

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

Section A: Data Analysis

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

The intent of this initiative is to measure progress in early literacy outcomes in selected districts. Ohio's two state-identified measurable results (SiMR) reflect an agencywide focus on early language and literacy development and are based on subsets of measures developed for Ohio's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan:

SiMR 1: The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or higher on Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test.

SiMR 2: The percentage of all kindergarten through third grade students who are on track for reading proficiency, as measured by state-approved diagnostic reading assessments.

Pilot districts report SiMR measures to the state's data system as state assessment data. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the ordered school-building closure in spring 2020, state assessment data were not collected across all pilot districts.

- 2) **Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?**

No

- 3) **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).

Not applicable.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

- 4) **Baseline Data:** 18.2% (26 of 143)
- 5) **Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission?** No
- 6) **FFY 2018 Target:** 33.0% **FFY 2019 Target:** 33.0%
- 7) **FFY 2018 Data:** 31.1% (46 of 148) **FFY 2019 Data:** N/A
- 8) **Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met?** No
- 9) **Did slippage¹ occur?** No

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:

*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.

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the ordered school-building closure in spring 2020, SiMR data were not collected across all pilot districts. Thus, we are unable to accurately determine whether slippage occurred.

This space will be used to further define the SiMR targets and cohorts implementing Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot.

Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot is being implemented over five years among two cohorts representing 15 districts and 24 schools. Cohort 1 includes 14 buildings within eight districts (three urban). Cohort 2 includes 10 buildings with seven districts. Cohort 1 began pilot implementation in 2016-2017 and Cohort 2 began implementation one year later.

Both Ohio's SiMRs were designed to gauge progress for Cohort 1 schools. Only Cohort 1 SiMR data is reported here due to space limitations.

Cohort 1 SiMR 2

SiMR 2 Baseline data: 56.3% (1,955 of 3,470)

SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Target: 75.0%

SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Target: 75.0%

SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Data: 56.4% (1,844 of 3,269)

SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Data: N/A

Cohort 2 SiMR 1

SiMR 1 Baseline data: 34.7% (44 of 127)

SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Target: 33.0%

SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Target: 33.0%

SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Data: 33.0% (33 of 100)

SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Data: N/A

Cohort 2 SiMR 2

SiMR 2 Baseline data: 62.2% (3,665 of 5,895)

SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Target: 75.0%

SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Target: 75.0%

SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Data: 59.2% (1,634 of 2,762)

SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Data: N/A

The Ohio Department of Education recognizes the state-approved reading diagnostic used to assess whether students are on track for reading proficiency varies across districts. It also notes that SiMR 1 includes the results for students who take alternate assessments, and SiMR 2 does not include any student placed on an alternate assessment because such students are excused from the reading diagnostic.

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

-
- 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.

Yes

12) 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).

Districts collect Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM) as additional measures of student outcomes and a proxy for SiMR data that were not collected. These measures are administered to each student up to three times per year (beginning, middle and end of the school year), known as benchmark periods. These measures assess students’ basic early literacy skills, including phonemic awareness, basic phonics, oral reading fluency and comprehension.

By the middle of the 2019-2020 academic year, the percentages of all students at or above benchmark for each measure and grade are as follows:

Cohort 1

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency = 62%
 Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency = 57%
 Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency = 53%
 Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency = 35%
 Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency = 43%
 Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency = 43%
 Grade 3 Comprehension = 39%

Cohort 2

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency = 76%
 Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency = 73%
 Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency = 70%
 Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency = 53%
 Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency = 62%
 Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency = 63%
 Grade 3 Comprehension = 61%

From the beginning to the middle of the 2019-2020 academic year, the following change patterns were observed with respect for students meeting benchmark goals (due to the COVID-19 pandemic, end-of-year data was not available and patterns reflect beginning to middle of the year change): For Cohort 1, there was no change (-0.2%) in grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency, a 1.3% decrease in grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency, a 6.3% decrease in grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency (sig. $p < 0.001$) and no change (-0.6%) in grade 3 Comprehension. For Cohort 2, there was a 15% increase for grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency (sig. $p < 0.001$), a 4.3% increase in grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency (sig. $p < 0.001$), a 1.9% increase in grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency, and a 3.0% increase in grade 3 Comprehension.

