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

Illinois

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 percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase.

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)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The current theory of action is on the ISBE website: www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-17.aspx.

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
2018	9.97%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs Scoring at or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,632	18,741	7.06%	10.00%	8.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specification FS178.

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

ISBE utilizes data on all 4th grade children with IEPs from the EDFacts file specification FS 178 to measure progress toward the SiMR. Specifically, ISBE analyzes data from the Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) to determine how many 4th grade children with IEPs scored at or above proficient on this regular assessment. Then ISBE determines whether the current FFY target was met based on the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient as compared to the number of students who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned.

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.

In addition to the primary source of data used to demonstrate progress toward the SiMR (statewide assessment data), ISBE's evaluation plan includes the following additional data collected: Professional development post surveys, Evidence-Based Professional Development Worksheets, The Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (Illinois IFI), systems screening tools, State Capacity Assessments, and Regional Capacity Assessments. Professional development post surveys are administered to gather data regarding participant perceptions of their own growth in both knowledge and skills, the likelihood of their implementing in their classrooms what was learned, and their perception of the effect of professional development experience upon the success of their students with disabilities. Evidence-based professional development worksheets provide data for clear expectations for the providers and trainers of the professional development; accountability for the quality of the professional development and coaching, the utilization of effective, research-based adult learning methodology, and the collection of data with high fidelity to the objectives. The Illinois IFI collects qualitative and quantitative data on how the training is implemented in specific classrooms. Systems screening tools allow the Illinois Elevating Special Educators (IESE) Network and districts to ascertain the needs of districts within each of the identified areas of the state so that the work of the program advisor can target the needs of the districts. The IESE Network is a statewide system of professional learning funded by a five-year IDEA Part D State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The overall goal of the Network is to improve outcomes for students with IEPs by providing tiered professional development and technical assistance to the educators supporting these students. The Network supports special educators through research-based professional development, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching. The SSIP outcomes are aligned with the SPDG outcomes. State and regional capacity assessments measure the capacity the state and the region have to implement the IESE Network, with the expectation that capacity will grow over the years of the SPDG, which includes perceptions about resources, leadership, data systems, and communication. Data that have been collected at this time include post-professional development surveys, evidence-based professional development worksheets, systems screening tools, the State Capacity Assessment completed in October 2022, and Regional Capacity Assessments completed in February and September 2022.

IAR Data from 2020-2021
In the May 2022 SPDG Annual Performance Report to OSEP, IAR baseline data was included on measures of student achievement and success: (1) IAR data for students with disabilities, comparing the data of those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities (and, therefore, SSIP activities) with the statewide averages; and (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from those students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those who were not. While all educators in the state have the ability to access universal supports (at a minimum), not all educators choose to do so. These data are considered a baseline to be used as a comparative measure for Spring 2023 IAR data.

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)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

The current evaluation plan is on the ISBE website: www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-17.aspx.

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.

Instead of using the RESET Rubrics as the measure of implementation, the IESE Network developed an individualized instrument, the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (Illinois IFI), to measure fidelity of implementation to better meet the specific needs of the IESE Network.

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

The RESET Rubrics are designed to measure the implementation of evidence-based practices and are strong and validated instruments. The professional development provided through the IESE Network aligns with High Leverage Practices; however, the RESET rubrics are based upon specific evidenced-based practices which are evidenced in many of the professional development sessions offered by the IESE Network, but not all. Therefore, it was necessary to find or develop an instrument that aligned with all of the professional development occurring through the IESE Network. The Illinois IFI, developed by the SPDG/IESE Project

Evaluator and approved by the IESE Leadership and the OSEP SPDG Program Director, allows for a broader scope of professional development applications with fidelity.

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

The SSIP improvement strategy addresses providing educators with differentiated professional learning activities (training, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching) focused on literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development and improvement. Activities associated with the improvement strategy focus on delivering research-based professional learning activities to 1) enhance the effectiveness of staff who support students with disabilities and 2) build seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners. ISBE collaborates with the IESE Network to address the improvement strategy and activities. The Network divides the state into five regions, with an IESE Network Program Advisor leading each of the regions. With the district's LEA Determination in mind, the Program Advisors utilize a universal screening tool and collaborative analysis guide to identify the needs of each district. Then differentiated supports that target those district needs directly are planned, implemented, and assessed. The IESE Network screening tool focuses on helping districts identify the factors related to the lack of progress for any identified indicator, while the collaborative analysis guide helps facilitate a deeper dive into the root cause of low performance for each identified indicator. This infrastructure design allows each area team to identify and plan differentiated support for the districts in their assigned area. By using this process in conjunction with the assessment tools, the IESE Network team can gain stakeholder input at the local level as well base services on data to determine the individual needs of each district.

Districts that are designated as Meets Requirements or Needs Assistance through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 1 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists make contact with Tier 1 districts in one of two ways. First, IESE Network Staff send informational emails to all Tier 1 districts. Districts can request more information from that email. Also, Tier 1 districts can inquire about supports and services through an online referral form on the IESE Network website. An IESE Network Program Advisor will reach out to the entity to set up a meeting. If Tier 1 districts agree to partner and want individualized support, IESE Network staff meets with district and building leaders to review data and make recommendations on the most relevant and valuable resources to include in a professional learning plan. The IESE Network currently supports 32 Tier 1 Districts. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported 18 Tier 1 districts.

Districts that are designated as Needs Assistance for Two or More Consecutive Years through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 2 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. Tier 2 districts are advised of state and national technical assistance resources that may help them address the area(s) for which they need support. The IESE Network is one of the available resources. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported three Tier 2 districts using the districts' improvement plans as the foundation for their services. Services for these districts continue this school year.

Districts that are designated as Needs Intervention, Needs Intervention for Three or More Consecutive Years, or Needs Substantial Intervention through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 3 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. The IESE Network collaborates with ISBE staff to facilitate improvement planning and provide individualized oversight, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching support. The IESE Network is currently supporting one Tier 3 district, using the district's improvement plans as the foundation for their services. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported two Tier 3 districts. Services for these districts continue.

To monitor the integrity and implementation of this process, the IESE Network Grant Coordinator meets with each area team once a week and the statewide team once a week. During these meetings, IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists report on the progress being made in each Continuous Improvement Agreement with districts. The grant evaluator attends these meetings to review area wide and statewide data with the team. She also collaborates with each team as they are creating their improvement plans with districts, so data collection procedures and timelines are met. Data from current mentoring sessions and/or professional learning sessions is also reviewed and used to plan future sessions. The ISBE Program Director also attends the statewide IESE Network Team meetings.

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.

Short-term outcomes focused on increasing knowledge of literacy, social-emotional learning (SEL), and systems development and improvement through the systems framework area of professional development (PD) and/or technical assistance. Surveys were administered for each area. Participants indicated whether the statements were evident to no extent (1), a small extent (2), some extent (3), or a significant extent (4). Four literacy trainings serving 66 special educators and two conference sessions were delivered. Sessions covered strategies for phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension across grade spans and tiers. Surveys indicated that educators perceived increased knowledge (M=3.35, SD .67), increased understanding of content (M=3.31, SD=.62), increased ability to apply knowledge (M=3.42, SD=.61), and the intent to incorporate knowledge into teaching (M=3.50, SD=.62). They believed the PD would increase student success (M=3.44, SD=.62).

Educators also reported on their level of content knowledge pre- and post-training on a 0-100 scale (0 = no knowledge and 100 = complete knowledge). There was a significant increase in perceptions about level of knowledge prior to the training (M=69.11, SD=23.59) as compared to after (M=83.94, SD=15.36) (t(46)=6.911, p<.001). A second question addressed PD strategy implementation. There was a significant increase in perceptions about implementation of content from before the training (M=66.91,

SD=24.67) as compared to after (M=85.11, SD=14.69) (t(46)=6.367, p<.001).

Fourteen SEL sessions were held for 387 educators, one session was held for 268 paraprofessionals, and three conference sessions were delivered. A training video was also created for a large district. Sessions addressed behavioral and executive functions, trauma-informed practices, positive relationships, relationship building, and function-based classroom and individual interventions. Educators perceived that PD increased their knowledge of students with disabilities (M=3.30, SD=.71) or increased their understanding of content (M=3.24, SD=.70). Participants reported an increase in the ability to apply the knowledge (M=3.33, SD=.69) and incorporate it into their teaching (M=3.45, SD=.66). Participants believed that the PD would increase student success (M=3.36, SD=.65). Educators also reported on their level of content knowledge pre- and post-training on a scale between 0-100. There was a significant increase in perceptions about their level of SEL knowledge prior to the training (M=62.54, SD=23.64) as compared to after (M=81.47, SD=14.19) (t(156)=12.094, p<.001). A second question addressed implementing the PD strategies. There was a significant increase in perceptions about the implementation of the content from before the training (M=62.71, SD=24.12) as compared to after (M=82.36, SD=14.31) (t(156)=12.327, p<.001). Paraprofessionals who participated in training indicated that it increased their knowledge (M=2.86, SD=.75) or understanding of content (M=2.81, SD=.84), increased their ability to apply this knowledge (M=2.87, SD=.84), incorporate it into their practice (M=3.12, SD=.78), and evaluate and adjust their practice (M=2.87, SD=.84). SEL was also a topic of online PD for early career special educators. They reported the PD would contribute to student success (M=3.37, SD=.69), contribute to better communication with parents (M=3.22, SD=.70), and increase the likelihood of remaining in their position (M=3.19, SD=.68).

Forty-two systems development and improvement trainings for 874 educators and one training for 401 paraprofessionals addressed inclusive practices, high leverage practices in special education, IEP goals, and paraprofessional roles and responsibilities. A systems training video was also created for a large district. Participants reported increased knowledge (M=3.16, SD=.81), increased understanding of content (M=3.13, SD=.80), and increased application to practice. They believed they increased their ability to apply the knowledge to their teaching (M=3.15, SD=.82); to reflect upon, evaluate, and adjust their teaching (M=3.22, SD=.81); and the likelihood that the knowledge would be incorporated into and affect their teaching (M=3.25, SD=.78). They reported that the PD would increase student success (M=3.23, SD=.83). Participants reported on their level of systems knowledge pre- and post-training on a scale between 0-100. There was significant growth in both knowledge of content and intent to implement. Prior to PD, participants reported lower perceptions of their content knowledge (M=67.57, SD=22.66) as compared to after (M=81.18, SD=17.34) (t(852)=22.565, p<.001). Prior to PD, they reported lower levels of implementation of the content into their classrooms (M=69.98, SD=22.06) than after, where they reported significantly higher intentions to implement what was learned (M=82.96, SD=16.94) (t(852)=22.250, p<.001).

Intermediate outcomes focused on the implementation of seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners through the systems framework area of PD and/or technical assistance. IESE Network staff met with districts to establish partnerships and identify support based on ISBE LEA Determinations and other data. Network staff used Learning Forward's PD standards and the High-Quality PD Checklist to implement research-based professional learning experiences. Network staff worked with districts in a train-the-trainer model for sustainability of professional learning and seamless delivery of services. Two instruments developed by the State Implementation and Scaling-up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center were used to measure systems: the Regional Capacity Assessment (RCA) and State Capacity Assessment (SCA). The SCA uses a consensus model of data collection that incorporates qualitative and quantitative data to determine if statements about the capacity for the Network to effectively enact its innovations is (0) not present; (1) partially present; or (2) fully present. SCA data collected in September 2021 and October 2022 noted significant growth in the capacity of the Network to implement effective innovations across the state in all three categories. Leadership data increased from 50% to 88.89%, Infrastructure & Resources data from 83.30% to 91.67%, and Communication & Engagement data from 55.60% to 88.89%. The RCA similarly measures capacity but focuses on the region versus the state. The RCA was conducted with all five regional teams in February 2022 and September 2022. All regions made significant gains in the capacity to implement the Network initiatives. Leadership data improved from 64.29% to 97.14%, Competency from 40% to 66.67%, Organization from 35.56% to 62.22%, and Stage-Based Functioning from 50% to 90%. Overall RCA percentages improved from 45.71% to 75.36%.

Intermediate outcomes also focused on enhancing the effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities via coaching and mentoring. Surveys indicated level of agreement to statements about literacy support received through the IESE Network. Levels of agreement were chosen from a six-point scale: strongly disagree (1); disagree (2); slightly disagree (3); slightly agree (4); agree (5); or strongly agree (6). All participants agreed that the mentoring and coaching increased their knowledge and understanding of content (M=5.33, SD=.58), had been directly applied to their classroom (M=5.67, SD=.58), and positively affected student success (M=5.33, SD=.58). Network staff are coaching 25 educators in literacy, 43 in SEL, and 48 in systems and are mentoring 31 educators in literacy, 59 in SEL, and 61 in systems.

With special educators having increased knowledge, reflecting upon that knowledge to incorporate it into their practice, applying it to their teaching, and believing that it will increase their students' success, it is anticipated that this will positively affect SiMR percentages.

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

NO

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

Next steps for the infrastructure improvement strategy include continuing to collect data to determine the effects of the differentiated professional development (PD) upon multiple measures of student achievement and success, as well as to grow the capacity of the

IESE Network to implement effective educational innovations. The infrastructure improvement strategies of the Network are expected to affect the achievement and success of students with disabilities in all partnering schools. This will be measured with (1) IAR data for students with disabilities, comparing the data of those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities with the statewide averages; (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from those students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those who were not; (3) student attendance data; and (4) student suspension/expulsion data, again examining whether any differences are evident between those who had educators who were participating in the IESE Network as compared to state averages. The data help inform whether the SSIP intermediate outcomes of enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities and improved outcomes for students with disabilities are met. The expectation is that the activities of the IESE Network will affect student achievement, as measured by the IAR scores.

Another step toward infrastructure improvement uses RCA and SCA data to identify clear next steps toward growing in the capacity to implement effective educational innovations both at the State and Regional levels. Data from SCA and RCA administrations were shared with the IESE Network Leadership Team at a retreat in May 2022, and again in quarterly in-person meetings on 3 October and 16 December 2022, The Network Leadership Team met to review the data and discuss the next steps toward improvement based upon the data. The Network Leadership team will meet again in March and May 2023 to review data, discuss adjustments, and plan next steps. Below are the next steps that will be addressed by the Network Leadership Team by its next quarterly meeting in March 2023. The following action steps were presented to the Network Leadership Team on October 3, 2022, with the expectation that they will be addressed and reflected in the administration of the SCA in March 2023:

1. Communication of an Overarching Data Plan. Although the Network has improved in the areas of data collection, analysis, and reporting, a next step by 17 March 2023 needs to be the communication of an overarching data plan that is cohesive with the statewide vision, yet applicable in all of the individual Areas.

2. Clarity of Roles and Expectations. Although the Network has clearly identified roles, functions, and structures for its members, these are not as clearly defined for the Regional Specialists who are hired by the Regional Offices of Education (ROEs). A next step is for the Grant Coordinator to meet with each of the sub-granting ROEs to clarify the structure of responsibility, training, roles, guidance, and supervision of the Regional Specialists. These meetings occurred in January 2023 and will occur quarterly through the life of the grant.

3. Enhance communication and engagement with statewide stakeholder groups. Although the Grant Coordinator and Project Director are in regular communication with stakeholders, the Network Leadership Team has limited awareness of these conversations. A next step is to clearly define the stakeholders who are involved in designing solutions alongside the Network, at both the state level and the regional level. Finally, communication to the entire Network, at the in-person quarterly meetings about how these stakeholders are provided information, given feedback, engaged in dialogue, and addressing any barriers to effective communication.

Following the administration of the RCA, participants were asked to consider action steps based upon the conversations surrounding the items of the RCA. Below are action steps that were identified by IESE Network staff in almost all of the respective Areas to be completed by the administration of the five RCAs throughout the month of February 2023.

1. Establishment of a Coaching System. Although a coaching system is identified in each of the Areas, the use of a delivery plan to support district implementation teams and the collection of coaching effectiveness data are not in place. The next step is for the Network to engage in conversations and planning about what this would look like in each of the Areas, given the capacity provided by the resources in existence.

2. Establishment of a Fidelity Instrument for PD Application. The HQPD Checklist is a good fidelity instrument to determine the quality of the PD being provided, but there does not exist a fidelity instrument to measure how well the PD provided is being applied at the point of the student. Every one of the Areas across the IESE Network identified this as being "partially in place," or "not in place." A next step is the development of the Illinois IFI (which has been completed and is currently being piloted across the Network).

3. Updates to the IESE Network Handbook. Several items from the Area RCA administrations indicated updates that are needed to the IESE Network Handbook that would address identified deficiencies in regional capacity. These include:

i. Identification of Executive Leader and Coordinator Persons. Areas clearly identified the Program Coordinator as the "Coordinator," but were varied in the person they identified as the "Executive Leader." In January 2023, these roles have been clarified via meetings the Grant Coordinator had with each of the Area teams.

ii. Regional Specialist Roles and Responsibilities. Areas were clear on the reporting structure and job descriptions of the Program Advisors, but not the Regional Specialists. They reported that the reporting structure, responsibility for writing professional learning plans, and responsibility for training new Regional Specialists were partially in place and not in writing. Using the current role descriptions, Network Area Teams further defined, in writing, each role specific to their area. Regional Specialists were provided with a template for writing professional learning plans and identified training will be provided through the grant.

iii. Clarify Process of Communicating with the SEA on Policy Relevant Information. A written, short paragraph in the Handbook on how the Network Areas communicate policy relevant information to the SEA/ISBE, as well as discuss it among the Network Leadership Team would address this item. The process for communicating with the SEA was discussed at the December quarterly meeting as well as written in the IESE Handbook.

The above information was shared with the Grant Coordinator and the Project Director, as well as with the IESE Network Leadership Team. The RCA will be conducted twice a year with each of the statewide areas of the Network, with the next one scheduled to occur in February 2023. The expectation is that through data collected via both instruments, and reflection upon that data resulting in implementing change in the state and regional capacities of the Network, these are clear strategies to improvements in infrastructure.

The SPDG Annual Performance Report (APR) and/or current data is shared with members at each of the quarterly meetings. The members have provided insight into issues impacting districts, educators, and families. Numerous suggestions from council members have been adopted by the Network Leadership team. Renewed efforts and changes to the IESE Network activities occur with Advisory Council input, and results will continue to be brought before the Council on a regular basis.

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

Last cycle, educators participated in professional learning activities to increase their knowledge and enhance their effectiveness in the following areas related to literacy and social-emotional learning based on area and district need:

? Early Literacy Instructional Delivery: The Big 5 (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension)
? Reading and Writing Interventions: IXL, Read 180, Reading Plus, Read Naturally, Lexia Core 5, SPIRE
? Social/Emotional Learning: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Framework

The SSIP continued to focus on implementing evidence-based practices in early literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development. However, the number of trainings held, and evidence-based practices covered increased. Educators participated in these activities throughout the year to increase knowledge and skills in the following areas based on need:

? Explicit Instruction
? High Leverage Practices in Special Education (Collaboration, Assessment, Instruction, Social/Emotional/Behavioral Supports)
? Early Literacy Instruction (phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension)
? Literacy Standards and Curriculum Evaluation
? Reading and Writing Interventions
? Literacy within MTSS
? Science of Reading/Structured Literacy/Scarborough's Rope
? Social-Emotional Learning: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Framework
? CASEL's Theory of Action for Effective SEL Implementation
? Understanding Functions of Behavior - Function-Based Behavioral Interventions, Managing vs. Changing Behavior
? Trauma-Informed Practices - ACES
? Building Positive Relationships (effects of anger, emotional competence, crisis communication, active listening)
? Positive and Consistent Classroom Management
? Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation strategies

During conversations with partnering districts, entities, and the IESE Network Advisory Council, systems improvement was identified as a high district need. Without adequate, effective, and efficient systems in place, early literacy and social-emotional learning can be impacted. Literacy and SEL are also often embedded within other systems. For instance, literacy implementation examples are included within inclusive practice professional learning opportunities. SEL is also discussed as an imperative educational environment consideration within UDL and Differentiation. Therefore, the number of trainings may not adequately represent how often Literacy and SEL are discussed.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

High Leverage Practices in Special Education include the following domains: Collaboration, Assessment, Instruction, and Social/Emotional/Behavioral. With educators' consistent use, HLPs have been shown to increase outcomes for students with disabilities. Professional learning provided fell under these domains through evidence-based practices. Early literacy instructional delivery includes addressing foundational skill standards (The Big Five), phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The IESE early literacy training follows the Science of Reading, Structured Literacy, and Scarborough's Reading Rope as a specific framework for improving instructional delivery of the foundational skills for learning to read. Instructional delivery such as explicit instruction was also provided. These trainings are available in all three tiers of support. At Tier 1, IESE delivered overviews of evidence-based practices in early literacy to small groups of educators, schools, or districts as requested. Participants had already received training on early literacy instruction and needed a general overview of the components. Schools or districts that needed more detailed sessions on parts of early literacy instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to implement early literacy instructional strategies. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis.

Reading and writing interventions are multi-tiered approaches to the early identification and support of students with learning needs in these areas. Training sessions covering reading and writing interventions included phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Some of these techniques included Focus on vowels, CVC Words, Word Slide, Sound it out in your head, Nonsense words, Review and Repetition, chunking, visual cues, pattern searching, read to partners, highlighting, think alouds, annotating, and others. Writing interventions further focused on critical thinking, syntax, text structure, mechanics, and spelling. Each of these techniques is research based for early literacy and intervention instructional methods.

Social-emotional learning (SEL) is a methodology that helps students of all ages better comprehend their emotions, feel those emotions fully, and demonstrate empathy for others. This includes self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. Some techniques included in the SEL trainings were for adults to use while others were for students to learn to use. All techniques are based on behavioral science research and taken from universal trainings such as Therapeutic Crisis Intervention, Positive Behavior Facilitation, De-escalation, Active Listening, Emotional Competence, Trauma-Informed Practices (Adverse Childhood Experiences), and Effective Interventions for Behaviors (disruptive, aggressive, and violent). Positive relationships are the basis for social-emotional learning and were covered in all trainings. Behavioral functions were presented to recognize educators' own behaviors as well as why students may act in various ways. Function-based classroom and individual interventions were reviewed. Also included in this training is how to effectively implement an SEL framework (CASEL) in a building or district, which requires a systematic plan that infuses social-emotional and academic learning throughout the school day. Much like the tiers of support for literacy, Tier 1 support consisted of overviews of evidence-based practices in SEL to small groups of educators, schools, or districts that requested it. These participants came from districts with an SEL Framework in place and needed a general review of the components. Schools or districts that needed a series of more detailed sessions on SEL instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. At this tier, IESE also helped districts analyze discipline data to

determine the areas of SEL for training focus. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to infuse SEL into their academic instruction. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis.

Systems development and improvement evidence-based practices include UDL and Differentiation. While UDL is a framework for designing instruction for a broad range of learners, Differentiation is considering different learners in lesson delivery. To effectively reach more students, educators should also consider adaptations (accommodations and modifications) needed based on individual student characteristics, preferences and needs.

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.

Early literacy continues to be the main focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on early literacy instructional delivery (the Big 5) as well as on reading and writing interventions. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding literacy. With increased educator knowledge in literacy, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. Early literacy acquisition is vital to learning. When students have access to high quality, evidence-based early literacy instruction, they learn to read in K-2, and by 4th grade, they can transition from learning to read to reading to learn. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented academic evidence-based practices. It also relates to the long-term outcome, or SiMR, which states, "The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase." Professional development on early literacy has been provided to teachers around the state through Tier 1, district, or area wide meetings. These trainings included presentation of the four foundational skills of early literacy: print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency. Once the instructional strategies of these basic concepts are understood, training continues to include building comprehension skills. Research from the last decade has repeatedly indicated the need for these foundational concepts, which are vital for early literacy success.

Social-emotional learning continues to be a secondary focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on social-emotional learning based on the CASEL framework. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding social-emotional learning. With increased educator knowledge in social-emotional learning, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. CASEL cites research indicating when students can self-regulate emotions, this translates into the classroom, which supports them in focusing on academic learning. Hundreds of studies offer consistent evidence that SEL bolsters academic performance. When students have positive self-perceptions, feel connected to the school, and can express their feelings in productive ways, they are more comfortable taking academic risks and accepting feedback on their work. SEL supports acquisition of academic skills throughout a student's school career. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented environmental evidence-based practices.

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

There are two identified instruments used to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change: the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Checklist and the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (IFI).

HQPD Checklist
The High-Quality Professional Development checklist is used for each of the professional development sessions held throughout the IESE Network to ensure that the professional development provided meets the quality standards in Illinois. While creating and refining professional development, IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists consider each HQPD indicator and complete the checklist after implementation. The Project Evaluator reviews compiled data and shares them with the IESE Network Leadership Team and IESE Advisory Council. Data are used to reflect on current practices and plan for needed adjustments. The Project Evaluator also reports this data to ISBE and OSEP. Data for the HQPD Checklist was available as of the end of November 2022. Data continues to be collected through February 2023 for the May 2023 SPDG reporting period. SSIP data is a part of this SPDG data collection and will be reported in next year's SSIP. The data showed that 77% of professional development was delivered with 90% fidelity (the SPDG performance measure is 90% of professional development delivered with 90% fidelity). The data was shared with the IESE Network Leadership Team at its quarterly meeting in December 2022, with discussion about the data identifying items which are most problematic for high quality professional development:
? Content builds on or relates to participants' previous professional development.
? Includes opportunities for participants to apply content and/or practice skills during training.
? Engages participants in assessment of their acquisition of knowledge and skills.
? Details follow-up activities that require participants to apply their learning; and
?   Describes opportunities for coaching to improve fidelity of implementation.
The IESE Network Leadership Team discussed ways to better address these in the professional development being provided. Data will continue to be collected through February 2023 for the May 2023 SPDG reporting period.

In addition to using the HQPD Checklist to ensure fidelity of high-quality professional development, the Illinois IFI was developed by the IESE Network Leadership and reviewed and approved by the OSEP SPDG program director for use toward ensuring fidelity of implementation of the professional development received. The IFI collects data from individuals who have participated in the training sessions offered by the IESE Network. There are three quantitative questions, each followed by an open-ended qualitative question,

asking about:

1. whether and to what extent the elements from the training session were implemented into their classroom and professional practice.
2. perspectives of the effect that implementation of the training elements had upon their students with disabilities; and
3. a reflection regarding how they plan to incorporate these elements, long-term, into their professional practice.

The IFI is currently being piloted for training occurring from November 2022 through February 2023. The data collected during this pilot period, including response rates, will be reviewed by the IESE Network leadership to determine its effectiveness in measuring fidelity of implementation and whether changes need to be made in order to increase its validity and reliability for future use. As of the time of this report, there has been a 26.32% response rate to the IFI from participants of the professional development provided by the IESE Network in December 2022. Since the IFI is sent out 3 weeks following the PD, this response rate is likely to increase. Of those who responded, 97.9% reported that all (37.0%) or some (60.9%) of the professional development strategies were applied. Seventy-seven percent believed that the PD that was implemented positively affected student success and/or engagement, and almost half of the participants (48.9%) plan to FULLY incorporate the PD strategies with few or no changes, with an additional 13.3% planning to fully implement it with some significant tweaks. This is preliminary data that is still being collected through PD completed in February 2023.

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.

For all professional development offered through the IESE Network, a post professional development survey is required. QuickReports are sent each Monday to the IESE Program Advisors and Regional Specialists who review the responses and adjust content for future professional development sessions. These are also used for remote mentoring sessions, administrative academies, and cohort mentoring groups that are occurring across the state. The distributed surveys include questions about participant perceptions of the professional development content, application to the curriculum or pedagogy of the educator, their intention in implementing it, and their own growth in understanding the content. Questions also are designed to ask about what participants knew prior to engaging in professional development and what they know after participation, both about content knowledge and classroom implementation. Finally, some questions that are aligned to the identified performance measures of the SPDG which are also connected to the SiMR include: perceptions of how this professional development will affect student achievement, how well it enhanced their ability to connect this information to parents and families, and whether participating in these types of sessions contributes to the likeliness of their remaining a special educator in the state of Illinois. Current data support the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

While this data is currently being collected, the data collection that encompasses the entire SPDG year is still in progress. Once the data is fully collected and reviewed in April 2023, decisions about the need to address activities of the IESE Network will be made after reviewing the data. This additional information would be included in the FFY22 SSIP. A focus will be placed upon the connections between the independent variables (professional development, mentoring, coaching, and technical assistance) and the dependent variable (student IAR data) to determine whether correlations have been found between them. Second, the data from each of the IESE Network activities will be reviewed considering the strengths and the weaknesses that the data provide, discussing both and why those numbers may be what they are. Particular attention will be paid to the initial baseline data from the fidelity measures of the High-Quality Professional Development Checklist and the Illinois IFI, discussing how these, and possibly other measures, can be utilized. Finally, and most important, data will be shared with the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of stakeholders from all contributors to the education process, seeking perspectives that those individuals more closely involved in the IESE Network may not see or identify. From continued data collection, decisions will be made about continued use of practices and ways in which to add/change evidence-based practices.

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

In April 2023, the data from the post professional development surveys, the State Capacity Assessment Tool, the Regional Capacity Assessment Tool, the Illinois IFI, and the High-Quality Professional Development Checklists will be reviewed to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the IESE Network activities. The data will then be viewed through the lens of the multiple measures of student achievement. Taken together, these will enable the IESE Network to make data-based decisions on the next steps for the following year(s)of the SSIP. The post-professional development surveys will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine the extent to which the professional development, the mentoring cohorts, and the remote professional development conversations have contributed to perceptions of content knowledge gains, applications into classrooms, and further understanding of research-based practices and their effects upon student achievement. The State and Regional Capacity Assessments will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine whether the leadership, communication, data sharing, and resources need changes in order to provide the state team and the regional teams with the capacity to continue to expand the initiatives of the IESE Network across the state of Illinois. Finally, the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of a wide range of stakeholder supporters, will review the data at their regular meetings and provide extensive feedback and direction to the next steps of the IESE Network. The IESE Network is a statewide initiative that involves a great number of people and organizations, each of which has a claim in contributing to the success of the students with disabilities across the state of Illinois. It is the intent and plan of the IESE Network Leadership Team to lean upon these resources to use data to make the best decisions possible for Illinois students.

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 assessment instruments that are being used by the IESE Network project evaluator to determine the extent to which the Network is meeting its stated outcomes are providing data that identifies the strengths and next steps toward improvement for the SPDG. Data from the administration of both the State Capacity Assessment and the Regional Capacity Assessment have indicated that the capacity for the state and the region to implement the effective educational innovations identified by the IESE Network are strong, as well as uncovering areas of improvement, as described in previous SSIP sections. The HQPD Checklist provides data on the quality of the professional development being provided through the members of the IESE Network leadership team, as measured against a validated instrument regularly used and recommended by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. This instrument, in partnership with data from the post-PD surveys provides data on the quality and perceptions of the professional development provided across the state. As reported, the data from these instruments are reviewed and discussed in weekly Quick Reports to the IESE Network areas, in bi-weekly meetings of the IESE Network leadership team, in quarterly in-person meetings of the IESE Network leadership team, and in annual IESE Network leadership retreats, always with the eye of using the data to make next-step decisions about providing support throughout the state of Illinois to elevating special educators. Finally, the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument was recently developed and is being piloted to collect data on how the high-quality professional development across the state of Illinois is being implemented in the classrooms of those who participated in the support provided by the IESE Network. Data from the administration of this instrument will be shared and discussed in order to determine next steps for increasing the implementation of evidence-based practices in our state's classrooms. Based upon the data provided throughout this report, the IESE Network and ISBE do not believe any changes are necessary at this time in implementing the SSIP.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:
•Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
•Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
•Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
•Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
•Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
•Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education
Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. It is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.

ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Date regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicits input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Council, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council provides broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, ISAC, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

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

ISBE engages with the SPDG/IESE Advisory Council as the main stakeholder group for SPP Indicator 17. ISBE met with the Council on February 3, 2022, to provide a report on the SSIP. An overview of the SPP was provided before taking a deeper dive into SPP Indicator 17 (SSIP) and its focus. The SSIP improvement strategy and its corresponding activities were reviewed with the group. The theory of action, logic model, and improvement plan/evaluation plan were also discussed. One stakeholder asked about SSIP targets, and those were explained in more detail for the Council. Stakeholder input and feedback indicated that the SSIP strategy, activities, theory of action, logic model, and improvement plan/evaluation plan aligned well with the SPDG. Stakeholders indicated that they appreciated the fact that efforts were not being duplicated. There was a stakeholder question and subsequent discussion around how the science of reading played into the SSIP. Professional learning around this area was shared with the group. Another stakeholder asked about pre-service opportunities for university students as they prepare to enter Illinois schools. These individuals are being included in professional learning sessions and remote mentoring sessions that focus on meeting the needs of all students. One stakeholder mentioned ensuring that this work was embedded into the administrator academies that were being offered. The IESE Network acknowledged that suggestion. Lastly, a stakeholder asked about whether individuals had ongoing participation versus attending a single session. Surveys given to participants document what type of training individuals are involved in and if they were involved on a regular basis. The IESE Network analyzes that data to plan their next steps.

The Council met again on May 19, 2022, with the main topic of discussion being the SPDG APR. Stakeholders were pleased to hear about assessment data indicating that the gap between students with and without disabilities was decreasing and more students with disabilities were progressing toward improved state assessment scores. After hearing Network recommendations based on SPDG APR data, stakeholders also suggested that the Network ensure that special education cooperative directors receive Network communications to provide them opportunities to have a role in the process. The Network staff indicated that one of their goals was to facilitate regular and ongoing communication between special education cooperatives and districts, so educators had additional support outside of their building administrators. Several IESE Network continuous improvement agreements are currently with special education cooperatives. Providing administrator academies was also discussed by the Network as a means of increasing awareness and support.

The Council met on September 8, 2022, to discuss IESE goals and objectives, and to get a statewide report from the Network. One stakeholder indicated that early childhood personnel would like increased engagement with the Network. The Network leadership planned to meet with this stakeholder to discuss this possibility further. Such increased engagement could potentially positively impact the SSIP as the target grades are pre-K through grade 4.

The Council met on November 10, 2022, to receive another statewide report and to plan next steps. Future activities to explore included assessing the implementation of professional development at the student level, developing a sustainable statewide coaching system, and communicating a comprehensive data plan for stakeholders. Stakeholders asked about the coaching system and were told that some Network team members are currently coaching; however, there is no set statewide system in place as of yet. Current coaching opportunities include administrator requests and following a PD session. A statewide system will provide similar opportunities. It will provide a model for team members to make coaching decisions and include structured observation and feedback protocols. Such a system would mutually benefit the SPDG and SSIP activities as coaching is strong component for both.

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

NO

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.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions