

Missouri Part B FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters without space).

The SiMR is to increase the percent of students with disabilities in grades three to eight and in their tested grade in high school who perform at proficiency levels in English/language arts (ELA) in the Collaborative Work (CW) schools by 6.5 percentage points by FFY 2018.

Due to COVID-19, statewide testing requirements were waived for the 2019-20 school year, thus there is no SiMR data to report for this SSIP submission.

As a note of clarification, the State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) effort, originally called Collaborative Work (CW), involved implementation of evidence-based practices at the building level. This effort transitioned to district level implementation called Missouri Model Districts (MMD). The improvement model adopted by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is now referred to as District Continuous Improvement (DCI).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? No

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: FFY 2017: 19.30%

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

FFY 2018 Target: 20.8% **FFY 2019 Target:** 20.8%

FFY 2018 Data: 19.8% **FFY 2019 Data:** Not available

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? Choose an item.

Did slippage¹ occur? Choose an item.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

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

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

No

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Click or tap here to enter text.

As noted above, the state does not have SiMR data for FFY 2019 because state assessment requirements were waived due to COVID-19.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? Yes

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

During the past year, DESE accomplished outcomes critical to furthering district continuous improvement through collaborative efforts of leadership at all levels across the statewide system of support and in all offices of DESE using these new strategies.

New strategies:

- 1) Virtual Learning Platform (VLP) enhancements including new reporting features and reorganization of content into pillars aligned with DESE’s strategic plan are in process.
- 2) Professional learning modules including district level leadership, collective efficacy and behavioral modules have been added to the VLP. Development of tutorial videos to assist users with VLP usage is in process.
- 3) District Continuous Improvement (DCI) cadre reorganization into Implementation Zones allows DCI field staff to work cross regionally to provide and share expertise across the state helping districts to evaluate current implementation status and progress of DCI work.

Corresponding outcomes:

- 1) Highly effective, universal level educational practices are embedded into DESE DCI efforts including making numerous resources and tools available to all districts to support improvement efforts.
- 2) Common, online platform to scale educator access to professional development and district level improvement tools for statewide implementation of highly effective educational practices through development and enhancement of the VLP as part of the DESE website.
- 3) DCI districts develop internal capacity to implement DCI activities with minimal outside support documenting a shift from complete reliance on regional consultants for improvement activities (training, coaching and planning).

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

Continued strategies:

- 1) VLP materials and tools promoted as the agency's online system that houses and maintains the tools and resources to support district continuous improvement efforts.
- 2) DCI Coaching Support Team (CST) meetings held monthly to articulate vision, direction and need of the DCI process to regional field staff. Meeting content emphasizes the use of virtual communication for meetings, trainings and coaching sessions; strategies for shared collaboration when appropriate; data collection/analysis; a continued shift away from reliance on training only model to a model that emphasizes coaching and technical assistance regarding highly effective educational practices.
- 3) Cross-regional work by field staff work within the Implementation Zone framework using virtual and face-to-face training, coaching and technical assistance focused on academic and behavioral DESE vetted materials.
- 4) The data continues to reflect expected areas of focus.
- 5) Consolidated contract that provides annual information related to roles and responsibilities for regional field staff (DCI consultants) was completed in May 2020. While these strategies have continued, they have been altered to fit virtual structures due to face-to-face and travel challenges presented by COVID-19.

Corresponding outcomes:

- 1) VLP provides unified, consistent, and transparent materials; tools; and resources allowing districts to build internal capacity for improvement by increasing knowledge and skills, regardless of administrator and teacher mobility. Districts provide their own professional development and maintain data collection tools for monitoring progress and fidelity of implementation of effective educational practices. Districts may choose to provide their own training and/or coaching or access regional staff for assistance.
- 2) Field staff are kept informed about VLP enhancements, share success, and challenge data DESE uses to adjust practice and improve materials and tools. Log data show an increase in training (increase of 264) and coaching (increase of 663) events from last year. Regional staff continue to shift away from a reliance on training only to a 79% increase in coaching over training only events.
- 3) Consultants collaborate and share expertise across Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) regions rather than being siloed in their respective RPDCs resulting in growth of skills and knowledge for all and fostering collective efficacy across the statewide system of support (SSOS).
- 4) DESE and DCI consultant log data show a dramatic increase in virtual events. This shift was significantly aided by the emphasis on virtual contact in lieu of face-to-face events due to COVID-19. While 78 new districts joined the project, the number of DCI staff remained constant. District interactions improved from 2,389 the previous year to 4,245 in this reporting period, a 78% increase.
- 5) Consolidated contract terms define roles and responsibilities of regional field staff and solidify DESE's goals and expectations of regional and SSOS work across several consultant types.

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

The VLP is the agency's electronic platform that houses and maintains all of the materials, tools and resources districts need to access and provide their own professional development and data collection tools for monitoring progress and fidelity of implementation of effective educational practices. State level data on VLP usage is reviewed regularly and show a continued increase in access to these materials and tools.

The Self-Assessment Practice Profile (SAPP) is used to outline implementation criteria using a rubric structure with clearly defined practice-level characteristics. All participating DCIs regularly complete the SAPP at least twice annually. SAPPs are used to monitor individual implementation of the practices and in teacher growth plans. Data reveal the number of fully completed SAPPs at a 96 percent increase over the same reporting period last year. Consideration should be given to the fact that there are 78 new districts in the project and implementation took place within the pandemic year. The number of SAPPs completed is 25,188 during this reporting period.

Data in specific categories is entered monthly by regional staff into an electronic DESE consultant log data system which is compiled, reviewed and analyzed regularly by OSE staff to ensure engagement of regional staff and show the progression of implementation in participating DCIs. Data continue to reflect district interaction in expected areas of focus and show three times as many coaching over training events this reporting period over the previous year.

DCI/CST data is also collected through logs maintained by the DCI facilitators that include district interactions (training, coaching and planning with district leadership team meetings) based on attendance, duration, topics covered, evidence collected or viewed, and resources used. This information is compiled, reviewed and analyzed regularly by the SPDG Management Team and OSE staff to understand types and frequency of engagement using the district-based model to inform capacity issues related to scaling and sustaining. While the number of districts participating more than doubled, the number of interactions per district stayed constant with 1-2 interactions per district and the number of DCI/CST staff remained the same. Interactions through February 2020 averaged 1.6 per month, with the final average at 1.2 per month, likely due to the pandemic. The number of topics covered at district interactions improved from 2,389 in the previous academic year to 4,245 in this reporting period, a 78 percent increase.

The Collaborative Work Implementation Survey (CWIS) is required annually of all DCI participating districts in these domains: effective teaching and learning practices (ETLP), common formative assessment (CFA), data-based decision-making (DBDM), leadership, and collaborative culture (CC). Participation on the CWIS during 2020 was somewhat impacted by COVID-19. Educators reported an average score of 3.9 equating to a key practice occurring "most of the time" in ETLP. Scores in other domains were higher, averaging 4.0 for CC, 4.3 for CFA and LEAD, and 4.2 for DBDM. Following multiple years of project implementation, significant improvements ($p < 0.001$) are seen in ETLP among districts with three and four years of experience.

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

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

Continued refinement of the materials and tools on the VLP to reflect a more systematic, district level improvement process is planned. The District Needs Assessment tool is in development to assist districts in collaboratively self assessing performance in key components of universal level practices (leadership, collaborative culture, effective teaching/learning practices and data-based decision making). VLP content will be organized into five main pillars further demonstrating collaboration and unified promotion of essential district level improvement work across DESE. Tool development includes enhanced reporting features involving data such as usage/completion of the Professional Learning Modules (PLM) and in-depth SAPPs information. The observation tool in development is a resource designed to provide a structure for guiding implementation and monitoring increased district wide implementation and monitoring of school based coaching and implementation of highly effective educational improvement practices.

Plans are in place to provide statewide access to the VLP for all districts and educators in 2021-22. Access was only available to staff in DCI districts while the online platform was under initial development. Statewide access to highly effective, universal level materials, tools, and resources allows DESE to promote and provide consistent, high quality, district level professional development products to all Missouri educators.

Plans for expansion of VLP content include integration of academic and behavior domains, new modules expanding tier 2 behavior content, and inclusion of literacy modules. One set of literacy modules promotes structured literacy instructional practices based in the cognitive science about how children learn to read. The second set of literacy modules describes how to implement science of reading instruction with DCI structures and processes. The intent is to reach beyond foundational, content neutral practices by inclusion of universal level literacy instructional practices and show how to use DCI structures and process to implement that work as well as targeted level behavioral work. DESE considers these areas the next step in advancing guidance and professional development materials and tools in areas critical to district level improvement to achieve increased academic and behavioral outcomes for students.

Regional staff provide an increased number of virtual training, coaching and technical assistance events. While a long standing goal, it is challenging to change ingrained adult behaviors. COVID-19 pushed regional staff to change their behavior to respond to district needs which aligned with DESE's goal to use technology to make work more efficient. Data from consultant logs show regional staff continue to increase coaching skills as a marked increase in coaching over training has become a reality.

Outcomes for the strategies described above include 1) continued promotion of district-level improvement tools enabling districts to provide professional development and organize district-level improvement efforts in a systematic and comprehensive manner, 2) continue DCI alignment with DESE strategic plan and the SSOS, 3) continued growth of knowledge and skills for all Missouri educators at all levels of district wide work and regional RPDC staff on the implementation of highly effective educational practices, and 4) continue changing adult behaviors to better serve districts in a more efficient manner.

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

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

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

Continued module development based on Dr. John Hattie’s work resulted in the development of two new professional learning modules. During this reporting period, Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE) and a district level instructional leadership professional learning module that complements the existing building level instructional leadership module were added to the VLP. Both modules were selected by the SPDG Management Team and DESE due to high effect size (CTE 1.57) and promotion of effectiveness by Dr. Hattie’s research.

DESE has long supported the Missouri School Wide Positive Behavioral Supports (MO SW PBS) initiative. During this reporting period, the plan to include the behavior modules was achieved resulting in fifteen MO SW PBS modules and associated components (pre/post assessment, practice profiles and SAPP) posted on the VLP. These modules (universal and targeted level) may also be viewed on the Missouri Educational Systems and Instruction for Learning (MOEduSail) website that houses much of the VLP material available for public viewing <https://www.moedu-sail.org/mtss-facilitator-materials/>. Fourteen of these modules are universal level practices and one module is at the targeted resource level. The selection process for inclusion of these modules into the VLP was based on future plans for professional development of universal level behavior materials and resources ultimately leading to integration of academic and behavior materials and tools accessible to all educators. DESE worked collaboratively with MO SW PBS to select those universal level modules that would allow districts to begin implementing SW PBS work at the district level.

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

Evidence-based practices identified by Dr. John Hattie and the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) as having the highest effect sizes shown to result in exceptional student outcomes, including outcomes for students with disabilities, are included in the DCI work. All DCI modules developed to-date around these topics are available on the VLP for DCI districts and all Missouri educators. All DCI materials and tools remain available for public use at <https://www.moedu-sail.org>. No changes have been made to the improvement strategies since the selected strategies were all identified as highly effective through large scale, empirically-based research studies.

Teachers in DCI districts are trained to (1) work on teams which focus on helping each other (collaborative team structures), (2) use effective teaching/learning practices in all classrooms, (3) administer common formative assessments to provide data related to the effects of the teaching/learning experience, and (4) use data collectively to discuss and make decisions about next steps. Dr. Hattie also promotes instructional leadership as crucial to promoting and sustaining implementation of the evidence-based practices.

To ensure fidelity of implementation of the current framework and to support statewide scale-up and sustainability, data reveal a need to continue building a system that provides a continuum of support through regional consultants, standardized learning modules and resources, e-learning systems, digital applications, and on-demand progress data. These components are built into the materials and tools housed on the VLP.

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

A variety of data collection methods are used to measure both implementation and impact. Both quantitative and qualitative data are collected on a wide range of variables at the state, regional, district, building, and classroom levels.

The SAPP is used as a way of outlining implementation criteria using a rubric structure with clearly defined practice-level characteristics. This is an important tool for self-monitoring implementation because it serves as a reminder of the implementation criteria and is aligned with the fidelity checklists. Fidelity checklists are short, focused checklists targeting specific implementation steps. Data reveal the number of fully completed SAPPs at a 96 percent increase over the same reporting period last year. While there are 78 new districts to the project and implementation within the pandemic year, 25,188 SAPPs were completed over the same reporting period during 2018-19.

The Collaborative Work Implementation Survey (CWIS) is required annually of all MMD/DCI participating districts in these domains: effective teaching and learning practices (ETLP), common formative assessment (CFA), data-based decision-making (DBDM), leadership, and collaborative cultures (CC). This tool gives anecdotal data about participant opinion. Participation on the CWIS during 2020 was somewhat impacted by COVID-19. Educators reported an average score of 3.9 equating to a key practice occurring “most of the time” in ETLP. Scores in other domains were higher, averaging 4.0 for CC, 4.3 for CFA and LEAD, and 4.2 for DBDM. Following multiple years of project implementation, significant improvements ($p < 0.001$) have been seen in the domain of ETLP among districts with both three and four years of experience.

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

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

Throughout the DCI implementation process, DESE has worked to align policies, procedures and project content to align with the DESE's strategic plan for success. The strategic plan is under revision, and DCI work is firmly embedded into the new plan with main DCI components integrated into the agency's Missouri School Improvement Process (MSIP), the state's accreditation process. This has been achieved through collaboration across DESE and the SSOS.

The VLP provides consistent, transparent materials that allow districts to build internal capacity for improvement by increasing knowledge and skills. Districts may choose to provide their own training and/or coaching or access regional staff for assistance. The system provides consistent, high quality professional development materials and common language to Missouri educators. These materials remain available to all Missouri educators regardless of administrator and teacher mobility.

Educators in the DCI districts are trained to engage in practices promoted by large scale, empirically based research. These practices include: 1) working collaboratively in team structures, 2) implementing effective teaching/learning practices with exceptionally high effect sizes such as Developing Assessment Capable Learners (DACL), 3) administering common formative assessments to provide data related to the effects of the teaching and learning, and 4) use data collectively to discuss and make decisions about next steps. Crucial to promoting and sustaining implementation of the evidence-based educational practices is instructional leadership.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

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

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

Missouri stakeholder groups related to DCI work include the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), DESE's Division of Learning Services Leadership Team (commissioner, deputy commissioner and all assistant commissioners), SPDG Management Team, RPDC directors, DCI consultants, DCI district contacts, area supervisors and Missouri Parents ACT (MPACT). All stakeholder groups are given multiple opportunities through regular meeting structures to provide input and direction to implementation and evaluation of the initiative. These stakeholders bring a wide variety of expertise and experience to the conversation.

The SEAP reviews data, discusses and provides advice on what is not clear, and provides future recommendations about the state's plan for district-wide improvement efforts and the DCI model on a quarterly basis. The DESE Division of Learning Services Leadership Team provides direction for scaling the process and aligning with the agency Strategic Plan and ESSA plan. They are responsible for decisions regarding evaluation design and implementation direction. Through monthly meetings, the SPDG management team regularly reviews input from the stakeholder groups and project data to provide direction and develop resources for sustainability, scalability, and use of technology for efficiency and effectiveness. Monthly meetings of RPDC directors and DCI consultants offer numerous opportunities to discuss and offer feedback regarding the data collection, evaluation activities, data to inform about challenges and benefits of cross regional teams, and progress toward meeting goals. RPDC directors offer feedback on the district-wide model with recommendations for scaling coaching support teams and changing how regional staff spend their time. Cadre group meetings provide a depth of information relative to barriers districts face and how they move toward solutions. Districts are given the opportunity to provide feedback on DCI tools and materials. MPACT works in conjunction with DESE to develop and distribute parent resources and contribute data to inform about challenges and benefits related to these resources.

No major decisions or activities have taken place in implementation, modifications and evaluation of the SSIP without significant stakeholder input. All stakeholders are provided with the needed materials and background information to provide informed feedback. We rely on contributions from all stakeholder groups to inform the Plan-Do-Study-Act process and any revisions made to the SSIP.

Discussions with all stakeholder groups has proven beneficial in increasing support in the use of evidence-based educational practices and positions the SSIP as a key contributor to the state's blueprint for success. Multiple opportunities for collaboration with other offices within DESE ensures that this work contributes to the agency's Strategic Plan.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? Choose an item.

If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The SEAP expressed concern regarding expansion to new districts and ensuring regional capacity exists to support the work so as not to overwhelm the system. DESE addressed the purposes of cadre restructuring and discussed with the group whether the structure met those purposes. The discussion included consideration regarding what it takes to expand statewide and how technology is used to understand and respond to district needs.

The selection process used to assign DCI consultants to cadres that provide training, coaching and technical assistance was questioned by the groups most directly involved with day-to-day DCI work (RPDC and DCI consultants). To address this concern, DESE and the SPDG Management Team surveyed the DCI consultants and RPDC directors requesting input regarding consultant strengths about training, coaching and technical assistance across implementation zones. In all but two cases, consultants were placed in their area of preference.

Another area of concern expressed by RPDC directors, DCI consultants, and area supervisors is cadre restructuring and district appointment to cadres within the new Implementation Zone structure. Concerns included 1) districts forming new relationships with regional staff after they had established relationships in the previous year and 2) future implications as districts move through the Implementation Zone structure and whether this would end some longstanding district/RPDC relationships resulting in disconnection with the region where the district is located. DESE responded by examining the purpose of the Implementation Zone structure through discussion of the district placement process which is based on district engagement and implementation data and not random placement. The Implementation Zone structure is the most efficient way to organize field staff and meet like district needs.

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

All required information has been provided in the SSIP.