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

Guam

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)?

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE), a unitary educational system, facilitated the development of Guam's FFY 2021 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 7, which reports on the progress of the implementation plan and outcomes developed as the vehicle for improvement in infrastructure development and implementation of evidence-based practices for meeting Guam's SSIP State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR). In Phase 1 of the SSIP submitted to OSEP on April 1, 2015, Guam identified the following as its SIMR:

There will be an increased percent of students with disabilities in the 3rd grade that will be proficient in reading in the four participating schools as measured by the district-wide assessment.

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)

NO

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.

Changes to GDOE's Theory of Action (TOA) were made to better reflect and align the high leverage actions being implemented at schools to address the short-term, intermediate, and long-term goals of the SSIP. The TOA was originally developed in 2015. In the span of seven years, SSIP schools have navigated a multitude of changes related to district and school leadership, staff, curriculum, and most recently changes brought about by the global COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the schools felt it was an opportune time to pause, reflect, and review the TOA to determine if the changes experienced in the system have impacted the TOA. On May 19, 2022, school teams composed of representatives of stakeholder groups (teachers, principals, and families) from the four target schools and the four scale-up schools came together to review the TOA and provide input on possible modifications. Input was compiled and on October 13, 2022, school teams met again to finalize the changes in the TOA.
The updates to the TOA include the following:

1. Continuum of Supports was changed to Improvement Science. Improvement Science encompasses the comprehensive and systematic process that schools have been engaged in to address the reading deficits in classrooms. This process includes data-based decision making in which data from the universal screener is analyzed and used to develop a goal for improvement. This component sets the stage for the Plan-Do-Study-Act wherein data is used to identify a goal for improvement (Plan), implement an evidence-based strategy to address the goal (Do), collect and analyze data to monitor the outcomes for progress or problems (Study), and finally adapt, adopt, or abandon the strategy based on the data that was collected (ACT).

2. Parents and Community as Partners was changed to Families and Community as Partners. This change recognizes that engagement goes beyond parents but rather encompasses the entire family, including the student.

3. Professional Development was changed to Professional Learning. This change recognizes the shift in language used in the district's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Strategic Plan that emphasizes the "learning" aspect of training wherein teachers are empowered and recognized as learners, leaders, and knowledgeable professionals who are active participants in their development.

4. Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). EBPs have always been a hallmark of GDOE's SSIP journey and was included as an objective in the SSIP Action Plan. However, the strategy was never explicitly detailed in the TOA. Therefore, stakeholders felt it was necessary to include it as a strategy in the TOA to ensure that its use is clear and deliberate and directly connected to the TOA.

5. TA Support, Coaching, & Accountability was changed to TA Support & Coaching. By deleting the term "accountability" from the coherent improvement strategy, SSIP stakeholders acknowledge that TA Support and Coaching can not be successful if coaches and TA providers also function as an evaluator. The term "accountability" evokes this premise and therefore may detract from the goal and purpose of coaching.

6. Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP) was added as a coherent improvement strategy. An integral element of GDOE's SSIP has been in the development of IEPs that are procedurally and substantively sound. This process ensures that students receive the appropriate Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) that addresses their unique needs. However, the original TOA did not explicitly convey this priority thus prompting this addition.

7. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions was replaced by Monitoring & Accountability. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions is encompassed in the Improvement Science process under the first strategy. Therefore, isolating it as a separate strategy will be redundant and unnecessary. In addition, as aforementioned, Monitoring & Accountability should not be grouped in the same category as TA Support & Coaching as both are distinct and should stand alone.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The link to Guam Part B's current Theory of Action is as follows:

https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

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
FFY 2014	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	0.00%	5.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Grade 3 IEP Students Scored Proficient in Target Schools	Grade 3 IEP Students in Target Schools with Valid Scores	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
x	11	x	0.00%	x	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source for the FFY 2021 data is the district-wide assessment results for the FFY 2021 (SY2021-2022) assessments which include the ACT Aspire and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AA-AAAS) for students with significant cognitive disabilities, conducted in Spring 2022. The ACT Aspire is a vertically-scaled and benchmarked system of standards-based assessment that can be used to track progress toward the Common Core State Standards and the ACT College Readiness Standards. It is designed to measure students' progress in English, Reading, Math, Science, and Writing from grades 3 to 10 toward readiness for college and career, allowing for comparisons from one grade-level to another and one cohort to another (Guam Annual State of Public Education Report, 2019). The MSAA are assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math and are designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and grade 11. The MSAA covers grade-level content standards at a simplified level, and it includes many built-in supports, modified materials, and accommodations.

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, GDOE began SY 2021-2022 implementing two modes of learning: online instruction and in-person learning. In September 2021, the district shifted to on-line instruction because of a spike in COVID cases. In October, the district implemented a cohort model for in-person learning but by the end of November, the cohort model was replaced by 5-days of in-person instruction. Moreover, online instruction continued seamlessly until the end of the school year. All students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district-wide assessment (ACT Aspire). Online students were asked to come on-campus to take the ACT Aspire. For the ACT Aspire, the student's raw score is transmuted into a three-digit scaled score that provides a common language for discussing student achievement over time. Scaled scores that are above, at-grade level, below, or significantly below the ACT readiness benchmark are respectively categorized as "Exceeding" (Level 4) , "Ready" (Level 3), "Close" (Level 2), and "In Need of Support" (Level 1). In relation to the SiMR, students placed in Levels 3 and 4 are considered "Proficient".

Although the MSAA is an online assessment tool, there is no mechanism for students with disabilities to take this assessment remotely. The students need to be physically in school to be assessed by their teachers using the online tool. The students who participated in this assessment were the students who received in-person instruction and online students who came on-campus to take the assessment. Depending on the response modes used by the student (i.e., the student uses eye-gaze or uses gestures or points to responses), the student's response is entered into the MSAA system by the teacher; or the student enters the response to the questions independently. Students participating in the MSAA are scored on alternate achievement standards and given a scaled score and a corresponding performance level based on their responses. The performance levels are Level 4, Level 3, Level 2, and

Level 1. Students who achieved a scaled score and a performance level of 3 or 4 meet expectations of proficiency and would be counted in the SIMR.

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

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Universal Screener: aimswebPlus

Participation Rates
The participation rate for all students is determined by dividing the number of students screened in the 4 target schools by the number of enrolled students from the same schools. The participation rate for students with IEPs is determined by dividing the # of students with IEPs screened in the 4 target schools by the # of students with IEPs from the same schools.
All students
Fall (F) '21: 97% (1016/1047)
Winter (W) '22: 85% (958/1121)
Spring (S) '22: 91% (1061/1161)
F'22: 95% (1101/1156)
IEP Students
F'21: 72% (26/36)
W '22: 80% (32/40)
S '22: 77% (27/35)
F '22: 66% (23/35)

Performance Rates
Data shows the percent of students performing average & above (26th percentile & above) in Early Literacy (EL) measures for Kindergarten (K), Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) for grades 1st-3rd & Reading Comprehension (RC) for grades 2nd-3rd. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 26th percentile divided by the total # of students screened. Cohort data largely represents the same group of students as they move from one grade-level to the next; there are some variations in the cohort as new students may have entered the school & some students may have transferred to other schools.
K: Initial Sounds (IS)
All Students: Cohort
F '21: 43.4% (117/275)
W '22: 54% (148/276)
S '22: Not tested in Spring
All Students: SY '22-'23
F '22 (K): 29% (68/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F '21: x% (x/7)
W '22: x% (x/7)
S '22: Not tested in Spring
IEP Students: SY '22-'23
Fall '22 (K): x% (x/12)

K: Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)
All Students: Cohort
F '21: 33.8% (93/275)
W '22: 45% (125/277)
S '22: 54% (159/295)
All Students: SY '22-'23
F '22: 34% (79/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F '21: x% (x/7)
W '22: x% (x/7)
S '22: x% (x/7)
IEP Students: SY '22-'23
F '22 (K): 25% (3/12)

1st: ORF: SY '22-'23
All Students
F '22: 30% (101/332)
IEP Students
F '22: x% (x/5)

2nd: ORF: Cohort
All Students
F '21 (1st): 21.8% (47/225)

W ‘22 (1st): 29% (63/220)
S ‘22 (1st): 32% (69/215)
F ‘22 (2nd): 31% (75/240)
IEP Students
F ‘21 (1st): x% (x/5)
W ‘22: (1st): x% (x/3)
S ‘22 (1st): x% (x/4)
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

2nd: RC-Cohort
All Students
Note: RC is not tested in the 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): 79% (187/238)
IEP Students
F ‘22 (2nd): 86% (6/7)

3rd: ORF- Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 34% (95/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 37% (90/246)
S ‘22 (2nd): 39% (107/277)
F ‘22 (3rd): 35% (98/281)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 49% (128/262)
S ‘22 (3rd): 46% (129/280)
IEP Students
W ‘22: (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY 2021-2022
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

3rd: RC-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 53% (149/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 43% (108/252)
S ‘22 (2nd): 48% (134/282)
F ‘22 (3rd): 59% (165/279)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 48% (127/267)
S ‘22 (3rd): 42% (116/278)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 38% (3/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

Benchmark data shows the percent of students performing at or above the 35th percentile in EL measures & the 45th percentile in Reading measures. The 35th & 45th percentiles demonstrate aimswebPlus’ success probability target scores. Students scoring at these target benchmarks have an 80% or more likelihood of passing the 3rd grade district assessment. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 35th or 45th percentile divided by the total # of students screened.

K: IS
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 30.6% (82/268)
W ‘22: 41% (112/276)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 23% (54/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22: x% (x/7)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): x% (x/12)

K: LNF
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 32.8% (88/268)
W ‘22: 39% (107/277)
S ‘22: 54% (159/295)

All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22: 23% (54/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22:x% (x/7)
S ‘22: x% (x/7)
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 25% (3/12)

1st: ORF: SY ‘22-’23
All Students
F ‘22: 23% (75/332)
IEP Students
F ‘22: x% (x/5)

2nd: ORF-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (1st): 17.4% (38/219)
W ‘22 (1st): 28% (61/220)
S ‘22 (1st): 22% (48/215)
F ‘22 (2nd): 19% (45/240)
IEP Students
F ‘21 (1st): x% (x/5)
W ‘22 (1st): x% (x/3)
S‘22 (1st): x% (x/4)
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

2nd: RC-Cohort
All Students
Note: RC is not tested in 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): 31% (73/238)
IEP Students
Note: RC is not tested in 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

3rd: ORF- Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 24% (68/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 23% (57/246)
S ‘22 (2nd): 25% (70/277)
F ‘22 (3rd): 17% (48/281)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 24% (64/262)
S ‘22 (3rd): 28% (79/280)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

3rd: RC-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 26% (72/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 25% (62/252)
S ‘22 (2nd): 26% (74/282)
F ‘22 (3rd): 33% (93/279)
3rd:All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22: 36% (96/267)
S ‘22: 28% (78/278)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
Students w/IEPs: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

Summary: Participation Rates
The participation rate for all students, inclusive of those with IEPs, decreased by 2% from the last reporting period (F‘21) with 95% students screened in F‘22 as compared to 97% in F‘21. However, the disaggregation of the data by students with IEPs indicates there was an 8% decrease in participation from the last reporting period for students with IEPs with only 66% screened in F‘22 as compared to 72% in F‘21. The data indicate a large gap between the participation of all students & students with IEPs. Recommendations include a root cause analysis be conducted to understand the considerable disparity between the 2 groups in order to identify strategies to increase participation rates for students with IEPs.

Performance Rates
The performance rates looked at cohort data as students in the same cohort moved from one grade-level to the next. Data was examined for both “average & above" & “benchmark & above” categories to assess progress towards the SiMR. In examining the data, the results indicate progress being made when looking at the data for all students in grades K-3. However, in disaggregating the data by students with IEPs, there is a gap between the performance of all students & students with IEPs. Percent change between F’21 data & the latest data point was calculated by finding the difference between the two percentages, dividing the answer by the 2nd percentage, & multiplying the # by 100 to determine the percent of increase or decrease. Notable increases in performance percentages are detailed below:

Average & Above
24% increase in IS for K from F‘21-W ‘22 for all students
59% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
102% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for IEP students
42% increase in ORF for 2nd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 1st GR to F ‘22 when they entered 2nd GR (all students)
2% increase in RC for 3rd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 2nd GR to F ‘22 when they entered 3rd GR (all students)

Benchmark & Above
33% increase in IS for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
64% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
102% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for IEP students
26% increase in RC for 3rd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 2nd GR to F ‘22 when they entered 3rd GR (all students)

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.

In November 2021, in-person instruction resumed for 5-days a week. Students not receiving in-person instruction received online instruction. The ACT Aspire and MSAA summative assessments were conducted in the Spring of 2022. Students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district’s summative assessments. However, online students were asked to come on-campus to take the summative assessments. Not all online students abided with the district’s request to report to campus for testing. As a consequence, data completeness was significantly impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In SY 2018-2019, pre-pandemic participation rates for all 3rd grade students was 96% (2102/2189). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate for the same school year was 100% (80/80) (GDOE ASPER, 2019). For SY 2020-2021, the participation rate for all 3rd grade students was 42% (880/2110). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate was 43% (30/69) (GDOE ASPER, 2021). For this reporting year, participation rates for 3rd graders increased to 87% (1692/1928). Third-grade students with IEP’s who participated in the ACT Aspire were 86% (56/65). Though there was an increase in participation rates from the previous school year, the pandemic participation rates remain 10% lower than pre-pandemic participation rates. For students with disabilities who were tested in the district-wide assessment using an alternate assessment using alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS), the participation rate for 3rd-grade students was 75% (9/12). The pre-pandemic participation rate for students on the AA-AAS was 100% (21/21).

For the four SSIP target schools, the participation rate for 3rd grade students with IEPs was 89% (8/9) which is an increase from the last reporting period which had a participation rate of 44% (4/9). For general education students in the target schools, the participation rate was also 89% (270/302) which is an increase from last year’s rate of 79% (165/210). In both groups of students, there were significant increases from the last reporting year but the rates were still lower than pre-pandemic rates. Therefore, data completeness was impacted as a result of COVID-19.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection, GDOE called families of students who were receiving online instruction and highly encouraged them to bring their child/ren to the school campus to take the district-wide assessment.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

The link to Guam Part B's current Evaluation Plan is as follows:

https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

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

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

The changes to the evaluation plan are reflective of the changes in the TOA which were changed to better align with the improvement activities conducted at SSIP schools – see changes in Coherent Improvement Strategies under prompt: Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

In addition to the changes in the Coherent Improvement Strategies, the following changes were incorporated into the evaluation plan:
- development of a scoring criteria to measure the level of activity implementation. A score of "1" indicates little or no implementation; "2" is some implementation; "3" is moderate implementation; and "4" is strong implementation;
- identification of evaluation roles and responsibilities;
- clear articulation of the linkages between the improvement strategies and the intended outputs and outcomes; and
- update of evaluation questions and performance indicators to reflect the revised Coherent Improvement Strategies and to ensure that only the most important and meaningful outcomes related to the SSIP are being evaluated.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The SSIP evaluation plan had not been revisited since 2015. Within this time, significant changes in the system occurred including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the SSIP Core Team felt it was imperative to revisit the TOA, the Logic Model and the evaluation plan to identify strengths, gaps, and weaknesses. Stakeholders were involved in this self-assessment of the evaluation process. Two work sessions with stakeholders were held and input was collected on possible changes to the evaluation plan, TOA, and Logic Model. This process resulted in changes in all three components. The rationale for the changes are centered in ensuring that there is a clear connection between outputs, outcomes, and activities. In addition, stakeholders assessed whether there was an evident articulation between the outcomes, the TOA, and the Logic Model. In the original evaluation plan, the connection to the three elements was not well-defined. In addition, performance indicators were revisited to certify that they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.).

As a consequence of the stakeholder work sessions, specific changes in the evaluation plan were made. These changes included the following:
- development of a scoring criteria to measure the level of activity implementation;
- identification of evaluation roles and responsibilities;
- clear articulation of the linkages between the improvement strategies and the intended outputs and outcomes; and
- update of evaluation questions and performance indicators to reflect the revised Coherent Improvement Strategies and to ensure that only the most important and meaningful outcomes related to the SSIP are being evaluated.

In summary, the rationale for the changes in the evaluation plan are centered on solidifying the connection between outcomes, the TOA, and the Logic Model and ensuring that evaluation activities are relevant and meaningful and can be operationalized in tandem with implementation efforts.

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

The SSIP Logic Model (LM) provided the framework for how support was provided to the participating schools to improve infrastructure at the district and school levels. Each of the outcomes in the LM was aligned with the Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS) in the Theory of Action (TOA). Each outcome is supported by activities that demonstrate how the LM is implemented. The TOA, which is linked in this report, demonstrates the connection between the CIS to the goals of the SSIP. The following details each CIS, the corresponding outcomes from the LM and the related activities and is organized the following way:
- CIS: Infrastructure improvement strategies that will guide the development and implementation of specific activities that support the achievement of SSIP goals
- Outcomes: Targets in the SSIP LM that define the success of each CIS
- Activities: The specific steps related to the CIS that were implemented to achieve the SSIP goals

CIS #1: Improvement Science
Short-term Outcome: Administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in improvement science.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- Administrators and teachers implement PDSA cycles as designed and modify as needed.
- Teachers have increased knowledge in data-based decision making.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Professional Learning (PL) sessions on PDSAs, data literacy, data-based decision making, and EBPs

- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener
- Observations and feedback on classroom PDSAs

CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners
Short-Term Outcome: Administrators and teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge and skills in implementing evidence-based family engagement strategies to support improved reading.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- SSIP schools are implementing family engagement strategies for improving reading.
- Families reported that they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home and in the community.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Leveraging State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) work team sessions to include SSIP principals, an SSIP teacher, and SSIP parents
- SPDG Leading by Convening trainers include an SSIP principal, teacher, and parent
- GAPSD-considered Guam's Part B "broad" stakeholder group of individuals who provide input, suggestions, and recommendations for improving special education and related services for children with disabilities on Guam. One of the SSIP Core Team members is also a GAPSD member and a GEB member who shares information with the panel and board members, respectively.

CIS #3: Professional Learning (PL)
Short-Term Outcome: PL policy and procedures were developed that encompassed research-based practices and elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- PL activities adhered to established professional learning policy and procedures.
- Teachers at SSIP schools reported they were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning activities provided by GDOE.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Discussion & research on the procedures & standards for quality, evidence-based PL
- Leveraging SPDG to engage stakeholders in building a more responsive PL system to improve reading

CIS#4: EBPs
Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at the SSIP schools have increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs and supplemental interventions in reading.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- Teachers at the SSIP schools implemented EBPs in reading with fidelity.
- Teachers in the SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for struggling readers.
Long-Term Outcomes: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions on EBPs for reading (Science of Reading)
- PL sessions on the Reading Mastery program for RRTs

CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching
Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools receiving TA support and coaching reported increased knowledge and skills in reading instruction.
Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs and supplemental interventions with fidelity.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions provided by the district and the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components and development
- PL provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching and training to ICs on the district's universal screener
- IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new teachers
- SpEd coaches activities for SSIP schools: Coaching on the development of PLAAFP and goals

CIS # 6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)
Short-term Outcome: IEP teams increased their knowledge and skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs.
Intermediate Outcome: IEP Teams developed, reviewed, and revised IEPs to ensure they are procedurally and substantively sound.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions for SpEd coaches on IEP development from the Progress Center
- PL session for SpEd coaches in using universal screener for PLAAFP development
- Coaching on IEP development provided to IEP teams by SpEd coaches
- Coaching on specific IEP stipulations by SpEd coaches

CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability
Short-term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading.
Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading with fidelity.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:

- Fidelity observations for the implementation of Reading Mastery in the Resource Room
- Classroom observations on the implementation of PDSAs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener

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.

CIS#1: Improvement Science
Outcomes achieved:
- Administrators, teachers, & instructional coaches have increased knowledge in improvement science.
- Administrators & teachers implement PDSA cycles as designed and modify as needed.

The outcomes for CIS#1 support governance as it ensures that leadership at the school & local levels advocate for appropriate resources & effectively plan, communicate, & collaborate to drive ongoing system improvement. It is also related to data and accountability/monitoring & quality standards as data is used to inform decisions & to support the implementation of quality programs. CIS#1 supports system change & is necessary for the achievement of the SiMR, sustainability of systems improvements efforts & scale-up by ensuring administrators & teachers are equipped with the knowledge & skills to guide the implementation of EBPs & data-based decision making. Data collected to assess the outcome for this CIS are classroom observations, teachers surveys, & document reviews.

CIS#2: Family and Community Partners
Outcomes still in progress:
-SSIP schools are implementing family engagement strategies for improving reading.
- Families reported they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home & in the community.

The outcomes for CIS#2 are related to governance, professional development, & technical assistance. The focus of CIS#2 is on building administrative structures that maximize family engagement. CIS#2 involves providing opportunities for families to engage in learning opportunities centered on what they can do at home & in the community to support their child/ren's reading progress, which supports achievement of the SiMR. No formal TA activities were conducted for this reporting period as the focus was on alleviating the impacts of the pandemic on learning through a targeted focus on classroom instruction. However, SSIP classroom teachers have been working directly with families to engage them in activities to support families at home. Parent interviews were conducted to gather information from families with a child/ren with an IEP on how schools were helping families to support their child/ren in reading during & after the pandemic.

