

**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**

Iowa



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)?

Decrease the percentage of students with IEPs in grades kindergarten through 3rd grade identified as high risk on a literacy assessment.

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

NO

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

YES

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

The subset population is a set of students that are attending a district that participated in professional learning in the area of specially designed instruction (SDI) literacy between 2015-2022, have implemented SDI literacy strategies for grades kindergarten through 3rd grade, and have at least 3 or more years of experience with SDI literacy. These are the districts that participated in professional learning during Iowa's first SSIP. The SIMR, however, has been changed to more accurately identify continued progress and sustainability. Students attending districts that fit these criteria will be tracked over the course of the 2020-2025 SPP/APR period.

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.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1N-i_jPNxRkx7ZRHqpReQQj1At371Drs/view?usp=sharing

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
2020	50.56%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	50.00%	49.00%	48.00%	47.00%	46.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of IEP students in grades K-3 that are high risk on literacy assessment	Number of IEP students in grades K-3 assessed using literacy assessments	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
608	1,352	50.56%	50.00%	44.97%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

FastBridge literacy screening assessments, early Reading and CMBr English. FastBridge combines Computer Adaptive Tests (CAT) and CurriculumBased Measures (CBM) to screen students, identify skill gaps, and offer proven recommendations for reading instruction and diagnostic reading interventions. It is based on the research of Dr. Ted Christ and colleagues at the University of Minnesota.

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

Literacy assessments are administered in FastBridge. FastBridge reports include indicators of student risk for not reaching learning goals. These are known as benchmarks and include indicators for the following levels:

- Low Risk: likely to meet grade-level goals (41st to 85th Percentiles)
- Some Risk: unlikely to meet grade-level goals without supplemental instructional support (16th -40th percentiles)
- High Risk: very unlikely to meet grade-level goals without intensive instructional support. These risk indicators can be used to identify supports for individual students. (41st to 85th percentiles)

Data is pulled from FastBridge into Iowa's Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) data system. In the MTSS system, students are given risk level categories. For the SiMR, Iowa Department of Education (IDE) staff analyzed student data from the districts identified in the cohort. The numerator is the number of students matching the criteria (IEP, grades K-3) that were identified as High Risk on either the eReading or CMBr assessment in the spring of 2020-2021. The denominator is all students matching the criteria (IEP, K-3) that took the assessment.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

Iowa used an external evaluator for the initial years implementing the SSIP and found the formative evaluation data invaluable. The evaluation reports were used to inform implementation approaches, review progress on short term measures and evaluate effect. As such, Iowa will continue to use the current evaluation plan and has contracted with an external evaluator for the next six years.

Current evaluation plan:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mSdA3W8dDFC35QmOC65G0I9Uzsc6ukLB/edit?usp=sharing&oid=103733777135894690636&rtfpof=true&sd=true>

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:

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. The two structures established in FFY20 for the effective delivery of technical assistance continued to meet and ensure consistency and continuity of statewide implementation of professional learning materials. The IDEA Support Network consists of AEA administrators responsible for professional learning in each of 9 AEAs and Iowa Department of Education (DE) program consultants. It is facilitated by the State Director of Special Education, an AEA Director of Special Education and a program manager. The IDEA Support Network provided professional learning for the roll-out of the new statewide IFSP/IEP data system. The second structure, the SDI Literacy Implementation Network, continued to ensure consistency and fidelity to the SDI Framework and to the resources, materials, and tools developed by the Design Teams in each of the following instructional focus areas: preschool (PS), K-6 literacy (K-6), and significant disabilities (SD). Responsibilities of the SDI Literacy Implementation Network include: developing communication tools to use with AEA, district, and/or school staff and other stakeholder groups; coordinating revisions and development of professional learning materials; and providing and monitoring implementation guidance (negotiables and non-negotiables) for multiple levels (state, district, building, classroom).

A third infrastructure component was added in FFY 2021. This component is the Professional Learning Governance Council (PLGC) which acts as the oversight for all statewide professional learning. Specifically, the PLGC identifies and prioritizes statewide needs for professional learning. PLGC members include two representatives of local special education directors, two representatives of AEA directors of special education and two representatives of the SEA.

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. SDI Coaches work with teachers to implement SDI professional learning in their classroom(s). Coaching conversations take place a minimum of once per month throughout the learning and implementation. Coaching support is provided for Year 1 coaches using support materials that focus on both generic coaching skills as well as professional learning that is specific to the content area (PS, K-6, SD). Year 2 coaches continue to engage with support materials that enhance their ability to

be a coach and to assist with further content-specific professional learning.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Professional learning packages for each content area (PS, K-6, SD) have been finalized. Professional learning leads (PLLs) have been identified and trained in each of the nine area education agencies (AEAs). The PLLs identify districts / teachers to engage in the SDI training, implementation, and coaching. The PLLs deliver this training regionally. Ongoing support for the PLLs occurs monthly through a Community of Practice (CoP) structure facilitated by the state lead in each content area.

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.

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. Evaluation of the technical assistance system (e.g., SDI Literacy Implementation Network) occurs through system protocols, procedures, and decision-making guides that are used with fidelity. This technical assistance group oversees implementation across the state and ensures that all packages are implemented as designed and with fidelity. Implementation was monitored through checklists, observations, and participation in all aspects of SDI implementation in each area of focus.

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. Evaluation of coaching practices and implementation occurs through the Coaching Self-Assessment (CSA), which is administered each fall and spring to all SDI instructional practices coaches. Data from the CSA is utilized as part of a continuous improvement process. Based on the data, coaching support needs are identified, resources are provided, and next steps for implementation are determined. The continuous improvement process based on CSA data was replicated each fall and spring.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Evaluation of the delivery of high-quality professional learning occurs partially through the FIT, which is administered each fall and spring to teachers engaged in the SDI professional learning. Data from the FIT is also used as part of a continuous improvement process. Based on the data, areas of need are identified, additional training and/or coaching is provided, and support for implementation is provided to teachers. The continuous improvement process based on FIT data was replicated each fall and spring.

Review of the FIT data (teacher implementation data), student early literacy data and coaching self assessment data supported the decision to move forward with the scale-up of the implementation of SDI across the state through the AEAs. Collected data are reviewed and analyzed at the state, AEA, and local level to identify areas of strength and growth.

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

YES

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

A third infrastructure component was added in FFY 2021. This component is the Professional Learning Governance Council (PLGC) which acts as the oversight for all statewide professional learning. Specifically, the PLGC identifies and prioritizes statewide needs for professional learning. PLGC members include two representatives of local special education directors, two representatives of AEA directors of special education and two representatives of the SEA. The short-term outcomes achieved by the PLGC were the development of a statewide website for professional learning trainers and the launch of statewide training regarding IEP development and the SDI Framework.

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

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. The SDI Literacy Implementation Network will continue to meet regularly to build consistency across the state related to the implementation and support of SDI literacy. The group will continue to provide and monitor implementation guidance to ensure fidelity of implementation across the state, coordinate revisions and development of professional learning materials, and utilize communication tools to use with stakeholder groups.

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. More AEAs will support a network of SDI coaches in partnership with their general education coaching support counterparts. The coaching networks will continue to build knowledge and skills of coaches to support SDI implementation in districts / schools / classrooms.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Working in partnership with AEA leadership, additional PLLs will be trained to assist in the delivery of high-quality professional learning to districts as the scale-up of SDI implementation continues.

Continued next steps: a. Continue to support AEAs in implementing the three SSIP strategies of the SSIP Logic Model related to continued implementation and scale-up of SDI Literacy. b. Ensure fidelity of AEA-provided professional development delivery and coaching support to new districts. c. Use of professional learning materials and supports for instructional practices and system coaches across the system.

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

Implementation of the SDI project has focused on the following practices: (a) establishing a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI; (b) building capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity; and (c) delivering high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. As we move forward with the scale-up of SDI professional learning, coaching, and technical assistance to additional districts / schools, the focus continues to be on implementation fidelity. As professional learning occurs across the AEA's, it is expected that the materials will be used as designed with teachers as they are brought into the learning. It is expected that coaching will occur at least monthly. The SDI Literacy Implementation Network monitors the fidelity of implementation to ensure that there is consistency in delivery and coaching across the state. Data from the initial group of schools who engage in SDI professional learning and are supported by regular coaching indicated significant change in teacher practice, which also had a positive impact on student outcomes. We believe our plan for scale-up will have similar results.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Iowa's evidence-based practices are rooted in implementation science and are focused on infrastructure supports. See above description of infrastructure strategies.

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.

Implementation of effective specially designed instruction requires educators to accurately diagnose for instructional design, design for instructional delivery, deliver for student engagement, and engage for results. There are many evidence-based practices that align to an individual's need, the key is supporting all educators to make accurate and timely data-based decisions. The infrastructure to support them, however, is not yet strong enough to reach every teacher in every classroom. Iowa's evidence-based practices, therefore, are rooted in implementation science and are focused on infrastructure supports.

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

Framework Implementation Tool (FIT) data. The FIT is a tool that teachers utilize (fall and spring) to self-assess their implementation of the key SDI Framework components of Diagnose, Design, and Deliver. This data is shared with district leadership teams and coaches to determine relative strengths and areas of growth in the implementation of SDI professional learning. AEA's and statewide teams use the data to determine fidelity of the delivery of the professional learning as well as the supports that teachers need to implement the learning.

Coach Self-Assessment (CSA) data. The CSA is a tool that coaches utilize (fall and spring) to self-assess their ability to coach teachers in implementing the key SDI Framework components of Diagnose, Design, and Deliver. These data are shared with stakeholders as part of a continuous improvement process to determine supports that coaches need to enhance their ability to coach teachers in implementing the SDI professional learning. Fidelity checks for each area of focus (PS, K-6, SD). Each content area has implementation checklists, which are used for data collection regarding the level of fidelity of implementing the professional learning. The fidelity checklists for each area of focus assist coaches and teachers in determining how well the evidence practices are being implemented in each classroom.

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.

N/A

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

Continue to support AEA's in implementing the three SSIP strategies of the SSIP Logic Model related to continued implementation and scale-up of SDI Literacy. b. Ensure fidelity of AEA-provided professional development delivery and coaching support to new districts. c. Use of professional learning materials and supports for instructional practices and system coaches across the system.

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.

Continue to support AEA's in implementing the SSIP, the current evaluation data sources are identified to be most relevant to SSIP and being collected systematically, they are feasible to track, report and use for evaluation of implementation. Those evaluation data evaluated the progress the AEA's has made on implementing SSIP and indicated that the target of implementation for this year was met.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The state had a number of opportunities throughout the year for stakeholder input on updates and revisions to State targets, as needed, as well as input on the progress of the SSIP. Overall input to the APR includes a review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMR, and updated data. Discussions occur over time regarding the current state of data, whether outcomes are meeting targets, and what activities may contribute to decreases or increases in results. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets six times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

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

Membership on development groups and task teams; feedback loops; evaluation surveys; focus groups.

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.**

None

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

N/A

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

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Iowa has used a threshold setting for the SSIP targets, so that the data should be less than or equal to the target set. Per instructions from PSC, the targets and current year of data are submitted as intended, and the display will be updated by the technical team after submission.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response**17 - Required Actions**