State of Oklahoma

Part B SSIP Narrative: Phase III Year Three

April 1, 2019

Oklahoma State Department of Education, Special Education Services

Table of Contents

Introduction

Starting with the FFY 2013 APR submission in April 2015, the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) required all state education agencies to develop a state systemic improvement plan (SSIP) as part of OSEP's updated state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) process. Each state had to analyze infrastructure and performance weaknesses in Phase I (FFY 2013), create the improvement plan in Phase II (FFY 2014), and implement the plan in Phase III (FFY 2015 to 2018). States were to define their plans with a desired outcome in mind.

SIMR: State-identified measureable result

In Phases I and II, Oklahoma Part B SSIP stakeholders decided to target third grade reading assessment scores as its State-identified Measureable Result (SIMR) to improve student literacy across the state. In response to OSEP recommendations, Phase II stakeholder discussions produced a refined SIMR that targeted Tulsa County public school districts. This SIMR was later modified twice to reflect new proficiency expectations resulting from changes in the state's content standards and assessments:

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

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

System-focused, State-wide Infrastructure

1. Develop data tracking mechanism for children exiting SoonerStart (Oklahoma's Part C early intervention program) and entering an LEA;
2. Implement a new differentiated monitoring system that incorporates performance measures, such as reading assessment performance;

Site-specific Support (Evidence-based Practices)

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

---

[1] Please refer to the beginning of Section One for a description and justification of the changes to the SIMR targets.
[2] The Phase II report describes in more detail why Tulsa County districts were selected. There are fourteen districts in the county.

Theory of action summary

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

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

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

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

| *Practical training* | **Strategy 5**
Provide access to early literacy resources for families with 3-5 year olds in the target area

Strategy 6
Provide targeted professional development to LEA personnel in evidence-based practices in early literacy. | When parents engage in daily literacy activities such as reading aloud with their children, their children show significantly improved cognitive growth, enabling them to enter school ready to learn and preparing them for substantial literacy gains as they move from grade to grade.

Teachers who are knowledgeable in evidence-based reading practices in early grades provide a solid foundation for student achievement in reading. This foundation will help students transition from learning to read to reading to learn as they advance through the grades. |

Expected changes

In summary, all of these activities and strategic changes through the lifecycle of the SSIP are expected to lead to substantial improvements in infrastructure and parent and teacher knowledge and skills in literacy that will encourage improved performance for all special education students on the third grade reading assessment. When all improvement strategies are fully implemented, Oklahoma expects to see the following changes in its infrastructure and programs:

1. All children transitioning from Part C to public school districts will maintain their state identification number, facilitating a smooth transition from Part C to Part B, promoting greater continuity of services and supports, and permitting long-term assessment of the benefits of participation in early intervention on school outcomes;

2. School performance will be incorporated into annual district determinations, enabling the state to provide greater oversight and support to struggling districts and highlight those that exceed expectations;

3. Parents and other caregivers will advocate for their students' access to and use of assistive technology and accommodations in the classroom and on assessments, as appropriate, to enhance students' engagement, learning and performance in school;

4. Teachers and service providers will understand and apply core knowledge related to assistive technology and accommodations in the classroom and on assessments;

5. All students with disabilities who may benefit from any form of assistive technology will be identified early and will receive appropriate aid through the support of their teachers and related service providers;

6. All students with disabilities who need accommodations in the classroom and on assessments will be identified early and will receive the support they need to be successful;

7. All families with preschool-age children in the targeted region will receive meaningful early literacy information that highlight local resources and supports, leading to increased caregiver engagement in evidence-based practices that promote early literacy; and

8. All educators will be well-trained in early literacy evidence-based practices and will receive individualized coaching support so that they can improve their students' literacy in the classroom.

Section One: Summary of Year Three of Phase III

After two consecutive years of major assessment changes that resulted in dramatically reduced SIMR outcomes and targets, Oklahoma's SIMR achievement dropped for a third year in a row (Table 2). Districts did not, on average, increase their proficiency rates on the third grade reading assessment. Tulsa County districts were not the only ones to experience lower rates of proficiency in FFY 2017, however. Statewide, districts experienced a drop in achievement rates for general enrollment and special education students. The lower achievement rates are due to a number of factors that include a high rate of teacher turnover and an associated jump in emergency certifications among general education teachers (a full explanation of these factors was provided in the Indicator 3C APR slippage statement). Oklahoma's education system is facing significant challenges that are not easily offset by the SSIP improvement strategies described here.

Table 2: Third Grade Reading Proficiency SIMR Targets & Data for FFY 2013-2018					
	FFY 2014	**FFY 2015**	**FFY 2016**	**FFY 2017**	**FFY 2018**
Targets	54.00%	24.0%	14.88%	15.15%	15.50%
Actual County Rate	22.76%	22.79%	14.88%	10.5%	

Of all districts in Tulsa County, 22 percent improved their proficiency rate on the third grade reading assessment between FFY 2016 and FFY 2017. Five districts had zero students rated proficient or better. Rates ranged from zero percent to 34 percent in FFY 2017.

Year three accomplishments

Despite these challenges, the Oklahoma SSIP team has made progress on the implementation of each improvement strategy in year three (FFY 2017), although the degree of progress varies substantially among strategies. The SSIP team is confident that Oklahoma is on target for meeting many of its strategic implementation goals that may affect the SIMR in the long-run. The following list highlights strategic achievements in year three.

Strategy 1: The mechanism for assigning unique identification numbers to Part C eligible children has been implemented and is working consistently the majority of the time. Students are maintaining their numbers when they transition to Part B.

Strategy 2: The differentiated monitoring system adopted in year two was updated for year three and continues to be implemented successfully. Fewer districts were found to need "assistance" (Level 2 Support) or "intervention" (Level 3 Support) in year three than the previous year.

Strategy 3: In partnership with the Oklahoma Parent Center, a community-based training was developed to share information about IEPs with parents of young children. Content included specifics about assistive technology and accommodations. The training was delivered at four locations to more than 30 families.

Strategy 4: Accommodations training for general and special educators was scaled-up via in-person and online training, reaching at least 35 additional districts across the state. Assistive technology training continued in the northeast and southwest regions, and was produced on and shared through a sustainable online format.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

Strategy 5: This strategy was delayed in year three. The SPDG partnership will hold its first parent outreach on early literacy in May 2019 in Sand Springs Public Schools.

Strategy 6: LETRS training is being provided in Sand Springs Public Schools after many delays due to changes in SPDG planning and personnel. Training will be completed in late spring 2019.

Stakeholder involvement

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

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

As implementation has become more routine, stakeholders have played a reduced role. All stakeholders are regularly informed of implementation updates and evaluation findings, including survey results. This report will be made available to stakeholders on the Part B state website, in the data section.

As the current SSIP cycle comes to its conclusion in the next year, the evaluation and leadership teams will meet with stakeholders to consider the success of the various strategies implemented through this SSIP and how similar activities could be improved in the future. Stakeholders will also convene to consider which systemic improvements should be implemented in future iterations of the SSIP. Such discussions will also include a review of the SIMR and the adoption of a new SIMR.

Evaluation summary

The SSIP evaluation team, which consists of OSDE-SES data analysts and evaluators, program specialists, and program directors, worked in year three to ensure that data were collected to measure progress on implementation as defined in each strategy's evaluation plan. Data collected through the SPDG partnership is limited (for strategies 5 and 6) because of changes in planning and personnel. Details about the strategic objectives and outcomes, findings and results are described in Section Two for each strategy. Please refer to the year two narrative report for each strategy's logic model.

Section Two: Strategy Descriptions

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

Implementation and evaluation timeframes

All strategy timeframes are generally aligned with the Oklahoma fiscal year, running from July to the following June. Planning for design and implementation of all improvement strategies began at the end of Phase II in April 2016. Implementation began for most strategies in fall 2016, the first year of Phase III (July 2016 to June 2017). Year three falls between July 2018 and June 2019. However, each strategy has a different start date and its baseline evaluation data were collected at different points in year one. This has caused the evaluation timeframe to vary across strategies, especially when we need to collect data annually (twelve months apart). Each strategy's evaluation timeframe is listed with the performance target data for that strategy.

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

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

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

Summary of progress: Year three

The implementation of this strategy has continued as planned. As of March 1, 2019, 77.5 percent of children eligible for services through the SoonerStart program during the past year have been assigned a unique STN. As in the previous year, there was a delay in STN assignments in fall 2018. The strategic leadership team has learned that it is due to personnel workloads; the file transfers must be done manually by individuals who are involved in several other data projects at the start of the public school year. The delays were resolved more quickly this year by instituting regular progress reviews of the data sharing steps. Processes such as these, including regular email updates among all parties, have been adopted to avoid the problem in fall 2019 or reduce its impact on SoonerStart.

Evaluation

No changes were made to the evaluation plan in year three. The strategic objectives and medium-term outcomes are:

Objective 1: Nearly every child will automatically be assigned an STN when determined eligible for SoonerStart services, starting March 2017

Objective 2: When an STN cannot be automatically assigned, personnel review potential conflicts on a timely basis, starting September 2017

Objective 3: LEA personnel activate transferred records on a timely basis, starting March 2017

Outcome 1: LEAs will maintain the STN provided to children who leave SoonerStart and enroll in the LEA

Outcome 2: The data mechanism process meets requirements for sustainability

Table 3 lists each objective and outcome and the program's status in the second evaluation year (year three of implementation) on the related performance measures.

Table 3: Strategy 1 Performance			
	Performance Measures	**Targets**	**Year Three Findings: Target Achievement**
Objective 1	1. Percent of SoonerStart children assigned an STN at eligibility 2. Percent of SoonerStart children transitioned with STN	90% in year two*; 95% in year three and beyond	Did not meet targets: 1. 77.5% assigned an STN[3] 2. 84.9% transitioned with an STN[4]
Objective 2	Percent of potential record conflicts reviewed within two weeks	95% in year two; 100% in year three and beyond	Approaching target: 95.0% reviewed timely[5]
Objective 3	1. Percent SoonerStart records transferred electronically 2. If transferred, percent records transferred timely (prior to TPC) 3. Percent records transferred timely that are activated timely (prior to TPC)	90% in year two; 95% in year three and beyond	Target met: 1. 100.0% transferred electronically Approaching target: 2. 92.0% of records were transferred timely Target not met: 3. 51.7% activated timely[6]

---

[3] Data source: Child records in SoonerStart database.

[4] Data source: Child records in SoonerStart database. Findings are based on a random sample of records of children who have transition target dates between January 1, 2019 and March 15, 2019. Children whose parents did not give consent to share records were not included in the sampling frame, nor were children who left SoonerStart prior to beginning the transition process. The sampling frame included 500 children. A random sample of 218 records was drawn from this population pool. This size of sample produces a margin of error of 5 percent and a confidence level of 95% for this size population.

[5] Data source: Statewide "STN Wizard" tool for reconciling student records

[6] Data source: Student records in Part B database; also for Outcome 1.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

Outcome 1	Of children transitioned with an STN, percent not assigned a new STN	95% in year two; 100% in year three and beyond	Approaching target: 98.0% not assigned a new STN
Outcome 2	The data system mechanism meets the following requirements for sustainability:[7] 1. leadership supports and advocates for the mechanism to stakeholders; 2. funding is secured for at least five years to maintain and improve the mechanism; 3. adequate processes are in place to identify and remedy system lapses; 4. documentation exists to transfer knowledge about the mechanism and all processes to new personnel.	Year two: elements 1, 2 and 3 are fully implemented Year three: Continued, with development of element 4 Year four: Continued, with element 4 fully implemented	Targets met: 1. leaders advocate strongly for the system and are involved in all decision-making 2. funding is secured[8] 3. processes are defined and implemented Approaching target: 4. documentation is in development[9]

*Year one had no implementation for this activity. Year two: 4/1/2017 to 3/30/2018; year three: 4/1/2018 to 3/30/2019.

Findings for performance measures 1.1 and 1.2 were lower than expected. The evaluation team attributes the low achievement rates to two things. First, for measure 1.1, the team believes the target for automatic assignment was set too high. No districts in the state have such high rates of automatic matching at enrollment, and conflicts that need to be resolved occur daily. Automatic assignments are made only when a child's information is unique enough to not be matched with a current student record. As the student population increases, the need to resolve potential conflicts between new and current records becomes more likely. This simply means that staff will need to spend more time reviewing "resolutions" prior to an STN being assigned. However, each resolution takes one to two minutes to complete, so the increased time will not be too challenging. Children will still receive STNs prior to transition to LEAs.

The second explanation for low rates applies to both performance measures. The state continues to face delays by one of its vendors with processing the full set of records sent to them. In February, for example, two files with over a thousand records were sent to the vendor for STN processing. Fewer than 100 records were returned. The leadership team is examining why so few records are being processed correctly and will resolve the issues as soon as possible. The vendor is on a standard contract for other services with the Agency, and OSDE-SES does not have much recourse to hold the vendor accountable for this specific service.

Of greater concern is the low activation rate on the districts' side after SoonerStart transferred children's SoonerStart records (objective 3.2). Because the transition planning conference (TPC) should be held with district representatives to help guide transition, the best practice is for district personnel to activate the record prior to the meeting so that all individuals involved can be knowledgeable about the child's history. Transferred SoonerStart records arrive in the district's online IEP system as inactive, where only district administrators can see them initially. The low activation rate suggests either that district personnel are arriving at the TPC without having seen the child's records (since

---

[7] Recommended characteristics derived from the DaSy-ECTA Quality System Framework.
[8] Data source: Project documentation
[9] Data source: Project documentation

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

SoonerStart is transferring 92 percent of records timely), or that administrators are printing copies of the records to give to personnel without activating them. The evaluation team will review user actions more closely to determine which happens more frequently. Data will also be reviewed to determine whether there are regional or district patterns to the low activation rates.

Activities in year four

The activities in year four will continue to focus on improving the functionality and sustainability of the strategy. The entire process will be fully documented as will all policies, practices and procedures involved in the oversight and implementation of the mechanism. Because its success relies heavily on the manual completion of several steps, proper documentation will sustain the initiative permanently.

In addition, the 619 coordinator, Part B program and data personnel, and SoonerStart personnel have committed to provide training across the state to support Part C to Part B transitions. This includes training on proper procedures and best practices for record reviews and the documentation of decisions. The evaluation team will continue to monitor districts' adherence to high quality practices for electronic transition between Part C and Part B. We will use this data to shape the content and format of future training, documentation and practice.

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

This infrastructure improvement is intended to ensure that districts are held accountable for compliance *and* performance indicators in the annual differentiated monitoring process. Oklahoma expects that with greater accountability for performance outcomes, districts will improve practice, leading to better student outcomes in academic performance. This improvement is critical to advancing the SIMR because districts are held accountable for students' assessment performance in comparison to the state target in the annual district determination. This will provide an additional incentive to improve educational practices that advance student performance. Through this process, OSDE-SES will provide specific supports districts as they identify weaknesses in practice and work toward change.

Summary of progress: Year three

Year three of Phase III has been extremely productive for this strategy. For a second year in a row, Oklahoma implemented the new differential monitoring (DM) system described in the year two narrative report. Of the approximately 545 operating LEAs in SY 2017-2018, 81 were assigned level two support and 13 were assigned level three support. None was assigned level four.

The leadership team completed all planned activities except one, and made substantial progress toward sustainability. Updated elements are documented in the updated GSS RBA and Monitoring Manual on the OSDE-SES Compliance website (https://sde.ok.gov/compliance) and in associated posted documents (such as the self-assessments).

1. The team incorporated a mechanism into the online district agreement and assurances process to identify new special education directors, enhancing the quality of the risk assessment. This was a planned activity identified in the year two narrative report.

2. Also as planned in last year's report, LEA communication improved and was standardized.

   a. Instead of sending out multiple notices over several months, all documentation related to the district data profiles, determinations, differentiated monitoring results, noncompliance findings, and significant disproportionality were sent out simultaneously on November 15, 2018, as planned.

   b. Information about required district activities at the DMR levels 2 and 3 support was shared via webinar to all identified districts. This ensured that all districts heard a consistent message from team leaders. The level 2 and level 3 webinars were held in early December, shortly after materials were sent to districts, and posted online.

3. Tracking improved for participation in training activities, which are counted as a bonus to moderate risk and determination scores. This improved overall data quality.

4. District self-assessments were updated substantially to incorporate root cause analysis, data-driven improvement, and district-led change. The review and rewriting took several months, and the self-assessments were completed in January 2019 for distribution to districts.

5. Two additional staff have been added to the monitoring and compliance team, augmenting the capacity of OSDE-SES to implement differential monitoring (DM) across all districts. This has alleviated strain on program personnel and reduced the need for expanded personnel training.

6. The monitoring and compliance worked with NCSI personnel over a day and a half to review and finalize policies, practices and procedures for the DM process.

7. All internal documentation for the DM process has been written and implemented.

8. A second data retreat was held successfully in January with 39 districts attending. The schedule for the data retreat was altered to allow time for districts to use the skills they learned to shape their self-assessments, professional development and improvement plans.

9. Feedback from districts has led to plans to make additional changes in the weights applied to compliance and performance measures on the determination.

Last year's report stated that Oklahoma would develop methods to identify top performing LEAs to serve as models to others while incentivizing high quality work. Unfortunately, the other updates to the overall system took precedence, and this activity has not yet been completed. Conversations with LEAs are occurring, with the intent to finalize incentives for exemplary work in year four.

Stakeholder Involvement

Primary stakeholders consist of two major groups: OSDE-SES personnel and LEA representatives. Although most of the work has been completed with the needs and requirements of OSDE-SES foremost, LEA feedback has been important for refining elements of the process, from communication procedures to the content of the risk and determination measures. LEA representatives have been notified of all changes prior to implementation, and consulted frequently for feedback. This year, for example, districts have been concerned about the weighting of early childhood outcomes (ECOs) in the determination. This is primarily a problem for smaller districts whose early childhood results can be dramatically affected by a handful of records that are not completed correctly. As a result of this concern, the OSDE-SES is re-weighting the ECOs on the SY 2018-2019 determinations.

Districts have responded very positively to the redesigned self-assessments, remarking that the updated questions have encouraged them to examine their data and practices more carefully than expected, leading to make important changes to policies and practices that should improve student outcomes.

Through surveys and conversation, districts also responded positively to the data retreat (focusing on root cause analysis). Those who participated have demonstrably better self-assessments, hopefully leading to improved outcomes in a variety of areas. Data retreat participants also shared ideas for improving the retreat over time, including incorporating an 'advanced' track for those who have attended in previous years. Oklahoma will take this advice and incorporate it into future plans.

Evaluation

The strategic objectives and medium-term outcomes reflect the need for permanent functionality and sustainability of the differentiated monitoring process:

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

Objective 2: The differentiated monitoring system design is high quality

Outcome 1: The differentiated monitoring system implementation is high quality

Outcome 2: The differentiated monitoring system is sustainable

Table 4 summarizes the performance measures, annual targets and target achievement for each of the objectives and outcomes. As mentioned in the summary of progress, substantial work has been done to meet the design, implementation and sustainability objectives and outcomes identified here. Only two elements have not been achieved: the design and implementation of a system for identifying and incentivizing exemplary work (objective 2 measure 3 and outcome 1 measure 4), and the alignment of this differentiated monitoring system within a unified, agency-wide monitoring approach (outcome 2 measure 6). Some informal coordinated work has been conducted, but broadly, the agency is not prepared to overhaul its monitoring systems yet.

	Performance Measures	Targets	Year Three Findings: Target Achievement
Table 4: Strategy 2 Performance			
Objective 1	The initial DM[10] model is launched by November 2017	Deadline is met	Deadline achieved

Objective 2	To demonstrate high quality, the DM system *design* is characterized by…[11]
	1. high data quality
	2. plans for:
	  a. timely communication
	  b. comprehensive LEA improvement
	  c. district-led change
	3. incentives for exemplary work
	4. full documentation
	5. active feedback loops to support continuous improvement
	6. training plan for SEA personnel
		Year two: partial to full implementation of all elements
		
		Years three/four: full implementation of all elements
			Targets met for each element except number 3:
			1. data are pulled from valid, reliable, complete sources;[12]
			2. plans are completed for:
			  a. LEA communication,
			  b. comprehensive improvement, and
			  c. district-led improvement;
			3. *incentives for exemplary work are developed in part*;
			4. documentation is complete;
			5. the SEA has mechanisms in place to acknowledge and respond to feedback; and
			6. the training plan for SEA personnel is completed.[13]

Outcome 1	The system implementation is high quality, characterized by… 1. efficient, timely, effective, clear and responsive implementation 2. accurate data reporting 3. timely, consistent communication 4. incentives for exemplary work 5. trained, capable SEA staff 6. full documentation 7. active feedback loops 8. data-informed improvement 9. district-led improvement	Year two: elements 1 to 3 fully implemented; elements 4 to 9 partially implemented Year three: growth and improvement in elements 1 to 3; elements 4 to 7 fully implemented; elements 8 to 9 partially implemented Year four: full implementation of all elements	Targets met for each element except 4: 1. implementation met goals; 2. data quality was very high and concerns were addressed immediately; 3. communication was timely; 4. *some incentives were provided;* 5. staff received training; 6. documentation is complete; 7. feedback loops are in place; 8. improvement is data-informed; and 9. improvement is district-led.

---

[10] DM: differentiated monitoring

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

[12] Data sources: Oklahoma State Aid and State Finance offices, EdPlan, and monitoring documentation

[13] Data sources: program documentation. Also for outcomes 1 and 2.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

Outcome 2	The DM system meets the following requirements for sustainability and continuous improvement:[14] 1. Leadership supports and advocates for the system to stakeholders; 2. Adequate processes are in place to include stakeholder input to identify enhancements to the system; 3. Documentation exists to transfer knowledge about the system to new personnel; 4. A comprehensive internal PD system is functional; 5. Ongoing assessment is used for continuous system improvement; 6. This system functions within a unified agency monitoring system for school support and improvement; and 7. The process and supporting components (personnel, TA) are sufficiently funded.	Year three: elements 1 to 4 are near full implementation; elements 5 to 7 are partially implemented Year four: all elements near full implementation	Targets met for each element except 6: 1. leadership supports and advocates for the system; 2. stakeholder input is incorporated; 3. documentation is adequate; 4. internal PD framework has been developed; 5. ongoing assessment conducted and influential; 6. *framework is not incorporated into agency monitoring system, but discussions have occurred;* and 7. funding is sufficient and sustainable.

*Year one: 7/1/2016 to 6/30/2017; year two: 7/1/2017 to 6/30/2018; year three: 7/1/2018 to 6/30/2019.

Lessons learned

A significant element of the success of the differentiated monitoring system for identifying districts in greater or less need of support is the accuracy of the weights assigned to the measures in the risk assessment and determination. A few point changes from one year to the next can lead to substantially different results. Last year, we added three measures and two bonuses to the risk assessment and determination. These changes resulted in a dramatic drop in the number of districts identified for level 2 and level 3 support: from 240 to 81 for the former and from 21 to 13 for the latter. The leadership team, in consultation with stakeholders, will tweak the weights and elements for the fall DM process to ensure correct identification for support.

As the level of support increases, the number and intensity of the required activities increase. The various activities required at the different levels of support are described in the General Supervision System: Monitoring & Results-based Accountability Manual.[15] The monitoring team learned this year that some districts identified for level 3 support may require a comprehensive on-site monitoring visit in place of a targeted on-site visit. During visits, teams realized that the districts are struggling in areas not measured on the determinations. Oklahoma will incorporate a thorough document review prior to monitoring visits next year, to ensure that districts that need a comprehensive monitoring receive it on the first visit instead of a second.

---

[14] Recommended characteristics derived from the DaSy-ECTA Quality System Framework and the "Ten Desired Elements" document referenced previously.
[15] https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/General%20Supervision%20System%20v2018_rev.pdf

Activities in year four

The DM process will continue to be implemented largely as it was in year three. However, plans are in place for year four to respond to lessons learned and feedback from stakeholders. Oklahoma will continue to engage in activities that refine the model and the overall system to become higher quality (objective 1 and outcome 1) and more sustainable (outcome 2). In particular, specific activities include:

1. adjusting the measures and bonuses (including their weights) to ensure proper identification of districts in need of support;

2. improving the self-assessments with stakeholder feedback, which will include:

   a. expanding the list of resources for districts to improve student outcomes in all areas (including literacy), and

   b. reviewing the questions to augment the ability of districts to dive deep into their data to focus on student improvement;

3. providing easier, permanent online access to November reports and documentation;

4. developing methods to identify and encourage model districts;

5. updating the data retreat based on participant feedback;

6. augmenting agency involvement by training regional accreditation officers and sharing district results with them; and

7. working with other agency representatives to continue moving toward a unified monitoring approach when possible.

Strategy 3: Improve parents' knowledge of accommodations & AT

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

This strategy took a different course than originally planned and described in the year one report. At that time, the leadership team was planning multiple training sessions across Tulsa County with the support of local disability advocacy organizations and districts. Unfortunately, this proved difficult to implement county-wide because of a lack of interest from advocacy organizations and districts on these specific topics alone. In year one, the Oklahoma Parent Center worked with OSDE-SES and ABLE Tech at its Regional Institute to include parent-oriented sessions on AT and accommodations. The event was successful with dozens in attendance, but the number who fell within the SSIP target population was less than five. In year two, a single community-district event was organized with Tulsa Public Schools and a large number of sponsors and volunteers. Training was provided on AT, accommodations, advocacy and early literacy. Unfortunately, as reported in the year two narrative report, this event did not draw a large number of participants, and the costs overwhelmed the benefits. It was not repeated.

Summary of progress: Year three

In year three, as described in the year two narrative report implementation plan, the leadership team decided to return to a focus on small-scale, local training to implement this strategy, relying on a well-developed partnership with the Oklahoma Parent Center (OPC). Last year, the OPC began to create a comprehensive IEP training for parents, caregivers and advocates, calling it "Putting Together the IEP Puzzle." This is a four-part training series (six to eight hours in length) and covers a range of topics relevant to parents. AT and accommodations training material have been incorporated into the series, rather than being offered as stand-alone topics. These sections of the training are being evaluated for the SSIP. The materials took much longer than anticipated to be developed, and were completed in September, 2018. The materials are comprehensive, including marketing flyers, all presentation slides and handouts, and draft invitation emails, among other documents. The OPC staff spent many hours ensuring that all materials would be ready for use prior to the first event.

The OPC has hosted four full training opportunities in various locations in Tulsa County since early November, with two more planned in April and June. Two of the events have been full-day training sessions, while others were separated into two parts. All have been on Saturdays. OSDE-SES personnel participated in the early training sessions to provide additional support. Across the four events, nearly 50 people registered and more than 35 attended the full four-part series. The majority of those who attended have children with IEPs or IFSPs, or suspect their child needs one. Ten participants included professionals, higher education students, and advocates.

Stakeholder Involvement

The primary stakeholders are OSDE-SES program personnel, OPC leadership and trainers, parents and host organizations. Since the training began, the most common recommendation from parents and host organizations is to shorten the series because the time commitment is too great for many parents to participate. This concern is reflected in registration numbers that have been lower than expected. In response to these concerns, OPC is now reviewing the content to determine which topics could be eliminated or abbreviated while still meeting the purpose and goals of the training.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

Evaluation

No changes were made in year three to the evaluation plan for this strategy. The objectives and medium-term outcomes are:

Objective 1: All participating parents/caregivers receive written guidance on the benefits and use of accommodations and AT

Objective 2: Parents are instructed on navigating the ABLE Tech website, including features highlighting the selection of AT by function and purpose

Objective 3: Parents are aware of and knowledgeable about available options for AT and accommodations for both assessment and daily instruction

Objective 4: Parents comprehend the variation across accommodations' function and selection, particularly for assessments (Note that the measurement of objective 4 is integrated into the accommodations measure for objective 3.)

Outcome 1: More parents advocate for their students' needs for AT and/or accommodations

Table 5 summarizes the performance measures for all objectives and outcomes and the program's status relative to the performance targets. Objectives 3 and 4 were measured through pre and post questionnaires that assessed participants' knowledge gained due to the training. The evaluation team was able to match 17 of the pre and post responses. Despite the small response set, paired means comparisons resulted in significant growth in knowledge of AT and comfort with advocacy, but not knowledge of accommodations. This is the second year in a row in which the training has not produced demonstrable gains in accommodations knowledge. The training content and associated data points will be reviewed for impact and alignment with the desired knowledge outcomes to inform the next steps of implementation.

Outcome 1 was not measured in year three because of the delay in implementation of the new training methodology. Participants will receive a follow-up survey phone call to query their changes in behavior in early summer 2019.

	Performance Measures	Targets	Year Three Findings: Target Achievement
Table 5: Strategy 3 Performance			
Objective 1	Participating caregivers are provided written materials to support training objectives and content	100% caregivers	Target met: 100% of training participants received written support materials[16]
Objective 2	Training includes demonstration and instruction on accessing AT content on the ABLE Tech website	100% observance	Target met: 100% of training sessions included website instructions & demonstration[17]
Objectives 3 & 4	1. Participants demonstrate growth in AT knowledge	Statistically significant[18] difference in	Target not met:[19]

---

[16] Data source: training documentation
[17] Data source: training documentation
[18] As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association.
[19] Data sources: pre and post event surveys for parents of children with disabilities. N=15.

		knowledge and comfort levels	2. Difference in knowledge of accommodations (pre to post) is not significant Targets met: 1. Difference in AT knowledge (pre to post) is significant with a mean increase of two times the original score 3. Difference in comfort with advocating is significant with a mean increase of 32%
	2. Participants demonstrate growth in accommodations knowledge 3. Participants demonstrate growth in comfort with advocating for child's needs		
Outcome 1	Participating families report increased advocacy efforts	50% respondents report advocacy activity	N/A

Activities in year four

Although new, the training has already seen some success in meeting the strategic goals of increasing AT knowledge and advocacy. The leadership team plans to continue to invest in this approach for the final year of the SSIP implementation and hopefully years to come. The OPC will continue to work with local partner organizations to host the training, with a tentative goal of eight training sessions in Tulsa County across year four. In response to multiple requests from other community groups, OPC also plans to train others within its organization to scale up the training outside of Tulsa County (personnel work in all regions of the state).

To ensure that the training increases participants' knowledge of accommodations and related best practices, OPC will consider several possible improvements to the Puzzle training of the trainers themselves, content, materials, etc. OPC will make any necessary revisions to materials, content and training in consultation with OSDE-SES.

OPC has also received requests from special education professionals to attend the training, and wants to expand outreach to this group. Because the training is actually designed in four parts, OPC may determine that certain topics are trained in some locations, while others are more appropriate for other audiences. The training sessions may also be adapted to a digital format to reach the most people possible. The ultimate goal is to provide the training in separate parts or as a whole series throughout the state of Oklahoma to parents of children with disabilities and the professionals who work with them, as often as possible. The leadership team believes that everyone benefits from learning or reviewing the training content, especially the children affected.

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

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

Summary of progress: Year three

The activities for the two strategic topics of assistive technology and accommodations are described separately, matching their distinct implementation. As planned for year three, both training initiatives were in the scale-up stage, and no training was provided in Tulsa County. In year two, the evaluation team determined that the trainings in Tulsa were successful and overall met the desired objectives and outcomes. As a result, the leadership team and related stakeholders determined that the training could be scaled-up to other regions across the state.

Assistive Technology Component

In year three, ABLE Tech conducted two in-person AT Support Team workshops across Oklahoma. One was held in the Owasso area for residents of northeastern counties outside of Tulsa, while the second was conducted in Lawton, a city in the southwestern region of the state. 237 teachers and service providers participated in either of the two series (each training series has three sections which are held on three separate days); 164 of those were teachers who serve grades PK through 3.

As mentioned in the year two narrative report, a survey of district officials revealed that personnel in smaller, more distant districts typically cannot attend in-person trainings. They do not have the substitute staff or the funds to participate. For these individuals, online training is a valuable substitute. In years two and three, ABLE Tech worked to develop several online modules that impart all of the content of the in-person training. These have already been accessed by personnel across the state, and are a critical method of outreach to smaller districts. Through the online professional development system, ABLE Tech has been able to train an additional 113 educators across Oklahoma in one or more modules, 22 of whom teach PK through 3. The permanent availability of the online AT training is a critical component of sustainable professional development for district special education personnel in the state.

Accommodations Component

The leadership team focused on scaling up the accommodations training in year three through two methods. The first was through in-person training provided through two different events: an in-person, three hour seminar, and a briefer overview at a state-sponsored regional conference. The annual conference is hosted by OSDE at several locations across the state. OSDE-SEs personnel traveled with the conference and presented an overview of accommodations in each location. The team reported that 422 educators participated in those presentations.

The three-hour seminar was provided in one region, using the updated format described in the year two narrative report. The northwest region was selected for implementation in year three, covering approximately 20 counties. The training sessions were held at two locations in November 2018 for nearby districts, 18 of which attended. In several of these districts, a large number of personnel attended, ensuring that many educators received the information first hand. The trainers were two OSDE-SES program specialists highly experienced in the implementation of accommodations in the classroom and on assessments. Detailed evaluation data are not being

collected because this region is not participating in the long-term SSIP evaluation because it is not the target SIMR area.

The second method used to scale-up the accessibility of the accommodations training was through an online professional development system. Online access to critical accommodations content has been important for the smaller districts, just as it has been for AT content. The online accommodations training was developed internally by the OSDE-SES personnel who implemented the in-person training sessions. The content is the same. The online module requires participants to complete activities, assignments and tests to pass. At the time of this report, 250 individuals have completed the online modules, 111 of which are identified with elementary or early childhood school sites.

Evaluation

OSDE-SES' vision for strategy four is that school educators understand the need for and use of AT and accommodations in assessment and daily instruction and incorporate them more appropriately into IEPs. The evaluation plan has not changed in year three. The objectives and outcomes for this strategy are:

Objective 1: All participating personnel receive written guidance on the benefits and use of accommodations and AT

Objective 2: Personnel are instructed on navigating the ABLE Tech website, including features highlighting the selection of AT by function and purpose

Objective 3: Personnel are aware of and knowledgeable about available options for AT and accommodations for both assessment and daily instruction

Objective 4: Personnel comprehend the variation across accommodations' function and selection, particularly for assessments (Note that the measurement of objective 4 is integrated into the accommodations measure for objective 3.)

Outcome 1: Variation in allowed accommodations will increase and the overall quality of IEPs will improve with regard to accommodations

Outcome 2: AT consideration and use among school-age students increase, as documented in IEPs

Table 6 summarizes the performance measures for all objectives and outcomes and the program's status relative to the performance targets. The evaluation has been conducted solely in Tulsa County because that is the target SIMR area. Because year three focused on the scaling-up of this strategy to other regions, no data were collected in Tulsa County, except for the measurement of outcome two. See the year two narrative report for the findings on objectives 1 through 4 and outcome 1.

Table 6: Indicator 4 Performance

	Performance Measures	Targets	Year Three Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	Participating educators are provided written materials to support training objectives and content	100% participants	N/A
Objective 2	Training includes demonstration and instruction on accessing AT content on the ABLE Tech website	100% observance	N/A

Objectives 3 & 4	1. Participants demonstrate growth in AT basic and practical knowledge 2. Participants demonstrate growth in accommodations knowledge	Statistically significant[20] difference in knowledge levels	N/A
Outcome 1	1. Selected accommodations meet the individualized needs of students 2. Teachers show improvement in the selection of accommodations	1. 95% of IEPs after training 2. 50% of teachers show improvement	N/A
Outcome 2	1. AT consideration is documented accurately and completely 2. AT is adopted as a tool more often in IEPs	1. 100% 2. 25% change, and is statistically significant	Insufficient data to evaluate

Outcome 2 findings

Originally, the evaluation team intended to measure outcome two by reviewing the IEPs of students whose teachers participated in the ABLE Tech AT training provided as part of the SSIP. The team decided that this was not a tenable approach for several reasons. The most important was that measuring IEP changes proved difficult for the accommodations intervention, and the team believed that this project's direct impact on student IEPs would be even more complex to assess. A secondary factor was the team's low capacity to review hundreds of IEPs before and after training, across multiple districts.

Instead, less rigorous self-assessment measures of behavior change were adopted, though a pre and post methodology was used. Participants were surveyed about their perceptions of change in their districts, allowing matches to responses given prior to and immediately after their training. Participants began their training by completing a self-assessment tool that incorporates the evidence-based "Quality Indicators for Assistive Technology" (QIAT) as district teams. The QIAT assesses the quality of a district's fidelity to best practices for the development and implementation of assistive technology policies and procedures. The follow-up surveys were intended to assess long-term behavioral change at the district level by comparing the results to a district's previous responses. Unfortunately, of the 45 participants who are still employed at public school districts in Oklahoma, only seven individuals (across four districts) responded to the survey after three contact attempts. The response pool is not large enough to draw any conclusions about changes in behavior due to training participation.

Activities in year four

Implementation of this strategy will consist of the same activities as year three, except that in-person training will be conducted in new locations. The leadership team and stakeholders are emphasizing the important role that the online training can serve in rural Oklahoma, and expect to market the opportunity to smaller and distant districts across the state. ABLE Tech and OSDE-SES will expand outreach to these areas to ensure that all general and special educators have access to both trainings. In addition, ABLE Tech will continue to provide an in-person training in at least one new location in year four. OSDE-SES will rely heavily on the online modules to provide the accommodations training. An in-person event will also be held if there is enough district interest.

---

[20] As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association.

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

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

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

Summary of progress: Year three

To implement this strategy, plans were made to work more extensively with the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) team in year three. Oklahoma was awarded the 2017 grant, abbreviated here as OK SPDG III. The goals and activities in the OK SPDG III included supporting the Oklahoma Part B SSIP. Throughout year three the SPDG and OSDE-SES SSIP staff, SPDG partners, and representatives of external contracts met periodically to plan, improve, and closely align the parent activities included in the OK SPDG III and the SSIP and their evaluation. The OPC has not been engaged at the level anticipated in the year two narrative report, although that may change as the strategy is implemented in year four.

Because of the SPDG team's focus on its primary initiatives that support the development and implementation of multi-tiered systems of support in Oklahoma's "Rising Schools" (low-performing schools), this strategy was not implemented as planned in year three. The first year three activity for parents of three to five year olds will be held in May, 2019. It will be held at the Sand Springs Early Childhood Center, where the first event for this strategy was held in late 2016. The spring event will focus on the needs of parents whose children are continuing on to kindergarten. The Sand Springs literacy coach will provide a half hour of early literacy training to parents, while a variety of support personnel will be available for consultation during the event. The details for the event are still being planned by SPDG personnel. The goal will be to share information about literacy best practices to support students' transition to kindergarten. Other activities are planned for year four.

Stakeholder Input

In year three, the primary stakeholder of interest was the OK SPDG III team because it was charged with this strategy's implementation. Sand Springs Public Schools' personnel were also consulted periodically about the implementation of this strategy because of its central role merging the implementation of the SPDG and certain SSIP strategies.

Evaluation

The objectives and medium-term outcomes for this strategy are:

Objective 1: Parents receive written guidance on early literacy best practices and resources

Objective 2: Parents understand the foundational concepts of early literacy

Objective 3: Parents understand importance of early literacy best practices

Objective 4: Parents access shared resources in Tulsa County

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

Outcome 1: Parents engage in more early literacy best practices in the home

Table 7 summarizes the performance measures for all objectives and outcomes. Because no events were held prior to this report's submission, no findings can be reported for year three implementation.

Table 7: Strategy 5 Performance			
	Performance Measures	**Targets**	**Year Three Findings: Target Achievement**
Objective 1	Participating parents are provided written materials on best practices and local resources	100% of parents	N/A
Objective 2	Participants demonstrate growth in early literacy foundational knowledge	Statistically significant[21] increase in knowledge	N/A
Objective 3	Participants report will increase best practices in the home	25% respondents report will increase best practices	N/A
Objective 4	Participants access local resources/the library more frequently	25% respondents report more frequent access	N/A
Outcome 1	Participants report more frequent reading activity	25% respondents report increased practice	N/A

Activities in year four

In addition to the parent outreach event in May, 2019, the team will also collaborate with administrators and teachers at the Sand Springs Early Childhood Center to support and provide early literacy training at its back-to-school night in October, 2019. This training will focus on the early literacy needs of parents new to the EC Center as the school year begins. Because only one literacy coach works full-time in Sand Springs, a single event is currently planned for year four. During the summer planning time, the team will consider the capacity of the district and the coach to provide additional training throughout the year, ensuring that all activities align with the SPDG parent professional development goals and this SSIP strategy.

---

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

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE

● Strategy 6: Improve educators' early literacy knowledge and practice

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

Oklahoma has offered a rigorous, evidence-based professional development to schools' reading instructors and specialists for several years through a contractor with the support of the OSDE Office of Instruction and the current State Professional Development Grant. LETRS (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) builds educator effectiveness through professional development, emphasizing current research and EBPs in reading, writing and spelling. LETRS will serve as the central component of early literacy training evaluated and monitored through the SSIP. No new changes have been made to the current implementation plan. The leadership team and stakeholders continue to support the vision of this strategy and want to maintain implementation, despite ongoing challenges.

Summary of progress: Year three

As with strategy 5, plans were made to implement the strategy through collaboration with the 2017 State Personnel Development Grant, which includes supporting and improving the SSIP. The OK SPDG III team is working with Sand Springs Public Schools as the SSIP implementation site in Tulsa County. As part of its partnership with the grant, the district committed to send appropriate educators to the LETRS professional development and support their growth over time. The first LETRS Foundations professional development sessions were held in Sand Springs between May 2 and 4, 2018. Unfortunately, although 40 educators registered for the event, only 12 individuals participated in the initial Foundations training.

This was unexpected since the district had committed to sending as many educators as possible in the target grade range. Since then, the district has continued to struggle to garner teacher participation in repeat and subsequent sessions. The final session was just recently concluded in early March, 2019. Eighteen educators in the target age range have completed Foundations and modules 1 through 3. The SPDG team has reviewed the registration and participation data, and has concluded that the main reason for low participation is a lack of principal support at certain sites. Each module requires several days out of the classroom, putting some stress on local sites to supply substitutes. Principal support is critical for the success of the provision of the LETRS professional development.

Low participation is problematic for the SPDG project because each session costs the same amount, regardless of how many participate. To lower its cost risk, the team has opened the sessions to anyone interested in the Tulsa area. This enhances the literacy goals of other districts, but reduces the program's efficacy in Sand Springs. The SPDG team has faced other challenges during implementation, also, including needing to hire a new literacy coach and trainer in the middle of the year. This delayed both the implementation of the project and its evaluation; the former coach left suddenly without communicating her procedures for data collection and monitoring. As a result, the team had to hire a second trainer and has no "pre" training data to measure knowledge gained over time. This was particularly problematic because the planning team had not adequately communicated with the coach about expectations and timelines.

Despite these challenges, the team is moving forward with the coaching plan in Sand Springs. Eighteen early elementary teachers from Sand Springs participated in the full set of the selected LETRS modules. These 18 will receive one-on-one coaching from a literacy coach dedicated to Sand Springs. The format and content of the coaching structure are being developed this spring and summer by the OK SPDG III team and Sand Springs PS stakeholders. All others will participate in periodic group coaching sessions.

Stakeholder Input

In year three, the primary stakeholder of interest was the OK SPDG III team because it was charged with this strategy's implementation. Sand Springs Public Schools' personnel were also consulted periodically about the implementation of this strategy.

Evaluation

The evaluation plan did not change in year three. The long-term goal is that instructors who participate in the professional development will permanently change their instructional practices to incorporate evidence-based practices related to early literacy (EL). The strategic objectives and medium-term outcomes are:

Objective 1: At least one district will commit to completing the training and will complete it by spring 2019

Objective 2: Participants understand the foundations of reading and EL

Objective 3: Participants feel competent to select instructional strategies and other evidence-based practices for improving early literacy

Objective 4: Participants have consistent, high quality coaching support

Outcome 1: Participants positively adjust practice in response to coaching feedback

Outcome 2: Teachers implement appropriate instructional strategies and other evidence-based practices in their classrooms

Table 8 lists each objective and outcome and the program's status on the related performance indicators. Because of the limited implementation of this strategy in year three, the evaluation has not yet been conducted. The SPDG evaluation team will not have its data collection ready for reporting until April, 2019. The performance measure for outcome one has changed slightly to measure the impact of the coaching process from the perspective of participants rather than the coaches. The tools that will be used to measure outcomes 1 and 2 are currently being developed and will be piloted in April.

Table 8: Strategy 6 Performance

	Performance Measures	Targets	Year Three Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	At least one district will complete training by Spring 2019	One district completed	Training completed in March 2019
Objective 2	Participants demonstrate growth in early literacy foundational knowledge	Statistically significant[22] increase in knowledge	N/A[23]
Objective 3	Participants report competency for identifying best practices in instruction	Statistically significant increase in perceived competency	N/A

[22] As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association. Also objective 2.
[23] Data sources: pre and post training surveys, also for objective 3.

Objective 4	Each participant has an assigned coach	All participants have a coach	Target met[24]
Outcome 1	Participants report the coaching process has improved their practice	85% participants report positive evaluations	N/A
Outcome 2	Based on a matrix measure, coaches observe teachers' improved implementation of best practices	85% participants receive positive evaluations	N/A

Lessons learned

The primary lesson learned in year three is the essential importance of cultivating and expanding district and site-level support for broad professional development initiatives. One of the main reasons that principals and teachers in Sand Springs did not support the LETRS PD as expected was that the primary advocate for its implementation left the district. She had not worked to expand the leadership's support for the initiative during her time, and the SPDG team has since struggled to engage new administrators. Given the drop in the third grade assessment proficiency rate (from 10.6 percent in FFY 2016 to 4.0 percent in FFY 2017), the lack of support for intensive literacy PD is problematic.

Activities in year four

The goal for year four is to develop and implement the coaching model in Sand Springs to support the teachers who have completed the LETRS professional development. The SPDG literacy coach is working with the larger planning team to establish methods to support teachers as they implement LETRS best practices into their classroom teaching. For example, sites have requested that the coach provide a series of group coaching and support sessions that will occur on Friday afternoons at various sites across the district. Although the meetings will target LETRS participants, other teachers will also be welcomed to encourage best practices for everyone. This particular activity may divert attention from participants temporarily, although they will receive dedicated one-on-one coaching in their classrooms on a regular basis.

The SPDG and OSDE-SES SSIP staff, SPDG partners, and external contracts, including the literacy consultant and coaches, will continue to meet regularly to plan, improve, and support the early literacy professional development and coaching components of the SSIP and OK SPDG III as well as their evaluation. This team will work more diligently to define expectations and timelines to ensure the needs of the SSIP are met in the final year of implementation.

---

[24] Data sources: training documentation, participant surveys and coaching reports. Also for outcomes 1 and 2.

Conclusion: The Future of SSIP Part B in Oklahoma

In year four, the OSDE-SES SSIP leadership team will begin work on planning for the next round of the SSIP. Oklahoma will not continue with the current SSIP as defined in FFY 2014. The state anticipates changing its SIMR and adopting new strategies to improve infrastructure and evidence-based practices to support outcomes unrelated to assessment scores. The leadership team will convene a variety of stakeholders, including members of the Part B State Advisory Panel, to discuss how to transition to a new SSIP. Plans to do this will be developed by September 2019.

Appendix A: Updated Oklahoma SSIP-B Theory of Action

2018 OKLAHOMA PART B THEORY OF ACTION

If the SEA…

- Implements aligned data systems between the Part C EIS program & Part B programs,

- Builds a new model to refine the entire general supervision system to incorporate RBA elements and a district risk analysis,

- Builds parents' capacity to advocate for best practices in IEPs for special factors, and

- Improves IEP teams' knowledge of special factors for IEPs,

- Increases access to early literacy resources for families with young children, and

- Provides targeted PD to LEAs in EBPs in early literacy,

(Effective Data Sharing)

(District Accounta-bility)

(Topical Targeted Assistance)

(Practical Training)

Then…

- LEA personnel will align needs, goals and services of children who received EIS,

- LEAs will improve performance in response to results-based monitoring, interventions, and guidance,

- Parents will advocate for appropriate accommodations & AT for their students, and

- Educators will be empowered to appropriately select, use & evaluate accommodations & AT for all students,

- Parents will work with children to excel at early literacy skills, and

- Educators will implement appropriate literacy instructional strategies for all students.

If these outcomes are achieved…

By FFY 2018, Oklahoma will see improved early literacy performance in specific districts in Tulsa County among students with disabilities taking the 3rd grade annual reading assessment.

The passing rate (proficiency or above) in Tulsa County will increase from 20 percent in FFY 2014 to at least 30 percent in FFY 2018. Participating districts will also realize statistically significant improvement in the rate of growth toward proficiency among these students.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
CHAMPION EXCELLENCE