CIS#3: PL
Outcome achieved: Teachers from the SSIP Schools were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning provided by GDOE.
The outcome for CIS#3 is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, & quality standards. Key to building the capacity of teachers is using data to determine critical areas for PL & to inform practices. The intended outputs accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of school-level, job-embedded sessions that were conducted. Improvement Science PL sessions were primarily focused on scale-up schools. Target schools received PL related to the Reading Mastery program which is used as an intervention in the resource room & to assist in the delivery of SDI for students with IEPs. Another outcome that is still in progress is the development of PL standards & procedures to ensure that the PL is of high quality. This outcome is aligned with GDOE's SPDG which is focused on creating a more responsive & relevant PL system that engages all stakeholders, including families. By leveraging the resources from the SPDG, the goal is to create a PL system that is sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, & classroom focused. In doing so, GDOE recognizes the benefits of calibrating initiatives & supports to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. These indicators support system change & are necessary for achievement towards the SiMR because it is centered on developing the skill-set of front-line implementers in the use of EBPs through high-quality PL. End of PL teacher surveys were conducted to determine the perception of knowledge gained after sessions and to communicate achievement of the outcome.

CIS#4: EBPs
Outcome achieved: Teachers at the SSIP schools have increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs & interventions in reading.
This outcome is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, accountability/monitoring, & quality standards. The use of EBPs in reading increases the likelihood of positive student outcomes & increases responsiveness to learner needs. Therefore, this CIS supports system change & is necessary for achievement towards the SiMR.
The outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of PL & coaching sessions provided to RRTs in Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) in order to ensure implementation to fidelity of EBP reading interventions for students with IEPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom observations & teacher surveys.

CIS#5: TA Support & Coaching
Outcome achieved: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs & interventions with fidelity.
The goal of CIS#5 is that teachers are knowledgeable & capable of delivering EBPs & interventions in reading. Therefore, the outcome is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, & quality standards.
Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instructional procedures, duration, & quality of delivery. This process supports system change, impacts the achievement of the SiMR, & supports scale-up. However, for coaches to competently provide coaching, GDOE must support coaches by building their capacity through PL.

For this reporting period, coaching was provided in the implementation of Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) for students with IEPs in the Resource Room to address their Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) on a monthly basis. CIS#5 is implemented in tandem with CIS#4 (EBPs) & CIS#6 in which TA support & coaching is provided to ensure effective implementation of EBPs & the development of substantive IEPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom fidelity observations.

CIS#6: Development, Implementation, & Monitoring of IEPs
Outcome in Progress: IEP teams increase knowledge & skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs. The outcome for CIS#5 is related to professional development/technical assistance & quality standards.
The focus of CIS#6 for this reporting period has been building the capacity of SpEd coaches through TA from the Progress Center in the development of the IEP components. SpEd coaches are at the frontlines in the delivery of technical assistance for teachers & IEP teams. Therefore, the district has invested resources in building their capacity to support teachers & IEP teams. Outputs for this strategy are centered on the number of IEP coaching sessions provided to SSIP schools & the number of IEP reviews conducted. However, since the district has newly adopted the role of SpEd coaches, time has been spent on providing PL to SpEd coaches to build their knowledge and skills to coach. The outcome was assessed through a case study methodology & IEP reviews.

CIS#7: Monitoring & Accountability
Outcome achieved: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs & supplemental interventions with fidelity.
This outcome is related to governance & quality standards. The focus of CIS#7 is the development of a systematic monitoring system to ensure implementation to fidelity of EBPs & interventions. This is driven by the need to guarantee that all students receive a high-quality education. CIS#7 is tethered to all other CIS as it ensures that all practices are ingrained in the system. This involves classroom observations, core team meetings, & data reviews. As a result, CIS#7 supports achievement towards the SiMR, sustainability of system improvement efforts, & scale-up. The outcome was assessed through the collection of fidelity data through observations & document reviews.

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

YES

Describe each <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

1. Continuum of Supports was changed to Improvement Science. Improvement Science encompasses the comprehensive and systematic process that schools have been engaged in to address the reading deficits in classrooms. This process includes data-based decision making in which data from the universal screener is analyzed and used to develop a goal for improvement. This component sets the stage for the Plan-Do-Study-Act wherein data is used to identify a goal for improvement (Plan), implement an evidence-based strategy to address the goal (Do), collect and analyze data to monitor the outcomes for progress or problems (Study), and finally adapt, adopt, or abandon the strategy based on the data that was collected (ACT).

2. Parents and Community as Partners was changed to Families and Community as Partners. This change recognizes that engagement goes beyond parents but rather encompasses the entire family, including the student.

3. Professional Development was changed to Professional Learning. This change recognizes the shift in language used in the district's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Strategic Plan that emphasizes the "learning" aspect of training wherein teachers are empowered and recognized as learners, leaders, and knowledgeable professionals who are active participants in their development.

4. Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). EBPs have always been a hallmark of GDOE's SSIP journey and was included as an objective in the SSIP Action Plan. However, the strategy was never explicitly detailed in the TOA. Therefore, stakeholders felt it was necessary to include it as a strategy in the TOA to ensure that its use is clear and deliberate and directly connected to the TOA.

5. TA Support, Coaching, & Accountability was changed to TA Support & Coaching. By deleting the term "accountability" from the coherent improvement strategy, SSIP stakeholders acknowledge that TA Support and Coaching can not be successful if coaches and TA providers also function as an evaluator. The term "accountability" evokes this premise and therefore may detract from the goal and purpose of coaching.

6. Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP) was added as a coherent improvement strategy. An integral element of GDOE's SSIP has been in the development of IEPs that are procedurally and substantively sound. This process ensures that students receive the appropriate Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) that addresses their unique needs. However, the original TOA did not explicitly convey this priority thus prompting this addition.

7. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions was replaced by Monitoring & Accountability. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions is encompassed in the Improvement Science process under the first strategy. Therefore, isolating it as a separate strategy will be redundant and unnecessary. In addition, as aforementioned, Monitoring & Accountability should not be grouped in the same category as TA Support & Coaching as both are distinct and should stand alone.

Note: Short-term and intermediate outcomes achieved were discussed in the previous section.

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

CIS #1: Improvement Science
Next Steps:

- Continued coaching and professional learning on the implementation of PDSAs
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased implementation of PDSAs in scale-up and target schools
- Increased fidelity in the implementation of the universal screener
- Increased knowledge for K-3 teachers in data literacy and data-based decision-making
- Implementation of at least 3 PDSA cycles a year

CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners
Next Steps:
- Coaching and support to SSIP schools on the implementation of evidence-based family engagement strategies from the Institute of Education Sciences
- Leveraging the work done through the GDOE SPDG to capitalize on the Leading by Convening framework and activities as a mechanism to engage SSIP families
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased family engagement activities at SSIP schools
- Increased knowledge of families in strategies for supporting reading at home

CIS #3: Professional Learning
Next Steps:
- Leveraging the work of the GDOE SPDG in developing GDOE's professional learning policy to encompass the ESEA definition of professional development, the Learning Forward Professional Development Standards, and the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased professional learning activities that encompasses policy and procedures that constitute quality professional learning
- Increased percentage of teachers who were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning provided

CIS #4 Evidence-Based Instructional Practices
Next Steps:
- Professional learning and coaching on evidence-based instructional practices.
- Implementation of Lesson Progress Charts to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.
Anticipated Outcomes:
-Implementation to fidelity of EBPs for reading instruction and interventions
- Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching
Next Steps:
- Continued professional learning for Instructional and SpEd coaches to build their coaching capacity
- Continued coaching for general and special education teachers in evidence-based instructional practices
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased knowledge and skills of teachers in EBPs for reading instruction and interventions
- Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

6. CIS #6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)
Next Steps:
- Continued professional learning and coaching on IEP development
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased alignment between IEP components
- Increased use of appropriate accommodations

7. CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability
Next Steps:
- Continued monitoring of the delivery of SDI and interventions for reading
- Monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.
Anticipated Outcome:
- Increased fidelity in the implementation of SDI and interventions for reading

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

The evidence-based practices implemented during this reporting period include the following:
1. Universal screening
2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Program)
4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading)
5. Coaching
6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Universal screening is a critical first step in identifying students who are at-risk for reading difficulties. Once identified, at-risk students can be provided with the appropriate scope of reading supports and interventions in addition to core instruction. Universal screening is essential in ensuring that reading problems are addressed timely before the achievement gap widens.

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Improvement science is the basis for continuous improvement. It is centered on the premise that sustainable change is an ongoing process based on data collection, adaptation, and learning. Continuous improvement is focused on a specific problem and in testing practices and adapting them based on ongoing data collection. Three main questions guide the continuous improvement cycle (Shakman, K., Wogon,D., Rodriguez, S., Boyce, J., & Shaver, D., 2020):
- What problem are we trying to solve?
- What change might we introduce and why?
- How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Explicit instruction is a systematic, direct, purposeful way of teaching. Rosenshine (1987) defines explicit instruction as “a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking for understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students”. The components of explicit instruction include having a clear objective, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, and supporting practices. GDOE utilizes the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading program in the resource room as a mechanism for the delivery of explicit and systematic instruction for students with IEPs in the resource room.

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (April 2020) summarized research in the area of reading instruction. The National Reading Panel analysis was clear in its assertion that effective reading instruction must be systematic and explicit and must include the following components: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Based on research by Joyce and Showers (2002), in order for the new skills learned in professional development to be transferred into the classroom, coaching is needed to help teachers successfully implement new knowledge and skills. Through on-going support from coaching, teachers are more likely to implement EBPs with greater fidelity. Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instruction procedures, duration, and quality of delivery.

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
The PLC framework is centered on the tenets of improvement science. It is during PLC meetings where the continuous improvement process unfolds. Three overarching principles undergird the PLC framework: ensure that students learn, a culture of collaboration, and a focus on results. In embracing the PLC framework, there is a shift from teaching to learning (Dufour, 2004). There are four focus questions that are threaded through a PLC meeting:
- What do we want students to learn?
- How do we know they’ve learned it?
- What do we do if they haven’t learned it?
- What do we do if they’ve learned it?

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.

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning on administering the universal screener (aimswebPlus)
- Professional learning on data analysis using aimswebPlus reading data
- Fidelity of administration observations were conducted to ensure that aimswebPlus was being administered with fidelity
Impact on the SiMR
- At-risk students were identified in a timely manner (Change in program practice)
- Data from the screener is used to drive classwide and individual interventions (Change in teacher practices)
- Data from the screener is used for PDSAs (Change in teacher practices)

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act-PDSAs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning sessions on improvement science, Science of Reading, data analysis, Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener
- PDSA classroom observations

Impact on the SiMR
- Teachers and students use data to develop a goal and strategies to improve deficits in reading. (Change in teacher and student behavior)
- Students take ownership of their data and their learning. (Change in student behavior)
- Facilitates an on-going process of data collection, use of evidence-based practices, and adaptation based on data. (Change in teacher and program practices)
- Provides the basis for the delivery of EBPs and interventions (Change in teacher and program practices)

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use
- Professional learning for Resource Room Teachers (RRTs) in the use of explicit instruction in the delivery of the Direct Instruction (DI) Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs
- Coaching for RRTs on the use of explicit instruction with the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs. (Change in teacher practices)
- Reading tasks are broken down into smaller steps to reduce the cognitive load for struggling readers. (Change in teacher practices)
- Practice and corrective feedback are provided in a timely manner to increase the attainment and mastery of reading skills. (Change in teacher practices)

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning in the use of knowledge of the 5 Components of Reading instruction in the development of PDSAs
- Professional learning in using data from aimswebPlus to determine what area of reading instruction needs to be targeted in instruction and in the development of PDSAs.
- Professional learning of various EBPs that fall under the 5 Components of Reading instruction (e.g. Elkonin boxes, repeated reading, word building, etc.)
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- Students are provided with reading instruction that is balanced and meets their needs. (Change in teacher practices)

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning sessions from the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components
- Professional learning provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching and training to ICs on the district's universal screener
- IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new SSIP teachers
- SpEd coaches activities for SSIP schools: Coaching on the development of PLAAFP and goals
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- The development of an effective PLAAFP statement and goals drives the determination of the appropriate SDI to meet the unique needs of the student. (Change in teacher practices)

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- PLCs provide the mechanism by which aimswebPlus data was analyzed to inform practices and to develop PDSAs
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased and deliberate focus on using data to drive instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practice)
- Increased and deliberate focus on identifying EBPs to address gaps in instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practices)

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

Core Team Meeting Notes (CIS#7)
Core team meeting notes were used to determine how monitoring and accountability were conducted.

Universal Screener Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 7)
K-3 teachers from the 4 SSIP target schools were systematically observed in order to examine their assessment practices in the areas of ORF & EL. The practices associated with ORF & EL were observed during the Fall '22 administration of the screener. School principals used a standardized protocol and fidelity checklist to determine the level of fidelity in the administration of the aimswebPlus EL and Reading measures. When analyzing the assessment practices in both the areas of ORF & EL, it was found that 90.94% (Level 4-strong implementation) of tasks were implemented with fidelity. In comparison to Fall '21, only 69.30% of tasks were implemented with fidelity. Further examination provides evidence that ORF tasks were implemented at a 91.22% fidelity level (Level 4-strong implementation) while EL practices were implemented at 90.18% (Level 4-strong implementation) fidelity rate. In addition to the number of tasks implemented with fidelity, the observation data were analyzed to determine how many teachers were implementing all observed tasks with fidelity. Across the 4 schools, a total of 41 teachers were observed using at least one fidelity

checklist. The data indicated that a high percentage of teachers (82.93%) are implementing 85-99% of the tasks with fidelity. Of note, 12% of 2nd-3rd grade teachers did implement all the ORF fidelity checklist tasks with fidelity and 8% of the Kindergarten & 1st grade teachers observed implemented all the tasks with fidelity.

Professional Learning (PL) Feedback (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
The following indicates the percentage of satisfaction from participants with the PL content provided during this reporting period:
SSIP School 4 1st Grade Session on the Five Components of Reading & Lesson Planning: 100% (4/4)
Fast ForWord Program Overview & Implementation: 100% (2/2)
SSIP School 4 1st Grade Session on Continuous Improvement in Reading: 100% (3/3)
aimswebPlus Administration Training Session: 92% (12/13)
Progress Monitoring Overview Sessions: 100% (55/55)
Urgency of Reading Proficiency & Continuous Improvement Session for Scale Up Schools: 99% (76/77)
Continuous Improvement in Reading Onsite School Sessions for Scale Up Schools: 100% (31/31)
RM & Corrective Reading Training series for RRTs: 100% (4/4)
SSIP School 1 Kindergarten Direct Instruction Reading Mastery I & II Overview: 100% (2/2)
SSIP School 1 Direct Instruction Reading Mastery Overview: 100% (7/7)
SSIP School 2 Data Literacy: 94% (16/17)
SSIP School 3 Improvement Science: 90% (36/40)
In summary, the overall satisfaction average for participants in PL sessions is 97.91% which is Level 4 or strong implementation indicating that participants find the content and delivery of PL relevant. Next steps include the development of PL policy and standards to ensure that PL is based on practices that are research-based and encompass elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.

Improvement Science & Science of Reading (SOR) Retrospective PL Survey
As evidenced through PL surveys that measured knowledge increase before & after a session, there was a 95% increase in knowledge of K-3 teachers from the scale-up schools. The teachers reported increased knowledge from “no or low knowledge” before the session to “moderate or high knowledge” after the district session on Improvement Science & the SOR. This percentage is indicative of Level 4 or strong implementation.

Universal Screening Data (CIS #1,7)
aimswebPlus is described under the prompt “Has the state collected additional data?”

IEP File Folder Reviews (CIS #5,6,7)
22 IEPs were reviewed by 6 individuals on 17 indicators using a checklist. The 22 IEPs were for students attending the 4 new scale-up schools & will be used as baseline data. Of the 22 IEPs, the ratings of 11 were removed as the PLAAFP was not current (over 30 days old). This resulted in a summary of the ratings for 11 IEPs. For each IEP component (PLAAFP, Annual Goal, SDI), the IEP is considered to have met the criteria if the IEP component met at least 80% of the indicators. The results demonstrated below represent the percentage of IEPs that met the 80% criteria:
PLAAFP: x% (x/11) of the IEPs
Annual Goals x% (x/11) of the IEPs
SDI: x% (x/11) of the IEPs
The scale-up schools have not received any coaching on IEP development. In contrast, in FFY2020, target schools received coaching on PLAAFP development. Data from IEP file folder reviews of the target schools in FFY2020 showed at least half of the IEPs from the target schools (57% & above) met the indicators under the PLAAFP component as a result of coaching.

Direct Instruction (DI): Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Classroom Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Observations were conducted at three of the four SSIP school sites with a total of 6 resource room teachers (RRTs). One of the 4 SSIP schools just received a new RRT in December 2022 & DI training was just completed in January 2023. Therefore, no observations were completed for this teacher at the time of reporting. The observations were centered on the fidelity of implementation for the DI Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs which are used to address the SDI for students with IEPs as well as to measure the coaching provided by TA providers. All 6 RRTs observed showed that they were using the DI reading programs (Reading Mastery I, Reading Mastery III, and Corrective Reading Decoding B2) with their students in either a 1:1 format or in a small group setting.
Fidelity data, presented below, was collected based on these implementation areas:
- Materials organized and ready: 83% (5/6) Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
- Begins lesson promptly: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Students on task: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Follows steps and script in exercises: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Uses clear signals: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Students respond on signal in a conversational tone: 67% (4/6) Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
·- Allows think time: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Corrects errors : 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Delayed tests for missed items: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Pacing: 83% (5/6) Level 4
In summary, the classroom observation data of the implementation of DI in the Resource Room demonstrated Level 4 or strong implementation in 90% (9/10) of the fidelity indicators. Next steps include examining lesson progress to ensure that lessons are being completed & students are moving at an appropriate pace through the program.

PDSA Classroom Observations (CIS #1, 3. 4. 6, 7)
SSIP principals from the 4 target schools conducted classroom observations & document reviews to determine the level of

implementation of PDSA cycles in grades K-3 to support Improvement Science. The observations showed 97% (59/61) of K-3 teachers in the 4 target schools have implemented a PDSA cycle based on their universal screening data. The two teachers currently not implementing the framework are substitute teachers. This percentage is indicative of Level 4 or strong implementation.

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.

Improvement Science Survey (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
An online survey was conducted in January 2023 to assess the impact of SSIP in the knowledge and skills of teachers in the elements of Improvement Science. Teachers surveyed were K-3 and RRTs from the 4 target schools. The response rate was 83.6% (51/61). Using an agreement scale for the items, categories of Strongly Agree and Agree were used to calculate an overall agreement level about teacher knowledge and skill in the elements of Improvement Science. The results demonstrated the following:
- Data Literacy: 86% (44/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4-Strong Implementation)
- Data-based Decision Making: 86% (44/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4)
- Development of PDSAs: 92% (47/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4).

IEP Case Study Analysis (CIS # 5, 6, 7)
An IEP case study analysis was conducted to collect data on how 2nd grade students with IEPs from the 4 target schools were progressing. The data collected was to assist in determining if students were on-track to meet the SiMR for the next reporting period and to identify areas in need of intensive support. The methodology for the case study centered on conducting IEP file folder reviews. The following information was collected: # minutes for SDI in reading, participation in reading core instruction, Fall '22 universal screening data, and the results of the IEP checklist for PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and SDI statements.

A total of ten 2nd grade students were included in the analysis. 6 students had a specific learning disability, x with multiple disabilities, x with intellectual disability, and x with autism. 7 students were in the general education classroom 80% of the time, 3 students were in the general education classroom 40% to 79% of the time. Four students were receiving their SDI in the general education classroom and 6 were receiving it in the resource room. 8 students had 30 minutes of SDI in reading, x had 25 minutes, and x had 20 minutes. The data from the universal screener revealed that all 10 students were well-below average in ORF which indicates a Level 1 or little or no implementation. For RC, x were on or above benchmark, 6 were average, x were below average, and x were not screened for reading comprehension which indicates a Level 3 or moderate implementation. The results between ORF and RC have no correlation which may be indicative of the way in which RC is administered. The data does not reflect any significant difference between the performance of students receiving SDI in the general education classroom in comparison with students receiving SDI in the resource room.

In the area of quality of PLAAFP & Annual Goals using an IEP checklist tool, the results showed the following:
PLAAFP:
- Current data–70% (7/10): Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
- Valid & reliable assessment–80%(8/10): Level 4
- Measurable & Observable–60% (6/10): Level 3
- Passes the Stranger's Test–60% (6/10): Level 3

Annual Goals
- Aligned with PLAAFP- x% (x/10): Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
- Measurable & Observable–100% (10/10): Level 4
- Passes the Stanger's Test–40% (4/10): Level 2 (Some Implementation)

The case study revealed areas of strength and areas for growth. Areas of strength include: a majority of PLAAFP and Annual Goal statements are measurable and observable; a majority of IEPs included some type of valid and reliable assessments; and the majority of IEPs include current data. Areas for growth include: PLAAFP statements need to be written so it can be understood by the general public and there needs to be alignment in the unit of measurement for the PLAAFP with the annual goal statement.

Teacher Self-Assessment: (CIS # 3, 4, 5, 7)
A teacher self-assessment survey was conducted at the end of SY 2021-2022 to assess the perception of teachers on the implementation of the Science of Reading. The tool used was the How Do I Feel Survey. The survey measured teachers' perceptions on 6 statements related to reading instruction. Teachers rated themselves based on the following Likert scale:
1. Not so clear about this
2. I know a little bit
3. I know about this well
4. I know this well enough to implement in my classroom
5. I have incorporated this in my classroom

67 K-3 teachers completed the survey from the 4 target schools. The implementation items on the survey (#4 and #5) were extrapolated to determine the level of implementation. The data yielded the following results:
1. Reading Big Ideas 49% (33/67) -Level 2
2. Phonemic Awareness 55% (37/67)-Level 3
3. Phonics 63% (42/67) Level 3
4. Fluency 54% (36/67) Level 3
5. Vocabulary 56%(38/67) Level 3

6. Comprehension 56% (38/67) Level 3

In summary, the data on how teachers felt about implementing the 5 Components of Reading Instruction in their classrooms yielded an overall Level 3 or Moderate Implementation.

Parent Interviews (CIS# 2, 7)
Information was gathered from parents on how schools could help families support their children in improving their reading skills and how the COVID-19 pandemic impacted their learning in reading. Telephone interviews were conducted with parents of children with IEPs who attended the 4 target schools. Interviewers asked parents 6 standard questions. Fifty-nine (59) families of students with disabilities across the 4 target schools were identified, and 55 parents were contacted via phone. Of those, 18 (33%) completed the interview. The following provides a summary of the data collected:

Parents who participated in the interview continue to express concern regarding the setbacks their child(ren) have experienced because of the pandemic and virtual learning. Parents expressed worry about both the academic and social emotional impacts that virtual learning has had on their child(ren). Parents reported that online instruction was challenging for students with regards to being able to focus on the computer and understanding instruction that was delivered via the computer. A number of parents reported seeing a regression in their child(ren)'s reading abilities due to the lack of face-to-face instruction and support in the classroom. Parents also discussed the social emotional impacts on their child(ren) as a result of virtual learning.

When asked how the school helped parents to help their child(ren) improve their reading, parents reported schools provided reading materials in appropriate formats as well as provided additional learning tools such as worksheets, flashcards, and other materials specific to the reading curriculum their child was using. Parents also described the strategies teachers and schools used to communicate with parents about their child(ren)'s reading performance. Some examples included using notebooks and journals, emailing information to parents, and using web-based applications such as WhatsApp. Other parents indicated that primary communication with the school and teachers was achieved through student conferences, face to face meetings, or the telephone.

When asked about what additional supports they need from the school, many parents indicated they would like additional materials to help support improving literacy at home. Some suggestions include providing children's books to parents, other materials that support improving reading skills (e.g., letter flashcards, teacher lesson plans that will help parents identify what areas to focus on). Other recommendations included enhancing parent engagement in the classroom, ensuring supply and use of special education teachers, and considerations for implementing other programming such as Direct Instruction (DI).

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

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL on data literacy using the universal screener
- Continued PL on progress monitoring
- Continued observations of the administration of the universal screener to ensure that data is being collected with fidelity.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skills in data-based decision making
- Increased proficiency in administering the universal screener with fidelity
- Increased knowledge and skills in implementing progress monitoring
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching on using data from the universal screener to develop PDSAs
- Continued PL on the selection of EBPs for PDSAs
- Continued PL & coaching on the development of classroom PDSAs
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing classroom PDSAs
- Increased knowledge and skill in selecting EBPs for PDSAs
- Increased implementation of EBPs and interventions for reading
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the district assessment.

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching for RRTs on DI Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Continued PL & coaching on explicit instruction components and how it can be incorporated with the Science of Reading and the school's core curriculum.
- Classroom observations and feedback on the delivery of explicit instruction for RRTs
- Implementation of Lesson Progress Charts to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.
- Monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.

Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in the delivery of explicit instruction through the use of the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching on developing PDSAs centered on the components of reading
- Continued PL & coaching on selecting specific EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading instruction.
- PL & coaching on how the SOR is incorporated in the school's core curriculum.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in the selection of EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing PDSAs centered on the 5 components of reading instruction
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Next Steps:
- Development of a systematic coaching system.
- Continued PL to build the capacity of SpEd and Instructional coaches.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Teachers implement EBPs & interventions learned through PL and coaching with fidelity
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.
- Through coaching, RRTs are knowledgeable and skilled in the development of procedurally and substantively sound IEPs.

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued use of the PLC as a mechanism for the implementation of data-based decision making, PDSAs, and job-embedded PL & coaching.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period
- Teachers are able to use the data from the universal screener to develop a classroom PDSA and to make data-based decisions.
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

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.

The following evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modification to the SSIP:
Areas Demonstrating Strong to Moderate Implementation
1. PDSA Classroom Observations–Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
2. Improvement Science Teacher Survey- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
3. Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading) Observations & Coaching- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
4. Universal Screener Fidelity Observation-Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
5. Professional Learning Surveys–Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
6. Teacher Self- Assessment -Science of Reading (SOR)-Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
7. Parent Interviews

Areas Demonstrating Some Implementation & Little or No Implementation:
1. Universal Screener Benchmark Data–Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
2. IEP File Folder Reviews (Scale-up Schools)--Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
3. SiMR Data –Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)

In summary, the data demonstrates strong implementation in teacher practices. However, the change in teacher practice has not shown the intended impact on student performance. A targeted focus in how these practices are being delivered at the classroom level is critical as a next step for the next reporting period. Continued coaching on the delivery of EBPs to fidelity and progress monitoring need to continue. Leveraging and calibrating supports from Instructional Coaches and SpEd coaches is essential.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents,

from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

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

For this reporting period, there were seven in-person key planning meetings held monthly with personnel from GDOE and the University of Guam CEDDERS to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing the activities outlined in the SSIP through the review of data from aimswebPlus and the observations and fidelity checks of the reading programs implemented in the classrooms. Each meeting was was announced via email as participants were sent calendar invitations for the meetings.

Additionally, there were nine Core Planning Team meetings that are held every third Wednesday of the month. Attendees at these meetings comprised of the SSIP school principals, teacher leaders from each of the SSIP schools, GDOE Instructional Coaches, and parents of children with IEPs enrolled in the SSIP schools. During the Core Team meetings, agenda items included the following:
- results of the previous and current summative and secondary data (aimswebPlus) for the SSIP
- fidelity checks of aimswebPlus administration; fidelity of reading instruction; and SDI observations in the resource rooms
- results of the observations of the fidelity of reading instruction (Reading Mastery program) and the core Reading program
- continued training on PDSA, explicit instruction, and reading strategies
- progress and updates on the revisions of the Theory of Action, the Logic Model, and the Evaluation Plan

During one Core Team meeting, participants conducted a "5 Why's" activity to discuss reasons for little to no improvement with the SIMR. This activity revealed that teachers at the SSIP schools needed more training on the core reading program because the level of knowledge in reading content and skills varied among the schools. In the end, Core Team members, most especially the SSIP Principals, committed to ensuring the teachers in their schools attend all professional learning opportunities geared towards increasing the content knowledge and skills in teaching reading and conduct consistent fidelity checks and observations during reading instruction to ensure there is movement and progress in both the universal screener and the SIMR.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders recognized the need to review and revise the Theory of Action, the Logic Model and the Evaluation Plan to ensure alignment between goals, coherent improvement strategies and activities. Once the revisions were made, the stakeholders felt clarity was provided to validate all efforts put forth into the SSIP.

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.

Activities to be implemented in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR will be focused on continuing the scale-up process. GDOE has scaled-up in two distinct ways this year: through widespread implementation of reading evidence-based practices with the addition of 4 more schools for a total of 8 SSIP schools; and through deep changes in classroom practices with the addition of math evidence-based content strategies. Moreover, the scale-up process will be in conjunction with GDOE's SPDG which establishes a professional development system centered on developing agency, choice, and engagement with stakeholders by utilizing the Leading by Convening framework. The SPDG is also focused on sustainability and the broad implementation of EBPs for reading. For this reporting year, the scale-up process focused on developing and providing support for implementation. This was accomplished through district and school-level professional learning. The scale-up schools are building their knowledge in Improvement Science and EBPs and starting the implementation of PDSAs. The target schools have started building capacity in EBPs for math. However, the math scale-up was paused to reexamine the district's Math curriculum and address the gaps in the selected priority standards. Moving forward, the core tasks for the scale-up process that will be implemented next fiscal year and are related to the SiMR include:
1. Supporting scale-up schools in the implementation of Improvement Science (data literacy, data-based decision making, identification of EBPs).
2. Supporting Resource Room teachers from the scale-up schools in the implementation of EBP supplemental interventions in reading for students with IEPs.
3. Conducting a math curriculum audit.

Other activities unrelated to the scale-up process include supporting schools in the use of EBPs for family engagement through the use of the resource from the Institute of Education Sciences, Supporting Family Engagement in Foundational Reading Skills.

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

1. Supporting scale-up schools in the implementation of Improvement Science (data literacy, data-based decision making, identification of EBPs)
Timeline: February 2023 to February 2024
Expected outcomes:
- Teachers at scale-up schools will have increased knowledge and skill in data literacy and data-based decision making.
- Teachers at scale-up schools will develop a PDSA cycle.
- Students from the scale-up schools will be proficient reading as measured by the universal screener & the district-wide assessment

Data collection:
- Teacher survey
- Classroom observations & document reviews
- Universal screening & district-wide assessment data–to be reported in FFY2022

2. Supporting Resource Room teachers (RRTs) from the scale-up schools in the implementation of EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for students with IEPs.
Timeline: February 2023 to February 2024
Expected Outcomes:
- RRTs have increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading.
- RRTs are implementing EBP supplemental interventions with fidelity.
- Students with IEPs from the scale-up schools will be proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener & the district-wide assessment
Data collection:
- Teacher survey
- Fidelity classroom observations
- Universal screening & district-wide assessment data–to be reported in FFY2022

3. Conducting a math curriculum audit.
Timeline: February 2023-May 2023
Expected Outcomes:
- Identification of learning gaps in the district's math curriculum
Data collection:
- Completion of curriculum audit

4. Supporting schools in the use of EBPs for family engagement through the use of the resource from the Institute of Education Sciences, Supporting Family Engagement in Foundational Reading Skills.
Timeline: February 2023-May 2023
Expected Outcomes:
- Increased percentage of SSIP schools that implement family engagement strategies for improving reading
- Increased percentage of families who perceive they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home in the community
Data collection:
- Family survey and/or interviews

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

Implementation of a Core Reading Program
A root causes analysis was conducted with grade-levels in the scale-up schools and SSIP principals to identify possible causes for the poor performance of students in reading. The "Five Whys" and the "Fish-bone diagram" improvement tools were used in the analysis. The root cause analysis revealed that schools were struggling with the lack of a guaranteed and viable reading program. The district recently adopted the "Journeys" reading program. However, the implementation of the program is patchwork with some schools using the program only as a supplemental resource. In addition, teachers noted a lack of training provided by the district in the implementation of the program.
Steps to address this barrier include working with the "Journeys" vendor to provide professional learning on how to effectively use the program for core instruction. In addition, overlaying the program with explicit instruction strategies so teachers can implement the program explicitly despite a lack of training in the program. Also, targeted monitoring by school administrators in the implementation of the program to ensure teachers are implementing essential practices well.

Recruitment and retention of certified teachers
This reporting period saw continued vacancies for certified teachers for both special education and general education. Though the amount of vacancies has decreased from the last reporting period, it is still an ongoing concern. One SSIP school is still waiting for a permanent special education teacher. In the general education category, currently there are 7 teacher vacancies at the SSIP target schools with 3 of the 7 vacancies in grades K-3. GDOE has addressed this barrier by leveraging district personnel such as SpEd coaches, service providers, and instructional coaches to cover vacant classes to address the teacher shortage. This strategy addresses the "symptoms" of the problem but does not tackle the underlying cause of the lack of certified teachers. Tackling this barrier involves community collaboration to determine what supports teachers need to stay in the teaching profession. This will involve working with GDOE's teacher mentors and with community leaders

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

It should be noted that although aimswebPlus can be predictive of performance in the summative assessment, the data from the screener demonstrates that proficiency in aimswebPlus has not correlated with success in the summative assessment. As an example, in Spring '22, 28% of 3rd graders at the SSIP target schools scored at the 45th percentile & above in ORF in aimswebPlus. However, on the summative assessment (ACT Aspire), only 9%-21% of all 3rd graders at the 4 target schools were proficient in reading. For all 3rd grade students in GDOE, the district proficiency rate was 13%. Two SSIP schools surpassed the district's overall average with 21% at SSIP School 1 & 14% at SSIP School 4. Also, the data for all SSIP schools were higher than in FFY2018 (pre-pandemic) in which only 5%-9% of all 3rd graders in the SSIP schools were proficient in reading. In stark contrast, for this reporting period, x% of students with IEPs were proficient in reading which was the same in FFY2018. Hence, as general education students continue to make progress despite the impact of the pandemic, students with IEPs continue to demonstrate low

performance in reading—pre and post pandemic. The data collected show that the gap widens as students move up grade-levels. In reviewing other data sources such as the IEP, it is evident that the SDI for students with IEPs needs to be clearly outlined to ensure the unique needs of students are addressed. To change the trajectory of students with IEPs, GDOE recognizes that there needs to be a shift from a procedural focus to a more substantive basis that builds the capacity of Special Education teachers in identifying and delivering effective Specially Designed Instruction. Instruction is essentially "where the rubber meets the road". As Anita Archer, expert in explicit instruction, acknowledged, "the magic is in the instruction". Moving forward, the next steps that GDOE has set forth in this report provides a targeted focus on the instruction that students with IEPs are receiving to ensure it is effective and incorporates the use of EBPs and interventions. Moreover, GDOE will work to ensure that teachers are systematically monitoring the progress of students with IEPs through the PDSA cycle and are adapting instruction, based on the data, to meet the emerging needs of students.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2021 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

17 - Required Actions