

**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**

Indiana



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 State-Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is currently:

Indiana will increase reading proficiency achievement on the Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD-3) assessment by at least .5% each year for all third grade students, including those with disabilities attending elementary schools participating in the Indiana SSIP Initiatives.

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

NO

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

YES

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

A cohort model has been used to measure progress toward the SiMR. Currently, due to the lack of LEA participation, there is 1 school participating in the intensive technical assistance that is a primary focus of the the current SSIP.

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 State continues to implement the previous Theory of Action (ToA) to guide the SSIP. The ToA is outlined below and can also be viewed at <https://www.in.gov/doe/files/2021-22-SSIP-Report.pdf> (page 11).

If IDOE: Provides a supported guidance for systemic alignment

Then the LEA: Will promote and support systemic alignment across the district

Then the Building Leader: Will promote and support systemic alignment across the district

Then Teachers: Will utilize building and district systems to drive instruction based on data

If IDOE: Supports the implementation of an MTSS framework, which includes the use of UDL

Then the LEA: Will build LEA and school leader's capacity to support implementation of this framework

Then the Building Leader: Will build teacher and school staff capacity for implementation of this framework

Then Teachers: Will implement this framework to support the instructional needs of all learners

If IDOE: Provides support for evidence-based practices in early literacy

Then the LEA: Will promote and support systemic alignment across the district

Then the Building Leader: Will promote and support early literacy through the use of the evidence-based practices

Then Teachers: Will utilize building and district systems to drive instruction based on data

As noted previously, the State is in the process of developing a revised Theory of Action based on data analysis indicating a lack of expected outcome related to the current SiMR and plan.

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	58.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%	62.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Numerator- Cohort Students Passing State Assessment	Denominator- Cohort Students Tested	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
61	68	76.61%	60.00%	89.71%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source for the FFY 2021 data is state reading assessment (IREAD-3) results for the participating school.

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

School districts in Indiana conduct the IREAD-3 assessment during state-assigned testing windows in the spring of the testing year. The IREAD-3 is scored digitally, and the data is collected by IDOE. Statewide analyses of student outcomes collectively and by specific populations are represented by number of students who Pass/Fail and by percentages of Pass/Fail. These data are publicly disseminated on the IDOE website, including individual district and school data (<https://www.in.gov/doe/it/data-center-and-reports/>). The percentages of Pass/Fail for all students participating in the assessment for SSIP Cohort Schools are used to determine progress toward the state SiMR.

As part of the data analysis completed within the SSIP, the State has identified concerns related to the current SSIP. These barriers were included in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR description of newly identified barriers and steps to address. A primary barrier identified was a lack of stakeholder and LEA engagement. Throughout this implementation year, the state has developed a consistent stakeholder engagement process. This group has completed an extensive data analysis and has proposed that the State revise the SiMR.

The proposed SiMR is as follows:

Indiana will increase the percentage of preschool children aged 3-5 with IEPs who enter the preschool program below age expectations and demonstrate substantial growth in the area of positive social-emotional skills by the time they turn 6 or exit the program.

The State continues to engage in the Analysis phase of the SSIP and plans to continue engaging stakeholders to select coherent improvement strategies and develop the Theory of Action. As part of this process, the State Part B and Part C programs have developed a partnership to analyze the potential alignment of the State SSIP plans for Part B and Part C to expand the impact for the State.

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.

Additional data collected to assess progress toward the SiMR includes:

iReady Data for students participating in services from coaches/teachers completing training related to the SSIP demonstrates:

Beginning of Year:

39% of students scored Early, On, Mid or Above grade level in phonological awareness;
27% of students scored Early, On, Mid or Above grade level in phonics;

Middle of Year:

60% of students scored Early, On, Mid or Above grade level in phonological awareness;
56% of students scored Early, On, Mid or Above grade level in phonics;

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 link that includes the State's current evaluation plan is <https://www.in.gov/doe/files/2021-22-SSIP-Report.pdf> (page 14).

The State is currently engaging with Stakeholders completing the 3 phases of the SSIP. Currently the Analysis phase is in process and the implementation plan includes moving to Phase II: Plan during the next reporting period. This will include include the development of an evaluation plan.

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

NO

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

Indiana continued to implement the following infrastructure improvement strategies in the reporting period: Systemic Alignment; MTSS/UDL, and; Early Literacy (Science of Reading).

1) Systemic Alignment: The purpose of Systemic Alignment is to align state and local efforts around the evidence-based practices (EBPs) targeted in the SSIP.

2) MTSS/UDL: The purpose of MTSS/UDL is to support schools in the implementation of an effective intervention model that identifies student need and provides access to evidence based interventions.

3) Early Literacy: The purpose of Early Literacy is to provide statewide universal technical assistance in early literacy (Science of Reading), including targeted and intensive technical assistance for specific districts and schools.

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.

Systemic Alignment

Outcome Achieved Related to Governance: Diverse stakeholder engagement based on review of stakeholder participation reports (attendance/response rates) throughout the reporting year related to role (from the targeted stakeholder checklist). This strategy led to improved stakeholder representation and input related to systems improvement efforts of the current SSIP and planning for the revision of the SSIP.

Outcome Achieved Related to Governance and Professional Development: Following professional development related to the role/responsibility of the stakeholder, participants reported an increase understanding of the role (survey results). This strategy led to improved stakeholder representation and input related to the sustainability and consistent input related to current implementation and revision of the SSIP.

Outcome Achieved Related to Governance: Stakeholders report communication occurred at a frequency to effectively inform participation in SSIP guidance (survey results). This strategy led to improved stakeholder representation and input related to systems improvement efforts of the current SSIP and planning for the revision of the SSIP.

Outcome Achieved Related to Governance and Quality Standards: Stakeholders report information provided allowed for informed decision making related to SSIP guidance (survey results). This strategy led to improved stakeholder representation and input related to systems improvement efforts of the current SSIP and planning for the revision of the SSIP.

Outcome Achieved Related to Governance and Accountability: Project timelines were met (based on timelines defined in Gantt Chart).

MTSS/UDL and Early Literacy

Outcome Achieved Related to Technical Assistance: LEA staff report that the number of staff and students participating in training and services provided by trained teachers has increased.

Outcome Achieved Related to Technical Assistance: As noted in data presented previously, student performance is improving with ongoing technical assistance being provided.

Did the State implement any new (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.

Systemic Alignment Next Steps:

1) Continue to implement practices to effectively inform and engage stakeholders to ensure informed input and consistent participation.

2) Continue to seek input from participating administrators, coaches, teachers and parents related to the outcomes achieved and any barriers identified to guide implementation of the current SSIP and complete Phase I of the SSIP revision and initiate Phase II.

MTSS/UDL and Early Literacy Next Steps:

1) Continue to support State sponsored intensive technical assistance to ensure necessary supports are provided as needed to effectively implement practices.

2) Continue to monitor school level fidelity of implementation to ensure improved student outcomes are achieved/improved.

3) Continue to monitor student level outcomes to ensure student outcomes are achieved/improved.

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

The evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period include:

- 1) Intensive technical assistance has been provided to participating school as part of the Indiana Priorities for Early Literacy Implementation Plan (<https://media.doe.in.gov/news/indianas-priorities-for-early-literacy-final.pdf>).
- 2) Instructional Coaching to implement identified district-level change for SSIP schools (as noted in the Early Literacy Implementation plan linked above).
- 3) Science of Reading as defined within the Indiana Priorities for Early Literacy Implementation Plan (<https://media.doe.in.gov/news/indianas-priorities-for-early-literacy-final.pdf>).

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

IDOE is supporting a coaching model as part of the Early Literacy Implementation Plan that includes intensive, on-going technical assistance and in-district instructional coaching. The purpose of coaching is to provide consistent, job-embedded support to teachers based on research-based practices. IDOE will provide transformational coaching to help teachers make appropriate instructional changes that will improve student outcomes through the implementation of the Science of Reading. Research supports the effectiveness of coaching, and shows that at its foundation, it has resulted in an “increase [of] the instructional capacity of schools and teachers, a known prerequisite for increasing learning” (Neufeld & Roper, 2003). The increase in instructional capacity leading to increased learning is the ultimate goal of all schools. Coaching, because of its emphasis on the involvement of educators as well as administrators and ongoing professional development, encourages program sustainability.

Research supports that the greatest benefit to coaching, as a form of professional development, is that the support is job-embedded and continuous (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). When educators receive consistent and relevant support that can be used specific to the needs of their students and themselves, they have a greater likelihood of implementing new instructional practices or carrying out new initiatives with fidelity. Because Indiana’s Priorities for Early Literacy is rooted in the importance of early literacy instruction’s focus on the Science of Reading, it requires that teachers are well-trained, regularly-supported, and continuously-developed in this approach to reading instruction. This accessibility to support is the missing piece for the majority of educator professional development. Providing a coach in schools will give teachers a common source of guidance and information that is necessary for them to seek improvement and change. It will also support and encourage a community of professionals continuing to learn from each other.

In addition to yielding results in student achievement, coaching provides high-quality professional development. In a study of student achievement before and after the implementation of a coaching model, “There was a significantly greater percentage of students scoring at proficiency and a significantly smaller percentage of students scoring at-risk in schools where coaches spent more time working with teachers” (Bean, 2010). These outcomes have been reflected in multiple states like Mississippi and Louisiana, which have also used coaching as the main strategy to improve student literacy achievement. Specifically, Neufeld and Roper (2003) outline the positive improvements resulting from implementing a coaching model:

- 1) Translation of teacher development into classroom practice;
- 2) A willingness among teachers to share their practice with one another and seek learning opportunities from peers and coaches as well as a willingness to assume collective responsibility for their students’ learning;
- 3) High-quality principal leadership of instructional improvement;
- 4) Successful school cultures based on instruction being the focus of teacher and principal interaction; and
- 5) Instructional advancement informed by achievement data.

The Science of Reading is a term used to describe the body of research about “reading, reading development, and best practices for reading instruction” (Petscher et al., 2020). There are several important facts about this body of research (Defining Movement, 2021; Petscher et al., 2020):

1. It is interdisciplinary. These studies have been conducted by numerous independent researchers from separate, but connected, fields such as education, psychology (e.g., cognitive, developmental, school), linguistics, neuroscience, implementation science, etc.
2. It is substantial and well-established. It encompasses thousands of studies that have been conducted over the past 50 years.
3. It is high-quality and scientifically-based. These studies use methods and procedures that are “rigorous, systemic, and objective” (ESSA, S.1177 - 114th Congress 2015).

For additional information related to the evidence base for as part of the State Early Literacy Implementation Plan see <https://media.doe.in.gov/news/indianas-priorities-for-early-literacy-final.pdf>.

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.

Coaching: As noted previously, the greatest benefit to coaching, as a form of professional development, is that the support is job-embedded and continuous (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). When educators receive consistent and relevant support that can be used specific to the needs of their students and themselves, they have a greater likelihood of implementing new instructional practices or carrying out new initiatives with fidelity resulting in improved student outcomes.

Intensive TA: Although many factors contribute to low literacy levels, it is important for schools and education professionals to focus on malleable factors. One of these factors is providing educators with high-quality professional development and training about the

Science of Reading, which includes information about reading and the structure of language, reading development, and effective practices for instruction (Moats, 2020a; Seidenberg & Borkenhagen, 2020). The focus of the SSIP is to help educators better understand the Science of Reading to identify and implement effective instructional practices that can prevent reading difficulties and support literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

Early Literacy: In addition to research about reading and reading development, the Science of Reading includes numerous scientific studies about effective reading instruction and intervention, including what to teach (content) and how to teach it (methods and practices). The results from these studies have been synthesized in numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses and have important implications for teaching literacy to students in grades K-12. This will result in improved teacher practices and improved student outcomes.

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

The data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change includes coach observation of teacher instruction with feedback and student outcome data.

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.

No additional data was collected.

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

The current SSIP and the evidence-based practices identified will continue through the next reporting period. Anticipated outcomes include improved teacher practices and fidelity of implementation of the instructional practices being learned and continued improvement in student outcomes.

The district instructional coach will continue to participate in State supported intensive technical assistance related to the implementation of the Science of Reading. The instructional coach will implement the practices gained from technical assistance through a train-the-trainer model impacting teacher practices and ultimately student outcomes.

As part of the process to revise the SSIP and completion of the three phases, the State, with input from the Stakeholder group, will be identifying evidence based practices related to the proposed, revised SiMR as Phase I: Analysis continues.

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 state will continue the current SSIP. The evaluation data analyzed to support the decision to implement the current SSIP without modifications includes:

The SiMR performance data indicates a continue increase the student performance on the State reading assessment (IREAD-3).

Reports from staff participating in intensive TA indicates

Reports from Administrators of participating schools indicates

Following the next reporting period, the current plan will be sustained through support from IDOE unrelated to the SSIP.

The State intends to provide information related to SSIP modifications in the next annual performance report. This will be based on the continued Phase I analysis and the upcoming Phase II plan development.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The SSIP team engaged a broad base of stakeholders in 21-22. Stakeholders were intentionally invited to engage in key improvement efforts through a campaign of emails to stakeholders from the SSIP team, inviting them to participate.

Stakeholders included:

(a) the State Technical Assistant representatives;

(b) participants from SSIP LEAs;

(c) parent representatives;

(d) Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) representatives; and

(e) IDOE SSIP stakeholders (SSIP Coordinator, Early Childhood Specialist, Special Education Administrator, Student Supports Administrator, Early Literacy Specialist, Preschool Assessment Specialist, Fiscal Administrator, and Information Technology Administrator).

The SSIP team convened stakeholders quarterly over the course of the year in March, June, September, and December 2022.

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

Throughout the year, the SSIP team used specific strategies to engage stakeholders. In addition to receiving emails with dates and reminders of meetings, stakeholders were also sent pre-reading and pre-work for each meeting, ensuring stakeholders had the opportunity to come to the meeting more prepared. Stakeholders also had opportunities to provide feedback through meeting discussions and post-meeting surveys, discussed later in this section.

Meeting topics included:

- (a) an overview of SSIP, including the history, definition, current SSIP plan, and Theory of Action;
- (b) explanations of meaningful stakeholder engagement and stakeholders' role in the process;
- (c) the FFY 2020 evaluation plan;
- (d) infrastructure development and its accomplishments and needed improvements;
- (e) evidence-based practices;
- (f) SiMR and progress towards goals;
- (g) other data, including preschool outcomes, graduation rates, ISPROUT, and ILEARN; and
- (h) preschool and national discipline data.

During quarterly meetings, time for discussion, questions, and feedback was built into the agenda throughout the meetings and at the conclusion.

Stakeholders were surveyed throughout the year. Ahead of the Quarter 1 stakeholder meeting, stakeholders were surveyed to share their prior knowledge of SSIP, the areas the SSIP team should prioritize in the meeting, their perceived degree of helpfulness of the SSIP, and an open response for additional information the SSIP team could provide. In the Quarter 1 survey, half of respondents were unsure about their knowledge of SSIP, while 50% felt they had a good understanding of it. Respondents shared that they would like to prioritize stakeholder education, technical assistance activities, and the evaluation plan during the Quarter 1 meeting. The survey results were used to build the agenda for the sequence and content of the quarterly meetings.

Following the last quarterly meeting, another survey was administered. All participants shared that they understood their role as a stakeholder after attending the stakeholder meetings. One hundred percent of respondents indicated that the information provided to them from IDOE was timely and allowed stakeholders to effectively make informed decisions, and all survey respondents indicated that they would like to continue participating as an SSIP stakeholder. Based on the Quarter 4 survey, areas for improvement emerged. SSIP stakeholders shared that a more strategic effort is needed to ensure that the data collected and findings could be implemented to impact student achievement. Stakeholders expressed that more action is needed after results are analyzed so that the results can be useful in informing improvements.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State is addressing concerns expressed by stakeholders through the process of analysis as defined within the three phases of the SSIP. Based on the analysis completed thus far, the State, with stakeholder input, identified that preschool outcomes are the area in most need of support. This identification led to the proposed, revised SiMR discussed previously. An analysis of the State infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity is underway with the stakeholder group, which will lead to the selection of coherent improvement strategies and the potential revision of the Theory of Action.

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.

As noted previously, the State intends to revise the SSIP and continue implementing the three phases of the SSIP. Currently, the State, with a stakeholder group, have completed a portion of the Analysis Phase and intend to continue in this phase, moving then to the Phase II: Plan.

Activities to be completed in the next fiscal year include:

- 1) Confirm final version of the SiMR
- 2) Continue Analysis of the State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- 3) Select Coherent Improvement Strategies
- 4) Develop the State Theory of Action
- 5) Determine Infrastructure Development Plan including the plan to support LEAs in the Implementation of the identified evidence based practices
- 6) Develop the Evaluation Plan

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

Related to the revision plan:

- 1) Complete Phase I by May 2023
- 2) Complete Phase II by December 2023
- 3) Submit SSIP (with modifications) as part of the SPP/APR by February 2024

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

No newly identified barriers have been identified related to the current SSIP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions