

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb. 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Increase the percent of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment, currently ISAT by Smarter Balanced.

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

NO

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

N/A

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

N/A

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

N/A

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

N/A

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

YES

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

The subset of the population from the indicator are the LEAs participating in the SSIP professional development project, Cultivating Readers, during the 2021-22 school year. The LEAs included in the calculation are the following: Joint School District #2, Blackfoot, Boundary County, Filer, Future Public School, Inc., Gem Prep: Nampa, Gem Prep: Meridian, Gem Prep: Online, Gem Prep: Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Kuna, Lapwai, Minidoka County, Mullan, Notus, Preston, Project Impact STEM Academy, Ririe, Snake River, St. Maries, Sugar-Salem, Twin Falls, Wendell. These 23 LEAs represented 13% of the total number of LEAs in the state in FFY 2021 (23/172) and the number of students in this cohort made up 28% (789/2813) of the total target population of students. Idaho will measure the SiMR for this same cohort of LEAs from year to year. Idaho will calculate and report the SiMR data for 4th grade students in this same cohort of LEAs each year in the SPP/APR submission.

Staff from 24 unique LEAs participated in the SSIP/SPDG in the 2021-22 school year but only 23 are reported for the purposes of the SiMR. One LEA, Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA), is a co-op that employs its own staff to provide services to students in LEAs that form the co-op. Notus school district students receive services from staff from the COSSA co-op and its students will be reported in the SiMR data. COSSA staff will participate in the SSIP activities but no students from COSSA are included in the SiMR data.

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

NO

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

N/A

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-State-Systematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	13.02%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	14.20%	14.30%	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th grade students with disabilities proficient on the ISAT in ELA	Total number of 4th grade students with disabilities who participated in the ISAT in ELA	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
127	789	15.31%	14.20%	16.10%	Met Target	

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source for the FFY 2021 data is the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), by Smarter Balanced. The ISAT is Idaho’s summative assessment in English/language arts (ELA).
The EDFacts file where the data are reported is the SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178). Idaho uses a subset of the data reported in the EDFacts file for calculating the SiMR.

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

ISDE Assessment and Accountability Department received the raw assessment data from Smarter Balanced. The Assessment and Accountability team cleaned the data and provided it to the SSIP internal evaluator for analysis. 4th grade students with disabilities who were enrolled in an LEA participating in the SSIP in the 2021-22 school year were included in the calculation of the SiMR. The SiMR was calculated by dividing the number of 4th grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who scored proficient or advanced on the ISAT for ELA by the total number of 4th grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who were administered the ISAT for ELA. Idaho aligned the SSIP baseline data year and targets through 2025 with those of SPP/APR Indicator 3B for 4th grade ELA since the SiMR data is a subset of the data for that indicator.

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

YES

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

The SSIP State Leadership Team monitored progress of student outcomes on a monthly basis using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered in the fall and spring to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. The Special Education Department analyzed these data to assess LEA progress toward targets and provided LEAs with IRI reports with data from the 2020-2021 school year at the Fall 2021 Data Drill Down. These reports contained charts and tables disaggregated by student demographics including race/ethnicity, special education status, grade, and reading subskill. Additionally, LEAs were able to use the IRI as an informal progress monitoring tool at any time and the majority of SSIP LEAs used it as such. The SSIP internal evaluator obtained the informal, uncleaned progress monitoring data at the beginning of each month for the month prior, aggregated the data to the building, LEA, cohort and project levels, and used it for state-level program planning and estimating progress toward the SiMR. Although the ISAT measures a broader range of ELA content (reading, writing, listening and research), student data from the IRI is the only data the State Leadership Team has available for progress monitoring of student outcomes. Compared to the ISAT, the IRI is more useful in measuring student growth in reading specifically, which is the ELA area the SSIP focuses on improving. In FFY 2021, the State Leadership Team created school-level reports with the monthly progress monitoring data to help schools

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

identify their needs mid-year for training and TA during the February 2022 In-District Visits. The State Leadership Team developed similar reports for building teams to use for program planning during the spring 2022 Spring Institute. These reports were disaggregated by student characteristics, such as grade and disability status, as well as by reading subskill areas. The teams were able to target specific student groups and reading skills that might benefit from staff receiving additional professional development in those specific areas.

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

NO

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

N/A

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

NO

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

N/A

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

<https://sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/State-Systematic-Improvement-Evaluation-Plan.pdf>

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

NO

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

- (1) **Governance:** To align the SSIP work with other state-level initiatives and expand the reach of reading support, an analysis was conducted on LEA reading outcomes. Based on the analysis, the State Leadership Team conducted targeted outreach to LEAs with reading scores below the state average to apply for participation in the SSIP. The activities of the SSIP aligned with the Governor's and Superintendent of Public Instruction's literacy priorities that all Idaho students are proficient readers by 3rd grade. Idaho is a local control state, and each LEA develops and submits an annual Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan to the Idaho State Board of Education. This literacy plan outlines the LEA's plans to improve English language arts and literacy instruction. The Idaho State Leadership Team collaborated with LEA leadership teams, other departments at the ISDE, and community partners to share resources and communicate activities and priorities to improve reading and literacy instruction. The three priorities for the SSIP in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, other ISDE departments, and LEA leadership teams were to address the following:
- (2) **Finance:** Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020. Through the SPDG, SSIP LEAs were sub awarded funds for supporting their SSIP/SPDG implementation activities. The Special Education fiscal team and SPDG project director implemented a fiscal monitoring system to ensure appropriate use of SPDG funds. LEA personnel including business managers, special education directors, and principals were provided information during webinars, virtual meetings, and emails to ensure they understood their budgets, documentation they were required to submit with their reimbursement requests, and expected timelines for drawdowns and document submission.
- (3) **Personnel/Workforce:** With the support of SPDG funding, Idaho was able to expand the State Leadership Team to include the state Special Education Director, Fiscal Coordinator, Fiscal Contract Specialist, and Data and Reporting Program Specialist. In FFY 2021, the team continued to implement the activities of the SSIP ISDE provides statewide professional development opportunities face-to-face and virtually (both synchronous and asynchronous), delivered by qualified professionals. A website was developed to house sustainable training materials and various project resources. Through the SSIP, participating LEAs have access to national literacy experts that guide them through evaluating their LEA's literacy programs, instructional practices, and coaching support through the utilization of a continuous improvement cycle to implement change..
- (4) **Data System:** During the reporting period, Idaho implemented a robust data collection and analysis system. The team continued to collect both implementation and student outcomes data. The SPDG supported an expansion of the SSIP activities in FFY 2021 and those activities needed to be evaluated. Therefore, Idaho continued implementing the data collection and analysis activities from previous years and added additional activities in FFY 2021. Idaho began using newly developed data collection instruments. One example of this was a partnership Idaho established

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

with a vendor that developed and maintains a platform for virtual coaching. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator and SPDG external evaluator continued working together to improve and streamline surveys that were sent to project participants and collected training observation data to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist. Data elements that are collected, analyzed and used to make project improvements include the following bulleted list below. More information on results and changes made to project activities and timelines is provided in subsequent sections. Post-training surveys to evaluate participants' perceptions of the training they received and their gains in knowledge and skills

- Observations to evaluate training quality
- Fidelity of implementation of instructional staff and coaches
- School infrastructure for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R)
- Coaching frequency and quality
- Attendance and activities completion rates

The State Leadership Team also supports SSIP participants to improve their use of data and data literacy. During the Spring Institute training, school teams are provided data reports multiple times per year and participate in training to increase their understanding of the data and how to use them to improve their school reading systems and teachers' instruction.

The State Leadership Team supports a data system that collects both implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivates a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement. Participating SSIP LEAs receive training on data literacy at the annual fall data training delivered by ISDE staff, the Fall Institute training, and Spring Institute. The sections below describe the instruments and data collected in more detail.

- (5) **Professional Development:** The SSIP continued to provide a robust system of statewide professional development, offered both face-to-face and virtually (both synchronous and asynchronous), and delivered by qualified professionals. A website was maintained and expanded to house sustainable training materials and various project resources. Through the SSIP, participating LEA and school staff had access to national literacy experts that guided them through evaluating their schools' reading programs, teachers' instructional practices, and coaching supports through the utilization of a continuous improvement cycle to implement change. Technical assistance (TA) was provided through a variety of sources. TA for LEAs participating in the SSIP included onsite visits to schools in the Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-up years (years 2, 3, and 4 of participation), and monthly virtual technical assistance and coaching calls for instructional staff, coaches, administrators and parents. Differentiated training and TA successfully supported schools to align instructional practices across all Tiers of instruction, helped teachers and coaches improve their practices, and improved schools' collaboration with parents and families.
- (6) **Accountability and Quality Improvement:** ISDE conducted monitoring and accountability activities through the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), fiscal monitoring, and annual LEA Determinations. A team of ISDE Special Education staff improved the data calculation methodology of Idaho's LEA determinations to make a meaningful monitoring system to identify LEAs needing extra support and TA and provided them with those supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs that received a determination of "Needs Intervention" and were identified as low performing in ELA proficiency were approached to participate in the SSIP.
- (7) **Quality Standards:** Idaho continued to facilitate the Idaho Professional Standards Commission, which makes recommendations and renders decisions that provide Idaho with competent, qualified, ethical educators dedicated to rigorous standards, pre-K-12 student achievement, and improved professional practice. All teacher candidates were expected to meet the Idaho Core Teacher Standards and the standards specific to their discipline area(s).

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

- (1) Governance:
 - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
 - i. Increased the number of LEAs participating in the project and specifically targeted LEAs with relatively low student outcomes in reading.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Applications were open from January 1 through April 1, 2022, for participation in the 2022-23 school year. Staff at 7 LEAs with 7 total schools applied to participate. As previously reported, the State Leadership Team's goal was to recruit 10 LEAs and 20 schools. However, they were only able to recruit 7 LEAs with a total of 7 schools. The LEAs represent rural districts and small charter schools. The majority of the LEAs were recruited through a collaboration with the Federal Programs Department Idaho Principals Network.
 - c. Supports change: Adding additional LEAs allows Idaho to scale-up SSIP activities to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.
 - d. Assess and communicate achievement: The application process resulted in 7 new LEAs applying and joining the SSIP activities. In May 2022 the State Leadership team met with the incoming LEAs to provide an overview of the 4-year commitment. Stakeholders were updated through presentations, emails, and special education directors' webinars on the addition of new LEAs throughout the year. The state assessed achievement by tracking the number of application submitted and LEAs participating.
- (2) Finance: Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020. Idaho was able to begin sub-awarding SSIP LEAs to support their participation
 - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

- i. Set up system to award, monitor and reimburse SSIP LEAs for project-related expenditures. LEAs were required to submit reimbursement requests at least quarterly, provide detailed general ledgers of expenditures and submit quarterly expenditure monitoring forms to the State Leadership Team.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Awarded 24 SSIP LEAs subawards and monitored their expenditures. When LEAs requested reimbursements that were not allowable, the reimbursement requests were not approved. LEAs were able to pay their staff for off-contract work they completed for the SSIP or hire substitute teachers with funds.
 - c. Supports change: SPDG funds provide the necessary financial support to help LEAs sustain improvement strategies by supporting instructional staff and LEA-identified coaches in completing SSIP activities during off-contract time or by hiring substitute teachers.
 - d. Assess and communicate achievement: LEA subawards were set up and funds were withdrawn throughout the year. LEAs were reminded to drawdown funds through emails and administrative calls. Additionally, a webinar was held for LEA Business Managers on the type of fund, how to access funds, allowable expenditures, timelines and report submission requirements. The state assessed achievement by tracking expenditure types and percentage of funds that were drawn down quarterly, and through feedback from LEA personnel.
- (3) Personnel/Workforce: During the current reporting period, the SSIP worked to create sustainable training materials for LEA personnel to provide PD and TA for new and returning staff.
 - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
 - i. Created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA personnel to implement evidence-based practices.
 - ii. Added additional members to the ISDE Leadership team including a percentage of time of the fiscal coordinator, contract specialist, special education director and a program specialist, to assist in the implementation of the project objectives. The team began implementing an improved system of fiscal support and accountability, including allocating funds to LEAs based on their needs and developing a process for fiscal monitoring of LEAs. SDE personnel supported LEAs with fiscal issues through technical assistance via webinars, emails and phone calls.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. A series of online training courses were created by literacy and coaching experts on the foundational skills for reading, Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during training. Pageviews were tracked on the training materials to monitor how they were being accessed. The page views for the various training materials from August 2021 through July 31, 2022 are as follows: Foundational Skills resource page: 304 public views, an increase from 122 last year; Comprehensive Data Systems resource page: 436 public views, an increase from 148 last year; Vocabulary Instruction resource page: 96 public views, an increase from 54 last year; Reading Comprehension resource page: 228 public views, an increase from 78 last year; and the Science of Reading added during this reporting period had 440 public views.
 - ii. The State Leadership Team added an additional .75 FTE between the four new staff supporting the project. The team was able to implement a fiscal monitoring process as well as develop processes and materials that would not have been possible without the additional support.
 - c. Supports change: Creating online training material helps to sustain the SSIP activities. Utilizing a designated website organizes the resources and makes accessing materials easy. The State Leadership has greatly increased their capacity with the additional personnel support. This will increase the sustainability and scaling up of the project in the future.
 - d. Assess and communicate achievement: Sustainable material was developed and posted on the project website. The website has seen increased traffic, with all resources increasing page views over last year. The state assessed achievement by tracking the number of public views
- (4) Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho continued developing, implementing and improving a robust data collection system.
 - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
 - i. Developed, implemented and improved a robust data collection system.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Through the SSIP's comprehensive data collection and analysis system, State Leadership Team members were able to make data-driven decisions around areas to focus on for improvement and the strategies to employ. Short-term and intermediate outcomes of these data were primarily focused on improvement of the supports offered through the SSIP and identifying specific areas of reading instruction where SSIP teachers might have needed more support to improve their ability to deliver high-quality instruction. Student outcomes and implementation fidelity data are detailed in other SSIP sections.
 - c. Supports change: Idaho will improve SSIP activities using the data collected through its robust data collection system. Improved SSIP supports will result in LEA and school staff improving their practices and, subsequently, gains in student reading outcomes.
 - d. Assess and communicate achievement: The State Leadership Team assessed achievement through response rates of surveys, timely and accurate data submissions and through conversations with SSIP participants during virtual meetings. To communicate achievement, the State Leadership Team included data to celebrate in monthly reminders emails to all SSIP participants, developed an incentive system for submitting timely and accurate data, and collected and shared success stories through qualitative data collection methods that were compiled into an end of year video and shared with SSIP participants.
- (5) Professional Development: During the reporting period, Idaho continued developing, implementing and improving online training PD to support instructional and coaching staff.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. Develop and be prepared to deliver an introduction to the coaching platform training.
 - ii. Work with individual LEAs when necessary to understand and utilize the coaching platform to support coaching activities.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Deliver coaching platform training will help increase the number of videos submitted, rated, and providing meaningful feedback to instructional staff.
 - c. Supports change: Creating online training material helps to sustain the SSIP activities in meet the SiMR target.
 - d. Assess and communicate achievement: Professional development was embedded into the Fall Institute and instructional/coaching collaboration calls to help stakeholders understand and utilize the coaching platform. The state assessed achievement by tracking the number of videos uploaded and videos submitted to coaches. The State Leadership Team collected mid-year survey data related to the coaching platform, assessed usability, and made adjustments based on feedback from stakeholders.

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

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	--	---------------------

Yes

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

Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho added additional data collection tools and analysis and feedback processes.

- a. Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
 - i. Idaho launched implementation of a virtual coaching platform for instructional staff and coaches. This tool allowed instructional staff and coaches to upload videos of themselves delivering instruction and/or coaching, self-reflect, and share the video with peers or their coach who then provided feedback. The system collected data on each user's activity. The SSIP evaluator accessed the data on a monthly basis to monitor the level of activity of individuals and schools. The State Leadership Team followed up with building principals if there were concerns with low usage from specific schools. They also used the usage data to celebrate the individuals and schools who were utilizing the system regularly.
 - ii. Idaho began collecting data using two new tools in FFY 2021: The High-Quality Professional Development Observation Checklist (HQPD Checklist) and Virtual Facilitation Checklist. Additionally, a new feedback process was put into place for communicating data collected through these tools with the training facilitators. The SSIP evaluator included these data in a trainer feedback report, met virtually with trainers within 3 weeks of delivering the training, reviewed the data and summarized suggestions for improving future trainings.
- b. Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Idaho was able to monitor SSIP instructional staff's and coaches' activity in the virtual coaching platform. During the course of the school year, 235 videos of instruction were shared in the platform by 28 teachers.
 - ii. Third party observers collected training observation data to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist (see subsequent section for specific data obtained through using the HQPD Checklist) and a Virtual Facilitation Checklist. These data were utilized by the State Leadership Team to identify training strengths and weaknesses and to plan for improvements to future trainings.
- c. Support change: Idaho can improve SSIP activities through a robust data collection system which will help them meet their SiMR target. Additionally, sustainability of systems improvement efforts is supported with the coaching platform.

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

1. Governance: Idaho's elected Superintendent will be inaugurated in January 2023. Superintendent of Public Instruction Critchfield might establish different priorities or reading initiatives. The SSIP will work to align with the new priorities. An analysis of students' reading proficiency in kindergarten through third grade will be completed. The State Leadership Team will continue with targeted outreach to LEAs whose reading scores were below the state average and encourage them to apply to the SSIP. Idaho plans to target ten new LEAs and 20 additional schools for the project. The application is open from January 9 through March 31, 2023. Selected LEAs will be notified by April 2023. The addition of new LEAs and buildings will continue to expand the project, increasing the reach of the training to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices. In addition, the Idaho Legislature, during the 2022 session, passed funding for optional full-day kindergarten. The Idaho State Leadership Team will collaborate with participating LEAs to support this new opportunity for kindergarten students. The Idaho Legislature also passed new dyslexia legislation that requires training and professional development for all instructional staff from kindergarten-12th grade. The State Leadership Team will work to ensure the SSIP content and activities align with the legislation where appropriate.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. Initiate recruitment campaign for 2023-24 participation in the SSIP
 - ii. Target low-performing LEAs to apply to participate in the SSIP for the 2023-24 school year.
 - iii. Work with the new Superintendent of Public Instruction and staff to align with or incorporate the Superintendent's priorities into the activities of the SSIP
 - iv. Align professional development activities with Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together or SMART Project, Content Department initiative, and the SSIP. This will provide cohesion for LEAs that have instructional staff in both projects.
 - v. Align the SSIP training and PD opportunities with the new dyslexia legislation where appropriate.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes:
 - i. Add new LEAs that would benefit from participation in the project and increase reading proficiency for students with disabilities.
 - ii. Scale up the project through recruitment of 10 new LEAs
 - iii. Improve instructional staff's delivery of explicit instruction when teaching reading
 - iv. Build the capacity of LEAs to provide coaching for instructional staff
 - v. Improve schools' implementation of MTSS-R
 - vi. Improve LEA and school leaders' abilities to lead an implementation team effectively.
2. Personnel/Workforce: The SSIP creates sustainable coaching material to provide PD and TA for new and returning district-identified instructional coaches. SPDG funds have made it possible to develop a scope of work for an external evaluator to help provide additional analysis of project activities.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. We have created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA coaches to support instructional staff implementing evidence-based practices.
 - ii. Add an external evaluator to support the ISDE Leadership team in data collection, analysis, and reporting.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Create coaching support material to assist LEA-identified coaches in supporting instructional staff in teaching foundational skills for reading, the Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during training and monthly instructional/coaching calls.
3. Accountability/monitoring: The SSIP is a four-year project. LEAs during the 4th year of the project will be assisted in completing an Idaho SPDG Sustainability Assessment to determine if additional supports are needed to help with the sustainability of the evidence-based practices utilized throughout the project. The Sustainability Checklist has seven sections: Cost/benefit, funding stability, partnerships, organizational capacity, program evaluation, communication, and strategic planning. Additionally, surveys are sent out after all TA and PD activities, and the Leadership team wants to establish focus groups to gather participants' input on the effectiveness of project activities.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

- i. Create procedures on how to complete the Sustainability Checklist.
 - ii. Reach out to different roles in the project to recruit focus group members representing instructional staff, coaches, administrators, and parents.
 - iii. Develop standardized focus group questions that are open-ended to gather input.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Providing additional support identified through the Sustainability Checklist increases the LEA's ability to sustain evidence-based practices.
 - ii. Through focus groups, the Idaho Leadership team will be able to better address the needs of the participants based on their role in the project.
- 4. Professional development: The ISDE Content and Curriculum Department launched its K-3 reading project Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART), in conjunction with the first annual K-3 Reading Summit. SMART is a multiyear cohort project that provides training and coaching to K-3 educators across Idaho. The SSIP State Leadership team, in collaboration with the SMART Director, developed a plan for supporting SSIP schools whose teachers were interested in participating in the SMART project. The partnership will provide instructional staff with additional options to improve student reading outcomes. Additionally, Idaho utilizes a coaching platform to support the implementation of explicit instruction with fidelity. The LEAs do not currently utilize coaching platforms so the State Leadership Team will develop and provide robust training on the effective use of the platform.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. Develop a coordinated plan for LEA staff participating in the SSIP and SMART projects.
 - ii. Develop and be prepared to deliver a more robust coaching platform training.
 - iii. Work with individuals LEAs when necessary to understand and utilize the coaching platform to support coaching activities.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Aligning the SMART and SSIP will positively impact students' ability to read. Instructional staff will not have to choose one project over another to learn and implement evidence-based practices for teaching reading.
 - ii. A more robust coaching platform training will help increase the number of videos submitted, rated, and providing meaningful feedback to instructional staff.
- 5. Technical Assistance: LEAs are supported with technical assistance (TA) specific to their individual needs and the number of years that they have been in the project. Additionally, TA support is designed to address the various roles within the projects.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. Send monthly reminder emails to all participants to remind them of upcoming activities and requirements
 - ii. Facilitate monthly virtual calls for building administrators to provide training on Implementation Science, discuss barriers to implementation and project activities and timelines.
 - iii. Facilitate monthly cohort Collaboration Calls to provide training and technical assistance to instructional staff and LEA/school coaches on the project's evidence-based practices.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Monthly reminder emails, administrative calls, and collaboration calls result in higher participation and completion of activities, less project confusion, better implementation fidelity
 - ii. Monthly administrative and collaborative calls offer an opportunity to provide specific strategies on implementation of evidence-based and Implementation Science practices, which result in better implementation fidelity and improved student outcomes
- 6. Data: The State Leadership Team supports a data system that collects implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivates a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement.
 - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
 - i. Identify and hire an external evaluator to increase the State Leadership Team's ability to analyze project data and make recommendations for project improvement.
 - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
 - i. Through additional analysis of project data, the State Leadership Team will know what activities in the project are associated with improved results and which activities might need to be adjusted to meet desired outcomes.

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

ISDE supported the implementation of five evidence-based practices: Implementation Science Framework, Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA), IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide, Instructional Coaching, Explicit Instruction

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

- (1) Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science refers to the "methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability" of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation 161 Part B Science Framework provides methods and strategies to facilitate quality implementation and use of evidence-based practices. The SSIP utilizes the resources created by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- (2) Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 1, 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science to focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the Project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA system.
- (3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. The practice guide was developed utilizing rigorous research to provide specific recommendations for teaching reading. The evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills include: Recommendation 1 – Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge; Recommendation 2 – Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3 – Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and Recommendation 4 – Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

- (4) Instructional Coaching: LEA-identified staff receive training in coaching practices to support instructional staff with professional development and implementation of explicit instruction. Instructional coaches offer classroom modeling, supportive feedback, and observations of specific teaching practices.
- (5) Explicit Instruction: SSIP instructional staff are trained and supported to utilize explicit instruction strategies to deliver effective reading instruction to students with disabilities. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as “a systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented” form of instruction. The SSIP provides training to participating teachers and coaches on the effective implementation of explicit instruction as a part of the Fall Institute. Coaches are provided additional training on explicit instruction components within the Comprehensive Decoding RESET Rubric to support teachers with effective implementation of the EBP and evaluate fidelity of implementation. Instructional staff implement and measure progress on each component throughout the year and receive coaching support on identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Instructional staff receive expert TA from SSIP staff and contracted coaches during the Fall Institute, twice a year during In-District Visits, and during monthly calls with literacy experts to further their understanding and implementation of the explicit instruction practices.

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

- (1) Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science refers to the “methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability” of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation 161 Part B Science Framework provides methods and strategies to facilitate quality implementation and use of evidence-based practices. The SSIP utilizes the resources created by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- The State Leadership Team strengthens state-level infrastructure and LEAs implement EBPs using an implementation science framework. At the LEA level, implementation teams are formed, training on the Framework is provided by SSIP staff.
- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls
 - Tools Used: NIRN Initiative Inventory, Communication Plan Template, Implementation Drivers, Action Plan, Implementation Stages, and Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA)
 - Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials
 - Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of Implementation Science, LEAs review the health of their reading programs and make necessary changes in instructional practices and district policies to improve reading outcomes for students.
- (2) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science to focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the SSIP has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA system.

Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science with a focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA and building systems. Building teams complete the PDSA cycle at least annually upon completion of their MTSS-R review. SSIP staff provide TA during monthly administrator calls and In-District Visits to support their understanding of the process and promote effective implementation of the practices.

- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls
- Tools Used: Action Plan worksheet
- Data collected: Attendance, completed and submitted Action Plan, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials
- Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of a continuous improvement cycle, LEA and building leadership teams can track their progress in the implementation of evidence-based practices, use of student data to make decisions, improve the delivery of explicit instruction, align instruction across all tiers, and other LEA-identified priorities. All of these activities improve outcomes for students.

- (3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. The practice guide was developed utilizing rigorous research to provide specific recommendations for teaching reading. The evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills include: Recommendation 1 – Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge; Recommendation 2 – Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3 – Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and Recommendation 4 – Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide. SSIP instructional staff and coaches are trained on the EBPs outlined in the IES Foundational Skills Guide. This training is provided every year for schools in the Readiness year during the Fall Institute, as well as through an online course designed to support instructional staff to implement early reading EBPs in the classroom. All instructional staff and coaches complete twenty modules in two parts over the span of the school year during the Readiness year. Completion, knowledge gain, and satisfaction are measured for each module to ensure the SSIP provides training that supports improved implementation of EBPs in reading. A hybrid version of the module course is available for teachers and coaches entering the project after the initial Readiness year. This accommodates staff turnover, allowing new staff to gain the knowledge of the EBPs and participate fully in the project, since the original course is completed only during the Readiness year. Each subsequent year during the Fall Institute, instructional and coaching staff receive PD specific to the recommendations outlined in the IES Practice Guide.

- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, Collaborative Calls for instructional staff and coaches, online PD

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

- Tools Used: Contracted reading specialists, synchronous and asynchronous trainings, website to house resources, Fall Institute
 - Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials, HQPD Observation Checklist
 - Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support instructional staff's knowledge, skills, and abilities to deliver explicit instruction specific to the foundations of reading has a positive impact on student outcomes.
- (4) Instructional Coaching: LEAs/schools implement instructional coaching practices to support growth at the classroom level for students with disabilities. Instructional coaches participate in training to improve their knowledge and skills in both explicit instruction and instructional coaching. To improve their knowledge and skills around explicit instruction in reading, LEA-identified coaches attend training during the Fall Institute specific to their year in the project. During the Readiness Year coaches focus on the foundational skills of reading; Implementation Year focuses on data decision making; Sustainability Year focuses on vocabulary instruction; and the Scale-Up Year addresses reading comprehension. They also participate in training on the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric, a tool the SSIP uses to assess instructional staff's fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction. This training helps coaches understand what high-quality explicit instruction practices look like and helps guide their action planning and coaching with teachers. Training focused on improving coaching practices is delivered in a three-year cycle each December. Each year the SSIP has a specific coaching focus on Jim Knight's coaching practices.
- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, Coaching PD (years 2, 3, and 4), In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls, online PD,
 - Tools Used: Contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, website to house resources 163 Part B
 - Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials, observations of coaches, RESET Rubric ratings, coaching platform data
 - Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to develop and support instructional coaches' knowledge, skills, and abilities helps teachers improve their delivery of reading instruction. This, in turn, improves student outcomes.
- (5) Explicit Instruction: LEA instructional staff utilize explicit instruction to deliver effective reading instruction to students with disabilities. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as "a systematic, direct, engaging, and success oriented" form of instruction. The Project provides training on the effective implementation of explicit instruction to coaches and teachers as a part of the Fall Institute. Coaches and instructional staff are provided additional training on the 7 explicit instruction components within the RESET Rubric to support teachers with effective implementation of the EBP and to evaluate fidelity of implementation. Instructional staff implement and measure progress on each of the explicit instruction components throughout the year and receive coaching support on identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Instructional staff receive expert TA from SSIP staff and contracted coaches during the Fall Institute, twice a year during In-District Visits, and during monthly calls with literacy experts to further their understanding and implementation of the explicit instruction practices.
- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls, online PD, teachers videotape instruction and self-reflect using the RESET Rubric, coaches assess instructional delivery using the RESET Rubric to guide coaching
 - Tools Used: Contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, website to house resources, Fall Institute, RESET Rubric, coaching platform
 - Data collected: Attendance, survey data, training materials, RESET Rubric data and instructional videos uploaded by instructional staff, coaching platform data
 - Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support coaches' and instructional staff's knowledge, skills, and abilities to deliver explicit instruction with fidelity has a positive impact on student outcomes.

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

Idaho monitors fidelity of implementation on multiple levels; at the state, building and classroom levels. Below is a description of the instruments and processes used to monitor fidelity and a summary of the data collected in FFY 2021.

State-level systems assessment using the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet

As a SPDG grantee, Idaho is required to complete the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet annually to submit with the annual performance report (APR) in May. The SPDG State Leadership Team completed the worksheet from January through April 2022. The worksheet includes 16 components of high-quality professional development including personnel selection, quality of trainings, coaching, data systems and systemic leadership supports. The State Leadership Team developed an action plan for improving gaps in implementation and will continue assessing and updating the action plan.

Building-level systems assessment using the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading (MTSS-R) Checklist and Action Planning Tool

The MTSS-R Checklist and Action Planning Tool was developed by the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL). It is an evaluation, prioritization and planning tool that is utilized by building leadership teams to assess their school infrastructure to support high-quality reading instruction for all students. Annually, building leadership teams complete the Checklist and prioritization process and develop an improvement plan. Teams use the data from the Checklist and action plan monthly during leadership team meetings along with a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle to update their action plans to continuously improve their implementation. The State Leadership Team uses the data to monitor building, cohort and project-level systems improvements. FFY 2021 was the second year that Idaho used the MTSS-R Checklist. The Checklist is divided into 5 elements. NCIL updated the Checklist during the previous year, adding an additional element and modifying some of the existing indicators. The elements are as follows: Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention, Element 2: Data Use, Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching, Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership, Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School. Each element is further broken down into sections and individual indicators. Building leadership teams completed the Checklist and Action Planning Tool at the Fall Institute in August 2021. The average percentage of items implemented is reported below for each element.

Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention; 60%

Element 2: Data Use; 41%

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching; 33%
 Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership; 49%
 Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School; 42%

Classroom-level fidelity of explicit instruction assessment using the Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (RESET Rubric) and surveys

The RESET Rubric was developed under a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences (IES). The Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR) evaluates the teacher's implementation of a comprehensive decoding lesson taught using explicit, systematic instruction. In a comprehensive decoding lesson, the focus is on the instruction and practice of accurate sound-symbol correspondence, word reading, encoding and reading connected text. The RESET Rubric consists of 7 components made up of 18 individual practices. In the SSIP project, instructional staff are required to record videos of their classroom instruction, review the video and self-reflect using the RESET Rubric. They then submit the video to their LEA instructional coach in a virtual coaching platform, newly implemented in FFY 2021. The coach views the video and completes a RESET Rubric to assess implementation fidelity and sends the ratings back to the instructional staff in the virtual coaching platform. The coach and instructional staff develop an action plan collaboratively that they review and update monthly. A full RESET Rubric is completed twice per year, in the fall and spring, to assess improvement in implementation fidelity. The State Leadership Team collects the RESET Rubric data from LEA coaches and summarizes the data to identify areas where participants might benefit from targeted training and to monitor improvement in implementation fidelity at the building, LEA, cohort and project levels.

In FFY 2021, collecting high-quality and complete RESET Rubric data proved challenging. With the support of the SPDG funds, the State Leadership Team was able to partner with a vendor to provide a virtual coaching platform to facilitate the video recording and coaching process and to automate RESET Rubric data collection. Implementation of the virtual platform was launched in fall 2021. The State Leadership Team provided training and technical assistance in the Fall Institute and throughout the year. As with any new technology or intervention, uptake of the platform was slow during the 2021-22 school year and no coaches sent RESET Rubric ratings in the system to their instructional staff. Therefore, the internal evaluator did not receive any RESET Rubric ratings from instructional coaches. However, The State Leadership Team partnered with the Lee Pesky Learning Center (LPLC) to conduct external observations of teachers' videos using the RESET Rubric. LPLC is a non-profit educational consultancy company that partnered with Boise State University in developing the RESET Rubric. The State Leadership Team asked instructional staff to submit videos to LPLC for the external observation and rubric rating. In spring 2022, 5 instructional staff submitted videos that met all the criteria to be able to be scored. RESET Rubric targets were 40% implemented for those in Implementation cohort and 80% implemented for those in Sustainability cohort. Four out of five instructional staff met the target that corresponded with the cohort they were in. In FFY 2022, the State Leadership Team provided more training and technical assistance, developed resources, and improved processes to ensure better quality data submission in the future.

The State Leadership Team also collected data on participants' perceptions of their growth in knowledge and skills related to explicit delivery of foundational skills reading instruction. In the End of Year Survey sent to participants in May 2022, instructional staff were asked to rate their skill level at the beginning and end of the year on the following objectives: (1) delivering instruction on the Foundational Reading Skills, and (2) using explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading. 24 teachers responded to the questions and response percentages were as follows:

(1) delivering instruction on the Foundational Reading Skills

Beginning of the year – 8% Novice, 25% Advanced Beginner, 46% Competent, 21% Proficient, 0% Expert (21% proficient or above)
 End of the year – 4% Novice, 13% Advanced Beginner, 29% Competent, 50% Proficient, 4% Expert (54% proficient or above)

(2) using explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading

Beginning of the year – 8% Novice, 29% Advanced Beginner, 46% Competent, 17% Proficient, 0% Expert (17% proficient or above)
 End of the year – 0% Novice, 17% Advanced Beginner, 29% Competent, 50% Proficient, 4% Expert (54% proficient or above)

Fidelity of coaching assessment using the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT)

Through a thorough review of literature, a rubric for measuring the core components of instructional coaching, which also aligns with the training curriculum for LEA coaches, was developed in FFY 2021. FFY 2022 will be the first year data is collected on instructional coaches' fidelity of implementation. Data will be reported in the FFY 2023 SSIP submission.

Training fidelity of implementation using the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Observation Checklist

The HQPDP Observation Checklist is a 22-item instrument that addresses six domains present in high-quality professional development: Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation/Reflection, and Mastery. Two evaluators individually observed each of the SSIP trainings delivered in FFY 2021, rated the HQPDP Observation Checklist and then came together and calibrated their scores. The internal evaluator developed a summary report for each training that included strengths and areas for improvement. The internal evaluator and SSIP Coordinator met with each trainer within 3 weeks of the training, provided them the summary report, and discussed how the training could be improved in the future. The HQPDP Checklist scores were summarized as the percent of items observed. The target percentage of items implemented was 90%. Data for the FFY 2021 trainings are as follows:

- MTSS-R Training: 90%
- Reading content training sessions: 95%
- RESET Rubric sessions: 81%
- Leading by Convening: 62%
- Serving on Groups: 65%
- Library training: 90%
- Coaching Training: 86%

Virtual technical assistance fidelity using the Virtual Facilitation Checklist

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled/prepopulated) data	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled/prepopulated) data	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
--	--	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

In the same vein as the HQPDP observation checklist, a virtual facilitation checklist (VFC) was developed in FFY 2021, based on identified best practices, to (1) assist planners and facilitators in the design and delivery of virtual collaboratives and (2) observe virtual collaboratives in order to provide ongoing feedback to planners and facilitators for process improvements. FFY 2021 was the first year the VFC was used to evaluate the quality of virtual technical assistance meetings. Two evaluators individually observed and rated the VFC and then came together and calibrated their scores. The internal evaluator and SSIP Coordinator met with meeting facilitators to go over the strengths and areas for improvement identified through the observation and scoring process. The target percentage of items implemented was 90%. Data for the FFY 2021 virtual technical assistance sessions are as follows:

Instructional staff and coaches collaborative: 95%

Special education director collaborative: 95%

Parent collaborative: 100%

Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The State Leadership Team collects various data for progress monitoring and continuous improvement of the SSIP evidence-based practices. The results of the progress monitoring support the state's decision to continue the ongoing use of the previously identified evidence-based practices. The data collection instruments, processes and data summaries are described below.

Student progress monitoring

Idaho Reading Indicator

The SSIP State Leadership Team monitored progress of student outcomes on a monthly basis using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered in the fall and spring to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. The Special Education Department analyzed these data to assess LEA progress toward targets and provided LEAs with IRI reports with data from the 2020-2021 school year at the Fall 2021 Data Drill Down. These reports contained charts and tables disaggregated by student demographics including race/ethnicity, special education status, grade, and reading subskill. Additionally, LEAs were able to use the IRI as an informal progress monitoring tool at any time and the majority of SSIP LEAs used it as such. The SSIP internal evaluator obtained the informal, uncleaned progress monitoring data at the beginning of each month for the month prior, aggregated the data to the building, LEA, cohort and project levels, and used it for state-level program planning and estimating progress toward the SiMR. For example, when State Leadership Team members identified that the Text Fluency subskill of the IRI was an area where students were underperforming, they met with the SSIP literacy consultants and developed material and training to address the issue during the Spring Institute. The consultants also used the school-level IRI reports to target specific reading subskills during their In-District visits with schools in February 2022. The consultants provided specific technical assistance and coaching to help teachers improve their reading instruction delivery in the subskill areas where their students were underperforming.

SSIP participant progress monitoring

Essential Components for Reading Instruction (ECRI) Part I & II online training modules

An important part of the SSIP training for instructional staff and coaches is the ECRI online training modules. The purpose of these modules is for participants to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver effective instruction to students when teaching reading. The State Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on participants' completion and learning. Participants complete a short survey after finishing each module. The survey asks questions related to the quality of the training and participant satisfaction, as well as their perceptions around how they've increased their understanding of the course content and ability to implement it. The State Leadership Team tracks the completion progress of participants as they work their way through the modules and analyzes the survey data to better understand how participants perceive their improvements. The State Leadership Team reviewed the survey data for each module with the consultants who created the modules. The qualitative responses were especially helpful in determining what the issues were with the modules. When issues were reported in the survey, the training developers took action to fix them. 45 SSIP participants completed at least the first 10 online training modules (Part I) and 27 of those completed the whole 20 module series during FFY 2021. 84% (n=898) of Part I survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 26% (n=279) of respondents said that they understood how to teach the big idea or strategy of the module before the training (proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert), which increased to 57% (603) after the training. In regards to their ability to utilize the big idea or strategy from the module in their instruction, 27% (288) said they were able to utilize the big idea or strategy before the training compared to 56% (n=594) after the training. Regarding Part II, 91% (n=461) of survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 25% (n=127) of respondents said that they understood how to teach the big idea or strategy of the module before the training (proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert), which increased to 54% (273) after the training. In regards to their ability to utilize the big idea or strategy from the module in their instruction, 25% (127) said they were able to utilize the big idea or strategy before the training compared to 56% (n=283) after the training.

Post-training surveys

Fall Institute Post-Training Survey

The Fall Institute is the SSIP training kick off in which LEA and school SSIP participants learn the evidence-based practices associated with their role and year in the project. The training is delivered over multiple days and using both in-person and virtual formats. Teams come together to complete the MTSS-R Checklist for the school year and then participate in various other trainings on evidence-based practices according to their role. After the training, the State Leadership Team sends the participants a post-training survey which asks questions about their satisfaction with the training and improvements in knowledge and abilities around the evidence-based practices. The survey responses are used to better understand in which areas the trainings need improvement and to develop an improvement plan. Below are survey response data on participants' satisfaction and self-perceived learning acquired as a result of the Fall Institute trainings.

Percent satisfied with each Fall Institute session:

- MTSS-R: 104/125, 82%
- Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (28/29, 97%), Data Based Decision Making (18/18, 100%), Vocabulary (6/6, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (5/6, 83%), Data Based Decision Making (13/14, 93%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening: (12/14, 86%)

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	--	---------------------

- Serving on Groups (17/17, 100%)

Percent that increased skills as a result of the training (LT=learning target):

- MTSS-R (LT1 103/125, 90%; LT2 118/125, 94%; LT3 112/124, 90%; LT4 112/124, 90%; LT5 111/124, 88%)
- Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 28/29, 97%; LT2 28/29, 97%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 18/18, 100%), Vocabulary (LT1 6/6, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 6/6, 100%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 13/14, 93%; LT2 14/14, 100%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening (LT1 12/14, 86%; LT2 12/14, 86%; LT3 11/14, 79%)
- Serving on Groups (LT1 13/17, 76%; LT2 14/17, 82%; LT3 17/17, 100%; LT4 14/17, 82%; LT5 15/17, 88%)

As the skills assessed were tied to the evidence-based practices of the SSIP, when participants reported increasing their skills at high rates (>80%), trainings were determined to be effective and the State Leadership Team continued providing the trainings. When low participants reported increasing their skills at percentages lower than 80%, the trainings were reviewed and modified.

Coaching Training Survey

The Coaching Training took place in December 2021 and was attended by LEA coaches in years 2, 3, and 4 of SSIP participation. The purpose of the training was for LEA coaches to increase their knowledge of effective instructional coaching practices and ability to implement them. The Coaching Training survey was sent out to participants after the training. 100% (n=5) of survey respondents were satisfied with the training and reported they improved their skills on the learning targets.

Spring Institute Post-Training Survey

The Spring Institute is the SSIP's annual data training that takes place in May each year. The FFY 2020 Spring Institute took place in May 2022. Participants were sent the Spring Institute Post-Training Survey after completing the training. Similar to the other post-training surveys, respondents are asked about their perceptions around the quality of the training and satisfaction. 98% of respondents reported they were satisfied with the training (n=45)

In-District Visit Surveys

In the fall and spring each year, SSIP reading consultants visit each participating school to observe instruction and provide feedback, model instructional strategies, meet with leadership teams, and provide coaching. After the visits, participants are sent a post-In-District Visit survey. 96% of respondents said the support they received will help them improve their skills (n=24) and 96% said they were satisfied with the quality of the visit (n=26).

Librarian Training Survey

Librarians of schools participating in the SSIP and the public librarian counterparts in their school communities were asked to complete a training to improve their ability to engage struggling readers in the library. The training consisted of 4 hours of asynchronous virtual learning followed by a 1-hour live debrief session. 61 librarians completed the 4-hour asynchronous training. Upon completion, all participants had to submit a post-training survey. 100% of participants reported that the workshop was valuable and that they were likely to apply what they learned and at least 85% reported they increased their skills on all of the learning targets. 33 participants responded to the survey following the 1-hour live debrief session, with 97% answering that they plan to make improvements in their library setting as a result of the training.

End of Year Survey

In June, 2022, all SSIP participants were sent an end-of-year survey that included specific questions based on their role in the project. Participants were asked about their perceived improvement, the improvement they saw in their students, the importance and quality of the SSIP training and supports in which they participated, among other questions. Of the 51 participants who responded to the survey, 90% (n=46) said they were satisfied with the overall supports they received during the year as part of the SSIP.

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

- 1 Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams in implementing evidence-based practices, reviewing and revising their MTSS-R process, and supporting instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.
- 2 Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA) The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams to identify areas of need through the MTSS-R process and create and implement a continuous improvement cycle to support instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:
 - i. Addition of a mid-year call with schools and the National Center for Improving Literacy to monitor schools' Action Plans (PDSA).
- 3 IES Foundational Skills Practice: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support instructional staff to implement evidence-based instruction practices
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:
 - i. Create a padlet for each year of the project to post the monthly resources presented at monthly instructional/coaching calls, including recordings of the calls for staff that are unable to attend live.
 - ii. Continuously evaluate and improve the trainings and TA provided by the SSIP
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes:
 - i. Utilizing a designated website organizes the resources and makes accessing materials easy.
- 4 Instructional Coaching:
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	--	---------------------

- i. Develop and be prepared to deliver a more robust coaching platform training.
 - ii. Work with individual LEAs/schools when necessary to understand and utilize the coaching platform to support coaching activities.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes
 - i. Addition of robust training on the use of the virtual coaching platform instructional staff will receive synchronous and asynchronous coaching to improve reading outcomes for students.
- 5 Explicit Instruction:
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR
 - i. Support LEAs that have teachers in the SMART Project and align to SSIP activities.
 - ii. Incorporate the new Idaho Dyslexia Legislation training and professional development into SSIP activities.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes
 - i. Better coherence between the ISDE's two PD initiatives that focus on early reading
 - ii. Ensure that teachers meet Dyslexia Legislation requirements through participation in the SSIP. This will decrease teachers' frustration with having to participate in multiple trainings with very similar content.

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

No

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Additional activities and strategies are mentioned in previous sections. During FFY 2021 we continuously modified SSIP activities, strategies, and timelines based on quantitative and qualitative data we collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system. Information collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system resulted in making small adjustments to best meet the needs of LEAs and stakeholders. The stakeholders who provided information and data are listed in the next section.

Some of the changes to activities, strategies and timelines are listed below.

Timeline Changes

- Changed dates of Fall Institute to not conflict with the Idaho Superintendents' Conference
- Visited first-year elementary school principals in the spring before starting implementation in August

Justification for Timeline Changes

- In the previous year, the SSIP Fall Institute conflicted with the Idaho Superintendents' Conference resulting in administrators and special education directors not attending the MTSS-R training with the LEA/school team. The SSIP State Leadership Team swapped the Instructional PD days to the first week in August and moved the MTSS-R training to the second week. Adjusting the calendar of events resulted in complete teams attending the Fall Institute together.
- In the previous submission, the newly identified LEAs were visited virtually by one of the contracted state coaches. Members of the SSIP State Leadership Team met with each new elementary school principal and special education director in the spring before starting in August. Meeting in person allowed the State Leadership Team to share the expectations of the project, answer questions, and individualize the supports that would be necessary to ensure success.

Activity Changes

- Planned for alignment of the SMART/Cultivating Readers pilot LEAs
- Built in coaching platform check-ins during collaboration calls
- All participants signed an agreement to complete all required SSIP activities.
- Began using new data collection instruments (e.g., Virtual Facilitation Checklist, Coaching Fidelity of Implementation Tool (C-LIFT))

Justification for change

- To coordinate across ISDE Content Department and Special Education Department initiatives, the SSIP Leadership team aligned project activities with the new Content Department SMART initiative. It provided teachers who were participating in both initiatives to minimize duplicative work.
- To ensure coaches and instructional staff understood how to utilize the coaching platform, specific TA was built into each of the instructional collaboration calls.
- In an effort to improve completion of SSIP activities, fidelity of implementation, and data submission, all SSIP participants were asked to sign an agreement to continue receiving fiscal support for their participation.
- The new tools were used to evaluate aspects of the project that were not formerly evaluated. By collecting evaluation data on these activities, the State Leadership Team was able to target areas for improvement.

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

[populated if Introduction description is shared with all indicators]

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

[additional text box for SSIP only Stakeholder Input]

- 1) Special Education Advisory Groups
 - a) Directors Advisory Council (DAC)
 - b) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- 2) SSIP participants
 - a) Special education director meetings
 - b) Parent group meetings
 - c) District Leadership meetings
 - d) Individual SSIP participants
- 3) SSIP partners
 - a) Idaho Commission for Libraries
 - b) Boise State University
 - c) Metis Education Consulting
 - d) Idaho Parents Unlimited
 - e) University of Idaho
 - f) Lee Pesky Learning Center
 - g) National Center on Improving Literacy
- 4) ISDE collaboration
 - a) Coordination with Idaho SMART project
 - b) STAT team

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

Idaho engaged diverse stakeholders representing a wide range of perspectives. Stakeholders were engaged on various levels, depending on their background and depth of knowledge of the SSIP work. Stakeholders informed and provided input to the SSIP State Leadership Team on how to overcome challenges, improve implementation of evidence-based practices, improve the evaluation and address gaps in the SSIP project through the SPDG application. The State Leadership Team co-created content and project activities with the stakeholders who had more in-depth understanding and experience with the project on a transforming level of engagement. Below are details of the specific strategies the State Leadership Team used to engage each set of stakeholders. The levels on which the State Leadership Team engaged each group of stakeholders has been included next to each set.

- 1) Special Education Advisory Groups - (Networking)
 - a) DAC
 - b) SEAP

The State Leadership Team met with the special education advisory groups on a quarterly basis during half or full day meetings scheduled through the special education department and used various strategies for engagement. Some of the strategies included presenting information or project data to inform on the current status of the work, presenting barriers or challenges and asking for input on how to overcome them, and sharing evaluation data collected from SSIP participants and eliciting ideas for continuous improvement.

- 2) SSIP participants – (Collaborating and Transforming):
 - a) Special education director meetings
 - b) Parent group meetings
 - c) District Leadership meetings
 - d) Individual SSIP participants

On a monthly basis, the State Leadership Team or SSIP partners met with SSIP participants to review project data, discuss progress on building leadership team goals (e.g., Special education directors meeting address implementation of MTSS-R goals and action plans), asked specific questions to pinpoint areas of success and challenges, worked through a continuous improvement cycle, and evaluated fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices. SSIP Participants received PD and TA throughout the year. Upon completion of each PD or TA visit a survey was sent out to gather input on how to improve the activities implemented through the SSIP. The State Leadership Team and SSIP partners reviewed survey data and developed an action plan to improve support.

- 3) SSIP partners (Collaborating and Transforming)
 - a) Idaho Commission for Libraries
 - b) Boise State University
 - c) Metis Education Consulting
 - d) Idaho Parents Unlimited
 - e) University of Idaho
 - f) Lee Pesky Learning Center
 - g) National Center on Improving Literacy

SSIP partners are government agencies, universities, non-profits and private companies who work with the State Leadership Team to develop and improve the SSIP supports. The State Leadership Team met one-on-one on at least a quarterly basis with each of the partners listed above. Engagement activities included jointly developing a scope of work for the partner to carry out during the course of the year, debriefing trainings that took place by reviewing participant data collected via surveys and training observation data to come up with an action plan for improvement, discussing feedback the partners had collected from SSIP participants during any events they facilitated and coming to consensus on how to address the feedback, and reviewing project implementation or outcome data to collaborate and plan for next steps.

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	--	---------------------

- 4) ISDE collaboration (Informing to Transforming)
 - a) Coordination with Idaho SMART project
 - b) State Technical Assistance Team (STAT Team)

The State Leadership Team worked interdepartmentally to be informed of other ISDE professional development initiatives and to build cohesion among them. The ISDE Content and Curriculum Department launched its K-3 reading project Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) in conjunction with the first annual K-3 Reading Summit. SMART is a multiyear cohort project that provides training and coaching to K-3 educators across Idaho. The SSIP State Leadership team in collaboration with the SMART Director developed a plan for supporting SSIP schools whose teachers were interested in participating in the SMART project. The collaboration will provide instructional staff with additional options to improve reading outcomes for students. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator participated as a member of the STAT Team, an advisory group led by the Federal Programs Department to improve implementation of the school improvement efforts required under ESEA. The SSIP evaluator represented the activities and needs of the SSIP in STAT meetings.

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

Yes

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State Leadership Team gathered stakeholders' concerns through surveys, during meetings, in-district visits, and other forms of communications. The State Leadership Team looked at challenges and concerns through the lens of "technical" or "adaptive" challenges. Technical challenges were addressed through problem-solving and sharing experience from other members of the SSIP project. Adaptive challenges required meeting with the specific group and looking for ways to come to consensus on an acceptable solution. Staff turnover continued to be the biggest challenge. The State Leadership Team worked with each partner differently to address staff turnover. Some school teams were able to utilize SSIP-developed sustainable resources to train new staff. Other school teams chose not to advance to the next year of the project because they viewed the scope of the challenge as insurmountable.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

All activities are addressed in previous sections.

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

See previous sections.

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

Idaho has not identified any new barriers that have not been addressed in prior sections. The ISDE Leadership Team will monitor all activities, implementation, and data collection to determine if additional supports are needed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The current theory of action. <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-StateSystematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

Prior FFY Required Actions

<Required Actions identified for the Indicator in FFY 2020 will appear here>

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

OSEP Response

<OSEP Response identified for the Indicator in FFY 2021 will appear here>

Required Actions

<Required Actions identified for the Indicator in FFY 2021 will appear here>

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled (prepopulated) data)	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

--

Non-editable data field (preloaded/prefilled prepopulated) data	Editable data field (preloaded/prefilled prepopulated) data	Data entry field	Calculated field	[explanation of conditional fields]	<Non-editable data>
---	---	------------------	------------------	--	---------------------