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Results Driven Accountability (RDA)

- Balance between compliance and accountability

- State Systemic Improvement Plan
  - To improve one or more state identified measurable results (SIMRs)
**Evaluation**
- Evaluation of progress annually
- Adjust plan as needed

**Analyzing and Focusing**
- Identify starting point
- Initiate broad Data Analysis
- Conduct broad Infrastructure Analysis
- Identify primary concern (potential SiMR)

**Planning and Doing**
- Identify coherent improvement strategies (Exploration Phase)
- Develop action steps (address barriers/use leverage points)
- Develop Theory of Action
- Develop Plan for improvement (Implementation Framework)

**Investigating**
- Conduct root cause analysis (including infrastructure) to identify contributing factors
- For each contributing factor, identify both barriers and leverage points for improvement
- Narrow and refine SiMR

**SSIP**
- How well is the solution working?
- What is the problem?
- What shall we do about it?
- Why is it happening?
## SSIP Activities by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1—FFY 2013 Delivered by April 2015</th>
<th>Year 2—FFY 2014 Delivered by April 2016</th>
<th>Years 3-6—FFY 2015-18 Feb 2017- Feb 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data Analysis;</td>
<td>• Multi-year plan addressing:</td>
<td>• Reporting on Progress including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure Analysis;</td>
<td>• Infrastructure Development;</td>
<td>• Results of Ongoing Evaluation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State-identified measureable result;</td>
<td>• Support EIS Program/LEA in</td>
<td>• Extent of Progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coherent Improvement Strategies;</td>
<td>Implementing Evidence-Based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theory of Action.</td>
<td>Practices;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II - Improvement Plan: Infrastructure Development

Infrastructure development includes:

• Improvements to infrastructure to better support EIS programs/districts to scale up evidence-based practices
  – Who will implement infrastructure changes
  – Resources needed
  – Expected outcomes
  – Timelines
Infrastructure development includes (cont’d):

• Identifying steps to further align/leverage current improvement plans/ initiatives
• How to involve other offices and agencies
• Activities supporting implementation of evidence based strategies including:
  – Communication strategies and stakeholder involvement
  – How identified barriers will be addressed
  – Who will be in charge of implementing
  – How activities will be implemented with fidelity
Phase II - Improvement Plan: Evidence-based Practices

• Activities include (cont’d):
  – Resources that will be used
  – How expected outcomes of strategies will be measured
  – Timelines

• How multiple offices/other state agencies will be involved to support LEAs/EIS programs in scaling up and sustaining evidence-based practices implemented with fidelity
Phase II - Improvement Plan: Evaluation

• The plan to evaluate implementation includes:
  – Short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation and impact on results

• Plan must be aligned with:
  – Other components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
Phase II - Improvement Plan: Evaluation

• Plan must include:
  – How stakeholders will be involved
  – Methods to collect and analyze data on activities and outcomes
  – How State will use evaluation results to:
    • Examine effectiveness of implementation plan
    • Measure progress toward achieving intended outcomes
    • Make modifications to plan
    • How results of evaluation will be disseminated
• The plan will define how we will achieve measurable results by strengthening infrastructure, and implementing evidenced based practices.
  – Based on stakeholder input
  – Builds on all of the information gathered during Phase I
The plan will define how we will implement the SSIP, including:

• Identification of the improvement strategies, mechanisms and resources for implementing the improvement activities

• The timelines for beginning and completing the improvement strategies
Short and Long Term Strategies/Objectives

• Short Term Objectives – incremental steps with shorter timeframes that move an organization toward their goals usually accomplished in 1-3 years

• Long Term Objectives - Performance measures to be achieved over a period of five years or more
Clear Strategies/Actions to be Implemented

– Should address issues at all levels of the system
– Address aspects of the infrastructure that must be improved including resources needed and timelines
– Address how they will be aligned with initiatives and current improvement plans
– Activities must be connected and reflect the root causes impacting the SiMR
Some Ideas to Consider

The SSIP should be aligned to and integrated with other initiatives in the state.

– Supports leveraging of resources - greater influence
– Prevents duplication of efforts
– Builds momentum and capacity
– Improves results
EVALUATION
• Evidence of Progress:

1. Activities occurred and intended outcomes of each activity accomplished
2. Changes are occurring at the system, practice, and child/family level
For Each Activity...

• Did the activity occur?
  – If yes, what are evidences that it occurred?
  – If not, why not?
  – What do we need to do next?

• Did it accomplish it’s intended outcomes?
  – If yes, what are evidences that it accomplished intended outcomes?
  – If not, why not?
  – What else do we need to do before we move to the next activity?
Evaluation of Product
e.g. Guidance Document

• How will we know if the activity occurs?
  – Evidences, e.g.
    • guidance document developed and disseminated

How will we know if the activity accomplishes the intended outcomes?

– Evidences, e.g.
  • feedback from the field about whether the guidance document is clear, readily available, helpful, etc.
Evaluation of Process
e.g. Training

• How will we know if the activity occurs?
  – Evidences may include
    • training agenda, materials, activities
    • participation records

• How will we know if the activity accomplishes the intended outcomes?
  – Evidences may include
    • participant evaluations
    • measure of competencies
Measuring Results

• Results question
  – Have child outcomes improved?

• Performance measure
  – % of children exiting at age expectations in social emotional functioning

• Data source
  – Current state approach to SPP Indicators measurement of child outcomes
Measuring State Capacity

• Infrastructure
  – How has the state infrastructure been improved to support implementation of the practices?

• Implementation of Evidence Based Strategy
  – Changes to state systems (governance, finance, personnel—TA and PD, data systems, accountability and quality improvement, quality standards) which support the implementation of the evidence based strategy
Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan and Goals for the Day
Phase I - SSIP – Part B

What was originally proposed:

• Part B – State Identified Measurable Results (SIMR)
  – Narrow the gap
  – Improve social/emotional - preschool

• Part B – Strategy
  – Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)/RtI
  – Teaching Pyramid
OSEP Feedback on SSIP

• Positives
  – Added conclusionary statements for each component
  – Clearly identified strengths and challenges
  – Correlated and used logic between components

• Cautions
  – Target only one Measurable Result
• Narrow the reading gap at the 3rd grade level using MTSS as the strategy
Goals for Today - Part B

• Review current MTSS system
• Discuss and make recommendations for scaling up MTSS
• Discuss and make recommendations for new way to calculate District Determinations
• Plan for the future
Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan and Goals for the Day
What was originally proposed:
• Part C – SIMR
  – Increase the number and percentage of infants and toddlers who demonstrate progress in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills
  – Increase the percentage of families who report that Early Intervention (EI) services have helped their family effectively communicate their children's needs
• Part C – Strategies
  – Routines Based Interview (RBI)
  – Functional child and family outcomes
  – Quality routines-based home visits
OSEP Feedback on SSIP

• Positives
  – Added conclusionary statements for each component
  – Clearly identified strengths and challenges
  – Correlated and used logic between components

• Cautions
  – Target only one Measurable Result
• Increase the number and percentage of infants and toddlers who demonstrate progress in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills using the RBI, functional outcomes, and quality home visits.
Goals for Today - Part C

- Review progress and provide recommendations for scaling up state-wide
- Provide input for Phase II requirements
- Review/ Discuss State and PRT Determination
Part B Stakeholder Group
Agenda

• Introductions
• Review of Current MTSS System
• Review of Options for Scaling Up
• Discussion of Scaling Up Options & Recommendations
• Discussion of District Determinations & Recommendations
• Review of Evaluation Requirements
• Plan Next Steps
Introductions
Current MTSS Trainings

• Building & Refining Your MTSS Process Training Series
• Training and TA for Prioritized Districts
• Topical Refresher Training
• Training and TA for Partner Sites
Multi-year training for new districts/schools
• Initial focus on exploration and installation activities
  – Compare current practice to key MTSS components and what we know is necessary infrastructure-wise to fully implement MTSS – to identify areas for planning
  – Create Implementation Plan for MTSS
• Move to focus on activities for initial implementation of areas identified and planned for in the MTSS Implementation Plan.
  – Use of indicators of deep implementation to identify areas of success and need.
  – Systematic problem solving around implementation issues.
• Ensure systematization of procedures, scale up (to other areas, grade levels, etc.) to achieve full implementation
  – Continued planning around MTSS
  – Continued use of problem solving/improvement cycles
Current MTSS Training: Training and TA for Prioritized Districts

- For districts who have already attended NeMTSS IST training and TA
  - Prioritized based on data (e.g., Overall percent of students proficient on NeSA, overall percent of SPED students proficient on NeSA, size of current gap between SPED and non-SPED, % in SPED, size)
Current MTSS Training: Training and TA for Prioritized Districts

For districts who have already attended NeMTSS IST training and TA

• Focuses on assistance with initial implementation activities to help them achieve deeper implementation of their MTSS process

• 4 TA sessions with monthly check ins to help schools apply content from trainings and problem solve around issues that arise during initial implementation of MTSS in their identified focus area(s)
Current MTSS Training: Topical Refresher Training

For districts who have already attended NeMTSS IST training and TA

• Provide additional information on the key components of a MTSS and implementation science

• Session options include exploration/installation activities and support for initial implementation

• Topics include: leading the MTSS implementation process; instructional data – developing the system for analysis of instruction and analyzing the data to provide support; response rules – developing the system for analyzing progress and applying response rules; individual student problem-solving; evaluating your MTSS
For districts who have already attended NeMTSS IST training and TA

- Selected sites vary in size, demographics, focus areas for implementation (core and intervention), current level of implementation, programs/practices being implemented, and school configurations
Current MTSS Training: Training and TA for Partner Sites

For districts who have already attended NeMTSS IST training and TA

- Strong commitment from the district team to the change process and focus of efforts on achieving deep implementation of MTSS
- Training and TA to build knowledge and skills to achieve deep implementation of MTSS components
  - Support for development and implementation of effective MTSS procedures
  - Focus is on various phases of implementation based on each district’s current focus area and level of implementation
OPTIONS 1

NDE could increase the GAN awarded to UNL for the purpose of increasing the staff etc. necessary to provide statewide services to all districts requesting assistance from the Nebraska Multi-Tiered System of Support Team.
OPTIONS FOR SCALING UP

OPTION 2

NDE could, through the RFP process, provide grants to 2-3 ESU’s interested in establishing “mega” regional centers for the purpose of assisting districts in the implementation of MTSS.
OPTION 3

NDE could, through the RFP process, provide “mini” grants to districts/groups of districts or ESU’s interested in implementation of MTSS.
Options for Scaling Up

OPTION 4
Combination of options #1 and #2 and #3

OPTION 5
Other options suggested by Stakeholders
To ensure MTSS is implemented with fidelity to achieve anticipated results:

• ESUs or school districts receiving grant funds would be required to carry out a proposed plan for ensuring implementation with fidelity and engaging in training, consultation and collaboration with the Nebraska Multi-Tiered System of Support Team.
Funding for Scaling Up

• Approximately $1.5M – $2M is potentially available annually to assist NDE in the scale-up of improvement activities aimed at achieving the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

  3-year GANs could be issued on an increasing scale for example:
  
  Year 1 – Base Amount
  Year 2 - 15% increase over Year 1
  Year 3 - 20% increase over Year 2
Funding for Scaling Up

If the plan developed for the scale-up of MTSS does not utilize the $1.5M - $2M:

– NDE would utilize the remaining funds to assist districts in implementation of evidence based strategies (other than MTSS) included in the district TIP.

– In order to be considered for funding, the grant application would need to include an evidence based strategy and detailed plans for implementing the strategy with fidelity.
Discussion Questions

What changes in the state’s infrastructure will assist in scaling up MTSS?

What is the best method/model to scale up MTSS using the available funds?

How can NDE support districts who choose to use an evidence based practice to improve results other than MTSS?
District Determinations
Guiding Principles for New Calculation

• Ensure calculations more closely follow Federal process
• Emphasize indicators that are closely aligned with SSIP
• Align with AQuESTT when determining improvement
Considerations for New Calculations (2016-17)

• Mirror determinations after OSEPs
State determinations
  • Separate scores for compliance and results
  • Raise percentage cutoffs for “meets requirements”
• Allow for Assessment results (Indicators B3) to be the bulk of the results score
### District Determinations

**Possible New Calculation**

Compliance Score = 8 possible points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspension/Expulsion by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Representation in Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Find</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C to B Transition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Requests Resolved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**District Determinations**

**Possible New Calculation**

Results Score = 16 - 22 possible points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Descriptor</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Indicator Descriptor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suspension/Expulsion (4A)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LRE (5A)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Part - Reading</td>
<td>1 or 3</td>
<td>Preschool LRE (6A)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Part - Math</td>
<td>1 or 3</td>
<td>Preschool Outcomes</td>
<td>1 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Perf - Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Perf - Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post-School Outcomes (14C)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District Determinations

### Looking at Percentage Cutoffs with Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option 1 90, 80, 70</th>
<th>Option 1 80, 60, 40</th>
<th>Option 1 85, 70, 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>76.10%</td>
<td>76.10%</td>
<td>76.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Questions

Given the focus on results (RDA), which calculation provides more focus on student results?

Which calculation provides an accurate description of special education services within both small and large districts?

What else needs to be considered when making determinations?
Evaluation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan
Requirements

- How stakeholders will be involved
- Methods to collect and analyze data on activities
- How State will use evaluation results to:
  - Examine effectiveness of implementation plan
  - Measure progress toward achieving intended outcomes
  - Make modifications to plan
  - How results of evaluation will be disseminated
Considerations for Evaluation

- Use the Theory of Action as basis
- Develop a “Logic Model”
- Have intermediary and long-term measures
Planning for the Future

Next Steps

● Draft SSIP based on stakeholder input
  ○ This group (stakeholders)
  ○ SEAC
  ○ Other groups, i.e. NASES, etc.
● Meet with Stakeholder Committee - set meeting date
  ○ Review Draft
  ○ Discuss Evaluation process
● Submit SSIP in April
● Revise based on OSEP Review
● Move to evaluation of effectiveness