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

Rhode Island

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)?

K-8 students with disabilities will demonstrate improved mathematics achievement, as measured by an increased percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities demonstrating typical or high growth on the math statewide assessment—from 33% to 59% by FFY 2025.

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.

Students with disabilities in grade 8 who have growth data on the RICAS math state assessment

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://www.ride.ri.gov/informationaccountability/accountability/stateperformanceplan.aspx#41832102-theory-of-action-revisions

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.*

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	33.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	36.00%	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%	59.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

8th grade students with disabilities who demonstrate typical or high growth on math state assessment	8th grade students with disabilities that have growth data on math state assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
696	1,414	33.14%	36.00%	49.22%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

RICAS math state assessment student growth percentile data from spring 2022, spring 2021, and spring 2019 administrations

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

RIDE administers the RICAS assessment statewide and collects results at the individual student level with unique student identifier and data warehouse tools matching to IEP census and enrollment census to examine specific student groups. Data of 8th grade students with disabilities, all races, ethnicities, and disability categories, was reported as low (SGP 1-34), typical (SGP 35-69) and

high growth (SGP 70-100) for all students with growth data. RIDE then examined the percent of 8th grade students with disabilities statewide that showed typical or high growth spring 2022 on math RICAS state assessment for the SiMR. Data were shared across RIDE offices and with technical assistance providers for input and feedback. In addition to examining statewide data, RIDE has the capacity to examine the data by district, groups of districts, and by race and disability category. Examining 2022 growth data for students who attended districts that participated in the project coaching revealed the following: while 49% of 8th graders with IEP statewide showed typical or high growth on math RICAS, 64% of 8th graders with IEPs in project districts showed typical or high growth. This approximates typical or high growth shown by 8th graders without IEPs statewide (65.9%). Looking back at 2019 growth data, we see that for 8th graders in project districts 23% showed high growth that year whereas 27% showed high growth in 2022. In 2019, 37% of 8th graders in project districts with IEPs showed low growth while in 2022, 36% percent showed low growth.

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.

Screening/benchmarking data: Using the screening data collection tool described in previous submissions, we calculated the percentage of students in each instructional tier, and percentage changes between fall 2021, winter 2022, and spring 2022. Data was reported for all participating sites, except for one urban school district and one suburban elementary school. Elementary school benchmark performance in Grades 3-5 demonstrated an upward trend, with a 7% increase from fall to winter and a 1% increase from winter to spring of students meeting Tier 1 benchmarks. The data showed a percentage decrease of 2% from fall to winter and winter to spring for students requiring Tier 2. Interestingly, the percentage showing a need for Tier 3 intensive intervention decreased by 4% from fall to winter but increased by 2% from winter to spring. The percentage in Tier 1 for the middle school performance reveals an upward trend, as well, with a 5% increase from fall to winter and a 1% increase from winter to spring of students meeting benchmarks at Tier 1. Students requiring Tier 2 had a percentage decrease of 2% from fall to winter and a 1% decrease from winter to spring. For Tier 3, the percentage of students decreased by 3% from fall to winter, with no change between winter and spring.

Interim, formative mathematics assessments in use by LEAs: STAR Math, iReady, AIMsWEB, NWEA Math, Acadience Math, and Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP).

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) Case Studies: Eight out of the 11 (73%) case study students made moderate and ambitious growth toward progress monitoring goals as of June 2022. In relation to the language used in the SiMR, moderate growth equates to typical growth while ambitious growth equates to high growth. The state is comparing to pre-pandemic because the COVID pandemic impacted so much intervention time. Our case study results are similar to pre-pandemic data.

