

FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

Oregon's SiMR is:

To increase the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level, as measured by state assessment.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: 42.8%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 33%

FFY 2019 Target: 35%

FFY 2018 Data: 24.45%

FFY 2019 Data: Not available

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? No

Did slippage¹ occur? No

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

¹ The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (*i.e.*, *benchmark*, *CQI*, *survey*) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? Yes

If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (ORTII) provides MTSS coaching supports in literacy within participating schools across Oregon. Additional literacy screening data was collected through State-approved early literacy screening measures for students attending these participating schools. Cohort data collected for second grade students during winter 2020 demonstrates Oregon’s progress towards the SiMR through both: (a) an increase in the percentage of students performing at or above grade level benchmark (from 37.7% when entering kindergarten in 2017 to 54.6% of students at the middle of grade two in 2020), and (b) a decrease in the percentage of students needing intensive intervention (from 32.8% at the start of kindergarten to 25.1% at the middle of grade two). Taken together, this data suggests that Oregon districts are making progress toward the SiMR.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? Yes

If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The State noted data quality and quantity issues related to the collection of reading screening data as evidence of progress toward the SiMR. The State examined available reading screening data from LEAs receiving supports from Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (ORTII). Oregon does not require LEAs to report reading screening measures for students. While Oregon requires each student entering kindergarten or first grade to be screened for risk factors for the likelihood of reading difficulties including dyslexia, there is not a requirement for districts to report this information to the State. The lack of a statewide system for districts to use to track student reading screening data prevented the State from comparing student progress in reading among LEAs that did and did not receive SSIP supports.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes

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. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The State is unable to report SiMR data for the FFY 2019 reporting period due to COVID-19. Data completeness, reliability, and validity were impacted because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Oregon schools did not administer the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment in spring 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic and associated school closures. The Smarter Balanced Assessment is the State's summative measure used to report on the SiMR throughout all phases of SSIP reporting. The State received a waiver from the US Department of Education for the SBAC assessment due to the school closure.

Oregon's Governor closed schools in March 2020. The State needed to prepare to move from in person instruction to distance learning, and was uncertain how long schools would remain closed. Due to the lack of summative assessment data from the 2019-2020 school year, the State is unable to report progress towards the SiMR in this FFY 2019 report.

Instruction prior to the assessment window was interrupted because of the school closure in March 2020. Statewide school closure and the transition to distance learning models represents a concern related to data completeness and validity for data collected toward Oregon's SSIP implementation strategies. During the initial phase of school closure, students were exposed to less academic content. Intervention programs were modified to be suitable for distance learning instruction, compromising the fidelity of implementation of tiered instructional models. Survey tools used to measure fidelity of implementation to MTSS were designed for an in-person school setting. The conclusions drawn about LEA MTSS implementation based on implementation data in distance settings might not be valid or reliable.

The State took steps to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection and on the supports to LEAs. During fall 2020, Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention offered webinars to support schools in conducting virtual reading screening assessments. The State created extensive guidance related to available instructional models and considerations for students experiencing disability. The State published written guidance, offered statewide webinars for school staff on guidance implementation, and made Agency staff available for individual consultation with LEAs around distance learning topics. The Ready Schools, Safe Learners guidance is publicly available at <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/healthsafety/Documents/Ready%20Schools%20Safe%20Learners%202020-21%20Guidance.pdf>. The State also launched an open educational resources platform and provided statewide training to LEA staff on high quality distance learning instructional resources. These steps will support the data collection for the FFY 2020 submission.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? No

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Did the State implement any **new** (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? No

If “Yes”, describe each **new** (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The State continued to implement the infrastructure improvement strategy of braiding staff and fiscal resources across multiple federal programs to increase intra-agency coherence. This coherence effort continued to focus on increased state capacity to support a unified continuous improvement process and to support regions and LEAs in implementing MTSS through maintaining a coaching structure. Specific activities within this coherence strategy included the continued provision of joint technical assistance for LEAs participating in the State Personnel Development Grant and for LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive or targeted improvement (CSI/TSI) through the state ESSA model. These TA supports from SEA staff included consultation for continuous improvement process planning and virtual professional learning events. The intermediate term outcomes of increased intra-agency coherence included increased district capacity to implement priority-driven continuous improvement plans.

The State continued supporting regional coaching hubs as a part of the statewide cascading coaching structure intended to scale up a coherent Oregon MTSS. The State maintained contractual agreements with the SWIFT Center to provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance to the regional MTSS coaches. The State also maintained an agreement with Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (ORTII) to provide coaching services and technical assistance to schools participating in the elementary and middle school literacy cadres. Short term outcomes of the State's continued implementation of regional MTSS coaching include scale-up of MTSS efforts to include additional schools within supported districts. Intermediate term outcomes of these infrastructure investments in coaching through regional hubs and ORTII included growth in regional coach capacity and skills related to systems coaching and MTSS practices.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State evaluated outcomes for the improvement strategy of increasing intra-agency coherence by looking at the rate of adoption of the continuous improvement plan and process (CIP) among additional Agency programs. Increasing the number of state programs that require LEAs to use the CIP process is a mechanism for unifying LEA supports and desired output of intra-agency coherence. State staff analyzed inventories of state and federal programs using the aligned CIP. These programs included Federal Title Programs and the State Student Success Act. The CIP will also likely become a part of IDEA monitoring and supports, indicating there is consensus to continue implementation. The perceived utility of a unified CIP process was high enough among State staff to drive the decision to continue implementing this improvement strategy as a requirement for all districts.

The State evaluated outcomes for the improvement strategy of supporting the statewide MTSS coaching infrastructure using a coaching feedback survey. Districts receiving supports from MTSS regional coaches responded to survey questions regarding (a) the regional coach's general facilitation of discussion, and (b) specific facilitation of continuous improvement plan adjustments. At least 20% of participating districts within each region responded to the coaching survey. This represents a decrease from previous years in the number of districts responding. Of these responding districts, 73.6% reported that the regional coach supported discussion in general, and 67.5% of districts reported that the regional coach facilitated adjustments to the district continuous improvement plan.

The State also examined MTSS fidelity data collected from participating LEAs in evaluating the decision to continue implementing statewide MTSS coaching. Respondents from 11 participating LEAs provided responses to a survey measuring fidelity of implementation of MTSS. The respondents represent less than 50% of the LEAs implementing the MTSS coaching strategy. Respondents reported highest levels of implementation within the domain of professional development, with an average of 4.43, where 5 represents "always true of me" and 4 represents "almost always true of me" that they participate in professional development to improve instructional practices. The next highest level of implementation was reported within the domain of family engagement, with an average response of 4.38.

The State decided to continue using the CIP and supporting statewide MTSS coaching based on the outcomes observed within the SEA and in LEAs. Providing continued coaching supports for a unified CIP process will support LEAs in continuing to make progress toward their selected goals and ultimately the SiMR. Taken together, these evaluation data support the decision to continue implementing the strategy of cascading coaching supports.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State will continue implementing the infrastructure improvement strategy of increasing intra-agency coherence towards statewide MTSS efforts through cross-office work braiding human and fiscal resources across Federal Title Programs and the State Student Success Act. Short-term next steps of this strategy include using the cross-office partnerships to develop a request for proposal for a provider to deliver an intensive coaching program for LEAs not meeting growth targets established in their CIPs. The anticipated outcome of this tactic of the coherence strategy is the increase of capacity of targeted LEAs to support schools in MTSS coaching. During the next reporting period, the State expects to begin monitoring performance of these supports within identified LEAs. The State anticipates that the continued cross-office work to support cascading MTSS coaching through the intensive coaching program will result in increased SEA capacity to monitor and evaluate the impact of agency sponsored supports.

During the next reporting period, the agency also intends to maintain partnership with Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (ORTII) to deliver literacy coaching to districts participating in Cadre 11. Districts receiving literacy coaching supports experienced interruptions in the coaching cycle during the 2019-2020 school year due to school closures from COVID-19. ORTII provided support for these districts through webinars, virtual coaching sessions, and virtual conferences on topics including conducting reading screening online and individual problem solving/data based individualization.

The agency anticipates that districts receiving coaching supports from ORTII during the next reporting phase will continue to demonstrate progress toward sustainable MTSS implementation at school sites with MTSS already installed, and scale up to new implementing schools within the districts. As a result of continued State support of cascading MTSS coaching systems, the State expects districts participating in these supports will experience a faster narrowing of gaps in performance and growth on statewide literacy measures among targeted populations including students experiencing disability than observed statewide.

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

No

If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The State continued using a cascading coaching structure as the primary evidence-based practice aimed at improving reading achievement for grade three students experiencing disability. The State continued implementation of the MTSS coaching practice using the theory of action that by supporting implementation and scale up of school multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), more students experiencing disability will become likely to make greater improvements in literacy. Developing the capacity along the educational cascade to improve systems for MTSS remains the primary mechanism thorough which the State intends to impact the SiMR.

During FFY 2019, the State maintained previously established relationships with technical assistance partners to grow State capacity to support regions in scaling up MTSS in LEAs. These partners continued to support development of knowledge and skills related to effective coaching practices along the educational cascade. During school closures due to COVID-19, the State and regions pivoted to support LEAs in designing effective core and supplementary instruction in distance learning environments. Oregon published written guidance for LEAs on comprehensive distance learning, and supplementary guidance for LEAs to assist students experiencing disability and students needing increased academic or behavioral supports. Effective coaching at all levels of the educational cascade supports the State's theory of action that improving capacity for implementing an effective MTSS will lead to improved outcomes in reading for students experiencing disability.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

In FFY 2019, among LEAs receiving literacy coaching with implementation at or above 80%, there was a greater increase in the percentage of students reading at or above benchmark and a greater reduction in those needing intensive intervention when compared to LEAs with implementation at 60% or less. Among LEAs with levels of implementation at or above 80% in RTI for literacy, the percentage of students needing intensive intervention in reading decreased from 29% in 2018 to 19% in 2019. The percentage of students performing at or above benchmark increased from 58% to 65% over these years. In LEAs with less than 60% fidelity, the percentage of students requiring intensive intervention in reading increased from 30% to 32%. The percentage of students at or above benchmark increased less among these LEAs than in LEAs with higher implementation, from 33% in 2018 to 37% in 2019.

The State analyzed fidelity of implementation of MTSS coaching in districts using the School Implementation Scale (SIS). LEA staff measured belief of levels of implementation of specific activities within MTSS across the following domains: school culture, family engagement, use of evidence-based practices, and ongoing professional development. Staff responded on a 1-5 scale. Scores of 4 or 5 meant the staff member felt fidelity to implementation of the item was "almost always true or very true." Staff reported the highest levels of fidelity of implementation in evidence-based practices (EBP), at 61.60% of staff reporting a 4 or 5. Staff reported the lowest levels of implementation in ongoing professional development, 46.50%. In family engagement and school culture, the median percentages of staff reporting a 4 or 5 were 59.85% and 50.20%. This data showed a need for the State to maintain MTSS coaching based on the theory of action that EBP

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices implementation within MTSS promoted achievement.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

In 2019-2020, the agency provided professional development (PD) activities to regions and LEAs to support implementation of MTSS. These activities included monthly community of practice sessions for regional MTSS coaches, and quarterly community of practice meetings for LEAs organized by MTSS topic. Each of the regional coaches participated regularly in the community of practice sessions. Oregon Response to Instruction and Intervention (ORTII) continued providing PD seminars and direct coaching supports for Cadre 11 LEAs scaling up their MTSS in literacy. The State continued partnering with the National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII) and ORTII to direct professional learning supports toward leadership teams in schools with solid MTSS foundations looking to expand their ability to implement effective data-based individualization for students with the most intensive needs.

Due to COVID-19 and requirements for distance learning, the State revised the policy for school screening for reading difficulties including dyslexia in students in kindergarten and first grade. During spring 2020, the policy requiring reading screening in these early grades was suspended because of school closures due to COVID-19. In response to the shift to distance learning, the state approved additional screening tools to include specific computer-based assessment programs with early literacy measures. These additional screening tools allowed schools to administer reading screening assessments virtually. This policy revision enabled and required schools to attend to this foundational aspect of MTSS for literacy during the 2020-2021 school year.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

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

(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

During 2019-2020, the State's IDEA Part B team engaged district stakeholders (administrators, staff) to seek input on how the State can enhance improvement efforts for students experiencing disability. Stakeholders joined IDEA Part B staff in crafting a vision for equity, inclusion, and results to guide statewide improvement efforts including the work of the SSIP. Holding space for difficult conversations across the state around achievement for students experiencing disability was a key strategy utilized to foster stakeholder engagement in statewide improvement efforts. Building trust among SEA and LEA staff supporting federal programs is a necessary condition for a successful coaching relationship between agencies with common priorities.

The State committed to shifting communications with LEAs from a focus on compliance to results. This strategy was implemented across offices at the agency, with a focus on SEA communications with stakeholders regarding monitoring and support activities. These Part B activities were previously framed within the necessity of compliance; by IDEA staff adding focus on the impact of this compliance for students, SEA staff became better able to lay foundation for meaningful and ongoing engagement about student outcomes. The State committed to shifting focus toward student outcomes by creating consensus among State and LEA leaders around a common vision of equity inclusion, and results.

The State continued providing opportunities for engagement about SSIP improvement efforts with stakeholders from other offices in the SEA during the 2019-2020 school year. As the State experienced staff transitions and team reorganization, SSIP/SPDG coordinators shared project information and were included in workgroups related to initiatives that similarly target increasing student achievement for students from groups that systems have historically marginalized and underserved, including students experiencing disability. Each district across the state held engagement sessions with community members, families, and students of focal student groups to identify strategic priorities. Stakeholders examined longitudinal student achievement and growth data disaggregated by student group as a part of the priority development process. From these priorities, each district identified a set of student growth targets for specific student groups including for students experiencing disability.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the Governor closing schools in spring 2020, the State's work with LEAs shifted to supporting immediate crisis responses. The IDEA Part B team pivoted their engagement strategies from long-term planning to focusing on short term efforts, such as coalescing with LEA leaders in creation of toolkits to use during distance learning to support students experiencing disability. The State included representatives from LEAs and the State in the writing and testing of guidance and protocols for schools. This style of creating materials for the field represented a shift from working with stakeholders in an evaluative capacity to including stakeholders in the creation of tools that impact improvement efforts.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

No

If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

No concerns expressed by stakeholders.

(Unable to select a response in the above template response box.)

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Not applicable.