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

Kentucky

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)?

To increase the percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above proficient in middle school math, specifically at the 8th-grade level, with emphasis on reducing novice performance, by providing professional learning, technical assistance and support to elementary and middle school teachers around implementing, scaling and sustaining Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and evidence-based practices (EBP) in math.

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.

https://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/instresources/Documents/SSIPTheoryofAction.pdf

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
2021	11.92%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	11.92%	12.92%	13.92%	14.92%	15.92%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of 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
704	5,906	8.26%	11.92%	11.92%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Same data used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

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

The SiMR uses the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data to measure the percent of students with disabilities performing at or above proficiency in math at the eighth-grade level. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full

academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. The SiMR data and target are aligned with Indicator 3B for eighth-grade mathematics. Student outcome data is analyzed in conjunction with implementation data at each level of the system (state, region, district, school).

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.

Capacity Assessments--
Capacity assessment data is collected twice per year and used to inform the system of support at all levels (state, region, district, school). Implementation teams use these data to develop/refine action plans to improve infrastructure to support the EBP.

Active Implementation Frameworks (AIF) Training Outcome Data--
Transformation Zone (TZ) implementation teams at the regional and district level receive training in implementation science fundamentals during the installation phase. A series of pre/post-knowledge quizzes and post-training participation surveys are collected as training occurs. The data is used to improve the quality of training and meet the learning needs of participants.

EBP training outcome data--
Districts are responsible for the provision of EBP training for administrators and teachers. District Implementation Teams (DITs) are encouraged to collect math training component worksheets that align training development to adult learning strategies and the Kentucky Math Practice Profile. Participants in the training complete the Math Training Efficacy survey. When appropriate, math training also includes a pre/post-knowledge assessment. Data is collected as training occurs. The data is used in conjunction with fidelity, coaching and capacity data to make informed decisions on how best to support teachers.

EBP Fidelity Data [Observation Tool for Instruction Supports and Systems (OTISS) or Kentucky Mathematics Innovation Tool (KMIT)]--
In Kentucky, districts have the option to use the OTISS or the KMIT to measure fidelity of EBP implementation. Data is collected at least three times per year. Implementation teams triangulate implementation data (coaching, training, capacity) with fidelity data to inform the system of support for teachers.

Student Mathematics Benchmark Data--
Districts are encouraged to submit benchmark data and analyze it three times per year using mathematics benchmark data. Baseline data for Fall 2022 is being used to track progress within the TZ. Districts are expected to continue collection and analysis in Winter and Spring 2023.

Linked-Teaming Coaching Survey--
A common survey given to each level of the linked teaming infrastructure is collected annually to assess the system of support. In 2022, two rounds of this survey were collected, one in Spring 2022 and another in Fall 2022. In the Spring survey, of the 370 survey requests sent, 79 were returned for a 21.3% response rate which varied by respondent type (e.g., 43% RIT, 35% DIT, and 12% Building Implementation Team (BIT)).

A Fall Survey was also conducted. Of the 343 survey requests sent for this survey, 122 were completed for a 35% response rate which varied only slightly by respondent type (38% RIT, 36% DIT, 33% BIT).

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)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

In order to gauge the effectiveness of the system of support within the TZ, project measures were identified as part of the evaluation plan developed in 2015. As the work of the TZ has evolved, some measures are no longer relevant and others do not fit within the current system. The following items caused data quality concerns during this SSIP cycle:
AIF Training Effectiveness Data - One region and one district completed the AIF training effectiveness survey since the last SSIP submission. The small n-size of these responses impacts the ability to measure training effectiveness across the state.

EBP Training Effectiveness Data - Since the last SSIP submission, two districts submitted data measuring the efficacy and impact of four training events. This is a small n-size and is not a representative sample of the TZ.

To address these data quality concerns, the KDE worked with the external evaluator to develop a plan to update the evaluation plan during the next SSIP cycle.

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.

https://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/instresources/Documents/KySSIPEvalPlan.pdf

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:

Below is a brief description of infrastructure improvement strategies:

Scale-up to Additional Regions, Districts and Schools –
The TZ includes a total of 7 regions, 11 districts and 41 schools divided into 4 cohorts based on the year the region joined. Regions, districts and schools engage in a mutual selection process to determine readiness to participate within the TZ.

Cohort 1 Regions (n=2): One region from cohort 1 moved its focus to sustainability and scaling of systems implementation to an additional building and one new district. One district from another cohort 1 region chose to mutually deselect from the TZ due to staff turnover at the district and school levels. This region conducted exploration with other districts, but none chose to mutually select.
Cohort 2 Regions (n=3): Cohort 2 engaged in exploration activities and scaled to eight new schools. Teams focus on implementation drivers to build teacher capacity. Cohort 2 also mutually selected with an additional district. One region in Cohort 2 had a school mutually deselect, two schools merged to become one school and eight schools paused the work during the fall semester to onboard new principals.

Cohort 3 Regions (n=1): Cohort 3 began installation activities with 3 additional schools in one existing district. Installation of training and coaching continued for the first cohort of districts and building-level while building teams were established at the new TZ schools.

Cohort 4 Regions (n=1): Cohort 4 mutually selected one district and engaged in installation stage activities by establishing two building teams in that district. They have explored with a second district and worked to build readiness in that district. Cohort 4 paused their TZ work following the devastating flooding that occurred in Eastern Kentucky in July. During the months of August and September, the region supported districts in reopening schools and ensuring students had access to basic needs. The region restarted TZ work in October and held BIT meetings at the end of November.

Infrastructure Development –
State Design Team (SDT): The SDT completed a Practice Profile for PBIS in the classroom. The KDE began the review process of the PBIS Practice Profile.

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.

A goal of the TZ work is to build a multi-tiered system of training, coaching and technical assistance (short-term outcomes). Using a linked teaming structure, data is discussed through implementation teams at all levels of the system (state, region, district, school) to sustain improvement in math EBPs and scale-up. It is anticipated these successes in short-term outcomes will lead to achievement of the SiMR.

One method used to assess whether short-term outcomes are achieved is an annual Linked Teams Coaching survey. At two points during the past year (Spring and Fall), this survey was administered to Building, District, and Regional Implementation teams to assess the multi-tiered supports provided. According to results from the Spring and Fall surveys, the following progress measures were achieved:

Each year, 80% of Kentucky RIT members report the KDE State Implementation Team (SIT) provided high-quality support to increase their implementation capacity (supported by Linked Teams Coaching Survey data).

Each year, 80% of DIT members report their Kentucky RIT provided high-quality support to increase their implementation capacity (supported by Spring Linked Teams Coaching Survey data).

The Fall survey collected data about participants' tenure in the SSIP TZ work. Overall, nearly a quarter (22%) of respondents had only been involved in SSIP-related work 6 months or less; 43% had been involved for 3 or more years. In the spring survey, DIT members tended to rate the coaching and support received at the highest of three implementation levels in the spring survey and the lowest levels in the fall survey; respondents at both time points rated their supports favorably. Eight questions were asked about supports received and their influence on student outcomes with a 4-point Likert response scale (1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree). For DIT members, mean responses in the spring were high: with scores averaging 3.75 out of 4 (94%) and 97% of respondents rating questions at an average of 3 or 4 (agree or strongly agree). Ratings were lower for DIT members in the fall survey, with mean responses averaging 3.36 out of 4 and with 72% of respondents rating questions at an average of 3 or 4 (agree or strongly agree).

RIT members rated their support favorably at both time points. Mean responses in the spring survey averaged 3.40 out of 4 (85%) and 80% of respondents reported average scores of 3 or 4. In the Fall survey, mean responses averaged 3.54 out of 4 and 94% of respondents rated questions at an average of 3 or 4 (agree or strongly agree).

BIT members reported the lowest levels of training and support in the spring, with an average of 3.17 out of 4 rating (79%), though the majority (63%) of participants rated questions at an average of 3 or 4 (agree or strongly agree). In the Fall survey, mean responses averaged a score of 3.24 out of 4 and 73% of respondents rated questions at an average of 3 or 4 (agree or strongly agree).

In the Spring survey, members from all levels showed the highest agreement with the statement related to District, Regional and State team members supporting their confidence to use capacity assessment data to create implementation action plans. Fall survey data showed diverse experiences across levels. DIT members voiced most agreement with the statement about increased confidence using capacity assessment data, but also highest agreement (average 3.44 of 4) that the RIT used feedback that has increased their capacity to meet district SSIP goals. BIT members showed most agreement that DIT members' use of observation and guided reflection (average 3.34 of 4) and their support of improvement cycles (average 3.35 of 4) supported their ability to meet SSIP goals. RIT members in the Fall survey demonstrated the SIT's support in their use of Implementation Science and application of Implementation Drivers (average 3.69 of 4).

For each level, the lowest level of agreement was issued for the statement "Our SSIP efforts have improved math outcomes for students with disabilities" in both the Spring and Fall Surveys. For RIT members, this was tied with the question about monthly calls with the SIT members being an efficient use of their time to increase capacity to meet regional goals (3.5 out of 4). Responses to open-ended questions highlighted challenges related to re-calibrating efforts after COVID-related disruptions and staff turnover. Members also highlighted feeling motivated by the growth they observed in both students and teachers. It is anticipated that as capacity builds and instructional supports are hard wired into schools' operations, the short-term outcomes related to infrastructure building will eventually influence the targeted math outcomes.

Capacity assessments are collected 2 times per year for members of implementation teams at each level (school, district, region, state). They are used to assess the following progress measure; Each year, 80% of implementation teams (state, regional, district, and school) within the TZ(s) increase their capacity to implement SSIP Usable EBPs (including Active Implementation Frameworks (AIFs). This progress measure was met for BITs and RITs. Among BITs, 82% increased capacity in the Total domain; among RITs, 86% increased capacity in the Total domain compared to the last assessment. Among DITs, 71% grew in Total but 86% grew in at least one domain. The State Implementation Team decreased capacity, but all domains remained at high capacity (>75%).

Outcomes-
When looking at participants of the SSIP's evaluation data collection activities, the following progress measures were met during the reporting period. This provides evidence the state's implementation strategy has been effective at supporting participating teachers in the implementation of evidence-based mathematics practices.

100% of all SSIP EBP training sessions for teachers are trained with high fidelity.

Each year, 70% of TZ teachers report the training and support they received had a moderate to large impact on their knowledge of the SSIP EBP (an average of 3 and above on a 4-point Likert scale).

Each year, 70% of TZ teachers report the training and support they received had a moderate to large impact on their skills to use the SSIP EBP in their instruction (an average of 3 and above on a 4-point Likert scale).

Each year, 80% of TZ coaches report the training and support they received had a moderate to large impact on their knowledge of the SSIP EBP Practice Profile (an average of 3 and above on a 4-point Likert scale).

Each year, 80% of TZ coaches report the training and support they received had a moderate to large impact on their skills to coach the SSIP EBP practices (an average of 3 and above on a 4-point Likert scale).

TZ Scale-up-
During FFY 2021, three districts and 14 schools mutually selected to participate in the TZ. The KDE worked with regions to identify the level of support needed based on their implementation stage. Three regions chose to receive targeted support from the KDE while four regions chose to continue intensive support. Regions worked with the KDE to identify components of sustainability that were strong facilitators of scale-up and which components were the greatest barriers. The linked teaming structure allowed for barriers to be lifted up through the system of support. Developing a tiered support system promotes achievement of the SiMR because it creates capacity to bring on more districts and impact more students. Restructuring the SIT to focus on sustainability and scale-up was also identified as a need. Scale-up activities are integral to supporting the SiMR.

Infrastructure Improvement-
The Kentucky Mathematics Toolkit to Support Students with Disabilities, which includes the Kentucky Math Practice Profile and KMIT, was released universally across the state. Any district has access to the tools to improve teacher practice in the classroom and improve student outcomes.

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

YES

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

SIT--
Restructuring the SIT to focus on sustainability and scale-up for systems improvement efforts was identified as a need by stakeholders. The intermediate outcomes of the SIT were adjusted and include conducting a data and infrastructure analysis to determine successes, challenges and improvement strategies.

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

The Kentucky Department of Education will continue to work with the Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) to support the use of active implementation within the linked teaming structure (State, Region, District, School). All planned activities will continue to support effective mathematics instruction to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

SIT--
Next Steps: The SIT will meet and focus on the adjusted intermediate outcomes to support capacity, sustainability and scaling of the TZ.
Anticipated Outcomes of the SIT:
- Identify successes, challenges and improvement strategies on the communication process between districts, regions and the state;
-conduct a data inventory to identify areas of success and potential gaps;
-create a system to provide training for state, region and district support (onboarding, fidelity, coaching, innovations, data use, and systems); and
-develop a sustainability and scaling process.

Scale-up to Additional, Regions, Districts and Schools--
Next steps: TZs will build capacity through the linked teaming structure.
Anticipated outcomes: Mutually select additional regions to include all nine regions across the state. Scale to additional districts to participate in the TZ to impact the progress toward the SiMR.

Infrastructure Improvement--
Next Steps: Online training modules will be developed to support more widespread use of the mathematics toolkit.
Anticipated outcomes: More teachers across the state will use effective mathematics teaching practices and support improved outcomes for students.

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

EBP in Mathematics that align to the Kentucky Mathematics Practice Profile.
Active Implementation Frameworks (AIF).

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

EBP in Mathematics--
To meet the goals of the State-identified Measurable Result, the KDE supports districts and regions in the implementation of EBP in mathematics grounded in the eight mathematics teaching practices using the Kentucky Mathematics Practice Profile. While the KDE does not mandate a specific EBP, districts use the hexagon tool to select a mathematics EBP that is aligned with the Every Student Succeeds Act Levels of Evidence and best meets the needs of students.

Active Implementation Frameworks--
In 2005, the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) released a monograph that synthesized implementation research findings across a range of fields. Based on these findings, the evolving field of research and practice evidence, NIRN developed five overarching frameworks referred to as the Active Implementation Frameworks. Implementation science, the multi-disciplinary study of methods and strategies to promote the use of research findings in practice, seeks to address this by providing frameworks to guide the creation of conditions and activities that facilitate the use of EBP (https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/module-1/rationale).

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.

EBP in Mathematics--
The district-selected math EBP along with the Kentucky Mathematics Practice Profile supports teacher practices in the classroom. The fidelity, training, and coaching implementation data within the data dashboard is anchored in the eight mathematics teaching practices. DITs meet monthly to analyze the system of support for teachers to effectively implement EBPs. Districts and coaches use the results of the analysis to provide feedback and support to teachers to impact student outcomes in mathematics and support the SiMR.

AIFs--
The AIFs are intended to impact the SiMR by providing support at each level of the system to increase the effective implementation of EBP and achieve improved student outcomes. To accomplish these goals, the formula for success is used to put the frameworks in place by,
1. Usable Innovation: An EBP or program that is intended to improve results is chosen based on need, the best available evidence to achieve the specified goal and is operationalized to be teachable, learnable, doable and measurable.

2. Effective Implementation and Improvement: Teams receive training, coaching and feedback to effectively use the EBP and make improvements based on feedback.
3. Enabling Context: The team actively creates a hospitable environment to ensure an enabling context exists to support implementation and improvement in the use of the EBP.
4. Educationally Significant Outcomes: Successful implementation of the formula of success results in educationally significant outcomes.

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

State Level--
The SISEP-supported state capacity assessment was administered on November 9, 2022, approximately one year since the previous assessment on November 19, 2021. Although the assessment showed declines across all domains, ranging from 12% (Leadership and Communication and Engagement) to 25% (Infrastructure and Resources), all domains registered scores at or above 75%.

Region Level--
Among the seven participating regions, all completed capacity assessments in the first half of 2022; four also completed capacity assessments in Fall 2022. Each region's assessment responses for each domain were compared to their most recent capacity assessment: For four regions, Fall 2022 data were compared to their Spring 2022 responses; for the remaining three regions, Spring 2022 data were compared to their 2021 responses to monitor growth. Six regions (86%) showed growth in the Total domain; all seven regions (100%) showed growth in at least one domain. Across all domains, the one with the highest growth per site by far was Stage-Based Functioning, with an average growth of 478%, owing to gains in three regions. Four regions (57%) reported declines in at least one domain, the greatest (average decline of 22%) being Action Planning, owing primarily to declines from three regions. Across all regions, average scores remained above 75% for 8 domains, but fell below 70% for three: Action Planning, Coaching, and Systems Intervention.

District Level--
Of the 11 participating districts, 9 completed a 2022 capacity assessment for a participation rate of 91%. Eight districts had either prior or present-year baseline data with which to compare; the other two districts completed their baseline capacity assessments this year. An additional district is in the early stages of installation and completed its baseline assessment in November 2022 as well. Among the 7 districts with baseline data, 5 (71%) showed growth in the Total domain and 6 showed growth in at least one domain (86%). Two (29%) experienced declines in at least one domain. The most growth occurred for Coaching, owing primarily to significant growth from a site that increased capacity in this domain from 0% to 50%. The Fidelity domain also saw an average increase of 57% across sites. The domains with the greatest declines overall were Systems Intervention, with an average 14% decline, and Selection, with an average decline of 4% across all sites with baseline and current data. Across all sites completing capacity assessments during the reporting period, domain scores varied widely across sites, but generally trended lowest for Coaching (36%) and Decision Support Data Systems (42%) and highest for Fidelity (73%) and Leadership (66%)

School/Building Level--
A total of 26 schools (60%) completed a Drivers Best Practice Assessment during the reporting period, representing 8 (73%) of the 11 participating districts and 5 (71%) of the 7 participating regions. Among those, 17 had baseline data with which to compare. Among schools with baseline data, 14 (82%) demonstrated growth in the Total domain;16 (94%) grew in at least one domain, with an average growth of 31% across domains. The greatest increases in capacity were reported for the Systems Intervention (656% average growth) and Selection (36% average growth) domains. Although individually, 10 sites (58.8%) reported a decline in at least one domain, when averaged across all sites with baseline data, Kentucky observed a net gain in capacity across all domains. Across all 26 sites completing capacity assessments, average scores for each domain remained high: Domains of Selection and Systems Intervention showed average scores between 65.4-65.8%; all other domain scores ranged from 79.1% to 89.1%.

Fidelity of EBP Implementation (KMIT and OTISS)--
In Kentucky, districts have the option to use the OTISS or the KMIT to measure the fidelity of EBP implementation. The OTISS identifies highly effective, research-based instructional practices being used during classroom instruction. The OTISS is comprised of seven items based on John Hattie's (2009) work evaluating research behind factors that influence educational achievement (https://sisep.fpg.unc.edu/blog/observational-tool-instructional-supports-and-systems-empowering-teachers-instructional-leaders). The KMIT is based on the Kentucky Mathematics Practice Profile which was informed by the eight Mathematics Teaching Practices as identified by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. These data have been historically addressed in previous SSIP phases through project measure C.9: Each year, 80% of TZ School teacher implementation cadres increase their level of implementation and consistency of SSIP EBP instruction.

OTISS--
One district with 11 cohorts from 9 schools used the OTISS tool to meet the EBP fidelity metric. 100% of schools regularly reported OTISS data during the reporting period, with one beginning in September 2022 and all others beginning in Spring 2022. For the analysis, if two cohorts merged, the separate baselines of each cohort were averaged for a baseline score. If a new cohort was added, its initial OTISS assessment was used as baseline. Ten of the cohorts had >1 month of data; among them, 7 (70%) showed growth in the Total domain (average of all domains) from their baseline observation to their final observation.

Annualized trends from January to November 2022 showed an average growth of 5% across all OTISS practices. Declining scores were observed for two practices: Clear instruction (-8%) and Engages students (-7%); otherwise growth was seen across all other practices with the highest being for Adjusts to Responses (17% growth). Average ratings for each domain throughout the reporting period ranged from 61% (or 1.22 out of 2) for Engages Students to 91% (1.81 out of 2) for Provides Feedback.

KMIT--
Overall, 26 schools (76% of TZ schools) representing 8 districts (73%), and 6 regions (86%) submitted KMIT data. Annualized trends across schools from January to December 2022 demonstrated an average growth of 76% across all practices. Averaging the observations across all schools using the KMIT, the highest scores were recorded for the practice of Implementing Tasks (60% or 1.2 out of 2) and the lowest average score was for the practice of Establishing Goals (39% or 0.78 out of 2). The practices demonstrating the most growth during the reporting period included Posing Questions (230%) and Elicit Student Thinking (189%). When averaging scores for each practice across all schools, no declining scores were registered across any of the practices.

As of December 19, 2022, 23 schools had at least two months of KMIT observations in order to assess within site growth. Among those 23 schools, 17 (74%) demonstrated overall growth (growth in their average score across practices).

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.

Active Implementation Training Efficacy and Impact--
Participant evaluation results from five AI training events were received. Two (N=6) for a new region that has not yet begun full implementation, and three (N=26) for a new district that underwent its installation phase in Spring 2022. Participants responded to seven questions on a 4-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree); an eighth question asked participants to rate their current knowledge of the terms and frameworks discussed during meetings on a scale of 1(beginner) to 4 (expert). For individual questions, average ratings ranged from 3.53 (88%) for 'How would you rate your current knowledge level regarding the specific terms, frameworks, resources, and materials discussed at these meetings' to 4 (100%) 'the event achieved the session goals goals and objectives' and 'the event was of high quality'. Across participants, 94% self-rated their current knowledge of terms and frameworks at 'competent' (score of 3 or 4). Pre/post test was only completed by the two participants in the first regional AIF training. Nonetheless, their responses revealed that participants' awareness of AIF increased by 33% (75% for pre-test, 100% for post-test).

Math Training Efficacy and Impact--
Participant evaluation results from 4 Math training events across 2 districts within the Cohort 1 region were recorded during the reporting period, all from Fall 2022. 36 participants responded to 7 questions on a 4-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree); an eighth question asked respondents to rate their current knowledge of mathematical practices from 1 (beginner) to 4 (expert). Average ratings ranged from 3.88 (97%) to 4 (100%). 86% of participants self-rated their current knowledge of mathematical practices as 'competent' (score of 3 or 4). Average pre/post-test results for the 4 training sessions revealed a 185% increase in knowledge gained by training participants, from an average score of 29.25% on the pre-test to an average score of 83.25% on the post-test.

Student benchmark data--
Fifteen schools submitted student benchmark data at some point during the reporting period, some of which reported data separately for different cohorts. When aggregating cohorts for each period (Winter 2022, Spring 2022, Fall 2022), the average percentage of students meeting benchmarks rose from Winter to Spring 2022 (31.91% to 47.13%), but fell in Fall 2022 (23.91%). In Spring 2022, 100% of teams reported that students with disabilities showed growth and 93.3% reported that benchmark goals were met by students with disabilities. These percentages rose from the 82.35% and 76.47% that were reported respectively in Winter 2022. When asked the question of whether goals had been set for students with disabilities, 15 of the 16 teams (93.75%) reporting in Fall 2022 said "Yes."

Five schools had some change in cohort structure during the reporting period, with some cohorts merging or separating. For the within-cohort analysis, Kentucky retained separate cohorts when possible, using the "merged" score for pre or post data as appropriate for each individual cohort. Kentucky was able to assess Winter 2022 to Spring 2022 growth for 14 cohorts and Winter 2022 to Fall 2022 growth for 16 cohorts. While 13 (93%) of reporting teams saw growth in the percentage of students meeting the benchmark from Winter 2022 to Spring 2022, only 1 (6%) saw growth from Winter 2022 to Fall 2022.

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

Regions will continue to provide training and coaching to districts on the effective implementation of the AIFs and math EBPs. Districts will collect fidelity data to inform the system of support for teachers. The KDE will continue emphasizing the use of the AIFs, which includes SSIP universal EBP resources and supporting regions to add additional districts and schools to work toward achieving the goals of the SiMR (scale-up efforts). The KDE anticipates seeing an improvement in implementation team capacity assessment scores and improved evidence of EBP fidelity in the classroom (KMIT and OTISS), which will lead to better student outcomes in the Transformation Zone regions.

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

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Kentucky Planning Team (KPT)--
The KPT, which consists of the State Transformation Specialist (STS), OSEEL leadership and the SISEP partner will take over the function of the State Management Team (SMT) as described in FFY 20. The SMT was established when special education was housed within the Division of Learning Services. Since that time, OSEEL was created which elevated special education to its own

office. With that change, OSEEL leadership now has executive authority to make decisions pertaining to the work of the SSIP. The function of the members of the SMT from outside of OSEEL can now be facilitated by OSEEL leadership.

Evaluation Plan--
The KPT will work with the external evaluators to conduct a data analysis and gather stakeholder input. Based on the data analysis and feedback from stakeholders, the KPT will determine the next steps for the evaluation plan.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Target Setting for FFY 2020-2025-
As part of the new SPP package, the KDE engaged with a broad range of stakeholders to set new targets. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the KDE met with stakeholders virtually. Virtual participation allowed for a broader range of stakeholders to participate and allowed for more representation from each geographical region of the state. Stakeholder groups included parents of students with disabilities, KY-SPIN staff , educators, LEA staff, state agency partners, disability-focused advocates, affiliated agency staff, disability organizations and Kentucky's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC). The KDE designed its selection of stakeholders to include feedback from a representative group. This included consideration of urban and rural regions, diverse ethnicities, disabilities and socioeconomic backgrounds.

The KDE scheduled and organized stakeholder meetings to obtain input and advice. The goal of the stakeholder meetings was to present participants with historical data for each indicator, improve stakeholders' understanding of the indicators and gather input from stakeholders about future targets. Participants were informed about the process, expectations and desired outcomes of the stakeholder meetings through PowerPoint presentations, agendas, meeting notes and visual representations. An impartial facilitator led a whole group explanation of the indicators before breaking stakeholders into smaller groups where they reviewed and provided feedback about the indicators. During stakeholder engagement meetings, participants were provided with visual representations of Kentucky's historical indicator data as well as the proposal of three potential targets. An expert statistician identified the potential targets for the KDE's future focus. The KDE also gave stakeholders the opportunity to propose a target outside of the three potential targets developed by the KDE.

Following each target setting meeting, participating stakeholders were encouraged to broadly share the information presented and to provide any feedback received to the KDE. To provide an opportunity for broader stakeholder engagement, the KDE created surveys and posted them to the public reporting website. This allowed for more extensive input from a larger and more diverse group of individuals throughout Kentucky. The surveys also provided stakeholders the opportunity to provide input on progress, potential barriers and suggested improvement strategies.

Indicator 17-
The KDE also involved the SAPEC with target setting related to the SSIP and the SiMR. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) and previous SiMR targets were discussed. The SAPEC was presented with potential new SiMR targets as well as the change in alignment to Indicator 3B 8th grade mathematics. Members of the SAPEC expressed no concerns with the alignment to Indicator 3B 8th grade mathematics.

Also involved in the target setting process for Indicator 17 were the All-Transformation Zones (All-TZ). The All-TZs consist of Regional Implementation Teams (RITs) from across the state that serve Kentucky LEAs. RIT members were invited to join biannual meetings to provide feedback to the KDE regarding the implementation of activities to support the SiMR. At an All-TZ meeting, the KDE shared the proposed alignment for the SiMR targets (2020-2025 targets). Members of the All-TZ indicated the proposed SiMR target is rigorous and achievable, and the KDE should consider aligning to Indicator 3B 8th grade mathematics.

Prior to setting SPP targets for FFY 2020-2025, the KDE considered input and feedback from all stakeholder engagement activities. The new targets were distributed and posted on the KDE's public reporting page located at https://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/IDEA/Pages/Public-Reporting-of-IDEA-B-Data.aspx.

Revisions to Baseline/Target Setting-
For FFY 2021, due to recent changes in Kentucky's assessment and accountability system, the KDE sought broad stakeholder input to reset the baseline and targets for Indicator 3. A detailed description of the stakeholder engagement is provided in the Indicator 3 Description of Stakeholder Input section.

Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement-
The KDE continues to engage with stakeholders to analyze data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress.

The SAPEC provides guidance to the KDE with respect to special education and related services for students with disabilities in Kentucky. The SAPEC meets quarterly. Each meeting includes an open forum in which the public is invited to participate. The KDE solicits feedback from various stakeholders, including parents and educators, to increase the capacity to support activities around improving student outcomes. Additional information on the SAPEC can be found at https://education.ky.gov/CommofEd/adv/Pages/State-Advisory-Panel-on-Exceptional-Children-(SAPEC).aspx.

The SAPEC was provided with an update on the SPP/APR progress data. SAPEC members, parents and the community was given an opportunity to provide feedback, seek clarification, or provide suggestions during an open public forum and an electronic survey.

Additionally, the OSEEL convenes a Special Education Advisory Group for Infinite Campus (SEAGIC). SEAGIC is charged with ensuring that Kentucky's student information system addresses the special education needs of both Kentucky LEAs and the OSEEL. This group ensures the mechanisms are in place in IC to capture and maintain data. The SEAGIC meets several times throughout the year with representatives from IC to provide input and design forms, reports and navigation enhancements within the product. The SEAGIC is comprised of state and local personnel with both programmatic and technical knowledge of special education laws, regulations and program requirements.

The KDE provides a variety of opportunities for stakeholders within Kentucky LEAs to engage with state personnel. Annually, the KDE presents a professional development opportunity, known as the DoSE Institute. The institute is a three-day conference for Kentucky DoSEs. Targeted sessions include opportunities for participants to build their knowledge of the SPP/APR and the indicators as well as other information related to the IDEA. Also, the institute provides opportunities to network with other DoSEs and state leaders as well as ask questions or provide feedback to the KDE staff.

In addition, the KDE produces a brief, weekly email update for LEAs, SERTAC directors, regional TA providers, gifted and talented directors, DoSEs and other special education staff. The News You Can Use email provides important upcoming dates, updates on initiatives within the KDE and any timely information that may impact special education students and families as well as LEAs. The KDE also provides an opportunity for DoSEs to engage in direct conversation with the state director of special education on a bi-monthly basis in a virtual Dialogue with the Director.

The KDE works to incorporate feedback, develop resources and implement improvement strategies. Based upon feedback, the KDE created an Indicator Guide for Kentucky's stakeholders. It is a non-regulatory guide designed to provide an overview of the 17 Indicators in the SPP/APR. The guide includes a definition of each indicator, key vocabulary terms specific to that indicator, and a brief explanation of how the KDE collects data for each indicator. The KDE's Indicator Guide is located at https://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/IDEA/Documents/SPP_Indicator_Guide.pdf.

As part of the stakeholder engagement process, the KDE reached out to and engaged with a broad range of stakeholders throughout FFY 2021.

Stakeholder Input--
The KDE uses a Practice to Policy Communication Cycle to gather input and remove barriers through the linked teaming structure with regions, districts and schools within the TZ. Feedback reported through the linked teaming structure indicated staff turnover within implementation teams has increased. As a result, there is a need to consider turnover and its impact on scale-up and sustainability. Streamlining processes was posed as a potential solution to support scale-up.

Additionally, the KDE presented on the Kentucky Mathematics Toolkit to Support Students with Disabilities and information on the SSIP, SiMR and TZ during several events throughout the state. Stakeholders included special education directors, teachers, preschool coordinators and regional staff. The KDE received feedback that the tools were helpful and could immediately be used within districts.

The KDE engaged in All TZ meetings with RITs from across the state. RITs provided input on restructuring the SIT to focus on scale-up and sustainability.

The Usability Testing teams conducted training on the data practice profile with TZ districts. Feedback received from the training included suggestions for clarifying language within the practice profile and emphasizing the connection between academic and implementation goals.

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

As described in Phase II, the KDE uses a Linked Teaming Structure consisting of implementation teams at all levels of the system (state, region, district and school) to create an "enabling context" or a system that effectively removes barriers to achieving the goals of the SiMR.

The KDE also uses a Practice Policy Communication Cycle. This allows barriers encountered in practice to be rapidly communicated through the linked teaming structure to the highest level required for a solution. Stakeholder input reaches multiple levels of the system to inform practice and influence policy. (https://sisep.fpg.unc.edu/news/sisep-enotes-may-2015)

Stakeholder activities within reporting period--
All TZ Meetings continued to be held virtually. Based on feedback from regional partners, meetings were held biannually (May and November). During the May meeting, four regional teams shared the work they had done over the past year and all regions participated in identifying facilitators and barriers to scaling. The STS also shared updated training materials and data dashboard forms. A feedback survey was sent to participants following the meeting. The November All TZ meeting continued to focus on sustaining and scaling the TZ work. A feedback survey was sent to participants following the meeting.

RITs received monthly updates from the STS and those in intensive support had monthly meetings, both in person and virtually. During meetings, implementation celebrations and barriers were shared. The STS also provided training and coaching on the Active Implementation Frameworks.

Usability Testing teams meet as needed to develop training. Training on the practice profiles occurred during FFY 2021. The teams are composed of regional TZ partners who serve as liaisons between the team and respective regional partners. Based on stakeholder feedback, the training sessions and materials are being updated.

The 2022 OSEEL DoSE institute was held in person for all directors across the state. During the conference, a session was offered

to share the Kentucky Mathematics Toolkit to Support Students with Disabilities along with information on the SSIP, SiMR and TZ.

The 2022 Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children Conference was held in person and open to special education teachers, directors of special education and SERTAC staff. During the conference, a session was offered to share the Kentucky Mathematics Toolkit to Support Students with Disabilities along with information on the SSIP, SiMR and TZ.

The 2022 SISEP Active States Forum was held in person and virtually in June. The forum is held annually and includes STSs and implementation team members from SISEP Active States. During the conference, the KDE presented a problem of practice and participated in problem-solving with other active states.

SISEP Active States Community of Practice is composed of STSs and implementation team members from SISEP Active states. The meetings are held each quarter. Meeting topics included Building Teams, Communication Plans and Defining Sustainability.

The SAPEC provides guidance to the KDE with respect to special education and related services for students with disabilities in Kentucky. The panel meets quarterly with an SSIP update given annually.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders identified the need to focus on sustainability and scale-up for systems improvement efforts. To respond to stakeholder feedback, the SIT will focus on scale-up and sustainability by reviewing successes, challenges and improvement strategies.

Based on the feedback provided from the TZ districts during the Data Practice Profile training, the Data Usability Testing team met to update the materials. The team will continue to update the training and practice profile as additional input from stakeholders is received.

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

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its FFY 2021-2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions