STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2021

Colorado

PART B DUE February 1, 2023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Colorado students in grades K-3* who are identified at the beginning of the school year as Well Below Benchmark according to the DIBELS Next Assessment, will significantly improve their reading proficiency as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students who are identified at the end of the school year as Well Below Benchmark.

*Who attend one of the SSIP project schools
*Based upon the Structured Literacy Project

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

NO

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

YES

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

The subset includes students in first grade who attend one of the SSIP project schools. First grade data was selected as the most appropriate subset because first grade student performance is the most critical and pivotal year in early literacy development. Data are collected, analyzed, and reviewed across all grades but only first grade is reported in this summary.

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

YES

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

The Theory Action was updated for greater clarification based upon stakeholder feedback and alignment with CDE State Initiatives. It will be shared with new SSIP sites and at the annual Stakeholder meeting to be held Summer 2023.
The updated Theory of Action is:

If we provide a Science of Reading scope and sequence framework to K-3 grade special educators, general educators, interventionists, and leaders …
AND provide ongoing professional learning and customized coaching related to the evidence-based practices aligned to the Science of Reading, and the use of data to drive instructional decisions to meet the needs of all students within grades K-3…

THEN, our educators in SSIP schools will have increased knowledge and skills to teach language and literacy to K-3 students …

So that, all students, especially students struggling in reading, in K-3 will improve their reading proficiency by the end of the third grade.
THEN the targeted schools and districts will have built capacity to sustain effective literacy instruction.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/ssip_toa

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	26.34%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	34.00%	32.00%	30.00%	28.00%	26.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Description of Numerator: First grade students at end of year of were in the well below range as measured by Acadience.	Description of Denominator: Total number of first grade students enrolled who were participating in Structured Literacy Project.	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
267	857	35.01%	34.00%	31.16%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Acadience (DiBELS Next)

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

We collected benchmark data from the Acadience Assessments using the Amplify data collection system that are collected by each school site. The analysis included review of first-grade students who fell into the well-below benchmark range on the Beginning-of-the Year (BOY) and End-of-the Year (EOY) Benchmarks. CDE provides training to school sites on the administration of Acadience Assessments.

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

NO

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

NO

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

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.

1) Data Completeness: The Project collected data during the FFY2021 at the prescribed data points. However, the data completeness was impacted by high levels of absenteeism tied to school closures, suspension of in-person learning, and challenges with remote learning. Unfortunately, the impact of the pandemic was not equal among all student groups, and those most vulnerable to academic risk continued to experience the greatest impact. This impact was the most observable in the at-risk schools, which had larger student populations for poverty, second language learners, and trauma-based factors

2) Mitigation Plan: Staff at each of the Project schools worked with Project coaches and reached out to families to increase in-person attendance at schools during data collection intervals as well as for all in-person learning intervals. In-person and virtual attendance was monitored closely and families requiring support were contacted throughout the year. Project coaches continued to create and support the use of effective virtual learning tools, provided assistance with intensifying Structured Literacy routines for use during all in-person learning, and closely monitored the timely administration of the DIBELS Next Progress Monitoring.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/ssip_colorado_phase2

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

NO

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

As we began the 21-22 SY, Colorado continued to deal with the impact of the pandemic. As a result, the infrastructure improvement strategies from our findings during the 19-20 SY were interrupted by the pandemic. We had planned to better align instruction across all tiers of support and address the following infrastructure improvements: 1) the need to provide special education providers and interventionists additional professional development; 2) collaborate with school leadership in creating weekly/daily master

schedules that better met the need of students requiring additional and intensified literacy instruction; 3) support special education teachers and interventionists in grouping students for small group interventions more effectively; and 4) assist teachers and interventionists in establishing meaningful student IEP goals and instructional expectations. As the impact of the pandemic continued into the 21-22 SY, the Structured Literacy team, in collaboration with our partnering schools and districts, shifted their focus to supporting teachers in delivering daily Structured Literacy lessons either in-person or, as needed, virtually for all students. Due to occasional health and safety restrictions, the Structured Literacy coaches were prohibited from conducting in-person coaching and pivoted to working with teachers in the planning and delivery of Structured Literacy virtually. The Structured Literacy Coaches made a concerted effort to revisit past professional learning and the use of specific evidence-based daily routines that had been abandoned or compromised with the high variability of in person learning in the prior school year. Teacher attrition, lack of highly qualified substitute teachers, and fatigue were real-life factors that impacted fidelity of implementation. Infrastructure improvement strategies identified above are continuing and currently being implemented during 22-23 school year.

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

As a result of the significant interruption to normal school and instructional operations, we cannot report on outcomes related to our plans to add specific infrastructure improvements to enhance student outcomes and better align instruction across all tiers of support. Significant efforts were made and accomplished to maintain evidence based instructional practices in both virtual and in-person learning environments to return fidelity of daily instructional routines. Virtual coaching continued through the 21-22 school year whenever in person coaching was prohibited due to health and safety restrictions. Due to the deleterious effect of COVID on the State's ability to implement the Structure Literacy Project we were unable to address the full scope of the project including achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of the systems improvement efforts, and scale up. Please see next steps below for Colorado's plans to address the full scope of the Project during the 22-23 school year.

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

NO

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

Observations and experiences during the pre-COVID reporting cycle within the participating schools produced five common trends. The plan was to address these trends during the 20-21 and 21-22 school years. As a result of the significant impact the pandemic created in addressing these trends, these trends continue to be our next steps for the upcoming reporting cycle. The trends and next steps include:

Trend 1: School based Intervention staff continue to not be well-prepared in their understanding of the 'science of reading' and the structure of the English language. Due to the challenges of teacher attrition and general pandemic-related fatigue, the classroom teachers and interventionists had multiple additional duties that prevented routine professional development from the project. Next Steps: Work with administration to secure time for professional development for special education teachers covering a range of instructional strategies (i.e., phoneme -grapheme mapping, sound walls, word summing, building word matrixes, etc.) and alternate lesson planning and routines. Intensifying and individualizing strategies to enhance the outcomes of IEP students with specific reading disabilities.

Trend 2: Intervention and small group schedules did not consistently allow for adequate time to deliver effective Structured Literacy lessons and practice to the degree that is essential to support growth in struggling readers. In some instances, intervention was frequently canceled as staff completed other assigned responsibilities, impacting the consistency and continuity of instruction for students who require daily and consistent instruction to assure reading growth. Next Steps: Design and implement additional daily Structured Literacy routines with double-dosing whole group classroom instruction. Continue to work with Principals in adjusting schedules and prioritizing the time necessary to address basic literacy instruction.

Trend 3: While reading was the most commonly demonstrated need among students identified with mild-moderate disabilities, specially designed instruction (special education) typically did not include the time and intensity required to further these students' literacy skills. Instructional time was frequently split between multiple IEP Goals in multiple academic areas, leaving little time for intensive literacy instruction and practice. Next Steps: Identification of specially designed instructional strategies to intensify Structured Literacy intervention for students with IEPs identified with specific reading disabilities.

Trend 4: Instructional leaders lacked the understanding of the conditions that must be met to support literacy growth among the most at-risk students, including students with disabilities. Next Steps: Continue work with district and building leadership to address conditions in schools that create barriers for at-risk students to improve reading.

Trend 5: The minimizing effect of low expectations, most specifically for students with disabilities and those with other significant risk factors that might interfere with the acquisition of early foundational reading skills (i.e., poverty, limited early language experiences, etc.) permeated the learning environments in which these students participate. Next Steps: Continue work with leadership and instructional staff to encourage higher expectations of all learners regardless of circumstances.

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

(1) explicit, systematic instruction with cumulative practice, (2) data-based decision making, (3) cognitive strategy instruction and routines, (4) letter and sound principles, (5) phonemic decoding and syllable structure with embedded fluency, spelling/orthography, and syntax and grammar instruction, (6) coaching and professional development

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

1. The Project continues to emphasize direct and explicit structured literacy instruction to enhance students' understanding of the structure of the English language and build essential foundational reading/spelling skills aligned to the Science of Reading. Daily routines are established for whole group and small group instruction that includes letter and sound principles (see 4 above), phonemic decoding and syllable structure with a focus on morphology that leads to an increase reading fluency (see 5 above). The Project trains all participating teacher in the use of the Project's specifically designed Scope and Sequence of instruction to assure developmentally appropriate instruction, alignment to State standards and grade-appropriate instruction, and consistency with current reading research.
2. Project effectiveness and student growth are predicated on the use of data to inform instructional practices and program adjustments. The Project consistently administers Acadience Benchmark Assessment and Progress Monitoring. Data are collected and data meetings are routinely scheduled to discuss student outcomes and determine if instructional adjustments are necessary.
3. The daily use of Structured Literacy routines, common instructional language, and consistent scope and sequence of instruction is emphasized across all-tier of instruction to accelerate student participation and growth and minimize student confusion as they participate in an increasingly intensified continuum of service.
4. The Project, since its inception, has been designed to support instructional staff with effective professional learning opportunities that are both consistent in content and expectations, but are also customized to meet each individual teacher's professional learning needs. Teachers are coached by experienced literacy coaches to enhance their use and understanding of a Structured Literacy approach and to promote fidelity to the Project's design and instructional goals.

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

The evidence-based practices noted below continue to be our best leverage points for changing program / district policies, procedures, and teacher-specific practices. There currently continues to be implementation challenges due to personnel shortages, lack of highly qualified substitutes, and high frequency student absenteeism.

