-quality curricula with a belief that local school systems are best positioned to make curricular decisions, and the LDOE is well positioned to support these decisions. The LDOE is providing schools with tools, resources and professional development aligned with top-rated curricula to ensure effective implementation. The emphasis on curricula is producing results: Louisiana’s fourth grade students achieved the highest growth amongst all states on the 2015 NAEP for reading. Further, there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating the efficacy of high-quality curricula on improving student outcomes.³ The SSIP is aligned with this work to ensure that these results extend to struggling readers, including students with disabilities. In FFY 2017, the LDOE piloted evidence-based literacy practices that supported students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort. Through the evaluation, the LDOE was able to identify those practices that worked best and then utilized those to update the ELA Guidebooks—the LDOE’s own high-quality ELA curricula for grades 3-12. ELA Guidebooks are available to all Louisiana educators free of charge. Through the pilot of evidence-based literacy practices in the SSIP cohort it was found that, our current Guidebook curriculum needed a foundational component to truly meet the needs of every learner and educators needed further guidance on how to implement such resources. In response, the ELA academic content team has utilized a team of Teacher Leader Advisors to build out evidence-based foundational literacy components for the Guidebooks curriculum. In addition, and to support the implementation of these supports, our special education team, academic content team, and

³ Click [here](#) for more information on Louisiana’s curricula-focused approach. Click [here](#) for additional national coverage on Louisiana’s NAEP growth.

workforce talent team have collaborated to build out our Content Leader Initiative to include an additional set of trainings titled Intervention Content Leader. This additional set of trainings pairs together an administrator and one educator from each participating school and facilitates the collaboration and the development of systems, structures, and plans that empower teachers to meet the needs of all students, including those needing intensive intervention. As discussed above, this approach will produce results that will be reflected in the SiMR. Sustainability and scale-up are organically embedded in the structure of this approach.

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

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

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

- Used the *SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric* to determine whether all professional development delivered to the SSIP cohort used professional development practices to support attainment of the identified competencies. The LDOE rates professional development using sixteen evidence-based professional development practices on a 1-4 scale. One indicates a lack of evidence-based practices, while a four indicates strong evidence-based practices. Fourteen of sixteen practices were rated a three or four, indicating that professional development for SSIP school systems uses strong evidence-based practice.
- Used the *Evidence-Based Literacy Practices Matrix* to determine whether SSIP cohort schools were implementing the evidence-based practices in the schools and classrooms with fidelity. All SSIP schools assess their use of twenty-three evidence-based literacy practices in the classroom. For the SSIP reporting period, the percentage of schools demonstrating that the use of the twenty-three evidence-based practices at a level 2 or 3 on a 0-3 scale increased from 69% to 81%. This increase in use of evidence based literacy practices demonstrate that there is significant evidence that our coherent improvement strategies are achieving the intended results and will lead to increases in the SiMR.

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

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

- Used a categorical analysis to measure student progress on formative literacy assessments across the SSIP cohort, during the school year. In FFY 2016, SSIP schools saw 40% of students with disabilities in third grade, 36% in fourth grade, and 43% in fifth grade demonstrate improvement by one or more proficiency levels on their respective formative literacy assessments.
- Use implementation monitoring tools, such as the Curriculum Implementation Observation Tool, to closely measure the fidelity to which practices are implemented. From FFY 2017 to FFY 2018

the percentage of classrooms implementing evidence-based practices as intended increased from 54% to 86% indicating progress in implantation year to year.

- Used statewide assessments to measure student progress in achieving grade-level English language arts standards, school year over school year.

The student-level outcomes, particularly the statewide assessment results, indicate that the evidence-based practices are having the desired effects.

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

Louisiana’s SiMR measures ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades three through five, in the SSIP cohort of nine school systems across the state. The table below shows the cohort’s results on statewide assessments since FFY 2013:

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

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
SSIP Cohort Results	34.68%	34.97%	33.98%	39.81%	39.12%	32.27%

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

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

Please see table below for targets through FFY 2018. Please see section E.1.C above for SSIP cohort SiMR results from FFY 2013 to FFY 2017. It is important to note that while Louisiana reports on data and targets for FFY 2013, through FFY 2017, initial implementation began in FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE expected to see change in student outcomes in the SiMR beginning in FFY 2016, which is noted in section E.1.C.

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

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

PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR (F)

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

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

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

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

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

The LDOE identified barriers to implementation as part of the Infrastructure Analysis completed during Phase I and updated during Phase II. Now in Phase III, barriers and steps to address those barriers are identified through the evaluation process. Section D.1, “Concerns or Limitations Related to the Quality or Quantity of the Data Used to Report Progress or Results” describes some of these barriers and how they were addressed including 1) changes within the SSIP cohort over time and 2) challenges resulting from changing conditions at the state-level.

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

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

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

OSEP can assist the LDOE by

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

These resources will help the LDOE address barriers to improving literacy results for students with disabilities in grades three through five.

APPENDIX A – SSIP CONTRIBUTORS

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

SSIP LEADERSHIP TEAM	
Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Stacey Labit-Moorehead	Special Education Policy
Angelle Lailhengue	Academic Content

ADVISORY PARTNERS		
Representative	Organization	Area of Expertise
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center	Facilitation, Evaluation
Kerri White	South Central Comprehensive Center	State Capacity
Dr. Marcey A Moss	Center for Evaluation, Policy, & Research (CEPR) Indiana University	Evaluation
Amy Peterson	National Center for Systemic Improvement	Literacy
Jill Pentimonti	National Center for Intensive Intervention	Literacy
Dr. Shalanda Stanley	University of Louisiana - Monroe	Special Education, Literacy
Dr. Keita Wilson	University of Louisiana - Lafayette	Special Education

EVALUATION TEAM	
Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Dr. Marcey Moss	Center for Education Evaluation and Policy
Stacey Labit-Moorehead	Special Education Policy
Holli Jessee	Academic Content
Jennifer Wichers	Academic Content

Andrew Shachat	Office of School Improvement
Delaina LaRocque	Office of School Improvement
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy

LITERACY SPECIALIST GROUP	
Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Holli Jessee	Academic Content
Emily Kaiser	Academic Content
Angelle Lailhengue	Academic Content
Jennifer Wichers	Academic Content
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Jill Slack	Academic Content

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL	
Panel Member	Panel Role
Jackie Tisdell	Panel Co-Chair; Parent of a child with a disability
Belinda Davis	Panel Co-Chair; BESE member
Donna Reno	Parent of a child with a disability
Alissa Kilpatrick	Parent of a child with a disability
Nicole Flores	Parent of a child with a disability
Brenda Cosse	Parent of a child with a disability
Kelly Fleming	Parent of a child with a disability
Tamara Crane	Parent of a child with a disability
Cheramie Kerth	Administrator of a program serving students with disabilities
Carla Parrie	Administrator of a program serving students with disabilities
RaeNell Houston	Representative of a private school / Parent
Carolyn McGee	Representative from the state juvenile and adult correctional agency

Katherine Chenier	Representative of Charter Schools
Randall Brown	Individual with a disability
Kelly Boyter	Individual with a disability
Henry Brinkmann	Individual with a disability
Keita Wilson	Representative of Higher Education
LaTrese LeCour	Representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care
Kristen McDaniel	Teacher
Lindsey Jackson	Teacher
Sylvia Melancon	Representative of a state agency responsible for related services
Kellie Taylor-White	Representative of a state agency responsible for related services
Shayla G. Hilaire	An official who carries out activities under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and a parent of a child with a disability
Melissa Bayham	Representative of vocational, community, or business providing transition
Kristi-Jo Preston	LDOE Staff Coordinator