RIDE is also watching the Average Growth Percentile (AGP) on RICAS Math. Math RICAS AGP for 8th graders with IEPS is 47.31 which is higher than grades 3-8 math RICAS IEP (44) and lower than grades 3-8 math RICAS AGP for students without IEPs (51). In addition, RIDE examines the percent of SWD showing typical or high growth by disability category and race/ethnicity to look for equity issues in improving student growth. 8th graders with disabilities show typical and high growth at differing rates by disability: LD 61%, ASD 67%, ED 53%, SPL 52%. 8th graders with disabilities show typical and high growth at differing rates by race/ethnicity: two or more races 67%, Black 51%, Hispanic 57%, White 65%. Some groups have numbers too small to be reported. Finally, RIDE also watches the percent proficient. Currently, 2.3% of 8th graders with IEPs met or exceeded expectations on the math RICAS administered in spring 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)

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationaccountability/accountability/stateperformanceplan.aspx#41832104-ssip-evaluation-plan-revisions

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:

•   Cross-Office Collaboration within the RIDE Math Team
• Collaboration with the Office of District and School improvement (OSDI) to share resources and efforts within districts with particular attention to districts receiving support from OSDI and also from the SSIP Math Project.
•   Members of Office of Student, Community, and Academic Support (OSCAS) represent all federal programs including IDEA and regularly collaborate with the Office of Instruction, Assessment & Curriculum along with the Office of College and Career

Readiness. Two areas of continued collaboration are the ReThink Intervention grant work aligned to MTSS and Curriculum Frameworks initiatives. We will continue those endeavors along with participating on a math team representing the three offices.

The SSIP Math Project provides training and resources on evidence-based math instruction and DBI through an online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI (https://mtssri.org/). The BRIDGE-RI Courses are learning opportunities designed to foster active learner engagement, promote implementation of newly learned skills, provide learner choice, and build RI educator community. The courses engage participants through text, video or screencast of content or experts, video or audio from the course facilitator, or links to downloadable resources. The addition of self-reflection opportunities checks for understanding, and elements that allow course participants to interact with each other make courses engaging for the adult learner audience they serve. Currently there are three self-paced BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses: Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom (Part I): Foundations, Supporting All Learners in Math: Universal Design, Differentiation, and Scaffolding, and Supporting Language Development in Mathematics. The fourth self-paced mathematics course, Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom (Part II): Advanced - Facilitating Deep Mathematical Understanding will launch in the next quarter. Two self-paced BRIDGE-RI Tier 3 Courses were developed in collaboration with WestBay: Tier 3 Overview and Tier 3 Systems. The SSIP Math Project supported the creation of family and community engagement resources and highlighted math specific examples of the DBI process.

We continued with the District Model for two districts, Johnston and North Providence. For the district model, each district identified a group of educators across the district that included a combination of the following personnel: administrators, mathematics coaches and coordinators, special education leads, MTSS or RTI leads, and/or curriculum or instructional leads. The District Model allowed our coaches to support the districts with their infrastructure in order to scale and sustain their capacity for K-8 students, especially 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.

The Math Project works collaboratively with stakeholders within RIDE, special education directors, teachers, and the BRIDGE-RI team. The Math Project has always approached the achievement of the SiMR through a systems framework to support across all levels of the systems, the SEA, districts, schools, and parents. RIDE to schools to parents. Building capacity throughout a district through coaching and professional development (PD) leads to greater sustained efforts and supports sustainability and scale-up. Within each district, a group of stakeholders that included administrators, mathematics coaches and coordinators, special education leads, MTSS or RTI leads, and/or curriculum or instructional leads were selected to provide feedback regarding the professional learning and coaching and the current structure they are provided in to further support scaling and sustainability. The purpose was to create a system, driven by high expectations and standards, PD, and coaching that lead to the achievement of the SiMR by increasing the capacity to support K-8th students with disabilities. This systemic approach has supported scaling to additional school sites and sustaining practices to meet the needs of all students, but especially students with disabilities.

BRIDGE-RI provides PD online which allows educators to complete when it is convenient. It also allows user to go back into the modules, thus providing "just in time" support. Approximately 270 educators have completed at least one BRIDGE-RI math course. When asked, "To what extent did the content in this course advance your understanding of this subject," 51% of participants selected "Quite a lot," whereas 43% chose "Somewhat." It appears that the BRIDGE-RI math courses are achieving the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of DBI for math. When asked, "How much of what you learned will you apply to your practice," 42% of participants stated they learned several new things and will be applying at least one of pieces of information learned from the course immediately, whereas 50% stated they learned some new things and hope to implement at least one of pieces of information learned from the course in the future. The results show that the BRIDGE-RI math courses are demonstrating continued progress toward the intermediate outcome for increasing educators' application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity.

In the District Model, participants received training and coaching from a Math Project coach, a mini-grant award to support implementation activities for 2 years, and access to the Math Project's professional learning modules. Teacher-level training/coaching focused on ensuring access for all learners, including increasing participant knowledge of Universal Design for Learning, differentiation, and scaffolding in mathematics instruction.

Participants in the district model also received training on how to support students with solving word problems by learning "attack" strategies and schema-based instruction. They engaged in virtual training/coaching around Peer Assisted Learning Strategies and Data-based decision-making and received follow-up during the winter and spring of 2022. These training modules along with the educational personnel team structure of the District Model aligned with the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use.

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

YES

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

A Specially Designed Instruction and Data-Based Individualization (SDI/DBI) workgroup and virtual Communities of Practice (CoP) will begin following the submission of this report. The description and data outcomes will be shared in next year's report.

In partnership with Special Education Directors, RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN), and BRIDGE-RI, the SDI/DBI workgroup will identify trends and areas of improvement related to specially designed math instruction (SDI), define SDI in mathematics, and develop a framework in Rhode Island for accessible evidence-based math instruction. The virtual, statewide targeted Communities of Practice will be tailored to schools' training plans and participants' roles, include activities to enhance knowledge in accessible evidence-based math instruction, SDI, and components of DBI, to provide schools with the resources they need to effectively implement and take action. The workgroup and communities of practice aim to achieve the short-term outcomes of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI and increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use. They also aim to achieve the intermediate outcome of increasing educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction.

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

Using the networks of our partners, the Math Project will recruit ten to twelve educators, leaders, higher education faculty, advocates, and parents to join the SDI/DBI workgroup. The workgroup will convene to review various documents, provide feedback to drive implementation and user guide document(s), and will establish consensus on implementation methods and user guide document(s) prior to sharing with the field. We are anticipating the implementation of the products created by the workgroup will be used in the field by RIDE and districts/LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Starting with our sixteen existing school partnerships, the Math Project will annually administer a comprehensive needs assessment to determine what level of support each school needs and for what they are ready. Based on the level of readiness, we will recruit up to four schools with similar math professional learning goals to join a quarterly targeted content-specific CoP. These schools will engage in asynchronous learning through the coursework and then join facilitated sessions to discuss implementation of the professional learning. Facilitated sessions will include opportunities for educators to share problems of practice and action plan around potential solutions, as well as engage with colleagues across the state that might not have intensive coaching support at their school but have taken at least one of our existing courses. We are anticipating attaining completed needs assessment as well as training feedback for the asynchronous and facilitated learning sessions.

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

The following Common Core-aligned EBPs in mathematics across MTSS Tiers are incorporated into training and coaching activities with participating SSIP sites:

• DBI process (includes evidence-based intensification strategies, including fluency practice)
• Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) using concrete and virtual manipulatives
• Clear and concise mathematical language supports
• Visual schematic diagramming (e.g., Frayer model, place value thinking squares)
• Schema-based instruction for word problem solving
• Systematic and Explicit Instruction
• Peer-assisted learning strategies (PALS) in mathematics

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The EBPs selected for implementation listed above were identified using the Institute of Education Sciences (IES)/What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guides: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/26) and Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 through 8 (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/16). Each of the strategies has moderate to strong evidence, based on the IES/WWC criteria. Additionally, the Intervention Tools Chart from the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) was consulted to identify specific programs that incorporate the EBPs (e.g., PALS Math, Pirate Math). The DBI process, is "research-based process for individualizing and intensifying interventions through the systematic use of assessment data, validated interventions, and research-based adaptation strategies" (NCII, 2021).
For any intervention program selected by individual school sites, the staff coaches will help school sites determine the level of intensity. For example, the Strategic Math Series from the University of Kansas and the Bridges Math Intervention from the Math Learning Center are intervention platforms comprising EBPs that are based on IES recommendations, as mentioned above.

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.

The Math Project offers training and coaching to support math EBP implementation to an estimated 296 educators across the state of Rhode Island. Educators directly involved as SSIP participants during the first iteration of the Math Project were from 28 participating schools (20 elementary, 8 middle) through site cohorts and/or district models. Across sites, there were a total of 3,940 students enrolled. The DBI case study process has been conducted with 53 students since the project's inception in 2016. In addition, materials for educators and families and online asynchronous learning are freely available online to all schools and districts in the state and distributed through regular email notices to Special Education directors and also any educators registered with accounts on BRIDGE-RI (currently > 6,000 educators).

Site Cohorts – Three cohorts of schools participated in the RI Math Project, focusing on different aspects of implementation (e.g., learning and implementing evidence-based practices in mathematics, DBI in mathematics). Since the contract for the previous SSIP implementation ended in June 2022, all three cohorts focused on scaling and sustaining implementation. Each site had an action plan that prioritizes two to three goals for the academic year related to not only increasing knowledge and implementation of Common Core–aligned EBPs in mathematics across the tiers but also the structural changes (i.e., teaming processes) required to achieve results. Action plan goals aligned to the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of DBI for math and intermediate outcome of increased educator application of skills related to DBI for math. Action plans were implemented by the school teams with coaching support from the project.

The Math Project team continued to leverage the asynchronous learning modules on its website as well as the BRIDGE-RI courses as a part of its ongoing professional learning. By completing module professional development sessions and actively participating in coaching activities focused on mathematics instruction progressions and EBPs across the tiers, all cohorts made progress toward the previous short-term outcomes related to increasing their knowledge of core mathematics instruction and data-driven processes. In addition, Math Project staff provided coaching support to ensure implementation fidelity of learned EBPs (e.g., PALS) and more use of the CRA approach to build conceptual understanding and the use of Schema-based instruction (e.g., Strategic Math Series, Pirate Math, and. Bridges Math intervention).

District Model: In this model, participants received training and coaching from a Math Project coach, a mini-grant award to support implementation activities for 2 years, and access to the Math Project's professional learning modules. Teacher-level training/coaching focused on ensuring access for all learners, including increasing participant knowledge of Universal Design for Learning, differentiation, and scaffolding in mathematics instruction. Participants in the district model also received training on how to support students with solving word problems by learning "attack" strategies and schema-based instruction. They engaged in virtual training/coaching around Peer Assisted Learning Strategies and Data-based decision-making and received follow-up during the winter and spring of 2022.

Leadership Professional Learning Community (PLC) – For this reporting period, the Math Project continued implementing its PLC for district and building leadership. The Leadership PLC addressed the previous long-term outcome of improving LEA capacity to support, scale, and sustain improvement efforts. The Math Project hosted a virtual synchronous kick off session introducing accelerated learning. Due to the continuation of the pandemic, staff decided to switch from synchronous sessions to asynchronous learning modules for the other accelerated learning topics. Topics included (a) making acceleration a schoolwide focus (for administrators), (b) developing a yearlong plan using acceleration (for teachers), (c) developing a unit plan using acceleration (for teachers), (d) assessing student needs (for teachers, (e) developing a lesson plan using acceleration (for teachers), and (f) the role of the interventionist in acceleration.

Book Study - The Math Project continued to offer a virtual book study, as it had in the past reporting period. This approach aligned with the Math Project's previous theory of action and long-term outcomes; it provided a mechanism for school districts to build their internal capacity, take ownership of professional learning activities, and work toward sustaining practices across time. The book study approach has been favorably received by participants. During this reporting period, the book study occurred between February and May 2022, focusing on the text, Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success by Andratesha Fritzgerald. During this reporting period, there were 23 participants from 9 sites, including classroom teachers (both general and special education), math interventionists/coaches, and school administrators. This iteration of the Book Study included an accompanying podcast, "Math Chat Podcast," led by two coaches from the Math Project to help educators better understand the text.

In early spring 2022, RIDE issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify a vendor to support implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, based on the current theory of action and logic model. The Math Project at AIR was awarded as the vendor. The logic model includes activities of providing training and resources on evidence-based math instruction and DBI through the online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI. This model also specifies virtual and in-person coaching of teams on DBI and SDI and utilizing the Book Study. Under this new phase of implementation, the Math Project will recruit more districts through virtual communities of practices, thus impacting more students.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.
DBI Pulse Check Survey: As part of the support and planning with cohort sites, Math Project staff conduct an end of year (EOY) pulse check at each site to explore the changes in previous years. The items were included as part of a larger survey. The pulse check measured short-term and intermediate outcomes of educators' knowledge and application of DBI as well as the long-term outcome of educators' perceptions related to their school sites' implementation of DBI. The rating scale for the pulse check is from 1 – 6, with 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 6 representing "strongly agree."
For this report, we present weighted average responses for various survey items. Fifty-eight participants completed the survey items aligned with the EOY pulse check. Of these, five took survey for the first time, and 53 were returning participants who completed the pulse check at least one other time during the project. This report highlights comparative data of recurring participants from the baseline data in 2018 to the most recent data in 2022.

EBP Fidelity: The Math Project collects fidelity data on implementation of learned EBPs (e.g., PALS) and instructional strategies geared at increasing student dialogue in the math classroom (e.g., Number Talks) to promote alignment with math content and practice standards. Implementation protocols have been designed to determine the degree to which educators implemented with fidelity the skills attained during trainings. Multiple fidelity monitoring tools are tracking EBP implementation (e.g., teacher self-report, implementation logs, and observations) in a typical year. For teacher self-report, there are five items from the end-of-year (EOY) pulse check that provide information about the fidelity of overall implementation of project activities. For items that provide a more nuanced understanding of implementation (e.g., student-level plans are developed and followed, goals and progress monitoring plans are in place), the ratings were increased across all items (100%). The item with the highest difference in ratings related to the

customization and individualization of interventions to maximize the likelihood of a student's success (2018 = 1.9, new = 3.92). These increased ratings suggest that recurring participants have ensured processes are in place to document and monitor student-level mathematics interventions. The increased ratings also demonstrate progress toward the long-term outcome of improved fidelity of school-level implementation of DBI in mathematics.

Knowledge of Intensive Intervention Practice Changes: Items analyzed in this domain included prompts related to knowledge of implementation, strategies to identify students in need of intensive intervention, the purpose of progress monitoring and diagnostic data, and developing student-level plans. On all but one of the seven items related to participants' ratings of their knowledge of intensive intervention, there were increases in ratings for recurring participants when comparing 2018 with 2022. The decrease rating for the prompt, "There is a difference between progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data," suggests that educators continue to have difficulties distinguishing between the types of data used within the DBI process to support intensive intervention implementation. The item with the largest difference between means was the prompt, "I have appropriate knowledge about developing intensive math intervention plans for students" (2018 = 3.5; 2022 = 4.07). This finding suggests that educators' knowledge for this topic grew significantly during their participation with the Math Project.

Student Plan Implementation Fidelity: Items analyzed in this domain included prompts related to school schedules, resources, and cultural and linguistic considerations when selecting interventions and assessments. Recurring participants increased their ratings across all seven items (100%) from 2018 to 2022, suggesting educators are applying their gained knowledge into their student plans. The item with the largest difference between means was the prompt, "Schedules are flexible enough to allow time for intensive math intervention outside of core instruction" (2018 = 1.7; 2022 = 3.76). This finding suggests educators and administrators have improved their efforts in ensuring designated time for intensive intervention for students.

Data-Driven Instruction Survey: The Data-Driven Instruction survey was an internally developed resource to assess educator beliefs about using data to inform instruction. It includes 12 items related to data efficacy and data-use. Responses to the Data-Driven Instruction survey and attributes related to those skills included a set of items on which respondents rated their agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). This survey was also administered to educators across the SSIP sites for the past 5 years. We can report the comparative data from the baseline in 2017 to the survey administration during the 2021-22 school year. There were rating increases across all survey items (100%) from teachers' confidence in their ability to interpret student data to using assessment data/results to measure the effectiveness of their math instruction. This finding suggests that educators have improved their capacity to use data to inform their instructional decisions, determine causes of students' math performance, and set targets and goals for students.

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.

All cohorts made progress toward the previous logic model's intermediate outcome, applying learned skills to student-level DBI case studies. The case study protocol included (a) identification of mathematics skill deficit areas based on screening or progress monitoring results, (b) strategies identified to address instruction and behavior, (c) progress monitoring tools used, and (d) results achieved by the students on formative assessments. A critical component of the student-level case study was to select and implement a progress monitoring tool to track growth in students' mathematical skills and abilities. Tools used to monitor students' progress for this reporting period were Acadience Math, AIMSweb, and Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP). The frequency with which the assessments were conducted varied according to by students' targeted needs and the progress monitoring measure's administration recommendations. For example, MBSP is administered weekly, whereas Acadience Math typically is administer twice per month. Of the 11 case study students, five made ambitious growth, meaning they achieved more than a year's worth of growth in a year to close gaps. Two students who made ambitious growth exited intervention. Three students made moderate growth and four students made minimal growth. Educators applied their learned skills of implementing EBPs in mathematics, resulting in 73% of case study students demonstrating ambitious or moderate growth. During the first 6-year iteration of the Math Project, we conducted fifty-three student-level DBI case studies. Of the 53, forty-three students (81%) made moderate to ambitious growth.

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 following steps are occurring under the new vendor contract with RIDE that began in October 2022.

We are continuing with the same EBPs but providing more clarification around how to align these practices within SDI. TA will be provided on these EBPs through four primary professional learning activities: statewide professional learning, targeted professional learning content-specific Communities of Practice, targeted coaching, and leadership Communities of Practices. The anticipated outcomes to be attained are the short-term outcomes of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity of instruction from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI and increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use.

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.

Changes were made and submitted in last year's report (FFY 2020) and thus will be carried forward and implemented in schools and districts beginning in the 2022-2023 SY and beyond. We will begin working with more middle schools and will receive more

feedback if additional coaching and training are needed. At this point, all stakeholders are satisfied with the work being provided. It is also apparent from this submission that the SSIP implementation has led to positive student outcomes.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022.

As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also compiled and analyzed data for the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) utilizing the expertise of internal personnel. A draft along with the data was reviewed with the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC). RISEAC (a) advises the Commissioner and Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education on matters concerning the unmet educational needs of children with disabilities; (b) comments publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities; (c) advises the Rhode Island Department of Education in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618 of the IDEA; (d) advises RIDE in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal Monitoring Reports under Part B of the IDEA; and (e) advises the RIDE in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. Membership of the committee is composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. Parents of children with disabilities birth through 26 maintain the majority of the Committee Membership. The Membership also includes 5 Part B individuals with disabilities, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, private schools, charter schools, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities foster care and homelessness, vocational, community or business organizations, juvenile and adult corrections and State Child Serving Agencies. The RISEAC reviews the draft and provides suggestions and input. These are considered and, as appropriate, incorporated into the final copy of the SPP. Progress and slippage in meeting the targets in the SPP and SSIP are discussed in detail regarding each indicator submitted to OSEP. All indicators are publicly available on the RIDE website at the following link: https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx Each year RIDE publicly reports per 34 CFR

300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). Per OSEP, this typically occurs the first week of June. The link for accessing Rhode Island's public reporting information, which

details the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP is as: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

The SSIP Math Project conducts additional stakeholder groups, workgroups, and survey opportunities to engage a variety of stakeholders in the work. Specific details are outlined in the following sections.

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

To gather robust details on how the Math Project has supported LEA capacity, a series of interviews were conducted with LEA personnel to gather more detailed information on how their internal capacity has shifted. The 13 LEA personnel interviewed were from all three cohorts, both school sites and district models. The interview included a couple of questions asking about specific training or implementation activities that were most impactful on the schools' successes as well as the most helpful technique for schools during their participation with the Math Project. Most LEA personnel expressed that the on-site coaching & modeling, intervention trainings, and assistance with creating systems related to data were the most helpful for themselves and their

educators. In response to their feedback, the Math Project will continue to offer targeted coaching activities that focus not only on building educator competency related to the delivery of accessible, evidence-based math instruction through DBI but also on building the systems-related elements needed to support implementation.

In addition, stakeholder improvement efforts included:
• Sharing resources with Office of District and School Improvement and Office of Assessment, Instruction, and Curriculum, CEEDAR State Leadership Team, Cross-office Math Team at RIDE, the Academic Strategies team at RIDE, Office for Student, Community and Academic Supports Team which represents all federal programs.

• RI Special Ed Advisory Council - regular input, updates, and recruitment to the new Math project advisory

During the Parents and Family Support Survey and Interviews administered during FFY 2020, parents/caregivers and family members shared that they utilize websites such as Google and YouTube for mathematical concept tutorials to improve their mathematical understanding. Yet parents/caregivers and families expressed that they continued to seek out additional resources for support, particularly strategies informing parents/caregivers on how the "new math" works. As a result of this feedback about parents/caregivers utilizing YouTube for math tutorials, the Math Project developed a vetted playlist of YouTube videos for parents/caregivers and families to help them better understand mathematical concepts and methods. Since not all YouTube tutorials are of high quality, the Math Project staff selected or developed videos that align with Common Core mathematical standards and evidence-based practices. We have ongoing evaluation of this playlist to ensure it meets the needs expressed by parents/caregivers and families and make adjustments accordingly. In response to the feedback about parents/caregivers wanting additional resources on "new math", the Math Project team developed a suite of parent and family infographics on math homework. These resources, available in both English and Spanish, are designed to provide guidance to parents/caregivers and families on supporting their student's math learning at home. The series provides explanations of research-based math strategies in easy-to-understand language and offers multiple suggestions for fun activities families can do at home to support those strategies. The project plans to conduct future surveys to understand their use of the new resources and additional needs.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Based on feedback from LEA and school personnel, parents & families, etc., educators, schools and districts need more support and guidance around specially designed instruction (SDI). As a result of this feedback, the second iteration of the Math Project is establishing a work group and creating additional self-paced learning courses through BRIDGE-RI that will address these specific concerns raised by the stakeholders. In addition, RIDE and BRIDGE-RI have reached out to the Progress Center for additional TA and RIDE and LEA staff are participating in the special education guidance PLG organized by the Progress Center. In OSCAS communications to districts, Progress Center materials such as IEP tip sheets are shared.

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.

The current contract that funds the Math Project and will implement the current SiMR, TOA, and evaluation plan began October 2022.

Timeline of Activities:
• Determine Professional Learning needs for potential schools based on a comprehensive needs assessment to onboard schools for targeted coaching and "offboard" to leadership CoPs. [Oct 2022 – Feb 2023]
• Facilitate the Workgroup to develop the framework for SDI and DBI in math in Rhode Island. [first meeting to be held at the end of Jan 2023]
o   Develop BRIDGE-RI Moodle courses around SDI in mathematics based on the framework and guidance from the Workgroup.
o Develop math instruction professional learning guides.
• Establish Leadership Communities of Practice (CoP) to support sustainability of current adopters as leaders across the state (up to 10 schools). [To begin in Jan-Feb 2023]
• Develop a series for targeted coaching on SDI and DBI. [To begin in Jan 2023]
o   Pilot the coaching series with 6 existing schools.
• Facilitate the self-paced Podcast and Book study of the text, Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success by Andratesha Fritzgerald with educators and leaders. [Spring 2023]
• Facilitate another Book Study to begin in Fall 2023; book to be determined. [Fall 2023]

Anticipated Data Collection & Measures and Expected Outcomes
• Needs assessment – increased education knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI (short-term)
• BRIDGE-RI Moodle courses & training implementation and evaluation data – increased educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use (short-term)
• Math Beliefs Survey - Increased educator, family, and stakeholder beliefs of mathematics (short-term)
• EOY Pulse Check - Increased educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction (intermediate)

• Observational tool data - Increased educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction (intermediate)
• Stakeholder engagement survey - Improved stakeholder engagement to support improved math outcomes for students with IEPs (long-term)
• Progress Monitoring, Universal Screening, and State Assessment growth data - Improved formative and summative assessment outcomes in math for students with IEPs (long-term_

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

The number of initiatives that schools and districts are engaging in (High-Quality Curriculum Materials, Right to Read, etc.) is limiting educators' time and capacity to meaningfully engage in our work post-pandemic. As a result, we have shifted our coaching model to four primary activities (mentioned above) and is based on schools' and districts' readiness.

As reflected at the national level, there is a teacher and substitute shortage in the state , making it a challenge for schools to have coverage for educators during PD training and/or coaching. Due to the shortage, the Math Project is offering more asynchronous training opportunities via BRIDGE-RI modules.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions