

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION



STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Part B

Phase III, Year 4 Report

April 1, 2020

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Section I: Progress in Implementing the SSIP	8
Illinois' SSIP Implementation Progress	8
Stakeholder Involvement in SSIP Implementation	9
Section II: Data on Implementation and Outcomes	13
Monitoring and Measuring Outputs	13
Demonstrating Progress	15
Stakeholder Involvement in SSIP Evaluation	36
Section III: Data Quality Issues	38
Data Limitations	38
Section IV: Progress toward Achieving Intended Improvements	39
Assessment of Progress	39
Section V: Plans for Next Year	46
Activities, Barriers, and Additional Supports	46
Appendix A: Theory of Action	47
Appendix B: Logic Model	48
Appendix C: Improvement and Evaluation Plan	49

Executive Summary

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III, Year 4 report for Illinois Part B describes the Results Based Accountability (RBA) work implemented between April 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Network (IL MTSS-N), the SSIP Transformation Zone school districts, and external stakeholders. It also provides a brief overview of information that was previously submitted in the SSIP Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III, Year 1 through Year 3 reports.

Illinois Part B identified improving early literacy outcomes for all children through a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework being implemented with fidelity, with emphasis on students with disabilities in pre-K through 3rd grade, as its priority. In Phase I of the SSIP, ISBE, together with its external stakeholder group, completed an in-depth data analysis and determined that a substantial gap existed between the State's reading goals/targets and performance of students with disabilities on the statewide English-language arts assessment. This data eventually led ISBE and its stakeholders to identify improvement in early literacy for students with disabilities as the foundation of its State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

Phase II of the SSIP focused on the State's plan to build capacity to support school districts. The plan focused on leveraging the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-N) to build the capacity of the SSIP Transformation Zone (TZ) districts to implement and sustain: a MTSS framework with fidelity, a data-driven process to inform decision making, and evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture. ISBE and its stakeholders agreed that a 3-pronged focus on systems, data, and practice would lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR for children with disabilities.

Phase III, Year 1 of the SSIP focused on implementation and evaluation of the strategies and activities related to systems, data, and practice. Data were shared related to infrastructure improvements, the alignment of resources, systems implementation, and implementation of evidence-based practices within a MTSS framework. SSIP implementation began with two school districts that made up Cohort 1 of the SSIP Transformation Zone. Evaluation sources and methods were also discussed.

Phase III, Year 2 of the SSIP continued to evaluate implementation progress and results. Nine new school districts were welcomed into the Transformation Zone as part of the scaling up process for the SSIP. The IL MTSS-N worked with the two Cohort 1 districts and the nine Cohort 2 districts on implementing and sustaining systems, data, and practices.

Phase III, Year 3 of the SSIP continued to evaluate implementation progress and results. The IL MTSS-N scaled up its systems/data/practice implementation and sustainability work to include 26 schools in the two Cohort 1 districts and 49 schools in the nine Cohort 2 districts. In terms of systems, both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts demonstrated significant infrastructure improvements on all of the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) driver domain subscales. Regarding data, evaluation results showed that the data driver was one of the highest levels of implementation for districts in both cohorts. In addition,

it was noted that data-based decision making implementation fidelity was operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. In terms of practice, data documented that implementation fidelity was operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers.

Evaluation of implementation progress and results continued in Phase III, Year 4. The IL MTSS-N continued its work with the two Cohort 1 districts and the nine Cohort 2 districts on implementing and sustaining systems, data, and practices. In addition, the IL MTSS-N continued to work on the goal of district sustainability through utilization of its gradual release model. The gradual release model uses an “I Do, We Do, You Do” approach to sustainability. During the “I Do” phase of gradual release, the coach models the desired skills and competencies for district and building leaders and staff. During the “We Do” phase of gradual release, the coach provides support and feedback to transfer responsibility to leaders and staff. During the final “You Do” phase of gradual release, the coach releases responsibility to the district and building leaders and staff to independently perform and self-monitor.

Finally, many professional learning opportunities were provided to the TZ districts in all three areas of systems, data, and practices. Evaluation data show that trainings were of high quality, were carried out as intended, and were aligned to participant needs. Outcome data documented that participants’ knowledge, skills, and confidence improved after the trainings were provided. The TZ Cohorts have data indicating that levels of MTSS implementation are operationalizing. Now that systems are in place, IL MTSS-N and the TZ districts have placed added emphasis on implementing and sustaining evidence-based practices in early literacy and climate and culture with the goal of improved reading performance for students with disabilities.

Introduction

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is one of 17 indicators contained within the State Performance Plan (SPP). The SSIP is a multi-year plan designed to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The Illinois Part B SSIP describes the Results Based Accountability (RBA) work that has been implemented to date by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Network (IL MTSS-N), the SSIP Transformation Zone school districts, and external stakeholders. The SSIP has three phases:

- Phase I: Analysis (completed 04/01/15)
- Phase II: Planning (completed 04/01/16)
- Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (year one completed 04/03/17, year two completed 04/02/18, year three completed 04/01/19, and year four completed 04/01/2020).

Phase I

Illinois identified improving early literacy outcomes for all children through a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework being implemented with fidelity, with emphasis on students with disabilities, as its priority. In Phase I of the SSIP, ISBE, together with its external stakeholders, conducted a data review by identifying and analyzing key data,

such as SPP data and assessment data, to determine Illinois' SSIP focus. After completing the data review, stakeholders determined that reading performance for elementary aged students with disabilities should be the emphasis of the SSIP. Stakeholders and ISBE staff then examined possible root causes, or barriers, of low reading performance for students with disabilities in Illinois. Potential root causes were categorized into six categories: data-based decision making, high expectations, sufficient reading instruction, evidence-based instruction and management (practice), access to high quality core instruction, and evidence-based interventions (process).

After examining the six major potential root causes at a deeper level, the root causes were synthesized into one main root cause: the lack of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework being implemented with fidelity at the school and/or school district levels. That discussion led to the development of the State-Identified Measurable Result, or SIMR, and the beginning development of the state's Theory of Action for the SSIP (see Appendix A). The SIMR is a statement of the student-level results ISBE intends to achieve through implementation of the SSIP. Illinois' current SIMR is:

SIMR

The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase.

After reviewing baseline assessment data related to the SIMR, ISBE and its external stakeholder group agreed upon reasonable targets for the remaining years of the SSIP as shown below. For the FFY2018 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submission, states were required to set FFY2019 targets for next year's submission (year 7 of the typical 6-year SPP/APR cycle) due to the new SPP/APR cycle and information package not yet being released. Therefore, ISBE, and its stakeholders chose to extend the FFY 2018 target for FFY 2019 since research indicates that it takes three to five years before an impact on student results is typically seen.

Baseline and Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	7.7% (Baseline)	9.7%	11.7%	13.7%	13.7%

Stakeholders and ISBE staff also completed an infrastructure analysis to determine the capacity of ISBE's current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in school districts to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence-based practices to improve reading performance results for students with disabilities. Stakeholders and ISBE staff utilized this information to develop three coherent improvement strategies that would enhance the State infrastructure and support school district implementation of evidence-based practices (culminating with improving the State-identified result for students with disabilities):

1. Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity;
2. Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity; and

3. Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework.

Implementation of the three coherent improvement strategies addresses the identified root cause for low performance and ultimately builds school district capacity to achieve the SIMR of improved reading proficiency for 3rd grade students with disabilities. The State's Theory of Action (Appendix A) graphically displays these concepts. The hypothesis that the root cause of students with disabilities' low reading performance stems from school districts being unable to successfully implement a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity is at the heart of the Theory of Action. To address this root cause, the Theory of Action highlights improved student results through the three chosen coherent improvement strategies that focus on systems, data, and practice: the implementation and sustainability of a MTSS framework with fidelity, a data-driven decision making process, and evidence-based practices in early literacy and climate and culture. ISBE anticipates that improved results will stem from the local schools' and school districts' ability to build and sustain their capacity to provide appropriate academic and environmental supports for students with disabilities within a MTSS framework, so all students are college and career ready. Academic supports include evidence-based practices in early literacy. Environmental supports include evidence-based practices in climate and culture. Stakeholders recognized that improving climate and culture could be a significant factor related to improved reading performance. Specific to the SIMR, as one measure of success, ISBE expects the percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment to increase by making the coherent improvement strategies actionable (see targets above).

Phase II

The focus of Phase II was on building State capacity to support school districts with the implementation of evidence-based practices, primarily in early literacy, which will lead to measurable improvement in the State-identified result, or SIMR, for children with disabilities. Phase II of the Illinois SSIP gave a description of how ISBE planned to build school district capacity to implement a MTSS framework with fidelity by leveraging and modifying the state's infrastructure, supporting local school districts with the implementation of data-driven processes, supporting local school districts with the implementation of the evidence-based practices, and evaluating the intervention activities. A comprehensive logic model, developed by ISBE together with its stakeholders, was also presented. The logic model was designed to define, guide, and evaluate the key components of this plan. ISBE's SSIP Logic Model identifies the inputs, outputs, and outcomes (impact) related to the three coherent improvement strategies identified in the Theory of Action. The Logic Model pinpoints what human, fiscal, material, and temporal resources have been invested to implement the SSIP coherent improvement strategies for effective outcomes and a positive impact on students with disabilities. The Illinois Part B SSIP Logic Model can be found in Appendix B.

Illinois also began developing its SSIP Evaluation Plan in Phase II. The SSIP evaluation plan is centered on the three coherent improvement strategies and their corresponding nine activities. Each of the nine activities have steps identified that describe how the activities will be implemented. SSIP evaluation activities began in November of 2016 and

will be ongoing throughout the life of the SSIP. The SSIP Evaluation Plan is a part of the overall Illinois Part B SSIP Improvement and Evaluation Plan, which can be found in Appendix C. Several of the main evaluation measures utilized include the Time, Effort and Outcome Tracker (ThEO), the District Capacity Assessment (DCA), the Self-Assessment of MTSS-Illinois (SAM-I), pre- and post-tests for training outcomes, training fidelity checklists, and professional learning evaluations. These evaluation measures are discussed in detail in the following sections.

An external evaluator was tasked with assisting ISBE with implementing the evaluation plan. Project evaluation is both formative and summative and is based on a variety of sources and data collection methods. Development and implementation of the SSIP Evaluation Plan continued into Phase III.

Phase III

In Phase III, states have been assessing and reporting on their progress in implementing the SSIP. Much of the SSIP Phase III, Year 1 through 3 Reports focused on information related to the implementation of the systems, data, and practice coherent improvement strategies, including multiple professional learning opportunities and coaching supports provided at the local level. Also included was a description of the evaluation plan, including the prescribed activities, data collection methods, measurements for determining the extent to which the activity was implemented as planned, and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in the State-identified result for children with disabilities. After SSIP Phase III, Year 1, ISBE worked with the IL MTSS-N staff to hone the evaluation plan by clarifying language, reducing duplication of steps, and aligning activities, outcomes, and data collection methods. This worked well in SSIP Phase III, Years 2 and 3. The SSIP Phase III, Year 4 Report continues with this improved evaluation plan.

Section I: Progress in Implementing the SSIP

Illinois' SSIP Implementation Progress

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has made significant progress in implementing its SSIP. In terms of the SSIP Improvement Plan (see Appendix C), all steps under Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, Activities 1 and 3 were completed in Phase III, Year 2. In addition, Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, Activity 2, Step a) was completed in Year 2. Finally, Coherent Improvement Strategy 3, Activity 8 and 9, Steps a) and b) were completed in Year 2. In Phase III, Year 3, Coherent Improvement Strategy 2, Activity 6 was completed. In addition, Coherent Improvement Strategy 2, Activity 7, Step a) was completed for ten of the eleven Transformation Zone districts. The remaining district completed Activity 7, Step a) at the beginning of Phase III, Year 4. The completed activities or steps are described below. Progress for the remaining steps and activities is discussed in detail under Section II of this report, as the majority of them are ongoing throughout the life of the SSIP.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity

Activity 1: Implement the SSIP Transformation Zone (SEA)

This activity was completed in Phase III, Year 2.

Activity 2: Determine capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity

Step a) related to the existence of District Leadership Teams was completed in Phase III, Year 2. Steps b) and c) related to needs assessments and action planning will continue to be implemented throughout the rest of this SSIP cycle.

Activity 3: Align and leverage fiscal and human resources

This activity was completed in Phase III, Year 2.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2: Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity

Activity 6: Align and leverage data resources

This activity was completed in Phase III, Year 3.

Activity 7: Implement and sustain data-based decision making

Step a) related to staff access to data was completed in Phase III, Years 3 and 4. All districts have identified data contacts, aligned data resources, and documented alignment. Processes have been put in place for analyzing and using data. District leadership teams and building leadership teams review data on a regular basis. Teachers have access to local assessment data. Several districts have trained their staff to access

and utilize data warehouses. Other districts have created guidelines and manuals that specify the types of data to be used in instructional decision making for academics and behavior. Steps b) and c) will continue to be implemented throughout the rest of this SSIP cycle to ensure that data continues to inform system and practice decisions and screening and progress monitoring data are used to inform instruction.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework

Activity 8: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in early literacy

Steps a) and b) related to reviewing SIMR data and selecting early literacy evidence-based practices (EBPs) were completed in Phase III, Year 2. Step c) regarding early literacy EBP implementation will continue throughout the rest of this SSIP cycle.

Activity 9: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in climate and culture

Steps a) and b) related to reviewing SIMR data and selecting climate and culture EBPs were completed in Phase III, Year 2. Step c) regarding climate and culture EBP implementation will continue throughout the rest of this SSIP cycle.

Activities 1, 3, and 6 were completed as planned. Activities 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 have been implemented to some extent. The timelines for these activities run throughout the life of the SSIP. Please see Section II for a detailed explanation of the progress under these activities.

Stakeholder Involvement in SSIP Implementation

In Phase III, Year 1, ISBE met with its primary stakeholders, the SSIP External Stakeholder Group, in October of 2016 to update them on the status of the SSIP. The following constituents were represented by stakeholders in Phase III, Year 1:

- Chicago Public Schools (CPS)
- Family Matters Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)
- Family Resource Center on Disabilities Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)
- Higher Education
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS)
- Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA)
- Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB)
- Illinois Education Association (IEA)
- Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT)
- Illinois Parent Teacher Association (IPTA)
- Illinois Principals Association (IPA)
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC)

- ISBE Focus Schools Stakeholder Group
- Special Education Advocates
- Superintendents Commission for the Study of Demographics and Diversity

IL MTSS-N program and evaluation staff were also included in the stakeholder meetings and information sharing opportunities. The agenda included a brief review of SSIP Phases I and II, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) connections to the SSIP, OSEP Results Driven Accountability visit results, and potential revisions to the SPP, SSIP, and SIMR. Key SSIP documents, such as the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and the Improvement and Evaluation Plan were refined after stakeholder input was gathered. The SSIP baseline and targets were also revised as a result of the stakeholder meeting.

After the October 2016 meeting, stakeholders were kept up to date on the SSIP implementation via email. Stakeholders could provide feedback as they felt appropriate. SSIP information was also shared with other stakeholder groups during their meetings and conferences throughout the year, including the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC), and the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-N) Advisory Council. The annual Special Education Director's Conference has also been an avenue for providing SSIP information to stakeholders and receiving feedback. This type of outreach to multiple stakeholders continued into Phase III, Year 2 and Year 3.

In Phase III, Year 2, stakeholder input was primarily gathered through the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-N) Advisory Council. At the end of Year 2, it was decided that the SSIP External Stakeholder Group would be folded into the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council for Phase III, Year 3. The work of both stakeholder groups was becoming more and more duplicative, and participation at stakeholder group meetings was decreasing. The IL MTSS-N Advisory Council already represented many of the same organizations that were included in the SSIP External Stakeholder Group, such as:

- Family Matters Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)
- Family Resource Center on Disabilities PTI
- Higher Education
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS)
- Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA)
- Illinois Principals Association (IPA)
- Special Education Advocates

All SSIP External Stakeholder Group members were encouraged to represent their organizations as the transition was made to the newly expanded IL MTSS-N Advisory Council in Year 3. As a result, the following organizations were added to the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council:

- Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT)
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC)

- Superintendents Commission for the Study of Demographics and Diversity

In addition, three members whose organizations were already represented chose to transition over to become members of the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council. Other organizations represented on the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council include Project REACH, Early CHOICES, and the Illinois Service Resource Center. The IL MTSS-N Advisory Council has direct involvement in feedback to the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Network, which includes: reviewing the implementation of key tasks and activities to ensure full and effective delivery of project services, reviewing project evaluation data and using such data to identify needed improvements in the project, and assisting in the refinement and/or development of project training and resource materials.

In Phase III, Year 4, the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council continued to meet quarterly (June and October of 2019, January and March of 2020). SSIP implementation was discussed to some extent at each of the quarterly meetings in an effort to build understanding around SSIP goals and the use of evaluation data. During the June meeting, the IL MTSS-N staff shared SSIP data with the group. Stakeholders partnered with the IL MTSS-N and ISBE to use evaluation data to inform decisions around future SSIP activities. Multiple data graphs were shared displaying how Illinois had met its milestones in implementing the planned SSIP activities and how such activities resulted in intended outputs. After the data sharing portion of the meeting, advisory group members were asked to work independently, and then in small groups, to discuss strengths, challenges, implications for continuous improvement, and other data they desired. Each small group then reported out to the large group. The group discussed what was working well in terms of the SSIP and what might be improved. The largest challenge continues to be that the need for this type of systems work exceeds the capacity the SSIP has to provide it. There was rich discussion around supporting rural school districts. Professional learning around coaching was identified by stakeholders as a need in Illinois districts. The group set the following priorities for the coming school year: consistency across initiatives (systems), access and use of district data (data), and an enhanced focus on evidence-based practices (practices). The ability to “scale up” and build capacity was also a topic of conversation during the October, January, and March stakeholder meetings. The group discussed ways to obtain MTSS support in districts that were not TZ districts, such as expanding the availability of universal resources. Professional learning around intensifying interventions with a focus on special education was also a topic of discussion during the January and March meetings. This data will be shared with other stakeholders throughout the year at meetings and conferences. The SSIP is also available on the ISBE website.

In order to ensure that the stakeholders who are the most impacted by the evaluation results are the most engaged in the evaluation process, the Transformation Zone school district staff also have the opportunity to provide feedback on both implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. In Phase III, Year 4, ISBE and the IL MTSS-N continued to offer a Community of Practice (CoP) for the TZ districts to allow them to be partners in the SSIP implementation and evaluation process. The purpose of the CoP is to provide the TZ districts with the opportunity to share ideas and innovations with each other on a regular basis as they implement and evaluate their systems, data, and practices and work toward fidelity of implementation and sustainability. The June 2019 CoP webinar focused

on the SSIP Transformation Zone data. Participants reviewed the data with a facilitator from the IL MTSS-N and provided feedback to consider for the coming SSIP TZ year. Topics for the Phase III, Year 4 CoP webinars were identified by the CoP participants and focused on evidence-based practices. In Phase III, Year 4, the CoP webinars were open to any Illinois school district as a means of sharing information and TZ district experiences beyond the TZ district cohorts as requested by the IL MTSS Advisory Council stakeholders. The following CoP topics were addressed this year:

- Building Equity through an MTSS (October 2019)
- MTSS and Chronic Absenteeism (January 2020)
- Blending Social-Emotional Learning into an Integrated MTSS (March 2020)
- Intensifying Intervention at Tiers 2 and 3 (May 2020)

The CoP has quarterly webinars that are based on the needs of the TZ districts. Future topics will continue to encompass all three coherent improvement strategies by addressing systems, data, and evidence-based practices in early literacy and climate and culture. Transformation Zone districts have the opportunity to suggest topics based on their data and needs as they work to implement and sustain the SSIP work in their districts and schools.

Section II: Data on Implementation and Outcomes

Monitoring and Measuring Outputs

ISBE monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the SSIP Improvement Plan in multiple ways. Evaluation measures were aligned with the Illinois Part B SSIP Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Improvement Plan referenced previously. The SSIP Theory of Action graphically displays the three coherent improvement strategies selected by stakeholders to be addressed (systems, data, and practice). The SSIP Logic Model then builds upon the three coherent improvement strategies by delineating specific activities deemed necessary to successfully complete the coherent improvement strategies. The SSIP Improvement Plan then builds upon both the Theory of Action and the Logic Model by delineating specific steps deemed necessary to successfully implement each activity that is aligned with one of the coherent improvement strategies. The result is the SSIP Evaluation Plan that addresses each coherent improvement strategy, activity, and action step by outlining how ISBE will know the activity happened as planned, whether the activity was completed within the given timeframe, the data collection sources/methods, and any implementation successes/challenges.

Specific data sources are listed for each of the nine SSIP activities. The majority of the evaluation data is captured through the following sources, which are described in more detail throughout the remainder of this report:

- District Capacity Assessment (DCA)
- Time, Effort and Outcome Tracker (ThEO)
- Professional Learning Evaluations (PLEs)
- Pre-Post Tests for Training Outcomes
- High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Fidelity Checklist
- Facilitator Guide Fidelity Checklist
- High Quality (HQ) Fidelity Checklist for Coaching
- Self-Assessment of MTSS-Illinois (SAM-I)
- Observational Tool for Instructional Supports and Systems (OTISS)

Baseline data in Phase III, Year 1 was collected mainly through the DCA, SAM-I, participant pre-test tests for trainings, and student assessment data. Phase III, Year 2 data sources encompassed the list above with the exception of the OTISS. No OTISS fidelity data was reported in Phase III, Year 2, as it was too early in the process for its utilization. However, staff were trained in instrument administration using National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) resources. Staff also worked on inter-observer agreement for reliability. The OTISS was administered in Phase III, Years 3 and 4, along with the data sources mentioned above, after inter-observer agreement was demonstrated.

Student performance data on state and local assessments was also used to collect baseline data in Phase III, Year 1 and follow up data in Years 2 through 4. This data was used during the data review around the SIMR to identify areas of need. Specifically, The Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) data for each district was utilized to analyze the percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade

level standard on the state English-language arts (ELA) assessment. IAR is the state assessment and accountability measure for Illinois students enrolled in a public school district. IAR assesses the New Illinois Learning Standards incorporating the Common Core and is administered in English-language arts and mathematics to all students in grades 3-8. Student performance data is reassessed on an annual basis. Reassessment involves analyzing new data, making data comparisons, and assessing progress toward achieving the intended outcomes.

Because the ELA state assessment is a distal measure of students' performance, the IL MTSS-N worked on its capacity to collect and analyze local district assessments that are more proximal and sensitive to change, (e.g., AIMSweb, STAR, and NWEA MAP) in Phase III, Year 4. The IL MTSS-N purchased a software license for a data dashboard to meet multiple needs, such as collecting and analyzing data in meaningful ways. The goal was to standardize the data across schools and benchmarking assessments and enhance ISBE's ability to judge progress toward achieving the SSIP long-term outcome (SIMR). The IL MTSS-N piloted the collection of local progress monitoring data across the TZ districts and convened a team to review the results. This team gathered input from relevant parties and is developing a plan to improve the local assessment data collection process for next year.

During Phase III, Year 4, ISBE continued to actively use data gathered from the evaluation to assess progress and inform ongoing implementation of the SSIP. ISBE staff hold weekly calls with the statewide project director for the IL MTSS-N to review progress on implementation of the SSIP Improvement Plan. The Plan covers an entire year and is reviewed annually. It addresses activities, timelines, and outcomes for the TZ districts. The Plan aligns directly with the SSIP Theory of Action, Logic Model, Coherent Improvement Strategies, and Evaluation Plan. These documents, along with IL MTSS-N data, are shared among ISBE staff, the IL MTSS-N, and evaluation staff via Office 365 SharePoint. All SSIP documents and templates can be found in SharePoint, along with IL MTSS-N data and evaluation reports. The SSIP Evaluation Plan, in particular, has driven implementation and outcomes conversations among ISBE staff, the IL MTSS-N, and evaluators this year.

In addition to weekly calls with ISBE, the IL MTSS-N statewide project director has virtual meetings three times a month with the IL MTSS Network Capacity Coaches (NCCs). They meet semi-monthly for their NCC Internal Coaching Community of Practice (CoP) for new communication, professional learning to improve practice, collaborative problem solving, reflection on practice, and planning to ensure fidelity of services. Each of these meetings has included professional learning with the National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII). They also meet semi-monthly for their IL MTSS-N statewide staff call to evaluate outcomes, communicate expectations from ISBE, and provide updates. They have quarterly, two-day face-to-face statewide staff meetings for professional learning, data analysis, problem-solving to meet objectives, and evaluate outcomes. Finally, the IL MTSS-N also holds a summer planning retreat each year to prepare for the upcoming district engagement year.

After reviewing data with ISBE, the IL MTSS-N, and the IL MTSS-N Advisory Council, no changes to activities or steps were deemed necessary for the Phase III, Year 4 evaluation plan. The outcome descriptions for short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes in

the Evaluation Plan directly align to the coherent improvement strategies listed in the Theory of Action. Evaluation measures and reports align with each of the listed outcomes in the Plan. The SSIP Evaluation Plan is a part of the larger SSIP Improvement and Evaluation Plan, and can be found in Appendix C. The SSIP Evaluation Plan and its corresponding data and evaluation reports from the IL MTSS-N have been utilized to report progress on implementation and outcomes for Activities 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 as seen in the next section.

Demonstrating Progress

Three of the nine activities under the SSIP Improvement Plan Coherent Improvement Strategies have been completed (Activity 1, Activity 3, and Activity 6). In addition, Activity 2, Step a), Activity 7, Step a), Activity 8, Steps a) and b), and Activity 9, Steps a) and b) have been completed. The remaining six activities and corresponding steps are ongoing throughout the life of the SSIP. Progress for the activities is discussed below.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity

Activity 2: Determine capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity

Step b): An assessment tool that identifies readiness level, gaps or barriers to capacity building, and needs is completed

In Phase III, Year 1, Illinois chose to utilize the **District Capacity Assessment (DCA)** as its assessment tool to measure readiness level for MTSS, barriers to capacity building, and district needs. The DCA was developed by the National Implementation Research Network's (NIRN) State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) project to assist school districts in improving their capacity to implement EBPs and effective innovations. DCA developers collaborated with Michigan's SPDG to demonstrate technical adequacy of the instrument. The research demonstrated strong total internal consistency of .908. The IL MTSS-N has permission from NIRN to contextualize the instrument for Illinois. It examines three drivers: leadership, competency, and organization. The leadership driver encompasses planning and leadership. The competency driver encompasses performance assessment, selection, training, and coaching. The organization driver encompasses decision-support data systems, facilitative administration, and systems intervention. District staff score each item under the three drivers and use the results to develop an action plan and incorporate it into the district's overall improvement plan. Cohort 1 districts completed their initial DCAs between November 2016 and February 2017 and reassessed in September of 2017 and 2018. Both districts completed another reassessment by October of 2019 during Phase III, Year 4. Cohort 2 districts completed their initial DCAs between November 2017 and February 2018 and reassessed between September 2018 and February 2019. All Cohort 2 districts completed another reassessment between August 2019 and February 2020 during Phase III, Year 4 (see Figures 1-6).

After completing a crosswalk that confirmed alignment between the DCA and the **Illinois Quality Framework (IQF)**, the IL MTSS-N and ISBE's Special Education Department

collaborated with ISBE's Systems of Support Department to begin using the Illinois Quality Framework (IQF) and the **Illinois Quality Framework Supporting Rubric (IQFSR)** as a needs assessment tool option for the SSIP districts. The ISBE Support and Accountability Department is charged with implementing IL-EMPOWER as part of the approved Illinois ESSA Plan. IL-EMPOWER is a statewide system of differentiated supports and accountability to improve student learning, purposely designed for capacity development to leverage schools' strengths to meet student needs. This model empowers schools with greater choice and collaboration that is informed by data assembled through the IQF analysis. The IQF includes standards, indicators, and guiding questions for stakeholder groups to use in open, inquiry-based conversation. These conversations set the stage for completion of the IQFSR, which is composed of performance measures based on the standards. Use of the IQFSR is required for schools that are designated to receive targeted (TSI) or comprehensive (CSI) support through IL-Empower and is recommended for any school across the state.

In Phase III, Year 4, one district in Cohort 2 transitioned from using the DCA to the IQFSR. Five district schools completed the assessment, and results were analyzed by the IL MTSS-N. The crosswalk supported the identification of SSIP action steps.

Figures 1 and 2 display the average DCA scores for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. The figures demonstrate infrastructure improvements aligned to the Theory of Action Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, Activity 2. These infrastructure improvements provide evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of demonstrating improved implementation of an MTSS framework with fidelity. The DCA provides data regarding districts' readiness levels to build capacity to implement MTSS, barriers to capacity building, and district needs. Both Cohorts 1 and 2 continued to demonstrate infrastructure improvements on the DCA driver domain subscales in Phase III, Year 4 as seen below.

Eight of the nine driver domain subscales showed improvement or maintained at previous years' performance levels for Cohort 1. Improvements were noted in Leadership, Planning, Performance Assessment, Coaching, and Facilitative Administration. Previous performance levels were maintained in Training, Decision Support Data Systems, and Systems Intervention. For Cohort 2, eight of the nine driver domain subscales showed improvement. Progress was noted in Leadership, Performance Assessment, Selection, Training, Coaching, Decision Support Data Systems, Facilitative Administration, and Systems Intervention.

The highest levels of implementation for Cohort 1 were in Leadership (100%), Systems Intervention (100%), Planning (91.66%), Performance Assessment (87.5%), Decision Support Data Systems (75%), Facilitative Administration (75%), and Training (62.5%). The highest levels of implementation for Cohort 2 were in Leadership (90%), Decision Support Data Systems (68.75%), Systems Intervention (62.50%), Selection (59.38%), Planning (58.33%), Performance Assessment (56.25%), Training (56.25%), and Facilitation (53.13%). The lowest levels of implementation for Cohort 1 were in Coaching (50%) and Selection (37.5%). The lowest level of implementation for Cohort 2 was in Coaching (37.50%). Both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts had limited financial resources to hire or add district coaches to fulfill internal coaching service delivery goals. Selection decreased from Year 3 to Year 4 for Cohort 1 due to human relations department issues in both districts, as well as challenges with hiring.

Figure 1:





Figure 2:



Figures 3 and 4 display the actual percent improvement of implementation from Phase III, Year 3 to Year 4 for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. The greatest infrastructure improvement from Year 3 to Year 4 for Cohort 1 was in Coaching (100% improvement) and for Cohort 2 was in Training (57.5%). Additionally, Systems Intervention was maintained at 100% implementation for Cohort 1. IL MTSS-N staff speculate that the Training subscale maintained for Cohort 1 since much of that work was completed in Year 2. Such a plateau was anticipated and expected as the majority of the components of this domain had already been put in place. The Cohort 1 Data Support Data Systems subscale also maintained this year as one district was already implementing at 100%. As stated earlier, there was a decrease in the percentage for Selection for Cohort 1 because of issues with hiring in both districts. ISBE and the IL MTSS-N were pleased to see continued growth in five domains for Cohort 1 and eight domains for Cohort 2. IL MTSS-N staff conclude that the negative 5.77 change in Planning for Cohort 2 was related to two districts decreasing in the item area of implementation plan improvements. One of these districts was already at 100% implementation with fidelity, so the decrease may be attributed to ceiling effects.

Figure 3:





Figure 4:



Figures 5 and 6 display the actual percent improvement from Year 1 to Year 4 for both SSIP Transformation Zone Cohorts. The greatest infrastructure improvements from Year 1 to Year 4 for Cohort 1 were in Systems Intervention (300% improvement), Facilitative Administration (157.11%), Training (150%), Performance Assessment (133.33%), Planning (119.99%), Coaching (100%), and Decision Support Data Systems (80.01%). The greatest infrastructure improvements for Cohort 2 were in Performance Assessment (153.13%) Systems Intervention (125%), Training (125%), Decision Support Data Systems (118.38%), and Facilitative Administration (91.28%). Growth was also observed for Cohort 2 in Coaching (68.75%), Planning (57.49%), Selection (42.51%), and Leadership (30.65%). One area with minimal growth for Cohort 1 was Leadership (25%). This was expected as leadership was implemented at a high level during all four years (80%, 90%, 95%, and 100%), leaving less room for growth. Although positive change was noted in Selection across several years for Cohort 1, the performance level is back at the baseline level (2016-17) due to the hiring issues previously described. Therefore, Cohort 1 districts saw growth in eight of the nine domains across the four years. Cohort 2 districts saw growth in all nine domains across the four years.

Figure 5:

DCA Percent Change from 2016-17 to 2019-20 (Cohort 1)





Figure 6:

DCA Percent Change from 2017-18 to 2019-20 (Cohort 2)



Step c): MTSS action planning is completed based on a district data profile and incorporated into the district's overall improvement plan; monitoring is ongoing

In Phase III, Year 1, both Cohort 1 districts completed District Data Profiles with the Center for School Improvement (2016) prior to receiving support from the IL MTSS-N. In terms of action planning, one of the districts completed its original plan in February of 2017. In Phase III, Year 2, the second district completed its action plan, while the first district updated its original action plan. Both districts integrated their MTSS action plans into the district's overall improvement plan as of October of 2017. In Phase III, Years 3 and 4, both districts updated data profiles and analyzed their action plan status and progress. Monitoring of the plans is ongoing in both districts.

All nine Cohort 2 districts completed their action planning based on district data profiles between November 2017 and March 2018. As of Phase III, Year 3, action plans had been incorporated into districts' overall improvement plans in ten of the eleven districts. In the remaining district, the DCA action plan served as the district's overall continuous improvement plan. In Phase III, Year 4, all nine districts updated data profiles and analyzed their action plan status and progress. Monitoring of the plans is ongoing in all districts. This step is ongoing.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity

Activity 4: Engage in professional learning around a MTSS systems framework

Step a): District staff participate in professional learning (PL); PL opportunities are delivered with fidelity; the effectiveness of PL is monitored; PL participants increase their knowledge and skills

The term "professional learning" includes training as well as coaching and technical assistance (TA). Therefore, the data below reflect all three areas. The coaches are typically in districts 3-7 times per month for training, coaching, and follow-up activities.

The IL MTSS-N evaluates professional learning data via its **Time, Effort and Outcome Tracker (ThEO)**. ThEO is an online data system for collecting and tracking staff time and frequency of direct support with districts (training, coaching, and technical assistance support). IL MTSS-N capacity coaches input information following every direct district contact in which training, coaching, or technical assistance is provided. Data are analyzed in March each year prior to SSIP reporting. IL MTSS-N leadership has access to ThEO data at all times. Measures include direct contact hours and activities.

During Phase III, Year 1, MTSS Network staff delivered 74 professional learning (PL) activities to 845 district personnel (totals *not* unduplicated) in Cohort 1 districts to support MTSS implementation, totaling 170.45 hours of provided support. During Phase III, Year 2, IL MTSS-N staff delivered 396 PL activities to 3,671 district personnel (totals *not* unduplicated) in Cohorts 1 and 2 to support MTSS implementation, totaling 827.25 hours of provided support. During Phase III, Year 3, IL MTSS-N staff delivered 757 PL activities to 8,448 district personnel (totals *not* unduplicated) in Cohorts 1 and 2 to support MTSS implementation, totaling 1487.67 hours of provided support. During Phase III, Year 4, IL

MTSS-N staff delivered 501 PL activities to 5,939 district personnel (totals *not* unduplicated) in Cohorts 1 and 2 to support MTSS implementation, totaling 1,274.25 hours of provided support. There was an expected decrease in Year 4 as compared to Year 3 due to the gradual release of a large district in Cohort 1 as it builds sustainability.

Figure 7 displays the count of PL activities, total hours, and number of participants by year and by total. A significant increase in total activities, total contact hours, and number of participants can be seen from Year 1 baseline to Year 4. IL MTSS-N staff has provided a total of 1,728 PL activities for 3,759.62 hours supporting 18,903 participants across the state of Illinois in Phase III. Step f) of Activity 1 will continue.

Figure 7:

Phase III Year	PL Total Activities	Total Duration (hours)	# of Participants
Year 1	74	170.45	845
Year 2	396	827.25	3671
Year 3	757	1487.67	8448
Year 4	501	1274.25	5939
Total	1728	3759.62	18903

In Phase III, Year 4, staff in all Cohort districts continued to participate in professional learning. Two measures were used to gather data on training fidelity: the Facilitator Guide Checklist and the High Quality Professional Development Checklist. The **Facilitator Guide Checklist** measures whether the training components were carried out as intended. Network Capacity Coaches (NCCs) self-assessed their fidelity of implementation of training activities. Across all trainings provided across all four years of SSIP implementation, NCCs attained fidelity of 96.85%. The **High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Checklist** measures the quality of delivery of the intended training components by using research-based professional development indicators. When these indicators are met, training is determined to be of high quality. Overall, 98.47% of the high quality indicators were met across all four years. The level of success for these fidelity measures is 80%, so the fidelity of the training exceeds the standard.

In addition to training fidelity data, data were available on the effectiveness of professional learning. **Professional Learning Evaluations (PLEs)** were completed by participants after training sessions were delivered. The PLE measures the extent to which the training topic aligns to the participants' needs. It also examines the increase in knowledge and skills, supportiveness of the training materials, and training content quality.

Figures 8, 9, and 10 demonstrate improvements aligned to the Theory of Action Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, Activity 4. These improvements provide evidence for the Logic Model short-term results of increased knowledge in systems, data, and practice. The aggregate PLE data table shown in **Figure 8** displays data across all topics. For Item 1 (i.e., topic alignment), 76.3% of the participants indicated that the trainings aligned to their needs *“To a great extent”* and 22.2% indicated that the topics aligned to their needs *“To some extent.”* For Item 2 (i.e., increase knowledge and skills in MTSS), 69.2% of the participants indicated that the training increased their knowledge and/or

skills “*To a Great Extent*” and 30.0% indicated that the trainings increased their knowledge and/or skills “*To Some Extent*.” Therefore, approximately 98% of the participants indicated that new knowledge and/or skills were gained as a result of the trainings provided across the span of the SSIP.

Figure 8: Mean Percentages Across All Trainings

Percent	Topic Alignment to Needs	Percent	Increase Knowledge and Skills in MTSS
76.3%	To a Great Extent	69.2%	To a Great Extent
22.2%	To Some Extent	30.0%	To Some Extent
1.5%	To Very Little Extent	0.4%	To Very Little Extent
0.0%	Not at All	0.4%	Not at All

Pre-post test data for training outcomes was collected related to the three SSIP coherent improvement strategies of systems (e.g., MTSS framework), data (e.g., data-driven processes), and practice (e.g., evidence-based practices). Training participants rated their knowledge, skills, and confidence along the training outcomes prior to the training using a rating scale from 0 to 5, with 0 representing no knowledge/skills on the professional learning performance objective and 5 representing expert knowledge and/or skills. **Figure 9** presents pre-test and post-test mean scores across all training outcome categories (systems, data, practices). Participant means were 2.30 at pre-test and 3.71 at post-test for the data training outcome. For the evidence-based practices outcome, participant means were 2.29 at pre-test and 3.94 at post-test. Finally, participant means for the systems outcome were 2.23 at pre-test and 3.72 at post-test. Such data indicate that participants’ knowledge, skills, and confidence improved after the trainings were provided. The percentage of improvement from pre-test to post-test across all three training outcome categories is shown in **Figure 10**. Pre-Post Test data documented a 66.39% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on systems, a 61.10% improvement for the training component on data, and a 72.36% improvement for the training component on EBPs.

Network Capacity Coaches (NCCs) report the implementation of participants’ new knowledge and skills in all three areas in Phase III, Year 4: systems, data, and practice. One NCC noted that a district utilized MTSS tools to set up a system that was transparent to all district departments. This same district had gained knowledge around building capacity and sustainability. Another NCC reported that the alignment of the district strategic plan, school improvement plans, professional learning, and coaching was seamless in one of her districts. Yet another NCC reported that the school leadership teams have become more proactive in school initiatives. Districts are also using data as the basis for conversation at every meeting. Instructional staff are looking at data more frequently and using it to make instructional decisions. Finally, NCCs reported that reading instructional practices were changing to be more aligned to the New Illinois Learning Standards (NILS) and schools were focusing more on Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions. NCCs also reported reductions in office discipline referrals since the implementation of schoolwide positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS). One NCC stated that district staff were internalizing practices being implemented as demonstrated by a change in their language and viewpoints when participating in team meetings. This activity and step are ongoing.

Figure 9:

Pre-Test and Post-Test Means Across All Training Outcome Categories





Figure 10:



Coherent Improvement Strategy 1: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity

Activity 5: Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity

Step a): The IL MTSS-N systems PL framework is implemented

Step b): Technical assistance and coaching supports are utilized to implement and sustain a MTSS

Illinois uses a building-level assessment tool to measure progress and fidelity related to MTSS implementation. The Self-Assessment of MTSS Implementation (SAM) is an assessment tool that was developed by Florida's SPDG to assist districts in implementing and sustaining critical elements of MTSS with fidelity. SAM developers conducted national technical adequacy research. Confirmatory factor analysis resulted in a good fit (CFI=.96) and internal consistency reliability for each of the domains was high. The IL MTSS-N has permission from Florida SPDG staff to contextualize the instrument for Illinois, resulting in the **Self-Assessment of MTSS Implementation – Illinois Version (SAM-I)**. It examines the following domains: leadership, capacity/infrastructure, communication/collaboration, data-based problem solving, three-tiered instructional/intervention model, and data/evaluation. Each domain encompasses multiple items on which school staff rate their level of implementation. Levels of implementation include:

- Not implementing (0.0 – 0.4)
- Emerging/developing (0.5 – 1.4)
- Operationalizing (1.5 - 2.4)
- Optimizing (2.5 - 3.0)

School building staff score each item under the domains and use the results of the assessment to develop an action plan. Schools complete the SAM-I annually with midpoint progress monitoring checks. The SAM-Is were completed by TZ districts between September 2019 and March 2020 for Phase III, Year 4 data collection and reporting.

Figure 11 displays domain average SAM-I scores for Cohort 1 by year. The figure demonstrates infrastructure improvements aligned to Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, Activity 5. These infrastructure improvements provide evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of demonstrating improved implementation of an MTSS framework with fidelity. Cohort 1 demonstrated significant infrastructure and practice improvements on all six SAM-I domain subscales. All six of the domain subscales are operationalizing, or being put into use, with fidelity in Phase III, Year 4 and have increased since Year 3. The most fully implemented domains for Cohort 1 are Leadership (2.33), 3-tier instruction/intervention model (2.06), Communication/Collaboration (2.06), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.02). Even though the least implemented domains are Data Evaluation (1.82) and Capacity/Infrastructure (1.72), these domains are still operationalizing. In addition, the Leadership domain is nearing optimization at 2.33.

Figure 11:




Figure 12 shows the SAM-I percent change for Cohort 1 across four years. The greatest percentage improvements for Cohort 1 on the SAM-I from 2016-2017 to 2019-2020 were seen in the domain subscales of Data Evaluation (355%), Communication/Collaboration (267.86%), Leadership (219.18%), and Capacity/Infrastructure (208.62%). The greatest percentage improvement related to increased levels of implementation in Cohort 1 from Phase III, Year 4 since Baseline Year 1 is in Data Evaluation. Though Data Evaluation and Capacity/Infrastructure are the lowest implemented domains overall (see Figure 11), the data indicate the greatest longitudinal growth in Data Evaluation (355%) and a high level of longitudinal growth in Capacity/Infrastructure (208.62%). The 3-Tier Model domain showed the least longitudinal growth at 68.85%. However, most Cohort 1 schools made significant improvements in the 3-Tier Model with the percent change ranging from 98.51% to 388.24% for the majority of schools. However, one quarter of the schools had high baseline levels and maintained their high levels or demonstrated a relatively small percent change ranging from 0% to 25.00%. The high baseline scores for some of the schools in the 3-Tier Model resulted in overall less average growth than the other SAM-I domains. Finally, because Cohort 1 had very low baseline levels with a lot of room for growth and received an additional year of services, their growth percentages are significantly higher than those for Cohort 2 (see Figure 14).

Figure 12:




Figure 13 displays the domain average SAM-I scores for Cohort 2 across years. All six domain subscales are operationalizing with fidelity in Phase III, Year 4 (Implementation Year 3) for Cohort 2. However, Cohort 2 demonstrated fluctuation in infrastructure and practice across SAM-I domain subscales across all years of implementation. Levels of implementation decreased in four of six domains from Year 3 (Implementation Year 2) to Year 4 (Implementation Year 3). In one large district, turnover in administration impacted the status of their MTSS implementation with fidelity and, thus, SAM-I scores in Year 4. The district anticipates growth in the coming year. This impacted Cohort 2 aggregate SAM-I scores for Year 4. The most fully implemented domains for Cohort 2 are 3-Tier Model (2.23), Leadership (2.21), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.15), in which implementation is operationalizing. The closest domain to optimization is 3-Tier Model at 2.23. **Figure 14** displays the SAM-I percent change for Cohort 2 across three years. Cohort 2 made improvements overall across all six SAM-I domains since SSIP Year 2 (Baseline). The greatest improvements were seen in Leadership (19.46%), Data Evaluation (18.87%), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (18.13%). The 3-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model domain showed the least longitudinal growth at 4.69% as the baseline level was exceptionally high. This resulted in much less room for growth. In addition, all of the schools in one large district in Cohort 2 maintained or decreased their level in the 3-Tier Model domain due to disruptions with new administration.

Figure 13:





Figure 14:



Both Transformation Zone Cohorts have data indicating that levels of MTSS implementation are fully implemented. District Leadership Team (DLT) and Building Leadership Team (BLT) meetings are held regularly. Districts are creating MTSS manuals and process documents to assist with MTSS implementation. Technical assistance and coaching supports have been made available to all eleven SSIP Transformation Zone districts (see Activity 4 data). Coaches have assisted districts with their specific needs around MTSS implementation. Coaches are typically in districts 2-4 times per month for training, coaching, and follow-up activities. Local district staff with expertise in the targeted have gradually taken over the role of internal coaches to maintain the programs.

Data were also collected on the fidelity of the coaching provided by the IL MTSS-N to the districts. Overall data from the **High Quality Coaching Checklist** documented that 100% of the high quality coaching indicators were implemented with fidelity. The level of success for this fidelity measure is 80%, so the fidelity of the coaching exceeds the standard. Activity 5, and its corresponding steps, is ongoing.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2: Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity

Activity 7: Implement and sustain data-based decision making

- Step a): A process for providing staff access to data systems for timely formative and summative data analyses is established
- Step b): Data are used to inform system and practice decisions
- Step c): Screening and progress monitoring data are used to inform instruction

In Phase III, Year 3, IL MTSS Network Capacity Coaches and district staff used the District Data Profile as a tool to facilitate the alignment of data resources. District teams agreed upon required data and reports, and data resources were aligned in various ways. In addition, the District Data Profiles were utilized in the SIMR data review process for all TZ districts. In Phase III, Year 4, district staff accessed data sources, such as data dashboards and district data portals. Teachers had access to classroom data as well as statewide assessment data. Districts strengthened their use of benchmark and progress monitoring data to inform instruction and develop intervention plans. One district's individual school teams instituted grade and schoolwide interventions related to vocabulary, attendance, social-emotional learning, reading, and instruction as a result of their data reviews. One district used its SIMR data review process to identify two focus areas for school year 2020: improving the effectiveness of co-teaching and effectively utilizing progress monitoring tools to improve the achievement of students with IEPs in Grades K-3. A co-teaching survey was also utilized to gather perception data about the co-teaching process. As a result of the survey, co-teaching pairs were provided more planning time by shifting priorities. Another district used its OTISS data to examine its instructional practices in Tier 1 and build consistency at that level. Yet another district reviewed and implemented new district curriculum based on data.

District Leadership Teams (DLTs) and Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) review **Self-Assessment of MTSS Implementation-Illinois (SAM-I)** data and connect it to the district's overall improvement plan and the State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). DLT's and BLTs also action plan based on these data. DLTs analyze district-wide data to inform annual planning and expenditures. DLT and BLT meetings incorporate both academic and behavior data reviews, and data are utilized for making decisions. Data meetings are held on a regular basis to review progress monitoring data, determine individual student progress, inform instruction, and develop intervention plans.

Figure 15 demonstrates improvements aligned to the Theory of Action Coherent Improvement Strategy 2, Activity 7 as measured by the SAM-I domain of Data-Based Problem-Solving. This data provides evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of demonstrating improved implementation of a data driven process for systems and practices. This data demonstrates that data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing for Cohort 1 (2.02) and Cohort 2 (2.15) across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. Activity 7, steps b) and c) are ongoing for all districts.

Figure 15:

Cohort	SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving Score	SAM-I Descriptor
Cohort 1	2.02	Operationalizing
Cohort 2	2.15	Operationalizing

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework

Activity 8: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in early literacy

Step c): Early literacy EBPs are implemented with ongoing coaching and administrative support

Activity 9: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in climate and culture

Step c): Climate and culture EBPs are implemented with ongoing coaching and administrative support

All eleven TZ districts are implementing EBPs for early literacy and climate and culture. Part of the **SAM-I** examines the extent to which EBPs are being implemented with fidelity. **Figure 16** demonstrates high implementation fidelity of evidence-based practices aligned to Theory of Action Coherent Improvement Strategy 3, Activities 8 and 9 as measured by the SAM-I domain of Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model. The data provide evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of implementation of EBPs with fidelity. This data demonstrates that implementation fidelity of evidence-based practices is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-

emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers in both Cohort 1 (2.06) and Cohort 2 (2.23).

Figure 16:

Cohort	SAM-I 3-Tier Model Score	SAM-I Descriptor
Cohort 1	2.06	Operationalizing
Cohort 2	2.23	Operationalizing

NCCs reported on district progress related to EBPs in early literacy and climate and culture. When the SSIP began, several districts were not using evidence-based reading programs. Districts have since piloted and implemented evidence-based reading programs. In Phase III, Year 4, districts provided tiered supports and interventions, such as targeted small group interventions, and they were more intentional about providing Tier 2 interventions. Multiple NCCs reported that students with IEPs were now receiving comprehensive core English-Language Arts programs, and students with disabilities had access to the same grade-level core materials and academic vocabulary as students without disabilities. Another district NCC reported that classroom teachers are more intentional about connecting the vocabulary and strategies from interventions into the core curriculum. Yet another district indicated that progress monitoring data for K-3 grades showed growth in reading for each grade level. Evidence-based literacy practices being utilized that are specific to special education and Tier 3 include Leveled Literacy Intervention, Lexia, PALS, Reading Mastery, Reading Plus, Reading Rockets, Shared Reading, Elkonin Boxes, Wilson, and Wonders. In terms of climate and culture, multiple districts reported decreases in office discipline referrals. Evidence-based climate and culture practices being utilized that are specific to special education and Tier 3 include Camp Cope-A-Lot, Caring School Community, Check & Connect, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBITS & Bounce Back), Coping Cat, FBA/BIP, Home-School-Community (wraparound), Restorative Practices, Second Step Curriculum, and The CAT Project. Finally, one district reported that EBPs in early literacy and climate and culture were working in concert to support all learners in receiving robust Tier 1 instruction. The staff celebrated attendance and achievement building-wide, and social-emotional supports were evident in everyday interactions in classrooms.


The **Observational Tool for Instructional Supports and Systems (OTISS)** is a classroom assessment tool utilized to measure progress and fidelity of instructional evidence-based practices. It was developed and validated by the National Implementation Research Network’s (NIRN) State Implementation & Scaling-Up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP). OTISS is a fidelity assessment for high impact instruction practices in the classroom. It is a direct observation of teacher instruction, and an assessment of the quality of the system and supports available to help teachers use evidence-based practices in instruction.

The OTISS measures seven evidence-based practices in instruction: provides clear instruction, demonstrates instructional tasks, engages students in meaningful interactions with content, provides prompt and accurate feedback, adjusts to students’ responses to

instruction, provides multiple opportunities for students to learn, and adjusts to student engagement with instruction. Trained individuals complete the direct observations three times per year. Each practice is scored from 0 (not observed) to 2 (fully observed).

Figure 17 displays ELA OTISS scores across both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. The figure demonstrates high implementation fidelity of ELA evidence-based practices aligned to Theory of Action Coherent Improvement Strategy 3, Activities 8 and 9. The data provide evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of implementation of EBPs with fidelity. The OTISS was administered in the Fall of 2019, and 248 teachers across both cohorts were observed. Scores ranged from 1.64 for Clear Instruction to 1.97 for Multiple Opportunities. One district NCC reported that the individual and team OTISS conversations have provided an opportunity to reconsider structures. The NCC indicated that, across the seven instructional practices within the OTISS, staff have realized that all learners can learn across settings with every educator. District staff reported to the NCC that the use of this process has been empowering.

Figure 17:



Steps c) and d) of Activities 8 and 9 are ongoing for all cohort districts.

FFY2018 SIMR Data

Statewide **IAR assessment data** for the two SSIP Transformation Zone districts in Cohort 1 and the nine districts in Cohort 2 show an overall increase in the percentage of 3rd grade students with IEPs who met or exceeded on the English-language arts statewide assessment from Phase III, Year 3 to Year 4. The data provide evidence for the Logic Model long term results of increased percentages of 3rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the ELA assessment (SIMR). Cohort 1 district percentages were 7.7% in baseline year FFY 2015, 10.0% in FFY 2016, 7.8% in FFY 2017, and 10.09% in FFY 2018. Cohort 2 district percentages were 10.6% in FFY 2016, 6.1% in FFY 2017, and 8.67% in FFY 2018. In both Cohort 1 districts and in seven of the nine Cohort 2 districts, the percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who met/exceeded on the statewide ELA assessment increased from Phase III, Year 3 to Year 4. Although both Cohorts showed overall increases in the percentage of 3rd grade students with IEPs who met or exceeded on the IAR, the SSIP target for FFY18 was not met. **Figures 18 and 19** display the SSIP targets and actual data for each of the two SSIP Cohorts from FFY 2015 to FFY 2018.

Figure 18: Targets and Data (Cohort 1)

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
IAR Data	7.7% (Baseline)	10.0%	7.8%	10.09%
Target		9.7%	11.7%	13.7%

Figure 19: Targets and Data (Cohort 2)

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
IAR Data		10.6%	6.1%	8.67%
Target		9.7%	11.7%	13.7%

Figures 20 and 21 display the percent growth for last year's 3rd grade students who are now current 4th grade students. Data are shown for four race/ethnicities: Hispanic, Black, White, and Multiracial. The figures provide evidence for the Logic Model intermediate results of improved student outcomes from implemented EBPs. Even though the overall SIMR target was not met by Cohort 1, both districts showed growth when examining last year's 3rd grade students who are now current 4th graders. ISBE compared IAR results for FFY17 3rd graders with IEPs to FFY18 4th graders with IEPs for students who identified as Hispanic, Black, White, or Multiracial. In both Cohort 1 districts, all four races showed growth as displayed in **Figure 20**.

Figure 20:

	Hispanic	Black	White	Multiracial	Overall Percent Growth
District 1	50.0%	81.4%	68.3%	63.2%	73.4%
District 2	50.0%	76.9%	68.3%	57.1%	68.3%

Two of the nine Cohort 2 districts met the SIMR target of 13.7% with percentages of 21.21% and 17.24%. Even though the overall SIMR target was not met by Cohort 2, all nine districts showed growth when examining last year's 3rd grade students who are now current 4th graders. ISBE compared IAR results for FFY17 3rd graders with IEPs to FFY18 4th graders with IEPs for students who identified as Hispanic, Black, White, or Multiracial. In all nine districts, all four races showed growth as displayed in **Figure 21**.

Figure 21:


	Hispanic	Black	White	Multiracial	Overall Percent Growth
District 1	66.7%	50.0%	68.8%	100.0%	67.4%
District 2	67.9%	80.0%	60.0%	100.0%	69.2%
District 3	81.8%	N/A	66.7%	50.0%	76.7%
District 4	64.3%	71.4%	50.0%	60.0%	60.0%
District 5	62.5%	60.0%	57.9%	66.7%	60.0%
District 6	N/A	100.0%	61.1%	75.0%	65.2%
District 7	100.0%	66.7%	72.7%	100.0%	74.2%
District 8	86.4%	100.0%	72.2%	100.0%	77.2%
District 9	N/A	N/A	80.0%	33.3%	72.2%

Because the ELA state assessment is a distal measure of students' performance, the IL MTSS-N worked on its capacity to collect and analyze local district assessments that are more proximal and sensitive to change, (e.g., AIMSweb, STAR, and NWEA MAP) in Phase III, Year 4. The IL MTSS-N purchased a software license for a data dashboard to meet multiple needs, such as collecting and analyzing data in meaningful ways. The goal was to standardize the data across schools and benchmarking assessments as a means of enhancing ISBE's ability to judge progress toward achieving the SSIP long-term outcome (SIMR) by having the ability to collect and report intermediate outcome data and progress monitoring data. The IL MTSS-N piloted the collection of local progress monitoring data across the TZ districts and convened a team to review the results.

Figure 22 provides an example of data gathered from local benchmarking assessments in one, large SSIP Transformation Zone school district. The data represents 3rd grade

mean Reading RIT (i.e. Rausch Unit) scores and percent change from fall to winter for IEP and Non-IEP student subgroups in one of the Cohort 1 districts. This district is comprised of twenty-one (21) participating elementary schools reporting 3rd grade student-level NWEA MAP assessment data and receiving support through the IL MTSS-N. Across all twenty-one schools, the 3rd grade IEP subgroup improved by 5.6 points on average from fall (IEP subgroup $n=217$) to winter (IEP subgroup $n=224$). This represents a 3.22% improvement. Further, the 3rd grade Non-IEP subgroup improved by 5.3 points on average from fall (Non-IEP subgroup $n=697$) to winter (Non-IEP subgroup $n=702$). This represents a 2.74% improvement.

Figure 22:



Reading	Percent Change
3rd grade-IEP	3.22%
3rd grade-Non-IEP	2.84%

As discussed in the Theory of Action, ISBE, together with its stakeholders, hypothesized that students with disabilities had low reading performance because schools and districts have not implemented a MTSS framework with fidelity. Now that evaluation measures show that levels of implementation are operationalizing, ISBE would expect to start seeing improved statewide assessment data after all three coherent improvement strategies

have been implemented with fidelity. Research indicates that it takes three to five years before an impact on student results is typically seen.

Stakeholder Involvement in SSIP Evaluation

As previously discussed in Section I, stakeholder input was primarily gathered through the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-N) Advisory Council. The IL MTSS-N Advisory Council has direct involvement in providing feedback to the IL MTSS-N, which includes: reviewing the implementation of key tasks and activities to ensure full and effective delivery of project services, reviewing project evaluation data and using such data to identify needed improvements in the project, and assisting in the refinement and/or development of project training and resource materials. The IL MTSS-N Advisory Council meets quarterly (January, March, June, and October). The SSIP is discussed to some extent at each of the quarterly meetings in an effort to build understanding around SSIP goals and the use of evaluation data.

During the June meeting, stakeholders had the opportunity to review evaluation data that was to be incorporated in the SSIP report to OSEP and to provide feedback on the data, including any implementation changes needed as a result of the data. Stakeholders partnered with the IL MTSS-N and ISBE to use evaluation data to inform decisions around future SSIP activities. Multiple data graphs were shared displaying how Illinois had met its milestones in implementing the planned SSIP activities and how such activities resulted in intended outputs. After the data sharing portion of the meeting, advisory group members were asked to work independently, and then in small groups, to discuss strengths, challenges, implications for continuous improvement, and other data they wished they had. Each small group then reported out to the large group. The group discussed what was working well in terms of the SSIP and what might be improved. A significant challenge to this type of systems change work is that it requires significant resources, especially to support schools that are in rural communities. There was rich discussion around supporting rural school districts and professional learning around coaching. After lengthy discussion, the group set the following priorities for the coming school year: consistency across initiatives (systems), access and use of district data (data), and an enhanced focus on evidence-based practices (practices). The ability to “scale up” and build capacity was also a topic of conversation during the October, January, and March stakeholder meetings. The group discussed ways to obtain MTSS support in districts that were not TZ districts, such as expanding the availability of universal resources. Professional learning around intensifying interventions with a focus on special education was also a topic of discussion during the January and March meetings. The NCII provided professional learning to the IL MTSS-N Network Capacity Coaches (NCCs) during Phase III, Year 4 on intensifying interventions and students with IEPs so they could better support their TZ districts in this area. This data will be shared with other stakeholders throughout the year at meetings and conferences. The SSIP is also available on the ISBE website.

In order to ensure that the stakeholders who are the most impacted by the evaluation results are the most engaged in the evaluation process, the Transformation Zone districts also have the opportunity to provide feedback on both implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. In Phase III, Year 4, ISBE and the IL MTSS-N continued to offer a Community of Practice (CoP) for the TZ districts to allow them to be partners in the SSIP

implementation and evaluation process. The purpose of the CoP is to provide the TZ districts with the opportunity to share ideas and innovations with each other on a regular basis as they implement and evaluate their systems, data, and practices and work toward fidelity of implementation. The June 2019 CoP webinar focused on the SSIP Transformation Zone data. Participants reviewed the data with a facilitator from the IL MTSS-N and provided feedback to consider for the coming year. Topics for the Phase III, Year 4 CoP webinars were identified by the CoP participants and focused on evidence-based practices. In Phase III, Year 4, the CoP webinars were open to any Illinois school district as a means of sharing information and TZ district experiences beyond the TZ district cohorts as requested by IL MTSS Advisory Council stakeholders. The following CoP topics were addressed this year:

- Building Equity through an MTSS (October 2019)
- MTSS and Chronic Absenteeism (January 2020)
- Blending Social-Emotional Learning into an Integrated MTSS (March 2020)
- Intensifying Intervention at Tiers 2 and 3 (May 2020)

The CoP has quarterly webinars that are based on the needs of the TZ districts. Future topics will continue to encompass all three coherent improvement strategies by addressing systems, data, and evidence-based practices in early literacy and climate and culture. Transformation Zone districts have the opportunity to suggest topics based on their data and needs as they work to implement and sustain the SSIP work in their districts and schools.

Section III: Data Quality Issues

Data Limitations

Unlike Phase III, Year 1 in which the reporting period was limited to November 2016 through February 2017, Illinois was able to gather a full cycle of data for the Phase III, Year 2, Year 3, and Year 4 reporting periods. In terms of data quality, ISBE is able to report on multiple measures, data is well organized, data displays are easy to interpret, data has been standardized and cleansed, and data is disaggregated. ISBE strengthened the utilization of multiple measures of data in Year 2 as data was inserted into the District Data Profiles and district action plans were completed. Data displays were improved upon after input was received from the IL MTSS Network Advisory Council. ISBE also worked with the IL MTSS-N to develop the SIMR Data Review form to facilitate data collection specific to the SSIP. A status report template was also developed for the IL MTSS-N Capacity Coaches (NCCs) to input data that corresponded directly to the SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies, Activities, and Steps. All data is housed in Office 365 SharePoint and is easily accessible to relevant ISBE and IL MTSS-N staff. Improvements will continue to be made as the IL MTSS-N and ISBE receive more input from district and school leaders as well as stakeholders. ISBE staff and IL MTSS-N staff will discuss any necessary improvements on their weekly calls after the SSIP Phase III, Year 4 report is submitted.

One data limitation is in the area of standardization across progress monitoring tools across TZ districts. In Phase III, Year 4, the IL MTSS-N piloted a process to report uniform local district assessment data (e.g., AIMSweb, STAR, and NWEA MAP) for the SSIP. The IL MTSS-N purchased a software license for a data dashboard to meet multiple needs, such as collecting and analyzing data in meaningful ways. The goal was to enhance ISBE's ability to judge progress toward achieving the SSIP long-term outcome (SIMR). The IL MTSS-N did pilot the collection of local progress monitoring data across all but one of the TZ districts. A survey that would standardize the data across schools and benchmarking assessments was utilized. However, most district staff demonstrated that they did not have the capacity to organize their data in alignment with the survey; therefore, districts sent PDFs, Excel documents, and Word documents of each of their different types of benchmark assessments to the IL MTSS-N. Not all districts provided clean, clear, and workable data. Some local district data systems did not have the capability to disaggregate by students with IEPs. Pilot results indicated a lack of conformity across the eleven TZ districts. The lack of conformity did not allow for the necessary standardization. Therefore, ISBE could not include the depth of information regarding growth as evidenced by local progress monitoring data as it originally intended for Phase III, Year 4. IL MTSS-N has a team that is working to improve the local assessment data collection procedures for next year. This team has gathered input from relevant parties and is developing a plan to improve the data collection process for next year given the observed issues with the pilot.

Section IV: Progress toward Achieving Intended Improvements

Assessment of Progress

All 3 coherent improvement strategies, their corresponding 9 activities, and the 23 steps associated with the strategies and activities have been implemented to some extent. Three activities and fourteen steps under multiple activities have been completed. Below is a summary of progress for Phase III, Year 4. It is evident that the systems-level work has begun to cultivate high-quality instruction.

Activity 2: Determining capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity

The District Capacity Assessment (DCA) provides data regarding districts' readiness levels to build capacity to implement MTSS, barriers to capacity building, and district needs. The DCA documented infrastructure improvements from baseline on all nine of the DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 1. The highest levels of implementation for Cohort 1 were in Leadership (100%), Systems Intervention (100%), Planning (91.66%), Performance Assessment (87.5%), Decision Support Data Systems (75%), and Facilitative Administration (75%). The DCA also documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on all nine of the DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 2. The highest level of implementation for Cohort 2 was in Leadership (90%). The DCA documented the greatest infrastructure improvements from baseline in Systems Intervention (300% improvement), Facilitative Administration (157.11%), Training (150%), Performance Assessment (133.33%), Planning (119.99%), Coaching (100%), and Decision Support Data Systems (80.01%) for Cohort 1 and in Performance Assessment (153.13%) Systems Intervention (125%), Training (125%), Decision Support Data Systems (118.38%), and Facilitative Administration (91.28%) for Cohort 2. Therefore, both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts saw growth in all nine domains from baseline.

Activity 4: Engaging in professional learning around a MTSS systems framework

As expected, ThEO documented professional learning (PL) showed decreases in the frequency, duration, and number of participants from Phase III Year 3 to Year 4 as the TZ districts are in the process of being gradually released from IL MTSS-N support and are moving toward sustainability. The IL MTSS-N uses a gradual release model of "I Do," "We Do," "You Do" to build fidelity and sustainability with districts. However, during Phase III, Year 4, IL MTSS-N staff still delivered 501 PL activities to 5,939 district personnel (totals *not* unduplicated) in Cohorts 1 and 2 to support MTSS implementation, totaling 1,274.25 hours of provided support. Overall, a significant increase in total activities, total contact hours, and number of participants can be seen from baseline to Year 4. IL MTSS-N staff provided a total of 1,728 PL activities for 3,759.62 hours supporting 18,903 participants across the state of Illinois in Phase III.

Professional Learning Evaluations (PLEs) documented that 98.5% of participants indicated the trainings aligned to their needs, and 99.2% of participants thought the trainings increased their knowledge and/or skills. The HQPDP Fidelity Checklist

documented that 98.47% of the high quality indicators were met across all four years. The Facilitator Guide Fidelity Checklist documented fidelity of 96.85% across all trainings across all four years of SSIP implementation.

Activity 5: Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity

The SAM-I documented significant infrastructure and practice improvements from baseline on all six SAM-I domain subscales for Cohort 1. The most fully implemented domains were Leadership (2.33), Communication/Collaboration (2.06), 3-Tier Instruction/Intervention Model (2.06), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.02). All six domain subscales are operationalizing, and the Leadership domain is nearing optimization at 2.33. The SAM-I also documented infrastructure and practice improvements from baseline on all six domain subscales for Cohort 2. The most fully implemented domains were 3-Tier Instruction/Intervention Model (2.23), Leadership (2.21), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.15). All six domain subscales are operationalizing, and the 3-Tier Model domain is nearing optimization at 2.23. The High Quality Coaching Fidelity Checklist documented that 100% of the high quality coaching indicators were implemented with fidelity.

Activity 7: Implement and sustain data-based decision making

The District Capacity Assessment (DCA) documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on the DCA driver domain subscale of Decision Support Data Systems for Cohort 1 (75% level of implementation). The DCA also documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on the DCA driver domain subscale of Decision Support Data Systems for Cohort 2 (68.75% level of implementation). The DCA documented an infrastructure improvement from baseline in Decision Support Data Systems of 80.01% for Cohort 1 and 118.38% for Cohort 2. The SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.02 for Cohort 1, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. The SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.15 for Cohort 2, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers.

Activities 8 and 9: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in early literacy and climate and culture

The SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.06 for Cohort 1, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. In addition, the SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.23 for Cohort 2, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. In addition, English-language arts OTISS scores demonstrate high implementation fidelity of ELA evidence-based practices. Overall statewide assessment (IAR) data for the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed an increase in the percentage of 3rd grade students with IEPs who met/exceeded as compared to Phase III, Year 3 for both cohorts. In addition, two Cohort 2 districts met the SIMR target of 13.7% with percentages of 21.21% and 17.24%. All of the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed growth when examining last year's 3rd grade students who are

now current 4th graders for students who identified as Hispanic, Black, White, or Multiracial. While the SIMR target was not met overall, data still indicate movement across proficiency levels, which show some progress for ISBE's long-term results (SIMR). ISBE will continue to utilize the Illinois Part B SSIP Improvement Plan and Evaluation Plan to guide its SSIP work for the remainder of the SSIP.

There was more of a focus in Phase III, Year 4 on directly addressing the implementation of evidence-based practices in early literacy and on students with IEPs than there had been in prior years. SSIP Transformation Zone districts will continue to emphasize evidence-based practices in early literacy and tiered systems of support for students, specifically students with IEPs, to meet the SSIP long-term results goal, or SIMR. To date, evidence suggests that districts will be able to implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity within prescribed SSIP timelines. ISBE has noted that the current evaluation data show progress toward achieving the intended outcomes of the SSIP.

A supplemental table regarding SSIP progress toward achieving intended improvements is provided on pages 42-45.

ILLINOIS PART B SSIP Progress toward Achieving Intended Improvements

Activities/Outputs	Progress
Coherent Improvement Strategy 1	Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity (SYSTEMS)
1. Implement the SSIP Transformation Zone (SEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed
2. Determine capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity (LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCA documented infrastructure improvements from baseline on all nine of the DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 1. Specifically, Systems Intervention (100%), Leadership (100%), Planning (91.66%), Performance Assessment (87.5%), Decision Support Data Systems (75%), and Facilitative Administration (75%) had high levels of implementation. • DCA documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on all DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 2. Specifically, Leadership (90%) had the highest level of implementation. • DCA documented the greatest infrastructure improvements from baseline in System Intervention (300% improvement), Facilitative Administration (157.11%), Training (150%), Performance Assessment (133.33%), Planning (119.99%), Coaching (100%), and Decision Support Data Systems (80.01%) for Cohort 1. • DCA documented the greatest infrastructure improvements from baseline in Performance Assessment (153.13%), Systems Intervention (125%), Training (125%), Decision Support Data Systems (118.38%), and Facilitative Administration (91.28%) for Cohort 2.
3. Align and leverage fiscal and human resources (LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed
4. Engage in professional learning around a MTSS systems framework (LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ThEO documented the following in professional learning (PL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Frequency = 501 PL activities in Phase III, Year 4 and 1,728 activities total over 4 years ○ Duration = 1,274.25 hours of provided support in Phase III, Year 4 and 3,759.62 hours total over 4 years ○ Number = 5,939 district personnel in Phase III, Year 4 and 18,903 participants total over 4 years • PLEs documented that 98.5% of participants indicated that the trainings aligned to their needs. • PLEs documented that 99.2% of participants indicated that the trainings increased their knowledge and/or skills. • Pre-Post Test data documented a 66.39% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on systems. • Pre-Post Test data documented a 61.10% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on data. • Pre-Post Test data documented a 72.36% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on EBPs. • HQPD Fidelity Checklist documented that 98.47% of coaches reported that the training was of high quality. • Facilitator Guide Fidelity Checklist documented that 96.85% of coaches reported that the training components were carried out as intended.

<p>5. Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity (LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAM-I documented significant infrastructure and practice improvements on all six SAM-I domain subscales for Cohort 1. The most fully implemented domains were Leadership (2.33), Communication/Collaboration (2.06), 3-Tier Model (2.06), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.02). All six domain subscales are operationalizing. • SAM-I documented infrastructure and practice improvements on all six domain subscales for Cohort 2. The most fully implemented domains were 3-Tier Model (2.23), Leadership (2.21), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.15). All six domain subscales are operationalizing. • High Quality Coaching Fidelity Checklist documented that 100% of coaches reported that the coaching was of high quality.
<p>Coherent Improvement Strategy 2:</p>	<p><i>Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity (DATA)</i></p>
<p>6. Align and leverage data resources (LEA) 7. Implement and sustain data-based decision making (LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 6 is completed • The DCA documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on the Decision Support Data Systems domain (75% level of implementation for Cohort 1 and 68.75% level of implementation for Cohort 2. • SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.02 for Cohort 1, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. • SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.15 for Cohort 2, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers.
<p>Coherent Improvement Strategy 3:</p>	<p><i>Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework (PRACTICE)</i></p>
<p>8. Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in early literacy (LEA) 9. Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in climate and culture (LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.06 for Cohort 1, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. • SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.23 for Cohort 2, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. • ELA OTISS scores demonstrate high implementation fidelity of ELA evidence-based practices. • Overall IAR data for the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed an increase in the percentage of 3rd grade students with IEPs who met/exceeded as compared to Phase III, Year 3. • All Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed growth when examining last year's 3rd grade students who are now current 4th graders for students who identified as Hispanic, Black, White, or Multiracial. • Two Cohort 2 districts met the SIMR target of 13.7% with percentages of 21.21% and 17.24%. • In both Cohort 1 districts and in seven of the nine Cohort 2 districts, the percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who met/exceeded on the statewide ELA assessment increased from Phase III, Year 3 to Year 4.

ILLINOIS PART B SSIP Progress on Intended Outcomes

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Progress
Short term	<p>Increased knowledge re:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework • Data-based decision making • Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ThEO documented the following in professional learning (PL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Frequency = 501 PL activities in Phase III, Year 4 and 1,728 activities total over 4 years ▪ Duration = 1,274.25 hours of provided support in Year 4 and 3,759.62 hours total over 4 years ▪ Number = 5,939 district personnel in Year 4 and 18,903 participants total over 4 years ○ PLEs documented that 98.5% of participants indicated that the trainings aligned to their needs. ○ PLEs documented that 99.2% of participants indicated that the trainings increased their knowledge/skills. ○ Pre-Post Test data documented a 66.39% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on systems. ○ Pre-Post Test data documented a 61.10% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on data. ○ Pre-Post Test data documented a 72.36% improvement from pre-test to post-test for the training component on EBPs. ○ HQPD Fidelity Checklist documented that 98.47% of coaches reported that the training was of high quality. ○ Facilitator Guide Fidelity Checklist documented that 96.85% of coaches reported that the training components were carried out as intended.
Intermediate (TOA)	<p>Implementation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A MTSS framework with fidelity • A data-driven process for systems and practice with fidelity • EBPs with fidelity <p>Improved student outcomes from implemented EBPs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to Implement MTSS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DCA documented infrastructure improvements from baseline on all nine of the DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 1. Specifically, Systems Intervention (100%), Leadership (100%), Planning (91.66%), Performance Assessment (87.5%), Decision Support Data Systems (75%), and Facilitative Administration (75%) had high levels of implementation. ○ DCA documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on all DCA driver domain subscales for Cohort 2. Specifically, Leadership (90%) had the highest level of implementation. ○ DCA documented the greatest infrastructure improvements from baseline for Cohort 1 in System Intervention (300% improvement), Facilitative Administration (157.11%), Training (150%), Performance Assessment (133.33%), Planning (119.99%), Coaching (100%), and Decision Support Data Systems (80.01%). ○ DCA documented the greatest infrastructure improvements from baseline for Cohort 2 in Performance Assessment (153.13%), Systems Intervention (125%), Training (125%), Decision Support Data Systems (118.38%), and Facilitative Administration (91.28%).

<p>Long term (TOA)</p>	<p>The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities (SWDs) who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SAM-I documented significant infrastructure and practice improvements on all six SAM-I domain subscales for Cohort 1. The most fully implemented domains were Leadership (2.33), Communication/Collaboration (2.06), 3-Tier Model (2.06), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.02). All six domain subscales are operationalizing. ○ SAM-I documented infrastructure and practice improvements on all six domain subscales for Cohort 2. The most fully implemented domains were 3-Tier Model (2.23), Leadership (2.21), and Data-Based Problem-Solving (2.15). All six domain subscales are operationalizing. ○ High Quality Coaching Fidelity Checklist documented that 100% of coaches reported that the coaching was of high quality. • Data Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The DCA documented significant infrastructure improvements from baseline on the Decision Support Data Systems domain (75% level of implementation for Cohort 1 and 68.75% level of implementation for Cohort 2). ○ SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.02 for Cohort 1, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. ○ SAM-I Data-Based Problem-Solving subscale is implemented at 2.15 for Cohort 2, meaning data-based decision making implementation fidelity is operationalizing across content areas, grade levels, and tiers. • Practice Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.06 for Cohort 1, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. ○ SAM-I Three-Tier Instructional/Intervention Model subscale is implemented at 2.23 for Cohort 2, meaning implementation fidelity is operationalizing for evidence-based practices in academic, behavior, and social-emotional instruction and interventions at all three tiers. ○ ELA OTISS scores demonstrate high implementation fidelity of ELA evidence-based practices. • Student Outcomes and Increased Proficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overall IAR data for the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed an increase in the percentage of 3rd grade students with IEPs who met/exceeded as compared to Phase III, Year 3. ○ All Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 districts showed growth when examining last year's 3rd grade students who are now current 4th graders for students who identified as Hispanic, Black, White, or Multiracial. ○ Two Cohort 2 districts met the SIMR target of 13.7% with percentages of 21.21% and 17.24%. ○ In both Cohort 1 districts and in seven of the nine Cohort 2 districts, the percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who met/exceeded on the statewide ELA assessment increased from Phase III, Year 3 to Year 4.
------------------------	--	---

Section V: Plans for Next Year

Activities, Barriers, and Additional Supports

ISBE plans to move forward with the strategies, activities, and steps that have been prescribed for the SSIP, endorsed by stakeholders, and committed to by the eleven Transformation Zone districts. ISBE notes that progress has been made by the TZ districts in the areas of systems, data, and practice. ISBE will continue to engage in the activities as specified. ISBE will focus on ensuring that all of the TZ districts are implementing all remaining SSIP activities at some level and are making progress related to the activities. ISBE will continue to place emphasis on coaching and technical assistance to support implementation with fidelity. Therefore, ISBE will continue to implement both the improvement and evaluation sections of the SSIP Improvement and Evaluation Plan as written, reassess progress, and make any necessary changes based upon available data and stakeholder input.

In terms of additional technical assistance, ISBE is currently working with both the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) in various capacities but would benefit from support around two areas: early literacy specially designed instruction using EBPs for students with disabilities and scale up. Specifically, ISBE and the IL MTSS-N would benefit from continued professional learning from the National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII). SSIP data show that that a systems framework and data systems have successfully been put into place while evidence-based practices in early literacy still need improvement, specifically for students with disabilities. Districts and IL MTSS-N coaches have been challenged with how to best serve students with disabilities within a Multi-Tiered System of Support. Addressing the literacy needs of students with disabilities has been particularly demanding. Finally, as ISBE looks at the potential for statewide scale up of supports to achieve the SIMR based on evaluation of SSIP results and ongoing infrastructure analysis, including the State ESSA Plan, external technical assistance to support the integration of the SSIP into ISBE's statewide monitoring and support system would be extremely beneficial.

Illinois SSIP Part B Theory of Action

Illinois Hypothesizes That:

Students with disabilities have low reading performance because schools and local education agencies (LEAs) have not implemented a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity.

(Root Cause)

If Illinois:

Implements and sustains a MTSS framework with fidelity

Implements and sustains a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity

Implements and sustains evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework

(Coherent Improvement Strategies)

Then:

Improved results will stem from the local schools' and LEAs' ability to build and sustain their capacity to provide appropriate academic and environmental supports for students with disabilities within a MTSS framework so all students are college and career ready

(Improved systems, data, practice)

Then:

The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase

(State-Identified Measurable Result)

ILLINOIS PART B SSIP LOGIC MODEL

Systems: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity.

Data: Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity.

Practice: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework.

Inputs	Outputs	Outputs	Outcomes/ Impact	Outcomes/ Impact	Outcomes/ Impact
<i>What we invest</i>	Activities <i>What we do/produce</i>	Participation <i>Who we reach</i>	Short Term Results <i>Changes in knowledge</i>	Intermediate Results <i>Changes in behavior</i>	Long Term Results <i>Changes in environment</i>
ISBE Staff SSoS IL MTSS-N External Evaluators Funding Stakeholders Time Professional Learning Materials Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the SSIP Transformation Zone Determine capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity Align and leverage fiscal and human resources Engage in professional learning around a MTSS systems framework Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity Align and leverage data resources Implement and sustain data-based decision making Implement and sustain evidence-based practices (EBPs) in early literacy Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in climate and culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Education Agencies (LEAs) District Leadership Team (DLT) DLT DLT, district staff DLT, coaches, district staff LEA data staff DLT, Building Leadership Team (BLT), district staff DLT, BLT, district staff, coaches DLT, BLT, district staff, coaches 	Increased knowledge re: MTSS framework Increased knowledge re: data-based decision making Increased knowledge re: EBPs	Implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity Implementation of a data-driven process for systems and practice with fidelity Implementation of EBPs with fidelity Improved student outcomes from implemented EBPs	The percentage of 3 rd grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase <u>(SIMR)</u>

ILLINOIS PART B: SSIP Improvement Plan

Activities/Outputs	How Will We Know the Activity Happened As Planned?	Data Collection Source/Method	Evaluation Report (if applicable)
<p><i>Coherent Improvement Strategy (CIS) 1: Implement and sustain a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with fidelity</i></p> <p>1. Implement the SSIP Transformation Zone (SEA)</p>	<p>a) Criteria for LEA selection via cross-agency collaboration is established</p> <p>b) LEA invitations to apply are distributed</p> <p>c) LEAs are selected for the Transformation Zone</p> <p>d) The IL MTSS-Network (IL MTSS-N) vision, theory of action, logic model, and scope of work is developed</p> <p>e) SPDG and IDEA Part B discretionary funds support the IL MTSS-N</p> <p>f) The IL MTSS-N provides professional learning, coaching, and technical assistance to LEAs around systems, data, and (evidence-based) practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformation Zone selection criteria rubric • LEA invitation letter • LEA selection notice • IL MTSS-N documents • Fiscal documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 1 is completed (data collection source/method serves as the report)
<p>2. Determine capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTSS framework with fidelity (LEA)</p>	<p>a) A District Leadership Team (DLT) exists</p> <p>b) An assessment tool that identifies readiness level, gaps or barriers to capacity building, and needs is completed</p> <p>c) MTSS action planning is completed based on a district data profile and incorporated into the district’s overall improvement plan; monitoring is ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Leadership Team (DLT)/ Building Leadership Team (BLT) document identifying team membership • District Capacity Assessment (DCA) • District Data Profile • District/School Improvement Plans (DIPs/SIPs) with MTSS action planning embedded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 2, Step a) is completed (data collection source/method serves as the report) • DCA report on districts’ readiness levels to build capacity to implement MTSS, barriers to capacity building, and district needs
<p>3. Align and leverage fiscal and human resources (LEA)</p>	<p>a) Fiscal and human resources are aligned and leveraged; job descriptions fit the role and function of MTSS implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIPs/SIPs • DLT/BLT document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 3 is completed (data collection source/method serves as the report)
<p>4. Engage in professional learning around a</p>	<p>a) District staff participate in professional learning (PL) around systems, data, and evidence-based</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time, Effort and Outcome Tracker (TheO) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TheO report on professional learning frequency, duration, and # of participants

<p>MTSS systems framework (LEA)</p>	<p>practices; PL opportunities are delivered with fidelity; the effectiveness of PL is monitored; PL participants increase their knowledge and skills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Learning Evaluations (PLEs) • Pre-Post Tests for Training Outcomes • High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Checklist (fidelity) • Facilitator Guide Checklist (fidelity report) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLE report on topic alignment to participant needs, increase in knowledge and skills, supportiveness of training materials, and training content quality • Pre-Post Test report on participant knowledge, skills, and confidence along the training outcomes (systems, data, practice) • HQPD fidelity report on the quality of delivery of intended training components • Fidelity report on the degree to which training components were carried out as intended
<p>5. Implement and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity (LEA)</p>	<p>a) The IL MTSS-N systems PL framework is implemented b) TA and coaching supports are utilized to implement and sustain a MTSS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Assessment of MTSS-Illinois (SAM-I) • High Quality Checklist for Coaching (fidelity) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAM-I report on the extent to which critical elements of MTSS are being implemented with fidelity and sustained • High Quality Coaching fidelity report on the quality of the coaching received by the districts
<p><i>CIS 2: Implement and sustain a data-driven process to inform decision making around the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity</i></p> <p>6. Align and leverage data resources (LEA)</p> <p>7. Implement and sustain data-based decision making (LEA)</p>	<p>a) Data contacts are identified; staff come to consensus regarding aligned data resources; alignment of data resources is documented</p> <p>a) A process for providing staff access to data systems for timely formative and summative data analyses is established</p> <p>b) Data are used to inform system and practice decisions</p> <p>c) Screening and progress monitoring data are used to inform instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of data contacts and resources • District Data Profile • Progress monitoring reports • DIPs/SIPs • SAM-I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 6 is completed (data collection source/method serves as the report) • Activity 7, Step a) is completed (data collection source/method serves as the report) • SAM-I report on the extent to which critical elements of MTSS are being implemented with fidelity and sustained

<p><i>CIS 3: Implement and sustain evidence-based practices that address early literacy and climate and culture within a MTSS framework</i></p> <p>8. Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in early literacy (LEA)</p> <p>9. Implement and sustain evidence-based practices in climate and culture (LEA)</p>	<p>a) A data review around the SIMR is conducted to identify literacy needs</p> <p>b) Early literacy EBPs are selected</p> <p>c) Early literacy EBPs are implemented with ongoing TA, coaching, and administrative support</p> <p>a) A data review around the SIMR is conducted to identify climate and culture needs</p> <p>b) Climate and culture EBPs are selected</p> <p>c) Climate and culture EBPs are implemented with ongoing TA, coaching, and administrative support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Data Profile • Progress monitoring reports • SIMR Data Review • DIPs/SIPs • Documented EBPs in early literacy and climate & culture • SAM-I • Observational Tool for Instructional Supports and Systems (OTISS) • Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 8, Steps a) and b) are completed (data collection source/method serves as the report) • Activity 9, Steps a) and b) are completed (data collection source/method serves as the report) • SIMR Data Review report on districts' problem solving processes related to the SIMR and early literacy • SAM-I report on the extent to which critical elements of MTSS are being implemented with fidelity and sustained • OTISS fidelity report on the quality of systems and supports available to help teachers use best practices for instruction • IAR score report for TZ districts, aggregated and disaggregated
--	---	---	--