The use of listed evidence-based practices is supported by current reading research and have been carefully implemented to affect change in teacher's instructional behavior and increase student outcomes. In some instances, Project success as measured by improved student outcomes, has resulted in significant changes to district-wide literacy instruction and the adoption of instructional practices and resources that are aligned with the Project and the 'science of reading.'

The emphasis on direct and explicit instruction has resulted in observable changes in the way teachers design and deliver their daily instruction. It has allowed teachers to effectively provide instruction in whole group and small group setting in ways that students can demonstrate understanding and daily formative assessment can inform future instruction and intervention.

The alignment of direct and explicit instruction and the consistent use of common instructional language across all tiers of instruction, when possible, has increased student participation in activities that they readily understand and has provided the necessary frequent and distributed practice that is essential to young readers who require additional instructional supports.

Instructional staff have been provided with a scope and sequence of instruction that allows K-3 students to master the simple and consistent elements of the English language before they are introduced to the more variant and complex concepts. The Scope and Sequence is used as a framework upon which other resources are aligned, assuring adequate content coverage, practice, and alignment. Existing SSIP site teachers reported gratitude for the scope and sequence as an infrastructure for their daily lessons.

Teachers participating in the Project are supported in their own learning and in their implementation of Structured Literacy in their classroom through personalized instructional coaching that is provided by the Project's literacy coaches. Coaches can model and demonstrate effective instructional routines, strategies, and practices in teachers' classroom. They can observe whole group and small group implementation, help guide teachers' instructional choices, interpret data, and suggest instructional adjustments, and monitor fidelity.

Even the most effective instruction requires adjustment based on student need. The continuous use of progress monitoring and formative assessment are essential components of the Structured Literacy Project and when paired with professional learning in interpreting assessment results and using data to inform instruction, students benefit. This evidence-based practice has resulted in Project schools formalizing processes for data collection and review.

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

The impact of the pandemic has been most noticeable in our ability to effectively collect data monitor project fidelity. Our project schools have been impacted by staff shortages, fluctuating instructional formats, higher student absenteeism, controlled and inflexible student grouping related to absenteeism and health-safety protocols, and varied accessibility to virtual learning related to economic and social factors that are present in at-risk schools.

District and school leaders continued to ask for our collaboration and cooperation in limiting the number of tasks in which teachers

were asked to participate. As a result, we did not ask school leaders or instructional staff to complete coaching surveys or comprehensive school literacy rating evaluations, as it was already known that issues of inconsistent staffing, inadequately trained long-term substitute teachers, high absenteeism, and COVID mandated student cohorts impacted Project fidelity. Project literacy coaches consistently observed whole group and small group instruction, flexing from in-person to occasional virtual observation due to health safety protocols. They supported teachers implementing Structured Literacy practices with fidelity amidst the ever-changing personnel, environmental, and health conditions.

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

Reliable and valid data collected prior to the onset of the pandemic supported the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice. Schools had experienced increases in overall literacy performance and the Project documented positive growth among students initially within the Below Benchmark and Benchmark ranges. These positive growth trends showed greater numbers of students moving into the Well-Above Benchmark range.

At the beginning of the 2019-20 SY, Project staff addressed the need to accelerate the upward growth of students in the Well-Below Benchmark by initiating several Project adjustments. These included more direct and purposeful professional development for Special Education and Intervention teachers, with the goal of enhancing their practice and delivery of direct and explicit instruction. This increase in teacher learning was accompanied by a restructuring of the Project's literacy coaches and an increased emphasis on embedded coaching during small group instruction and intervention. Project staff observed positive changes, albeit small, as they implemented increased coaching and professional learning supports for those charged with the instruction of the most at-risk young readers. Unfortunately, the onset of the pandemic during the 2019-20 SY and subsequent personnel shortages significantly interfered with our work in realigning intervention schedules, implementing effective student grouping for small group instruction, providing intensified professional development, and establishing higher expectations for student with disabilities and those with at-risk factors.

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

The use of direct, explicit, and evidence-based instruction that is supported by effective data collection and interpretation will be essential to our goals of realigning all instruction across all tiers of instruction. We will continue to align instructional activities, strategies, and resources to our Project instructional sequence and support implementation with fidelity through the continued use of embedded coaching. A return to our enhanced focus on small group instruction, and those professionals who provide this instruction, will support increased reading growth among the most challenged young readers. We anticipate that consistent use of our evidenced-based practices, a recommitment to implementation fidelity, and focus on effective scheduling, grouping, and instruction for the most struggling early readers will return the Structured Literacy Project and student outcomes to the positive trajectory established before the pandemic.

In the Spring of 2022, the Structured Literacy staff began planning a return to 'more normal' learning conditions and a reset of the changes briefly initiated during 2019-20 SY to enhance small group instructional practices and increase professional development for special educators and interventionists. Based on pre-pandemic data we believe these strategies will be effective when fully implemented. In addition, the Structured Literacy team has developed intensified instructional routines and adjustments to daily instruction to boost and accelerate student growth as schools embark on recovering.

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

YES

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

Data collection, prior to pandemic, showed a positive trajectory in student outcomes with implementation of the evidence-based practices described above.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

CDE has worked with NCSI to address stakeholder needs and next steps. A stakeholder meeting was held on July 14, 2022 to review and assess the project. Stakeholders included in this convening included the project's literacy coaches, classroom teachers, special education providers, district leadership, and campus leadership. During the course of the convening stakeholders were asked to provide feedback in five areas:

1.) What has worked most effectively with the SSIP's improvement efforts?
2.) What did not work?
3.) What is the current level of support around literacy support for students with disabilities offered by CDE?
4.) What are the threats to ongoing improvement efforts?
5.) What do you hope CDE will address in the SSIP moving forward?

Through these five questions stakeholders indicated that the SSIP helped to facilitate collaboration at the school level and between CDE and schools. The project has built capacity among both general education teachers and special educations teachers. One of the areas stakeholders identified as a need was related to the transition from direct support from CDE to implementing the project

on their own at the district level. In fact, this was identified as a primary threat to the ongoing improvement efforts. Implementing structured literacy is intense and stakeholder noted that both funding and staff capacity were both significant issues for them in moving the project forward without direct support from CDE. In terms of instructional support for students with disabilities, stakeholders noted that the implementation of structured literacy was effective for students with disabilities, but that direct support within the project for this population could be improved. Finally, stakeholders expressed the desire for CDE to work with higher education to provide future teachers with the support they need to effectively teach reading at the elementary level.

Based upon this stakeholder meeting, the project has begun working more collaboratively with the literacy department within CDE to verify that the SSIP work is aligned with the READ act and professional development. We are in the process of placing this structured literacy project on the approved materials list published via CDE so that school sites are more inclined to participate. We are also planning on creating more internal data collection (e.g., coaching logs, fidelity forms) to decrease the amount of work on teachers, while still measuring the effectiveness of the project. Stakeholders also shared that the alignment across tiers has led to a decrease in students needing tiered support and as a group we brainstormed how to collect this data, along with the number of students identified or evaluated for special education. We will continue this conversation with stakeholder at the summer 2023 meeting. Overall, all participants rated the coaching and professional development as helpful and reported that their instruction is more aligned to student needs.

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

As noted above, CDE worked with NCSI to provide facilitation for a stakeholder meeting. Individuals selected for the focus group were purposefully selected to ensure multiple perspectives from sites that had been part of previous implementation or had direct involvement in the project. Included in the focus groups were classroom general education teachers, special education teachers, campus principals, and special education directors. CDE worked with NCSI to develop a set of uniform questions that would be presented to both the entire group and to smaller, subset of the group. Information collected from the focus group is currently being utilized as CDE considers potential modification to the project.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Of primary concern to stakeholders was the ability to both grow the project and maintain the project once direct support from CDE is discontinued at the end of the project for existing sites. CDE is currently engaged, with the support of NCSI, to make changes to the project which will seek to address the concerns expressed by stakeholders. Currently, CDE is considering how improved use of cohort groups could be used to facilitate capacity building at the local level. An updated logic model was created with a model of cohorts so that by year 4 CDE coaches would decrease time to teachers while building internal capacity of both teachers and coaches. The cohort model will be shared with stakeholders to gather input and determine if this would fit their need.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

There are no new implementation activities. COVID highlighted the challenges in collecting student level data and resulted in an incomplete story of the positive outcomes of implementing Structured Literacy. We also understand that student outcomes are not the only measure of success, building teacher capacity to understand the science of reading, leadership support of collaboration among teachers and support of high-quality core instruction, and decrease students needing tiered reading intervention support and/or special education are also vital to long-term outcomes. The CDE SSIP team has been working closely with NCSI to develop fidelity monitoring forms and working with school stakeholders to collect additional data beyond progress monitoring. These activities will be completed prior to the beginning of the 2023-24 SY.

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

July 2023: Update fidelity form for coaches to use during the 2023-24 SY.
End of school year 2022-23: Have participating teachers complete a survey to measure satisfaction with provided coaching and professional learning opportunities.
Summer 2023: Hold annual stakeholder meeting to gather feedback on implementation activities and plan for needed changes for the 2023-2024 school year.
End of school year 2023-24: Ask supporting schools to report the number of students kinder – 3rd referred to special education for reading SLD.

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

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State did not explain how its infrastructure improvement strategies support system change necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and (c) scale up.

17 - Required Actions

The State did not explain how its infrastructure improvement strategies support system change necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale up. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must address all components of this Indicator.