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

No

14) 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).

Not applicable.

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

Yes

16) 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).

Due to Ohio’s ordered school-building closure, data collected after March 2020 were incomplete. Specifically, spring curriculum-based measurements and the spring Ohio third grade English language arts achievement test were not administered, as schools were unable to assess students in-person. Classroom observational data and coaching data were collected, as coaching and observations could be completed remotely. However, fewer coaching sessions and classroom observations occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic and ordered school-building closure. For available data (fall and winter curriculum-based measurements, classroom observational data and coaching data), there were no concerns with validity or reliability of the results.

To mitigate the impact of the ordered school-building closure, regional early literacy specialists and district coaches were provided with the option to coach and observe classrooms remotely.

To mitigate the impact of incomplete spring curriculum-based measurements on analyses for 2019-2020, data were examined to measure progress from the beginning to the middle of the year. To mitigate the impact of incomplete spring curriculum-based measurements on longitudinal analyses, the external evaluators will use 2019-2020 middle-of-year results as a proxy for end-of-year data, given that, in the past, student middle-of-year and end-of-year performance scores were highly correlated (Pearson correlation coefficient=0.59-0.95 in 2017-18 and 0.68-0.95 in 2018-19).

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

17) Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?

No

18) 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).

Not applicable.

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

Yes

20) 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).

Building on the Early Literacy Pilot’s science of reading professional learning, Ohio launched the Adolescent Literacy Network during the 2019-2020 school year to build regional capacity among

*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.

specialists supporting adolescent literacy improvement efforts. This network, led by Ohio's adolescent literacy specialists, meets regularly to problem solve, learn about current research in adolescent literacy and interact with experts on topics such as writing, academic language, vocabulary and disciplinary literacy. Through these efforts, Ohio's students will be supported by teachers with a strong foundation in evidence-based literacy instructional practices in each grade.

Additionally, 10 of the 16 state support teams hired urban literacy specialists during the 2019-2020 school year. This position is mandated as part of the Doe Settlement (John Doe, et al., v. State of Ohio, et al., Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, 2018), in which 11 districts and the Department share a commitment to quality education for all students in Ohio through a results-oriented approach to special education. The urban literacy specialists will provide direct support to 11 large urban districts in Ohio to include those in Typology 8 along with Lima, Zanesville and East Cleveland (collectively, the "11 Districts"). Among the 11 Districts are three Early Literacy Pilot districts, Canton, Cincinnati and Dayton. This group of specialists meets regularly with regional specialists involved in the Early Literacy Pilot during monthly state and regional literacy meetings to deepen their knowledge of evidence-based language and literacy implementation for all students. Improvements will be demonstrated through the Ohio School Report Card K-3 Literacy measure and indicator 3c on Ohio's Special Education Profiles.

21) 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).

Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot is the foundation of Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement, which directly aligns to the state's strategic plan for education, *Each Child, Our Future*. The Department uses existing structures to refine the Early Literacy Pilot continuously, including Ohio's Learning Standards for English Language Arts, the extended standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, a standards-based system of assessments, data collection systems, accountability systems and report cards, the Ohio Improvement Process, quality preschools, the Third Grade Reading Guarantee, the Dyslexia Pilot Project and a strong system of regional supports.

Educational service centers and state support teams are examples of Ohio's strong regional support systems. Ohio's state support teams provide targeted support to districts in their regions on using evidence-based practices to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Included in this support are professional learning opportunities for leadership and all educators, targeted at increasing the achievement of students with disabilities and promoting strong core instruction so fewer students are identified for special education. Collaborating with the Department, the 17 regional early literacy specialists supporting the Early Literacy Pilot districts and two Ohio literacy leads from regional state support team offices have helped develop professional learning opportunities, resources and support systems that promote evidence-based language and literacy practices and interventions. Many nonpilot districts and early childhood education programs, as well as pilot districts have benefited from these resources. Specifically, curriculum-based measurements showed increases from the beginning to the middle of the 2019-2020 school year across all grades and measures for students engaged in the Early Literacy Pilot.

The Department has invested in the professional learning of existing state support team and educational service center staff to better support and strengthen the capacity of local personnel. Department staff members, working with national experts, developed a library of research-based professional learning webinars, recorded presentations and resources as part of Ohio's Literacy Academy, held annually since January 2018. These resources build on the online literacy toolkits to support implementation of evidence-based language and literacy practices.

Ohio has received multiple grants since the start of the Early Literacy Pilot to continue the efforts aligned to Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement. These include a \$5 million State Personnel

*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.

Development Grant, \$35 million Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant, \$42 million Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant and \$1.2 million Model Demonstration for Early Identification of Students with Dyslexia Grant. The Department will incorporate findings and lessons learned across these projects to build the most robust system of literacy supports for all Ohio learners. State leaders will continue to ensure these efforts align with the priorities and objectives of *Each Child, Our Future*, *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement*, *Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities* and other school improvement efforts. These efforts will continue to expand as the Department annually examines data and identifies targets for improvement.

22) 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):

Data are collected on several activities, including coaching, professional development (teacher knowledge) and systems change. Regional and district coaching that occurs is documented within coaching logs. Coaching logs capture data on both systems coaching (implementation of pilot activities within a building) and instructional coaching (supporting implementation of evidence-based early literacy strategies within a classroom) that are being offered as part of the Early Literacy Pilot. Coaching logs are separated into either systems or instructional categories. Coaching log data for 2019-2020 also were categorized as in person or remote. A total of 1,184 coaching sessions were provided to teachers in Cohort 1 (52% instructional; 48% systems). A total of 236 remote coaching sessions were delivered (35% instructional; 65% systems). For Cohort 2, a total of 1,698 coaching sessions were provided to teachers (56% instructional, 44% systems). A total of 276 remote coaching sessions were delivered (34% instructional; 66% systems). For 2019-2020, 80% of Cohort 1 teachers and 94% of Cohort 2 teachers received coaching. For coaching session facilitation, district coaches in both Cohorts 1 and 2 are independently leading the majority of instructional coaching sessions and nearly half of the systems coaching sessions, which is expected at this point in the pilot.

Teacher knowledge is measured by the online *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* pre- and post-test knowledge assessment. In 2019-2020, Cohort 2 K-3 teachers completed Units 5 to 8 and showed an average knowledge gain of 14%.

Systems change is measured via the Reading-Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI). The R-TFI measures the extent to which school leadership teams are using evidence-based practices to improve literacy (specifically student reading) to determine the existence and effectiveness of a support system for a diverse group of readers and to examine the collection and use of data to inform literacy activities. R-TFI findings demonstrate improvement and progress toward having systems in place to support schoolwide language and literacy core instruction and reading intervention. Since the start of the Early Literacy Pilot, both cohorts' R-TFI scores have increased considerably. Cohort 1's Tier 1 Overall score increased from 52% at baseline to 75% in 2019-2020, approaching the 80% target. Cohort 2 increased from 50% at baseline to 81% in 2019-2020. For both cohorts, Tier 1 *Implementation* and *Evaluation* supports are showing the greatest area of need. As these supports are put in place over time, the Overall score for both cohorts should increase and eventually exceed the 80% target for Tier 1. Though not approaching the 80% target, Tier 2 Overall scores have increased from 42% at baseline to 60% in 2019-2020 for Cohort 1 and from 58% to 74% for Cohort 2. Similarly, Tier 3 Overall scores have increased from 38% at baseline to 52% in 2019-2020 for Cohort 1 and from 60% to 70% for Cohort 2. All schools are continuing to work on all three tiers throughout the pilot.

23) 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):

*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.

Ohio will continue to implement and align several existing state initiatives. Ohio's strategic plan for education, *Each Child, Our Future*, provides structure for all literacy initiatives in the state. Ohio aims to provide all learners with effective, evidence-based instruction to acquire language and literacy knowledge. Ohio is committed to continued implementation of *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement*. This includes ongoing implementation and monitoring of several literacy grants and support of the infrastructure already in place for language and literacy, including regional early literacy specialist positions, state support teams and educational service centers. Additionally, 10 state support teams have hired urban literacy specialists to provide direct support to 11 of Ohio's largest public districts, three of which are currently engaging with the Early Literacy Pilot. As a result of the Doe settlement, the *11 Districts Plan* will outline the expectations for the state and districts' commitment to improving language and literacy development for students with disabilities in Ohio. Finally, *Each Child Means Each Child: Improving Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities* will structure Ohio's continued support of a multi-tiered system of supports framework to support ongoing literacy efforts.

State legislation also will drive Ohio's literacy efforts. Effective April 2021, House Bill 436 legislates additional supports for screening and supporting children with dyslexia. Ohio has partnered with the Region 8 Comprehensive Center to support state and regional staff in building their knowledge and capacity to support the implementation of this legislation. This includes a learning series specifically tailored to Department staff and a learning series and discussion forum for regional literacy specialists.

Ohio is organizing stakeholder meetings for spring 2021 to plan for the next reporting period, including determining the focus of the next State Systemic Improvement Plan. Stakeholders also will help the state determine how professional development and coaching in language and literacy will progress.

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

No

25) 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):

Not applicable

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

The Department identified evidence-based practices to implement at the district level to improve early language and literacy outcomes for all students in preschool through grade 3, including students with disabilities.

The primary evidence-based professional learning series selected for Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot is the *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling*. This series is based on decades of research on how children learn to read, including the neurobiological basis of reading development. *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* promotes evidence-based language and literacy instructional practices.

The second evidence-based activity is instructional and systems coaching for district and regional staff. Early Literacy Pilot implementation activities rely heavily on the evidence-based practices of content-specific professional learning and language and literacy coaching to improve outcomes for all students.

*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.

Pilot teachers regularly engage in instructional coaching with district coaches and regional literacy specialists to practice evidence-based instructional skills. The Department developed and implemented a framework for coaching systems to support implementation of evidence-based practices.

Ohio's focus on building teachers' capacities to provide high-quality, evidence-based, early language and literacy instruction and intervention required a detailed plan that outlined expectations and incorporated key components identified in the Theory of Action. *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement* was most recently updated in 2018 with stakeholder input. Research on continuous improvement, Universal Design for Learning, implementation science and Multi-Tiered System of Supports guided and influenced all elements of the action plan and will continue to support this work.

27) 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):

The state collects both systems and individual implementation data. Systems data come from the Reading-Tiered Fidelity Inventory that is completed by local teams and measures the extent to which school leadership teams are using evidence-based practices to improve literacy, determine the existence and effectiveness of a support system for a diverse group of readers and examine the collection and use of data to inform literacy activities. Individual data come from the Applications of Concepts (AoC) and coaching log data. These data are collected by coaches and regional early literacy specialists. AoC measures teacher classroom implementation of early language and literacy core instruction as observers indicate whether a specific indicator (measured in specific sections) was present during the observation (six sections for K-3 AoC and four for early childhood). The regional early literacy specialists complete at least one section of the tool two times on the same teacher to measure improvement over time. The AoC was piloted in 2018-2019 and expected to be fully launched in 2019-2020. However, the ordered school-building closure due to COVID-19 prevented many AoC data from being collected. A total of 19 K-3 and five preschool teachers were observed twice using the same section of the AoC. There was an increase in implementation for four of the six sections (range of 2%-6%), a decrease for one section and no observations for one section. Coaching logs capture data for both systems coaching (supporting implementation of Early Literacy Pilot activities) and instructional coaching (supporting implementation of evidence-based early literacy strategies within classrooms) that are being offered as part of Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot. Coaches were able to collect coaching log data and denote whether the coaching occurred in person or virtually.

28) 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):

This year's early literacy activities continue the focus on building knowledge of and implementing high-quality, evidence-based early language and literacy instructional strategies.

Regional support staff participate in the State Literacy Network, which provides access to all district and teacher-level professional learning supports and includes monthly literacy sessions. The four-year Regional Professional Learning Series in literacy began with the State Literacy Network in 2018 and was described in the 2019 report. Regional early literacy specialists also stay apprised of current research in language and literacy by attending conferences each year, including Plain Talk About Literacy and Learning.

Regional early literacy specialists and district coaches support district and school leaders through systems-level coaching. Systems-level coaching supports administrators and the district systems that sustain evidence-based language and literacy practices. Administrators also have access to workshops

*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.

with national literacy experts and systems-focused webinars led by Department staff and administrators from pilot buildings.

Districts engage in professional learning in multiple ways. Districts' content knowledge was built through *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* professional learning series, which included online units supported by face-to-face sessions with national experts. The professional learning included job-embedded actions in the form of bridge-to-practice activities to promote real-time application of evidence-based language and literacy practices. Teachers receive support from regional early literacy specialists, district coaches and building administrators in applying the concepts learned and practiced through the professional learning.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

29) Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

As in years past, stakeholders add tremendous value to the development of Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot and decision-making about ongoing implementation and evaluation. Several stakeholder groups meet to provide input, review data, address barriers and identify solutions.

Ohio's State Literacy Team meets biennial to review state, regional and local progress and revise *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement* as needed.

Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan Stakeholder Team is comprised of Early Literacy Pilot participants, regional and Department staff, and representatives from partner agencies. This stakeholder team reviews implementation progress and evaluation data and supports the Department in making modifications at least annually based on the data.

The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children meets four times per year. This panel reviews the State Systemic Improvement Plan evaluation at least annually and provides input specific to students with disabilities and family and community engagement.

State support team directors meet monthly and often discuss pilot activities, review data and make data-based decisions regionally. State support team directors provide input on implementation and regional needs, communicate with district administrators about the pilot and alignment with other state initiatives, and oversee daily operations of regional early literacy specialists, Ohio Improvement Process facilitators and family engagement leads.

Regional early literacy specialists provide feedback on all aspects of program content and pilot implementation. Regional early literacy specialists share their experiences and offer input on the design and role of the regional early literacy specialist position and lead regional literacy networks. Meetings occur each month, with pilot activities on every agenda.

Administrator forums are held quarterly with administrators from pilot schools. Administrators offer feedback on language and literacy leadership professional learning, build systems-level language and literacy content to support teachers' professional learning, and review and discuss implementation activities and data. These forums build capacity for principals to be instructional leaders.

Ohio continues to present updates and gather feedback from various other stakeholder groups, including the Dean's Compact on Exceptional Children, Ohio Association of Pupil Service Administrators, Guiding Coalition for *Each Child Means Each Child*, and participants in Ohio's Literacy Academy and Ohio's Special Education Leadership Conference.

*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.

30) Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes

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

Pilot participants shared concerns through implementation progress reports, a structured feedback opportunity offered twice each year. Concerns about pilot implementation were shared in terms of additional support or technical assistance needed and barriers or challenges identified. The concerns were not specific to implementation throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department reviewed these reports to identify commonalities.

Multiple districts engaged in the pilot requested additional support in the analysis, interpretation and use of data and the availability of coaching. Requests submitted by single districts included the need for PBIS implementation training, support for tiers 1, 2 and 3 instruction, continued access to professional development and networking for coaches and administrators. The Department responded to these requests for support and technical assistance by providing continued access to professional learning opportunities and by using the state’s infrastructure, including state support team consultants, regional early literacy specialists and Ohio literacy leads, to deploy additional needed supports.

A barrier to pilot implementation shared by several participating districts included the data dashboard built for the collection and sharing of data between pilot districts, state support staff and external evaluators. Concerns included the dashboard being difficult to navigate and time consuming. Other concerns shared by multiple districts included staff turnover at the district level, frequent absences, hesitancy to participate in coaching, differentiation of instruction in tier 1 and managing time for coaching and training. The Department responded to these concerns through direct, targeted, state-level discussions with districts and by making significant adjustments to simplify the data dashboard.

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

Not applicable.