

**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**

**Michigan**



**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 focus of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is on literacy progress for students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (below the 20th percentile on screening measures), including students with disabilities. The SiMR is currently measured using Acadience Reading K- 6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level (e.g., phoneme segmentation fluency, nonsense word fluency-- correct letter sounds and whole words read, oral reading fluency--words correct and accuracy). In future years, the SiMR may be measured using a variety of screening and progress monitoring measures based on what Michigan districts are using. The SiMR is represented as a long-term outcome in the evaluation plan logic model and goal 2.

#### 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 SiMR currently represents reading data from three elementary schools that participated in the data-based individualization (DBI) model demonstration during 2021-2022. Professional learning and implementation support from the MiMTSS TA Center began in August 2021, and a first group of 56 target students was identified in September 2021. The 56 target students included first (31) and second grade (25) students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (scored Well Below Benchmark on the fall Acadience Reading screening and below the 21st percentile). In the three elementary schools, the district's first-grade 20th percentile was equivalent to the national 4th percentile. The district's second-grade 20th percentile was equivalent to the national 5th percentile. The SSIP target student group includes 21 (38%) students with an individualized education plan (IEP) but are not exclusively students with an IEP. Of the 21 students with an IEP, the majority were eligible based on a Speech and Language Impairment (7). Four students had a Developmental Delay, three had an autism spectrum disorder, three had a Specific Learning Disability, two had a Cognitive Impairment, one with a Physical Impairment, and one with Other Health impairments. The SSIP target student group is 38% female and 64%, male. The racial/ethnic composition of the SSIP target student group is 94% White, 6% Hispanic/Latino, and 6% Multi-racial.

Two additional schools within a different district, began participating in the DBI model demonstration in September 2022, and 52 students were identified to be part of a second group of SSIP target students. These are 1st and 2nd-grade students who scored Well Below Benchmark on the fall Acadience Reading screening and below the 21st percentile from the two new schools. SiMR data from this second group of target students will be reflected in the FFY 2022 report.

These first two groups of target students represent schools within rural Michigan school districts, but the subset does not yet represent the full diversity of Michigan's students. Recruitment efforts are currently underway to support additional districts with greater racial and economic diversity, representing different geographic areas of the state. One potential new district has been previously identified as needing support based on an analysis of ESSA and IDEA outcome indicators. This district currently has their staff engaged in professional learning to help teachers understand scientifically based reading instruction, which will create a foundation for implementing DBI for reading within an MTSS framework in the future.

#### 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.

Theory of Action: [https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/SSIP\\_TheoryofAction.pdf?rev=cf67ac0d308e4d489c0e06fd341f5e55](https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/SSIP_TheoryofAction.pdf?rev=cf67ac0d308e4d489c0e06fd341f5e55)

#### 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)

YES

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	0.00%
B	2020	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%
Target B >=	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Part	Number of target students who make above or well above typical progress from fall to spring per the Acadience Reading Pathways of Progress for the Composite score / Number of target students whose progress monitoring scores improve after an intensification (3 of 5 of most recent post-intensification data points are higher than pre-intensification data points)	Number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 21st percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score / Number of target students whose data show a lack of progress and need for intervention intensification	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	36	56	0.00%	20.00%	64.29%	Met target	No Slippage
B	0	56	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening fall and spring composite scores, fall to spring pathways of progress based on the composite scores, and weekly progress monitoring scores.

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

The SiMR data collection and analysis plans are outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan (Data Analysis Plan and Data Collection Plan). This evaluation plan was developed in October 2021, with modifications proposed in October 2022. The SiMR is represented in the evaluation plan as a long-term outcome (improved reading outcomes) and Goal 2 (By the end of each school year, SSIP target students will demonstrate within-year reading progress in two ways: A) make above or well above typical progress from fall to spring per the Acadience Reading Pathways of Progress for the Composite score; B) improve progress monitoring scores after a documented intervention intensification, as measured by Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level). Data collection and analysis have been ongoing since Fall of 2021. Data are primarily collected by school staff and analyzed by multiple teams: school multi-disciplinary team, school leadership team, district implementation team, MiMTSS TA Center intensifying literacy instruction implementation team, and the SSIP leadership team.

**SiMR Part A**

Acadience Reading K-6 screening data are collected for ALL students using paper/pencil methods by an assessment team that includes classroom teachers, interventionists, and other school staff who have been trained to collect the data with fidelity each September, January, and May. Scores are entered into Acadience Data Management. To measure progress toward the SiMR targets, students' fall and spring composite scores are compared, including their fall to spring Pathway of Progress. Pathways of Progress provides a norm-referenced comparison of each student's progress throughout the school year, compared to other students who started the school year with the same composite score. We strive to have SSIP target students make above or well-above-typical progress compared to their same-grade peers who started the school year with similar skills.

## SIMR Part B

Acadience Reading K-6 progress monitoring data are collected weekly for all target students participating in reading intervention. Specific measures are selected based on the student's grade level and skills needing development (e.g., Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency--Correct Letter Sounds and Whole Words Read, and Oral Reading Fluency-- words correct and accuracy measures). Progress monitoring goals, scores, and intervention adaptations are entered into the Acadience Data Management system. First-grade students are typically monitored in Phoneme Segmentation Fluency until they've met the benchmark goal, Nonsense Word Fluency all year, and Oral Reading Fluency once they have met the first grade Nonsense Word Fluency benchmark goal. Second-grade students are typically monitored in Nonsense Word Fluency until they have met the benchmark goal and Oral Reading Fluency all year. These specific measures allow educators to closely examine student progress on the skills that reading intervention is (most likely) targeting. Progress monitoring data are analyzed weekly, starting after the first 5 weeks of intervention. During 2021-2022, the participating elementary schools were focused on establishing their Tier 2 reading intervention system to support 73% of their first and second-grade students and collecting progress monitoring data for those students (DBI Steps 1 and 2). The school multidisciplinary team still needed more skill building and practice analyzing student progress data to determine when and how to intensify intervention for students who were not responding to intervention instruction (DBI Steps 3-5). None of the schools made and clearly documented intervention intensifications during the desired time frame (using 5 data points initially and then again post an intensification), yielding 0% for the SiMR Part B FFY21 data. New schools are starting the 2022-2023 school year with clearer guidance on individual goal setting for student progress monitoring and data-based decision-making rules.

**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.**

Three SSIP target students met the end-of-year benchmark goal. These students and teachers worked very hard to dramatically change their reading performance from below the 16th percentile to above the 55th percentile within a single school year. An additional six students moved from well below benchmark at the beginning of the year to just below benchmark by the end of the year.

Goal 3: Annually, students within schools participating in the intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration and receiving intensive technical assistance will report more positive attitudes about reading and school compared to baseline, as measured by student interviews (sampling of elementary students) or surveys (secondary method for measure student attitudes about reading). The majority of students felt positive about school (69%), reading (64%), and intervention time (59%) at the end of the school year. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (92%) at the end of the school year. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if learners' perceptions change while their schools implement data-based individualization (DBI).

Goal 4: Annually, parents, families, and caregivers will report more opportunities to be involved in planning about their children's learning and more positive attitudes about the school's reading support, as measured by parent, family, and caregiver surveys or interviews and measured by Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory items. Most parents agreed (59-69%) that the school listens and involves them in planning supports for their child. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if parent or caregiver perceptions change while their school implements data-based individualization (DBI). We will also examine whether those who disagree are parents or caregivers for children with disabilities or other marginalized groups. One of the three schools only sent the survey to parents who were also teachers at the school in 2021- 2022.

**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.**

During the 2021-2022 school year, the MiMTSS TA Center worked with the multidisciplinary teams in the three schools to develop progress monitoring data collection plans, including consistent people to collect the data, using specific measures and decision rules for when to add or drop assessments based on students' progress. Late in the fall, the MiMTSS TA Center coach realized that each school had assigned just one person to collect the progress monitoring data for all students receiving intervention supports (approximately 74 first and second-grade students per school). This unfeasible workload, combined with a lack of clarity about which measures to administer, resulted in limited progress monitoring data being collected across all students, and for some students, too many unnecessary measures were being administered. By mid-winter, progress monitoring data collection had improved. Schools had switched to using first-grade oral reading fluency measures with their second-grade students per the MiMTSS TA Center's recommendation. However, when data showed that using first-grade assessment probes did not improve sensitivity to detecting student progress, the staff at one of the three schools did not want to switch back to using second-grade measures. They believed students would lose confidence when monitored using more difficult assessment probes even though the data did not show that students were performing any better on the first-grade measures. Schools in the second cohort of the DBI Model Demonstration project are starting 2022-2023 with clearer guidance on what measures to collect for students at each grade level. They also have a plan for collecting data for one student each day (taking approximately 2- 3 minutes) to ensure all data are being collected with minimal disruption to instructional time.

Student progress data (SiMR Part B) were also impacted by schools' adherence to decision rules for when to make changes to intervention. In the same school described above that did not want to switch back to using second-grade oral reading fluency

measures, staff were eager to respond to any data points below the aimline. Rather than waiting for an accumulation of at least three data points and first looking at attendance and intervention fidelity, staff regularly regrouped students and changed the intervention without documenting intervention changes in the Acadience Data Management platform. For many students, it was not possible to determine when intervention changes were made, what those changes were, and how impactful those changes were.

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

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

COVID-19 continued to impact student attendance during the 2021-2022 school year. As students were exposed to and diagnosed with COVID-19, district policies required students to stay home and, in some cases, whole classrooms were required to stay home and transition to remote instruction for days at a time. The first grade SSIP Target Students in one school missed an average of 26 school days (range: 6-63 days). The reduced attendance very likely weakened the potential impact of Tier 1, class-wide instruction and intervention instruction during 2021-2022. With more students and adults vaccinated and less strict quarantine policies, absences due to COVID-19 are likely to decrease during 2022-2023. However, attendance data will continue to be monitored.

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

Updated Evaluation Plan (November 2022) [https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/MI\\_SSIPEvaluationPlan.pdf?rev=ef3ff7d9ba124deebaf4e5487c88c582](https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/MI_SSIPEvaluationPlan.pdf?rev=ef3ff7d9ba124deebaf4e5487c88c582)

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

YES

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

The SSIP Leadership Team is proposing two modifications to the evaluation plan that was developed in October 2021. The first modification is related to the Coordinated Supports infrastructure improvement strategy (Short-term outcome: Documented process for matching school, district, and ISD literacy needs to a continuum of literacy based MTSS supports). This corresponds with Goal 5 (By Fall 2023, a reduced number of previously identified schools will be reidentified as needing improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities, as measured by MDE's determinations using IDEA result indicators (OSE "targeted" group) and ESSA TSI indicators (CSI and ATS as available) for students with disabilities) and Goal 13 (By September 2023, and annually thereafter, each district receiving state-level literacy-based MTSS supports including DBI will have a plan that outlines how state-level supports from MDE are coordinated and aligned, as measured by product review (district plans) completed by the state-level coordinated supports team for each district). It will be early December 2022 before ESSA indicators are applied to identify schools and districts needing additional state-level supports and monitoring. Then, it will take further time to co-construct a formal plan with each district. Given the time still needed to analyze accountability data and plan, we would like to remove the related short-term outcome, Goal 5 and Goal 13 from the evaluation plan at this time. Given this change, coordinated supports will not be described in the remaining sections of this report that are related to infrastructure improvement activities. The connection to coordinated supports will be added back when the system has had the opportunity to receive and act upon relevant ESSA data. In the meantime, work is underway to ensure there is a plan for scaling up DBI implementation in Michigan through the newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant and connecting with intermediate school districts through general supervision and local MTSS scale-up efforts.

The second proposed change to the evaluation plan is to consolidate two nearly identical goals (14 and 15) that are focused on who is participating in SSIP technical assistance (intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration). We propose keeping the more comprehensive Goal 15 (By June 2023 districts and ISDs of varying size and demographics, including sites that have been identified for support through state and federal accountability measures, will access a continuum of TA to help improve literacy outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities, as measured by universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance participation and training records housed in the MiMTSS Data System) and removing Goal 14 that was just focused on model demonstration sites.

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

The rationale for changes to the SSIP evaluation plan are included in the previous response field, alongside a description of each proposed change.

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

The FFY 21 infrastructure and improvement strategies reporting timeline is July 1, 2021, to October 31, 2022. The Theory of Action (ToA) focuses on developing capacity within MDE, Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), and local districts to fulfill their respective roles in the selection, coordination, support, and implementation of Data-Based Individualization (DBI) and other evidence-based practices, within a multi-tiered framework to improve outcomes for all learners, including students with disabilities. The emphasis on developing an internal infrastructure encompasses the MDE offices, aligning cross-office priorities through effective teaming structures by establishing clear governance and expanding stakeholder communication.

MiMTSS: MDE's MTSS Practice Profile defines standards and expectations for what MTSS looks like in practice and provides guidance for the implementation of MTSS, as indicated in Michigan's state law. The MDE MTSS Practice Profile specifically

describes educators' and leaders' actions when using an MTSS framework as intended. The Practice Profile also provides educational settings with a framework to organize the instructional strategies used to support tiers 2 and 3 using the steps outlined in data-based individualization (DBI) to support successful learner outcomes. The MDE ensures high-quality professional learning and TA is available to support the implementation of MTSS through the state's MTSS supports (MiMTSS). MiMTSS is governed by the MDE's MiMTSS Leadership Team, with the TA provided to educators and leaders by the MiMTSS Technical Assistance (TA) Center, and supported using statewide data to inform improvements using the MiMTSS Data System.

General Supervision: Since 2016, when OSEP informed MDE that ISDs as sub-recipients of IDEA grant funds are functionally the local education agencies (LEAs), OSE has worked to broaden and enhance the system of general supervision. The OSE has engaged regularly since 2018 with a group of ISD and member district stakeholders, along with stakeholders representing other constituencies. The OSE supports the ISD work through grants – General Supervision System Grants – with required applications for funds and semi-annual and annual reporting of progress. Also, the OSE has been engaging with ISD Directors through a series of iterative documents that began with reviewing OSEP's Critical Elements (CrAIG), which evolved into a Conversation Guide and further evolved into an ISD self-assessment of the general supervision development work. These activities are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within MDE, OSE, and ISDs. The OSE annually engages in activities to increase awareness and capacity, such as the SPP/APR presentation of indicator progress and trends to the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), OSE staff, and ISD Directors. The OSE has engaged and embraced a Data Use and Action Process to increase the OSE capacity to report, analyze, and use data to improve both results and compliance. The OSE is building two teams for this capacity-building work. The Data Use and Action Process Team has provided TA to three ISD data action teams since 2018. It is anticipated TA will be provided to three additional ISDs and up to five districts. Each of the ISDs will identify approximately two constituent districts for a total of five additional districts being supported. The Quadrant Data Use Team is charged with building the capacity within the OSE. There is some overlap in the membership of these teams to ensure coordination. ISDs will be encouraged to identify staff to also participate in the DBI State-Trainer Network and a DBI community of practice to develop the knowledge and abilities of ISD staff who have been identified by leadership to facilitate DBI professional learning to school multidisciplinary teams. This will help connect the Data Use and Action Process with efforts to analyze the impact of intensifying literacy instruction using DBI to accelerate reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

**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.**

MDE Office of Special Education: Professional learning and network for ISD directors and staff on how to develop regional infrastructures to support the literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. The OSE is beginning to consider strategic opportunities to connect and leverage the General Supervision and Data Use and Action Process with data-based individualization (DBI) technical assistance. For example, upcoming meetings with OSE staff and ISD Directors will include space for learning about how DBI and MTSS can be used to support growth for students with disabilities. Directors will access information about DBI and a summary of learning from the model demonstration project, including SiMR results. They will receive information about how they can partner with local districts to access a continuum of DBI technical assistance from the MiMTSS TA Center. As the OSE Data Use and Action Process Team provides TA to the field, ISD and district data action teams may identify a need to strengthen their Tier 2 intervention systems and Tier 3 systems for intensifying intervention. These teams could then be connected to the MiMTSS TA Center for DBI professional learning and implementation support that can be integrated into their strategic activities and plan.

MDE will apply implementation science to support alignment of MTSS supports from the capital to the classroom. The MiMTSS Leadership Team completes the State Capacity Assessment (SCA) annually to self-assess progress toward developing the necessary state-level infrastructure to support MTSS across the educational cascade. The most recent administration was in April 2022, and yielded a Total score of 54%, an improvement of six percentage points since February 2021. Upon reviewing the results, the Leadership Team decided to prioritize improvements around using data to drive state-level decisions related to MTSS. The team has started looking at MTSS implementation fidelity data to understand the scope of MTSS implementation in Michigan.

The MiMTSS TA Center will demonstrate learning from the DBI and MTSS model demonstration project and demonstrate how the learning is infused into other universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance. The following lessons were documented from the first year of the DBI Model Demonstration work with three elementary schools: 1) Schools need coaching support for multidisciplinary teams (systems coaching) and instructional coaching for interventionists, 2) Local assessment expertise needs to be developed, and tools that allow data to be easily summarized are needed, 3) MDTs are needing a lot of time to meet (at least weekly) to ensure their solid systems to support intervention access, ensure intervention effectiveness, and to provide ongoing individual student decision-making, 4) More intervention program adaptation examples are needed to demonstrate how to intensify the instruction. These lessons learned have all been used to design improvements to the data-based individualization (DBI) training materials and resources. In addition, efforts are underway to provide greater statewide access to data-based individualization (DBI) professional learning through the newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant, universal TA sessions at the annual MTSS conference, webinars and videos, and a targeted TA professional learning series for school and district teams who need small doses of professional learning in a shorter-duration to improve their intervention systems.

Intermediate Outcomes in the evaluation plan are conceptualized as "Improved Knowledge and Skills, Fidelity & Capacity." As a result of participating in professional learning, teachers, schools, districts, and ISD leadership will increase their understanding and knowledge of the core components of data-based individualization to improve reading outcomes, applied within an MTSS

framework.

School staff demonstrated a 7-percentage points improvement in data-based individualization (DBI) knowledge and skills based on a 39- item assessment that was given before training the multidisciplinary teams (pre) and again at the end of the school year (post). During the summer of 2022, this assessment was revised for the second and third usability cycles based on an analysis of the results from 2021-22 and alignment with the concepts and language used in the updated training materials. At the end of the school year, staff were also asked about the impact of participating in the DBI model demonstration project. 93% agreed that they were glad their school participated in the project. 98% of staff said they were able to implement all components of the intervention instruction effectively and 95% said they improved as a reading teacher. 95% of staff believed their school implementation of MTSS improved during the year and 100% of staff agreed that student reading outcomes improved.

Schools will implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and DBI with fidelity.

The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) was used to measure the implementation of the reading components of an MTSS framework. Tier 1 scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and stayed above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022. Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and were above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022. Observation data from the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons showed that while many interventionists technically used the lesson routines, they still needed support with implementation fidelity. The intervention was new to teachers during 2021-2022. It is therefore expected that teachers will be able to more consistently demonstrate intervention implementation fidelity during 2022-2023. Related to the steps of data-based individualization (DBI) that require intensifying intervention for students who do not initially make progress, approximately 67% of target students had data showing that they could benefit from intervention intensification. Only 19% of those students had an individualized intensive intervention plan developed. This is consistent with the lack of data available for SiMR Part B reporting.

Districts and ISDs will increase their capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS through implementation infrastructures, including local training and coaching capacity.

The District Capacity Assessment (DCA) was used to measure the district-level infrastructure available to support schools to implement MTSS and DBI with fidelity. The first model demonstration district has been sustaining their district implementation infrastructure above 80% since September 2019.

**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.**

The next steps for the infrastructure improvement strategies reported in FFY 22 will reflect work that is anticipated to occur between November 1, 2022, and October 31, 2023.

MiMTSS: Progress will continue to be reported for goal 11 (Annually, the MiMTSS TA Center will demonstrate learning from the data-based individualization (DBI) and MTSS model demonstration project and demonstrate how the learning is infused into other universal, targeted, and intensive TA, as measured by annual summaries from data-driven continuous improvement planning sessions and descriptions of each TA offering that integrates DBI data, systems, and practices.) and goal 12 (Annually, the state's capacity to support MTSS will improve or remain above 80%, as measured by the State Capacity Assessment total score.). In FFY 21, the MiMTSS State Action Plan was updated to illustrate the collective work and impact across the MiMTSS Leadership Team (LT), MTSS sub-committees, and the MiMTSS TA Center. The MiMTSS LT will continue to expand its use of data (reach, capacity, fidelity, and impact). The MiMTSS Evaluation Committee was formed to assist the MiMTSS LT in using relevant data, including disaggregated data, when planning and evaluating support for the effective implementation of MTSS. The MiMTSS TA Center will continue developing and expanding its TA Catalog offerings for DBI. The MTSS Resource Committee developed fiscal guidance to support districts in using state and federal funds to support the implementation of MTSS. ISDs are requesting comparable fiscal guidance since they are working to allocate consultants and other ancillary staff (e.g., school psychologists and teacher consultants) to provide DBI professional learning and coaching support. Learning from the model demonstrations for DBI, Interconnected Systems Framework (integrating Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support with social-emotional learning and school-wide mental health supports), and Early Childhood MTSS will continue to inform the development of a MiMTSS Resource Plan for statewide scale-up. Some of the FFY 2021 activities involving the MiMTSS TA Center will deepen knowledge of the MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team to understand how the DBI model demonstration's focus on intensifying literacy instruction is connected to several state and federal priorities to accelerate literacy outcomes. The MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team will review data related to learning from the DBI model demonstration and discuss opportunities for promoting and disseminating information about universal, targeted, and intensive DBI-related TA accessible to stakeholders.

General Supervision: Progress will be reported for goal 10 (Annually, the number of districts and ISDs with the capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS will increase, as measured by the number of district and ISD staff trained, pre-post DBI knowledge tests, and post-training installation and practice activities.). FFY 2021 activities are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within MDE, OSE, and ISDs to increase the ISDs' ability to apply DBI to accelerate literacy outcomes within an MTSS framework. The MiMTSS TA Center is formally collaborating with 13 ISDs who are working to scale up MTSS implementation across their counties/regions. Each of the 13 ISDs will have an ISD Scale-Up Plan that is approved by their executive leaders. The ISDs will have the opportunity to include capacity-building activities focused on DBI as they continue their efforts to scale MTSS. The TA Center will support the ISD capacity-building effort by having a DBI State-Trainer Network and a DBI community of practice to develop the knowledge and abilities of ISD staff who have been identified by ISD leadership to facilitate DBI professional learning to school multidisciplinary teams. There are also opportunities through state aid for ISDs to have their own Language Essentials for

Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Facilitators to develop educator and leader knowledge in scientifically based reading instructional methods. LETRS is a part of the intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration that is focused on DBI because it establishes foundational knowledge in reading acquisition that is necessary to know how to intensify reading instruction using the five DBI steps. LETRS professional learning is already available to Michigan pre-kindergarten through fifth-grade educators for free through state aid. Adding ISD LETRS Facilitators will not only increase the number of teachers and leaders who have access to professional learning in scientifically based instructional methods, but it will also help address teacher and leader turnover to ensure new staff has the necessary knowledge in reading acquisition.

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

DBI implementation and the district-selected reading intervention curriculum resource (Enhanced Core Reading Instruction) chosen for DBI step 1 started in September-October 2021. Next year's FFY22 report will include data from additional model demonstration partners that are using Reading Mastery as their intervention curriculum resource.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

DBI is a research-based process used by a multidisciplinary team for individualizing and intensifying interventions. DBI is accomplished by systematically using assessment data, using research-validated interventions, and adapting the intervention instruction using research-based strategies. The adaptations to the intervention instruction are categorized by the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity (dosage, alignment, comprehensiveness, or elements of explicit instruction, behavioral supports, and attention to transfer). The multidisciplinary team includes individuals with a variety of expertise who will attend to students' access to quality Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention supports (e.g., assessment, reading specialist, behavior specialists, speech and language). They ensure that the intervention supports being accessed by students effectively meet their needs.

There are five steps in DBI that can be categorized by Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports within an MTSS framework. The first step of DBI begins by selecting a research-validated intervention to deliver intervention instruction. Four of the five schools participating in the DBI model demonstration (three schools' data are reported in the FFY 2021 report and the two schools' data to be reported in the FFY 2022 report) already decided to use the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) as the validated intervention program to teach foundational word-reading skills in grades K-2. ECRI uses explicit instructional routines to teach phonemic awareness, decoding skills and develops reading fluency including teacher modeling, guided practices, and opportunities for learners to apply and extend their learning. The additional schools that are starting DBI professional learning have decided to use Reading Mastery as the evidence-based, standard protocol intervention representing DBI step 1. Like ECRI, Reading Mastery explicit instructional routines to teach phonemic awareness, decoding skills and develops reading fluency. The model demonstration does not require a specific intervention curriculum resource to be used. The TA Center works with district and school leaders to review the evidence of the intervention curriculum resources to confirm the intervention has quality evidence to improve literacy-related outcomes and is aligned with scientifically based reading research. District leaders and the MIMTSS TA Center mutually agree on the evidence-based standard protocol intervention curriculum resources used in the first DBI step. Step 2 in DBI is progress monitoring. The progress monitoring data are analyzed to determine whether students respond to the intervention instruction. When students are responding to the validated intervention. In that case, it continues until it is determined they can exit intervention and maintain their foundational word-reading skill progress during class-wide, Tier 1 reading instruction. The first two DBI steps can be classified as Tier 2 intervention supports within an MTSS framework. Students who are not responding to the intervention instruction as anticipated would progress to DBI steps 3-5 for individualized, intensive Tier 3 intervention supports. Step 3 analyzes assessment data in a diagnostic way and, when needed, administers additional diagnostic assessments to develop a hypothesis about why a student is not responding as expected to the intervention instruction. Based on the hypothesis generated, DBI step 4 is initiated by determining adaptations to the intervention instruction. The adaptations are documented in an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan. The interventionists implement the contents of the Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan with fidelity, and the student's progress is monitored. Progress monitoring is the last step of DBI, with the provision for analyzing the data to determine each student's response to the intensive, Tier 3 intervention supports.

Professional learning in scientifically based reading instructional methods is provided to educators and leaders participating in the DBI model demonstration using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite. The LETRS Suite is a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions with a certified LETRS Facilitator. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. It develops background knowledge in reading science necessary for educators and leaders who are members of the Multidisciplinary Team, interventionists, and some general education and special education teachers.

**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.**

DBI is in the second year of implementation across the three schools with data reported in this report. The FFY 2022 report will include additional schools participating in the model demonstration. It is anticipated that information about the impact of DBI on district policies and procedures and the impact on teacher practice will continue to be learned throughout the FFY 2022 reporting period. This information is also available in the Evaluation Plan Logic Model, specifically the intermediate and long-term outcomes. The DBI professional learning for the model demonstration is provided to two teaming structures that are expected to impact the SIMR by changing policies, procedures, and teacher practices: District Implementation Team and Multidisciplinary Teams. The District Implementation Team (DIT) is responsible for developing the district's implementation infrastructure by developing policies, processes, and procedures to support the effective use, scale-up, and sustainability of educational innovations. This would include the implementation of DBI to support the advanced tiers (Tiers 2 and 3) of an MTSS framework to accelerate literacy outcomes for



all learners, including students with disabilities. DIT membership typically includes a district executive leader, principal representation, teacher representation, and at specific times, additional stakeholders like a board member and family/caregiver representation. The newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant has the DBI professional learning for the district implementation team and elementary multidisciplinary teams happening in the first year of partnership. Future SPDG-supported district data will be included in future reports.

Intended impact on teacher/provider practices:

As a result of participating in professional learning, teachers, schools, districts, and ISD leadership will increase their understanding of the core components of data-based individualization (DBI) to improve reading outcomes, applied within an MTSS framework. Schools will also implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and DBI with fidelity. The three elementary school multidisciplinary teams are the second teaming structure receiving DBI professional learning. Sessions include introducing DBI, identifying students who need intensive (Tier 3) intervention supports, using data to inform intervention instruction, intensifying intervention instruction, behavioral supports to increase student motivation and engagement, and finally, evaluating DBI implementation efforts. These sessions impact the district/school policies, procedures, and teacher practices needed to impact the SIMR.

Intended impact on district policies, procedures, and/or practices:

Districts and ISDs will increase their capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS through implementation infrastructures, including local training and coaching capacity. The implementation infrastructure the district has been developing and using to support an integrated behavior and reading MTSS framework through the SPDG partnership has been expanded to include DBI to support the advanced tiers of an MTSS framework (Tiers 2 and 3). The DIT professional learning sessions encompass two sessions. The first session focuses on expanding the district infrastructure to support DBI implementation. The second session is focused on district decisions for successful DBI implementation. Some of the decisions districts make after participating in the professional learning impacting policies, procedures, and teacher practices involve the recruitment and selection procedures for elementary multidisciplinary teams to ensure individuals with the proper skillsets are chosen. They also approve a DBI professional learning plan for intensifying literacy intervention instruction and ensure the appropriate resources are allocated to support efforts (e.g., personnel, time, fiscal). The DIT also analyzes Acadience data to inform how students access Tier 2 intervention supports (DBI steps 1 and 2) and, when the data warrants, access the most intensive (Tier 3) individualized intervention supports (DBI steps 3-5). Districts ensure it is documented that Tier 3 intervention supports also include students with disabilities to ensure reading outcomes are accelerated. Finally, the district reviews its existing process and procedures for reviewing, evaluating, and selecting intervention curriculum resources to ensure it encompasses ways to evaluate interventions using the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity represented in steps 1 and 4 of the DBI process.

Intended impact on parent/caregiver and child outcomes:

Students with disabilities and their families will experience the following benefits resulting from data-based individualization and MTSS: 1) Improved access to evidence-based reading intervention, with intensification as needed, 2) improved reading outcomes, and 3) positive attitudes about reading and school supports. The professional learning sessions for the multidisciplinary teams include learning in how to meaningfully engage parent/caregiver and student voice in the intervention goals, as well as in developing an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan and corresponding intervention supports to accelerate reading outcomes.

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

The following three measures of fidelity were used to assess practice change from July 2021, thru June 2022:

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) 2.0: The R-TFI was developed to measure the reading components of an MTSS framework. There are two subscales: Tier 1 and the Advanced Tiers, which represent Tiers 2 and 3. The Advanced Tier items align with DBI and the dimensions of intensifying intervention that need to occur within the DBI process (steps 3 through 5). The R-TFI is the only measure available to assess scientifically based reading research, assessment measures, and systems needed for the reading components of an MTSS framework. Tier 1 scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and stayed above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022. Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and were above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022.

Tier 2 reading intervention fidelity: Step 1 of DBI uses a validated intervention program, and it is the foundation for intensifying instruction. The interventions used in the three elementary schools have a fidelity measure that the intervention program authors have developed. The intervention program fidelity rubrics will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive intervention plans) and intervention fidelity observations. Observation data from the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons showed that while many interventionists technically used the lesson routines, they still needed support with implementation fidelity. The intervention was new to teachers during 2021-2022. It is therefore expected that teachers will be able to more consistently demonstrate intervention implementation fidelity during 2022-2023.

Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan (IIIP) fidelity: Students who are not responding as expected to the Tier 2, validated reading intervention, enter into steps 3-5 of the DBI process. A multidisciplinary team, which includes the student's educator (special educator and general educator), and parents/caregivers develop an IIIP. It provides for monitoring the fidelity of the adaptations to specific components of the intervention. Data are collected to ensure the intensive intervention instruction is delivered as documented in the IIIP weekly. IIIP product reviews will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive intervention plans) and intervention fidelity

observations. Related to the steps of DBI that require intensifying intervention for students who do not initially make progress, approximately 67% of target students had data showing that they could benefit from intervention intensification. Only 19% of those students had an intensive intervention plan developed. This is consistent with the lack of data available for SIMR Part B reporting.

**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.**

**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 DBI model demonstration continues to be underway, and it is anticipated that progress will be made related to the short-term and intermediate outcomes outlined in our SSIP Evaluation Plan. Specifically, by the end of this reporting period (June 2023), the SIMR target (goal 2) will continue to be met for students accessing reading intervention supports and will demonstrate within-year reading progress as measured by Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level. Educator and leader knowledge will also increase in DBI due to participating in professional learning sessions and receiving coaching support from MiMTSS TA Center staff. It is also anticipated that progress will continue to be made on school and district capacity to support the advanced tiers (tiers 2 and 3) of an MTSS framework by implementing DBI (goals 7 and 9). Intervention and DBI fidelity goals are also expected to meet (goal 8), setting the stage for sustainability. The MiMTSS TA Center continues to work closely with the district and their elementary school(s) to teach them how to use DBI and develop their capacity to coach DBI implementation for sustainability. The formal partnership between the MiMTSS TA Center and schools participating in the DBI model demonstration is designed to last two years.

The DBI model demonstration will expand in FFY 2022 to include two additional districts and their elementary schools. One of the districts has been the recipient of the state's federally funded Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant. Initial conversations with the executive leaders in the two districts happened during the summer of 2022 and were facilitated by the MiMTSS TA Center director and staff supporting DBI. The readiness conversations with executive leaders outlined the purpose of the DBI model demonstration and its connection to the SiMR and SSIP. An overview of DBI was provided and included a summary of the professional learning sessions designed for a district implementation team (DIT) and multidisciplinary teams. Both districts needed to identify an evidence-based, standard protocol intervention before participation in the model demonstration could be confirmed. Each district chose Reading Mastery. Finally, the readiness conversation outlined the personnel needed to coordinate the DBI model demonstration and the assessment data that would need to be collected by staff. One of the two districts chose Acadience to use as the screening and progress monitoring curriculum-based assessment measures. The other district has been using Aimsweb and will provide the MiMTSS TA Center access to the Aimsweb data system so the professional learning and coaching support to the district can be appropriately contextualized for Aimsweb. Readiness conversations with elementary school staff have already occurred for one of the two schools. MiMTSS TA Center staff had a chance to meet the teachers (interventionists, special educators, classroom teachers) and provide an overview of DBI, the work that will happen across the 2022-2023 school year, and the professional learning and coaching support they will receive. The second readiness conversation should occur during late fall or early winter of 2022.

In one of two districts that have been recruited to participate, the teachers, leaders, and interventionists are currently accessing MiMTSS TA Center facilitated professional learning in the LETRS Suite, a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. It is not an intervention curriculum resource used in the DBI process. Knowledge in the fundamentals of reading instruction will help teachers, interventionists, leaders, and members of the multidisciplinary teams better understand how to implement the five steps of DBI, since it is foundational knowledge needed to inform accurate intervention placement (DBI step 1), reading assessment data analysis (DBI steps 2-3), instructional adaptations to intensify reading intervention supports (DBI step 4), and ongoing data analysis (DBI step 5). The second district is working on having teachers enrolled in state-aid-funded LETRS professional learning. The MiMTSS TA Center LETRS Facilitators will also provide professional learning to the teachers in the second school.

**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.**

While we will continue to use data to drive improvements to the implementation of Michigan's SSIP, we are not currently planning major modifications to the SSIP. Our evidence-based practice continues to be Data-Based Individualization (DBI), the SiMR remains focused on reading, and the major components of the evaluation plan remain in place. We are making progress toward our SSIP goals, and we will continue to expand the use of DBI and collection and use of data to inform decisions moving forward.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that

attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\\_88192---,00.html](https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598_88192---,00.html). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

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

The primary stakeholder group providing feedback about the SSIP is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), which meets monthly throughout the year. SEAC serves as Michigan's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandated State Advisory Panel. The SEAC advises the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Special Education and the State Board of Education (SBE). The SEAC has a broad diversity of stakeholders—administrators, providers, advocates, parents, and consumers—concerned with the education of all children, including students with disabilities. The IDEA requires at least 51 percent of SEAC's membership to be "defined" members: persons with a disability or parents of a child with a disability (a child less than 26 years of age who receives special education services). The State Board of Education appoints SEAC members. There are up to 33 members of the SEAC with some membership turnover from year to year.

For the FFY 2020 SiMR target setting, SEAC members were asked to view an online, interactive, self-paced Data-Based Individualization course before the meeting. The course was a starting point for building some common language and understanding of DBI amongst SEAC members before the MDE provided a formal presentation and overview of the proposed SiMR targets and SSIP efforts. During the October 2021 meeting, the MDE OSE Director and MiMTSS TA Center Assistant Director reviewed the SSIP Theory of Action (ToA). They also defined a "model demonstration" and provided a rationale so members understood why this SSIP reported on a DBI model demonstration. Members received information about the scope and sequence of DBI professional learning for a District's Implementation Team and elementary multidisciplinary teams. Three concerns were raised by SEAC members during the FFY 2021 target setting. The first was the small number of students with disabilities that could benefit from the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration. The second concern was developing sufficient state capacity for districts to implement DBI. The final concern expressed during target setting was ensuring the reading instructional methods and curriculum materials align with scientifically valid instructional practices.

During the fall of 2022, the MiMTSS TA Center Director and the MDE Director of Special Education presented the FFY 2021 SSIP data to SEAC members and outlined the lessons learned in the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration, expansion efforts with new districts, and how SEAC concerns expressed during last year's target setting continue to be addressed. Expansion efforts were discussed with members and were presented with information about the school demographics for the additional schools included in the model demonstration. Members also learned that the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration professional learning scope and sequence is embedded into the state's newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant in the first-year district elementary schools begin their work on implementing an integrated reading and social, emotional, behavioral MTSS framework. Information was also shared about the state's DBI capacity building effort that will begin next fall with a state trainer network for ISD consultants and ancillary staff. Related to the second concern, SEAC learned about the resources and worked examples that have been developed from the existing DBI model demonstration sites to help new district teams and school multidisciplinary teams to apply DBI.

Since the worked examples and implementation lessons span across school sites, SEAC members were able to see how a range of district and school characteristics are represented in the learning. SEAC members were also able to see how the worked examples are used to help develop district DBI capacity. Finally, information was shared about the intervention curriculum materials being used across sites and the need for those things to meet the criteria of an evidence-based standard protocol intervention to implement the first DBI step. Since SEAC members were concerned last year about whether intervention curriculum resources were "balanced literacy based" or "aligned with a structured literacy approach," additional information was shared during the meeting about how state aid funded professional learning in scientifically-valid reading instructional practices using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite is helping to increase understanding in reading acquisition and sources of reading difficulty. It is also creating shared language within the state about the elements of "structured literacy." In subsequent SEAC meetings throughout the 2022-2023 school year, SEAC members will begin to see how DBI is represented in the state's dyslexia handbook and how the learning from the model demonstration has set the stage for more students with disabilities to benefit from DBI.

The staff, students, and parents/caregivers are also stakeholders that are informing the SSIP. During initial model demonstration partnership conversations, staff are aware the intensifying literacy instruction work is connected to the SSIP. The MiMTSS TA Center staff director shares relevant goals from the SSIP evaluation plan. Additionally, they see how perception data collected at the end of the school year directly informs goals within the SSIP evaluation plan. At the end of the school year, staff were also asked

about the impact of participating in the DBI model demonstration project. 93% agreed that they were glad their school participated in the project. 98% of staff said they were able to implement all components of the intervention instruction effectively and 95% said they improved as a reading teacher. 95% of staff believed their school implementation of MTSS improved during the year and 100% of staff agreed that student reading outcomes improved.

SSIP target students attending participating schools were surveyed for their perspective at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The majority of SSIP students felt positive about school (69%), reading (64%), and intervention time (59%) at the end of the school year. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (92%) at the end of the school year. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if learners' perceptions change while their schools implement data-based individualization (DBI).

Parents were also surveyed at the end of 2021-2022. Most parents agreed (59-69%) that the school listens and involves them in planning supports for their child. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if parent or caregiver perceptions change while their school implements data-based individualization (DBI). We will also examine whether those who disagree are parents or caregivers for children with disabilities or other marginalized groups. One of the three schools only sent the survey to parents who were also teachers at the school in 2021-2022.

**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.**

N/A

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

The SSIP Evaluation Plan outlines timelines, data collection methods, measures, and expected outcomes for SSIP implementation activities. To access the SSIP Evaluation Plan click on the following link: [https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/MI\\_SSiP-EvaluationPlan.pdf?rev=ef3ff7d9ba124deebaf4e5487c88c582](https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/MI_SSiP-EvaluationPlan.pdf?rev=ef3ff7d9ba124deebaf4e5487c88c582)

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

The state has not identified any new barriers.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

#### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **17 - OSEP Response**

#### **17 - Required Actions**