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

Tennessee

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)?

In Phase I, Tennessee identified a SiMR of increasing by one percent annually the percent of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 scoring at or above Basic (since renamed "Approaching") on the statewide English/language arts (ELA) assessment. Evaluation activities were developed by the department to track progress toward and achievement of this ambitious but achievable goal.

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.

Tennessee uses a cohort model, calculating the SiMR for the group of districts participating in each annual iteration of the department's SSIP activities (originally the cohorts of the 2015-2020 OSEP funded State Personnel Development Grant [SPDG] and then the cohorts of the state funded continuation of SPDG activities branded as the Access for All initiative). The FFY 2021 cohort districts began/reengaged in SSIP activities in July 2020, thus the subset represents districts in active implementation of the SSIP evidence-based strategies during FFY 2021.

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.

Tennessee's detailed theory of action can be found on page 38 of the SSIP Phase III-4 report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_iii4_201920.pdf. The broad theory of action can be found on page 7 of the same document: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_iii4_201920.pdf.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	31.47%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	38.24%	39.24%	40.24%	41.24%	42.24%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP FFY21 districts scoring at or above Approaching on the statewide English language arts (ELA) assessment	Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP FFY21 districts who received a valid score on the statewide English	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage

	language arts (ELA) assessment					
1,542	4,591	37.24%	38.24%	33.59%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The observed slippage of 3.65% among SSIP 3.0 districts is slightly less than the statewide decrease of 5.44% observed among all students with SLD in grades 3-8 on the ELA assessment. Furthermore, although fewer students with SLD achieved at the "Approaching" level on the statewide ELA assessment in 2022, the proportion of those students who actually achieved proficiency increased from 1.16% in to 2021 to 2.94% in 2022 among SSIP 3.0 districts. Although six SSIP 3.0 districts did increase the percentage of SLD students who achieved at the level of "Approaching" or above, the majority of districts decreased which contributed to the slippage of the entire cohort.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The student level statewide assessment file used to populate EDFacts files FS185 and FS188 is the source of TNReady English Language Arts performance levels for students in grades 3-8. This file is merged with the student level End-of-Year Frequency file retrieved from the EasyIEP data system annually on June 30 to identify all students with SLD served by one of the SSIP districts at any point during the relevant school year. The instructional environment data comes from the federal Table 1 and 3 Report formatted to populate EDFacts FS002. It is pulled from the EasyIEP data system with a census date of May 1 in the relevant year.

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

The 2018-19 assessment results, compiled in the fall of 2019-20, were the baseline SiMR data for the current cohort of SSIP districts. For the 2021-22 school year, 33.59% of students with an SLD in grades 3-8 scored at or above Approaching on the statewide ELA assessment with a participation rate of 98.04%. This was a decrease of 3.65%.

Collection of baseline data regarding the percent of students with a SLD who have access to core instruction for 80 percent or more of the day for the current cohort of SSIP districts came from a census report pulled on May 1, 2019. As a baseline for this measure, 73.95% of the students with an SLD were in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day. The most recent comparison pull was completed on May 1, 2022 to assess change from the baseline data pull to the spring after trainings on access were completed. This data pull indicated that 84.73% of students with an SLD were served in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day, an increase of 10.78%.

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.

The Access for All initiative concluded its 2021-2022 activities and then the participating districts continued implementation of SSIP evidence-based practices through the Access for All Learning Network (AALN). Over a multi-year timeline, participants focus on access to high-quality tier 1 literacy and math instruction for all students, intensive reading intervention, and intensive math and writing intervention. The multi-year design allows more time to work with districts, allowing for gradual release of support duties to district personnel and school administrators. During FFY 2021 the participating districts were primarily focused on intensive reading intervention. Progress data were collected throughout the period of Spring 2021-22 and Fall of the 2022-23 school years through a series of post training surveys, classroom observations, coaching records, and a baseline Individualized Education Program (IEP) file review. This data collection was focused specifically on strategies one, two, three, and four.

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.

Tennessee's evaluation plan can be found on pages 62 to 108 of the SSIP Phase II report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_ii.pdf. Although some information such as dates and staffing may have changed, the core components of the plan (including the evaluation questions) remain intact.

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:

Infrastructure Changes
The department has continued the implementation efforts of several large-scale infrastructure changes previously undertaken to support the State's strategic plan, Best for All (https://bestforall.tnedu.gov/).

Winter/Spring 2022 -- The SSIP Evaluators in conjunction with the Access for All higher education partner (The University of Tennessee, UT CLEE) expanded on the initiative's data collection monitoring plan and data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders to include new activities.

Spring 2022 – The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE), the New Teacher Project, along with the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Center for Literacy, Education and Employment (CLEE) craft the Access for All Network. The network prioritizes professional development resources for district and school administrators – who have the greatest ability to remove barriers and promote the successful implementation of the SSIP EBPs within their classrooms.

Spring 2022 – The AALN is formally introduced to all SSIP districts through a series of virtual office hours and coaching conversations. All SSIP districts are encouraged to continue their efforts through the AALN.

Fall 2022 – The New Teacher Project and TDOE develop the content for the Fall Learning Network dates. The SSIP Regional Access Coaches develop the content and facilitative questions for the seasonal CoP.

Fall 2022 – SSIP member database and reporting schedule created by CLEE and evaluators to monitor participation, schedule coaching, and collect/analyze participant feedback.

Implementation Activities
Strategy One Access to Core Instruction and Strategy Two: Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention

Winter/Spring 2022 – Facilitators redelivered the content to their districts through a series of a winter/spring professional development in one full-day training and two one-hour spring CoPs. From January through May 2022, 1,852 from 35 districts completed the professional development participant survey and 1,276 participants from 31 districts completed one or both spring CoP surveys.

Winter/Spring 2022 – The Access for All initiative had eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who worked with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 were eligible for coaching. From January-May 2022, 178 coaching sessions occurred. A coach would see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day.

Winter/Spring 2022 – A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers who received the fall trainings observed again in the spring to ascertain the growth of SSIP strategy implementation at the school and classroom level. Through May 2022, 289 K-8 English Language Arts teachers from 30 districts had spring observations recorded.

Summer 2022 – 15 districts agree to continue their SSIP implementation with supports from the AALN through a formal partnership letter. All districts attend the 5 day Summer Workshop. Content built upon prior learning and connected it within new learning focused on high-quality instructional materials (HQIM). Each SSIP district wrote an SSIP implementation action plan that included milestone targets.

Fall 2022 – SSIP district participants attend monthly Learning Network meeting and seasonal CoPs (biannual) to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices.

Fall 2022 – AALN has eight SSIP Regional Access Coaches who work with the district and school administrators at least twice per month to track progress towards milestones, problem solve, and revise each SSIP district's implementation action plan. Coaches also regularly provide technical assistance to SSIP districts concerning infrastructure development and classroom implementation of the EBPs.

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through Instructionally Appropriate IEP (IAIEP) Development
May-September 2022 – A random sample of SSIP district IEPs were collected and analyzed as a measure of quality using a normed quality rubric addressing the present levels of educational performance (PLEP) and measurable annual goals (MAGs) of the IEP.

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.

Infrastructure Changes
Access for All Data Sharing (expansion of the data collection monitoring plan and redesign of the data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders) – Data measures were uploaded/updated daily and shared throughout the data communication systems. All data dashboards were redesigned to give expanded insights, be more accessible, and to increase access to data for regional support personnel, educator coaches, and district/school leaders. These outcomes were related to the data and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems

improvement efforts.

AALN Created and Installed – The professional development delivery model, curriculum, and learning calendar were created. Member districts were recruited from within the existing SSIP districts. These outcomes were related to the professional development and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

AALN Data Collection and Reporting System Installed – Post activity surveys were written, digital versions were created, data collection calendars put in place, and reports written and disseminated to all stakeholders. These outcomes were related to the data and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Implementation Activities
Strategy One and Two: Access to Core Instruction and Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention:
Access for All District Redelivery by Facilitators, Year Two, Winter/Spring (January through May 2022) 1,852 from 35 districts completed the professional development participant survey and 1,276 participants from 31 districts completed one or both spring CoP surveys for winter/spring content in year two (Strand 1). In addition, redelivery participants also complete survey questions designed to measure that the training was redelivered with integrity, with all required activities averaging at 87% or better. These outcomes were related to the governance, professional development, and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through the installation of EBPs and was necessary to the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale-up.

AALN Training w/ District Action Plan Writing – Participants from 15 districts participated in a 5-day Summer Workshop. Content built upon prior learning and connected it within new learning focused on ensuring students with disabilities have access to high-quality instruction through the use of HQIM. Each SSIP district wrote an SSIP implementation action plan that included milestone targets- this Action Plan is revised throughout the year. SSIP district participants also attend monthly Learning Network meeting and seasonal CoPs (quarterly) to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices This outcome is related to the governance, professional development, and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through the installation of EBPs and is necessary to the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale-up.

Coaching – From January through May 2022, 178 coaching sessions occurred. A coach would see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day. AALN has eight SSIP Regional Access Coaches who work with the district and school administrators at least twice per month to track progress towards milestones, problem solve, and revise each SSIP district's implementation action plan. Coaches also regularly provide technical assistance to SSIP districts concerning infrastructure development and classroom implementation of the EBPs. These outcomes are related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. These strategies support system change through their support of continuous improvement cycles and are necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Fidelity Measurement -- Through May 2022, 289 K-8 English Language Arts teachers from 30 districts had spring observations recorded. This outcome was related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through IAIEP Development:
IEP sampling – A random sample of SSIP district IEPs were collected and analyzed as a measure of quality using a normed quality rubric addressing the present levels of educational performance (PLEP) and measurable annual goals (MAGs) of the IEP.. This outcome is related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

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

YES

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

Strategy Four: Access to High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) and Access
A key shift in literacy textbook adoption materials in 2019 within the state was a focus on HQIM. Since 2014, Tennessee has had a State Textbook and Instructional Materials Quality Commission whose responsibility is to recommend an official list of textbooks and instructional materials for approval of the State Board of Education. The state then provides rubrics and needs assessment tools for the districts in selecting textbooks from this approved list. This support/guidance for local level leadership ensures HQIM, including access points and scaffolds foe all students. For literacy, the state also offers a free resource: the TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplement.

HQIM are one lever to ensure students with disabilities have improved outcomes (i.e., close the achievement gap). HQIM should be used to better provide access for SWDs in the general education classroom. This strategy includes strengthening opportunities for

ongoing collaboration among general education teachers and special education teachers, building leadership, and support staff to actively engage in lesson preparation and unit preparation when using HQIM.

In addition to the district adoption of HQIM for literacy, the state also offered early literacy courses/professional development, beginning in 2021, to educators across the state. These courses primarily focused on the use of the adopted materials for better preparation of lessons and units in each teacher's classrooms. TDOE launched an early literacy network in the same year to bring districts together for peer learning, technical assistance, mentoring, and HQIM supports connected with the State's Reading 360 initiative. The state is currently engaged in a Math textbook adoption cycle that mirrors the successes of the installation of Literacy HQIM.

Spring 2022 – HQIM content from the Reading 360 initiative continues to be connected within Access for All EBP trainings and supports. The Instruction Utilizing HQIM domain average score on the SSIP implementation fidelity instrument for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 75% from fall to spring with 78% of the elements of the HQIM practice or strategy observed during the spring.

Spring 2022 – While Access for All has embedded HQIM into its activities for the past three phases within its focus to align the SSIP practices with the broader state improvement plan, HQIM is selected as a primary SSIP infrastructure improvement strategy.

Summer 2022 – 15 districts agree to continue their SSIP implementation with supports from the Access for All Network (AALN) through a formal partnership letter. All districts attend the 5-day Summer Workshop. Content built upon prior learning and connected within new learning focused on ensuring students with disabilities have access to high-quality instruction through the use of HQIM. The workshop focused on making sure that ALL students in Tennessee learn foundational reading skills through HQIM. District teams were given significant time to explore and use their HQIM as they contextualized proper unit and lesson planning in their district's schools. Teams identified strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats for providing access to all students in their reading instruction and left the week with preliminary action plans.

Fall 2022 – SSIP district participants attend monthly Learning Network meeting and seasonal COPs (quarterly) to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices.

Fall 2022 – AALN has four SSIP Regional Access Coaches who work with the district and school administrators at least 4 times per year to track progress towards milestones, problem solve, and revise each SSIP district's implementation action plan. Coaches also regularly provide technical assistance to SSIP districts concerning infrastructure development and classroom implementation of the EBPs.

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

All district and school administrators will continue through this year's training support progression (Year One Literacy content) which includes monthly Learning Network meetings, the Spring CoP, and ongoing coaching until May 2023. These district and school leaders will continue to receive technical assistance from SSIP leadership as needed. Teacher fidelity observations (Instructional Practice Guide) will continue to be collected by SSIP districts through the 2022-23 academic year (Phase III:7).

Year Two Literacy content will be presented to existing and new SSIP district and school administrators beginning in August 2023. The implementation support activities for the 2023-24 school year will follow the same progression as this school year: monthly fall and spring Learning Network, quarterly CoPs, and ongoing coaching.

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

• Inclusive Culture and Environment
• Flexible Access to Instruction
• Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making
• Writing of IAIEPs
• Cognitive Coaching
• Access to HQIM

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Evidence-Based Practice: Environment – For a student to truly have access to core instruction, there must be an inclusive culture and environment established to effectively support students and research contends that both emotional support and classroom climate – which the department groups under the umbrella of "culture and environment" – have the capacity to yield improved student outcomes.

Evidence-Based Practices: Flexible Access to Instruction – This was one of the initial EBPs employed to address the SSIP's first improvement strategy. Work with this EBP has continued, in conjunction with additional training on the EBP of environment, as a positive environment is essential for flexible access strategies to be successful. Trainings around this EPB have focused on ensuring students have the appropriate scaffolds and infrastructure in place to succeed in the classroom. Flexible access centers on the principles of effective learning through flexibility in engagement, representation, and expression. Flexible access and scaffolding of instruction serve as effective complements. Flexible access encourages educators to respond to the beneficial, and inevitable, variance among students in the classroom to ensure access to instruction and accurate assessment of knowledge/skills. The use of accommodations and modifications for SWDs was one of the focal points of the trainings on access and scaffolding. This was done to ensure districts adequately understand that fair does not necessarily mean equal as (1) SWDs may require additional supports

and services to best access core instruction and (2) greater flexible access for all students lessens the need for individual student accommodations. This contention lies at the very heart of this EBP – it prioritizes that instruction must be accessible to every student in the classroom and that this is the responsibility of the educator.

Evidence-Based Practices: Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making – These EBPs have been grouped together, as they are innately intertwined. As shared in Phase III – 2, both inform one another, as do their sub practices. The materials developed for SSIP strategy two were focused heavily on utilizing a multi-sensory approach to educate and support SWDs, partially informed by the research findings on the integration of multiple senses to enhance and strengthen learning pathways.

Evidence-Based Practice: Writing of IAIEPs – This EBP has been implemented in several waves over the last several phases. To assess the quality of the IEPs being developed in the SSIP districts, the department created a rubric that continues to measure the quality of IEPs for specific sections of the document, and the annual review allows the department to identify concerning trends in writing IEPs, particularly regarding both the data collection and writing of present levels of performance and measurable annual goals. To address these prominently weak areas of the IEPs sampled throughout the SSIP's previous phases, these sections of the IEP became a major focus of continuing SSIP work.

Evidence-Based Practice: Cognitive Coaching – This EBP is a process that truly embodies what it means to "coach," contrasting with what "coaches" often provide in education which is actually "consulting." Cognition drives behavior, so in Cognitive Coaching, specific paraphrasing and mediative questions asked by the coach aim to draw out the district leadership and teacher resourcefulness and create more self-directed professionals who can change their own behavior. So, to see an even greater behavioral change in educators, leading to greater outcomes for students, the department created a coaching position in addition to the eight hired previously. These regional access coaches (RACs) have been added to the team to specifically provide coaching cycles at the district leadership and individual teacher level. These coaches engage in a planning conversation, then collect data in the classroom that the teacher requests, then engage in reflecting and/or problem resolving conversations using training in Cognitive Coaching.

Evidence-Based Practice: HQIM and access – HQIM are one lever to ensure students with disabilities have improved outcomes (i.e., close the achievement gap). Through professional development, HQIM are being used to better provide access for SWDs in the general education classroom. This professional development includes strengthening opportunities for ongoing collaboration among general education teachers and special education teachers, building leadership, and support staff to actively engage in lesson preparation and unit preparation when using HQIM.

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.

Inclusive Culture and Environment -- For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should be a part of a student's least restrictive environment given that appropriate interventions and supports should make access to core instruction in the general education setting a viable option for 80% or more of a student's day. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to district's prioritizing access to core instruction through both general and special education change in practice, inclusive teaching mindsets paired with greater educator efficacy, as a result, improved student outcomes.

Flexible Access to Instruction – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should focus on ensuring students have the appropriate access and scaffolds in place to succeed in the classroom. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of a larger and more flexible "toolbox" of engagement, representation, and expression, reducing the need for accommodations and modifications for SWDs. Greater access, through flexibility for all students, leads to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs.

Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should focus on ensuring students have learning activities that are strengths-based and naturally engaging. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of practices that are tailored to every child's learning needs which leads to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs who rely on this approach to learn, remember, and use new knowledge and skills.

Writing of IAIEPs – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – IEPs must capture thorough and accurate present levels of educational performance and reasonably calculated and individualized measurable annual goals. Consultation through district partnerships across the state provide districts with support to improve IAIEP writing.

Cognitive Coaching – The nine regional access coaches (RACs) provide coaching cycles at the district leadership or individual teacher level. These coaches engage in planning conversations, collect data in the classroom, and then engage in reflecting and/or problem resolving conversations using training in Cognitive Coaching. This activity supports the greater understanding of and implementation of the other EBPs which increases a student with an SLD's access to high-quality instruction which leads to better student outcomes.

Access to HQIM: If districts have HQIM and are provided high-quality professional learning focused on creating structures and alignment of HQIM to the individual needs of students with disabilities through the identification of access points and appropriate scaffolds, then educator and administrative teams will improve classroom practice for students with disabilities in grades K-12, leading to increased academic and post-secondary success.

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

The instructional fidelity observations gathered last spring for the Access for All initiative reflect successful classroom implementation and noteworthy fidelity growth from baseline. The fidelity observation instrument included 25 items representing six domains: Environment, Lesson Preparation, Assessment, Instruction Utilizing HQIM, Classroom Leader and Management, and Culture and Collaboration. The observer assesses each item not evident, not adopted, installing, installed, refining, or full implementation. While mastery of the EBPs is the long-term goal of all support efforts, the Access for All initiative set the goal of increasing the number of teachers who had the majority of items installed within their instruction (regular and consistent implementation). Through the spring, 70% of teachers had 70% of items at the installed level or better.

The Environment domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 50% from fall to spring with 84% of the elements of the classroom environment practice or strategy observed during the spring. The Lesson Preparation domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 60% from fall to spring with 79% of the elements of the classroom lesson preparation practice or strategy observed during the spring. The Assessment domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 82% from fall to spring with 72% of the elements of the assessment practice or strategy observed during the spring. The Instruction Utilizing HQIM domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 75% from fall to spring with 78% of the elements of the HQIM practice or strategy observed during the spring. The Classroom Leader and Management domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 73% from fall to spring with 73% of the elements of the leadership practice or strategy observed during the spring. The Culture and Collaboration domain average score for K-8 English Language Arts teachers increased 40% from fall to spring with 77% of the elements of the culture and collaboration practice or strategy observed during the spring.

The Access for All initiative had eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who worked with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 were eligible for coaching. In the winter/spring of 2022, 178 coaching visits occurred. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day. The most frequent coaching cycle components engaged during these coaching sessions were reflecting conversations (56%), data collection (41%), and planning conversations (33%). Coaches felt the most successful in implementing the conversation pacing, clarifying goals, and building rapport skill components of the cognitive coaching framework during the spring. The two components most chosen by coaches as a continuous improvement skill for their coaching were mediative questioning and having awareness of the coachees' state of mind. Coaches learned conversation "maps" to assist them in Cognitive Coaching with fidelity so that they are authentically coaching the person, not the process. Coaches' internalization (automaticity) of these maps has grown significantly over the full academic year; when comparing the first two and the last two months, the Planning Map confidence grew from 3.0 to 3.7 and the Reflecting Map confidence grew from 2.7 to 3.9 on a five-point Likert scale.

A random sample of IEPs from high-incidence disability categories in every SSIP district this year was collected and reviewed for quality using the current SSIP IAIEP rubric (developed under previous SSIP phases) between May 1 – September 30, 2022. During the same data window, a random sample of IEPs from common disability categories in every Early Childhood Access for All district were also analyzed.

The Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) is a rubric that an observer completes during a foundational literacy skills lesson walk-through. The observer focuses on interactions between materials, teacher moves, and student engagement through practice. Focus is on observable outcomes such as student work, student application, and student discussions. The primary focus of data collection is to provide feedback that is most beneficial for the teacher. All SSIP districts conduct systematic observations of instruction in a sample of their classrooms to gauge the implementation of EBPs and to inform continuous improvement. SSIP participants collect and share their IPG data regularly with the SSIP Regional Access Coaches to identify successes, address implementation barriers, and to update their District Action Plan items related to classroom instruction.

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.

Access for All Facilitators redelivered content to their districts throughout the Winter of 2022 through a series of a professional development days and two one-hour fall CoPs. Through May 2022, 1,852 educators from 35 districts had completed the professional development participant survey (93% response rate) and 1,276 participants from 31 Districts completed one or both winter/spring CoP surveys (96% response rate).

For the full day winter redelivery training, six main topics were taught through a combination of traditional instruction and adult learning strategies. These learning activities and tasks included literacy sort, topic sort, show your colors, main idea through art, making connections, and essences. Almost two-thirds of the trained educators last winter/spring primarily served students in general education settings; 92% teach K-8 students. 95% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I understand better that Literacy has 6 parts, with 3 inputs (viewing, listening, reading) and 3 outputs (showing, speaking, writing)." At least 93% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the three primary ability gain survey items; with "My ability to provide access to instruction and tasks by assessing and aligning to students' literacy strengths and needs has increased." having the highest overall positive sentiment.

The CoPs were set up to offer winter/spring redelivery participants with the opportunity to get a refresher on previously trained content, to dig deeper into these concepts, and to get technical assistance that would aid their continued implementation. Each school has the flexibility to conduct the two CoPs to their own scheduling needs; either hosting two 1-hour sessions or having one larger 2-hour session. Overall educators have seen great benefit from CoPs, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (95%) and that the CoP(s) provided them with the opportunity to apply the fall training concepts (94%). More than 91% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that "Given all trainings and follow-up support, I feel better equipped to support student with disabilities in my role," "The CoP(s) improved my ability to utilize my new learning in my role," and "My teaching

practices are improving based on my learning during the Winter training and/or Winter CoP(s)."

A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers who received the fall trainings observed again in the spring in order to ascertain the growth of SSIP strategy implementation at the school and classroom level. Through May 2022, 289 K-8 English Language Arts teachers from 30 districts had spring observations recorded. The observation instrument includes 25 items across six domains (environment, lesson preparation, assessment, instruction utilizing HQIM, classroom leadership and management, and culture and collaboration) and is completed by a trained district facilitation team member. The observer scores every item on a scale of not evident, not adopted, installing, installed, refining, or full implementation.

During June 6-10, 2022, teams of district educators from 15 districts across Tennessee were trained by TDOE Leaders, AALN Regional Access Coaches, and a national facilitator from The New Teacher Project. The workshop focused on making sure that ALL students in Tennessee learn foundational reading skills through HQIM. District teams were given significant time to explore and use their HQIM as they contextualized proper unit and lesson planning in their district's schools. Teams identified strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats for providing access to all students in their reading instruction and left the week with preliminary action plans. At the conclusion of the training, participants were provided with online evaluation surveys to gather their perceptions and suggestions concerning the training. Participants in the training completed 32 surveys. A little over half the participants (62.5%) worked primarily in special education, but a quarter (25.0%) worked in both special education and general education.

The post training survey used a Likert Scale to ascertain the participants' agreement with the nine statements aligned to the expected training outcomes. Most participants strongly agreed or agreed with all the survey items. The items with which respondents most agreed was "I plan to apply the content of this workshop in my school/district in this school year." and "I feel better prepared to support all teachers with providing students with disabilities access to our high-quality literacy materials." (94%). The item with the lowest agreement was "The support that my district team received throughout the week from the Regional Access Coaches, CORE Interventionists, and the TDOE enhanced our learning" (88%).

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

AALN will continue to employ a training and implementation support model focused on all four strategies. Consistent reinforcement of the work through the Learning Network, CoPs, classroom observations, coaching, and refined materials/resources ensure the continued integration of the strategies and EBPs into the classroom. Coaching will be used by SSIP Regional Access Coaches to continue to impact strong educator behavioral change through the effective implementation and access of HQIM. SSIP districts will continue to review, update, and revise their Action Plans through the use of data-driven decision making and continuous improvement cycles. Several districts have set increasing the opportunities for general educations and special education collaborative literacy unit and lesson preparation as the major priority. Other districts are looking to continue to install and then refine their implementation of the IPG walkthroughs protocol. It also anticipated that the SSIP Regional Access Coaches will be invited to facilitate district/school professional development topics related to district Action Plans. IAIEP data will be presented to districts to inform their district professional development activities and teachers will review and revise their IEP writing practices. The department will collect a new sample of IEPs for quality measurement between May-September of 2023.

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.

ACCESS to High-Quality Core Instruction for All Students was provided during the Summer before the 2021-22 academic year to 45 K-12 SSIP school district facilitation teams. Facilitators then redelivered the content to their districts in a series of PD activities spread across the fall and spring. Throughout the Winter and Spring of 2022 these trainings were provided through a series of a professional development in two full-day trainings and two one-hour CoPs. 95% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training helped them better understand that "literacy has six parts, with three inputs (viewing, listening, reading), and three outputs (showing, speaking, writing), and "delivery modes for instruction affect memory, and "covering" material does not lead to retention or understanding."

The CoPs were set up to offer winter redelivery participants with the opportunity to apply previously trained content, dig deeper into these concepts, and create collaborative discussion to strengthen implementation at the school and classroom level. Overall educators saw great benefit from CoPs, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (95%) and that the CoP(s) provided them with the opportunity to apply the fall training concepts (94%). 93% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that "The CoP(s) improved my ability to utilize my new learning in my role" and "My teaching practices are improving based on my learning during the training and/or CoP(s)."

A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers, who received the training, observed to ascertain that the content and strategies they were trained in are being used with fidelity in their classrooms. After matching the fall and spring observations for each teacher observed, a total of 295 of the 663 teachers taught English Language Arts in a K-8 classroom. The spring average (66.7) saw an 85% growth rate from the fall observation window; a positive indicator of the role that systemic professional development and coaching had on teacher practices.

The Access for All Initiative had eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who work with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 are eligible for coaching although only K-12 teachers will be included in this report. From August 1, 2021 through May 25, 2022, 451 coaching sessions have occurred, more than with 250 K-12 teachers. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day. 95% of

coachees felt that the coaching conversation supported their thought process to plan ahead or reflect. The post-coaching participant survey included a space for optional feedback. The responses were overwhelmingly positive and included terms of gratitude, validation, and cooperative activity. In addition to the K-12 SSIP work, the Early Childhood 3.0 cohort targets the need for appropriately less restrictive placements for preschool-age students, as we know that this trajectory begins in preschool and impacts student access to grade level standards and, ultimately, academic proficiency.

The AALN Summer Workshop was provided before the 2022-23 academic year to 15 SSIP school districts' central office and school administrators. The participants were trained by TDOE Leaders, AALN Regional Access Coaches, and a national facilitator from The New Teacher Project. The workshop focused on making sure that ALL students in Tennessee learn foundational reading skills through HQIM. District teams were given significant time to explore and use their HQIM as they contextualized proper unit and lesson planning in their district's schools. Teams identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for providing access to all students in their reading instruction and left the week with preliminary action plans. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their district team (who attended the workshop) was better prepared to voice the needs of students with disabilities in their district.

The monthly Learning Networks this fall were facilitated by the Regional Access Coaches to give district leaders the opportunity to build community while they learn, discuss, and collaborate on HQIM, tools, and content provided by The New Teacher Project. 91% of respondents felt empowered to be active participants during the Learning Network and found the facilitators knowledgeable and helpful. From before to after the meetings, there was a 34% increase in confidence of participants' ability to facilitate discussions in their districts regarding the use of the tools discussed.
The Fall CoP was set up to dig deeper into concepts taught during the Summer Workshop and give opportunities for collaboration between educational leaders on the topics of implementation tools and HQIM lesson preparation. 88% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training improved their ability to utilize new learning in their roles and were empowered to be active participants during the CoP. From before to after the meetings, there was a 29% increase in confidence of their ability to facilitate discussions in their districts regarding the use of the tools discussed.

The AALN employs eight Regional Access Coaches, four are assigned to work one-on-one with district leaders twice a month varying the discussions to meet the individual needs of each district, school-level staff member, or administrator on SSIP EBP implementation. The coaches accompanied the districts on IPG walkthroughs, helped facilitate collaboration between special education and general education, and gave individualized training on HQIM, problem-solving, lesson planning, and Unit Preparation. The coaching participation survey included 3 qualitative questions for feedback. The responses overall were very positive with several respondents expressing how beneficial the walk-throughs and planning sessions were for their district.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC met three times during FFY 2021 (July 2021, October 2021, and January 2022) and three times during FFY 2022 (July 2022, October 2022, and January 2023). Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR (including indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2021 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed

and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

The Access for All Initiative gathered participant feedback at every stage of the content delivery process through surveys that collect facilitators' knowledge and ability gains, their district's educators' knowledge and ability gains through district facilitation, the implementation of activities according to expected training fidelity, and a series of open-ended feedback questions. Surveys collected during this Phase have included winter/spring professional development redelivery days within districts, CoPs, and coaching sessions (both coach and coachee).

The full day redelivery Winter Participant Survey asked for how the training could be improved, and 628 responses were provided last winter/spring. 56% of respondents shared that they liked the training and that no changes were needed. Of the improvements requested, pacing was the most frequent theme (12%) with a desire for the training to be shorter and have more breaks. 4% of responses requested more attention to participant comfort – less crowded spaces, more comfortable chairs, better sound, and food; this was a 7%-point decrease from the fall trainings. 25% participants gave specific feedback regarding activities they disliked, request to expand the audience to other teaching/administrator groups, or additional material to cover in the future. Each district had employed different facilitators and varied redelivery approaches (with many having to revise plans due to weather cancelations of originally scheduled professional development days), therefore state SSIP leadership and the SSIP coaches addressed feedback individually with districts since isolating SSIP-wide improvement strategies was impossible. Also, improvement feedback was shared with districts through their personalized data dashboards.

The Winter/Spring CoP Participant Survey asked for how future CoPs could be improved, and 675 responses were provided last winter/spring. 57% of respondents shared that they liked the training and that no changes were needed. Of the improvements requested, scheduling was the most frequent theme (10%) with a desire for CoPs to be held at different times, different locations whether in-person or virtually, or to be paced differently. Other themes were more varied, of highlight, 6% requested more interactive/hands on activities and 6% wanted content more differentiated and specific to their grade level or curriculum.

Teachers were asked to take the post-coaching participant survey after each coaching session. The survey was aimed at providing key feedback to coaches and SSIP leadership for continuous improvement; it is anonymous and does not ask for any district, school, or classroom identifiers. 86 coaching sessions ended this spring/winter with a completed survey. 98% of coachees felt that the coaching conversation supported their thought process to plan ahead or reflect, and 1% selected "maybe," which is common as teachers get acclimated to cognitive coaching as it is very different than a consultative model. Teachers primarily spent their coaching session reflecting on something that happened or planning ahead (36-37% each).

The post-coaching participant survey also included a space for optional feedback. The responses were overwhelmingly positive and included terms of gratitude, validation, and cooperative activity. The specific coaching topics, goals, and next steps written about were all varied and provided evidence that coaches tailored the experience to each teacher's needs and self-directed goals. The majority of participants cited professional growth examples and a few also said they had seen student gains.

Thirty-eight K-12 classroom teachers from 23 districts concluded a full coaching cycle from January through May 2022. The average coaching sessions per cycle was 3.7 visits. About 10% of these cycles concluded prematurely due to the teacher no longer being interested in engaging with the coach any further. When appropriate, the coach and teacher can mutually select to begin a second coaching cycle. The most popular areas for focused improvement during the winter/spring coaching cycles were questioning (39%) , personal set-asides (16%), and internalizing the reflecting map (13%).

After a coaching cycle concludes, coaches also reflect on their hunches about the coachees' states of mind throughout the coaching cycle. The coaches focus their reflection in five areas: efficacy, craftsmanship, consciousness, interdependence, and flexibility. Some teachers in the fall initially resisted coaching because of time constraints (loss of planning period time) because they were unsure that they needed to grow, or because cognitive coaching was outside of their comfort zone and they needed more time to "buy-in," but this resistance dissipated in the spring.

The AALN also gathers participant feedback at every stage of the content delivery process through surveys that collect district administrators' knowledge and ability gains, the implementation of activities according to expected training fidelity, and a series of open-ended feedback questions. These surveys are tailored to each professional development activity and are annually reviewed, and content and surveys are modified at least annually by SSIP leadership based on participant feedback. Surveys collected during this Phase have included the summer workshop, monthly Fall Learning Network sessions, a Fall CoP, and Fall Coaching Survey.

The Summer Workshop Participant Survey received ten responses related to feedback about the content provided. Six of the responses were positive, "great learning" and "I really liked that you all modeled best practice by altering your instructional plans for the last few days in order to meet the needs of your learners." A few participants offered suggestions for shortening the number of days off the training or presenting content in a different sequence.

The monthly Learning Network Participant Surveys asked for how future Learning Network meetings could be improved and thirty responses were provided. Forty percent of responses were positive. Twenty-seven percent of respondents requested to receive PowerPoint slides, handouts, and other materials before the Learning Network meetings to make it easier to use them during discussion (many preferred to print them out). A few requested more discussion time with other districts while an equal number wanted to not have these breakout sessions.

The Fall CoP Participant Survey asked for how future CoPs could be improved, and eleven responses were provided. Almost half focused on the success of the sessions, stating that they were informative. Three participants felt the sessions should be shortened and four participants requested additional resources, more concrete examples, and strategies districts are using to support teachers in unit planning.

An electronic AALN Coaching Feedback Survey was collected at the end of Fall 2022. Ten participants provided feedback on what way(s) could the Regional Access Coach better support their district. Half of the responses were solely positive. The other half requested more in-person supports from their coach. The AALN Coaching Feedback Survey also included an opportunity to collect district needs for overall implementation during the upcoming quarter. The six responses varied and were specific to district action plans and classroom needs.

In addition, the Access for All initiative and AALN university partner (University of Tennessee) facilitates weekly meetings with all Regional Access Coaches and CORE Interventionists where real-time implementation feedback is provided and shared with the department's SSIP leaders. The department also hosts a monthly project Leadership Meeting where coaches, key stakeholders, and SSIP evaluators share participant and stakeholder input.

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

The department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three Access for All cohorts and the AALN. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, and the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes, including council/task force meetings and newsletters. In addition, partners have made content available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work through the Access for All website. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website.

Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. SSIP leadership from the TDOE have facilitated discussion and shared feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities meetings. AC members (comprised of parents of SWDs, individuals with disabilities, educators, and student and parent advocates) and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing.

To ensure that training is resulting in implementation, various data is collected on the quality of IEPs, the fidelity of training, observations focused on training concept implementation, and training and classroom visits by the SSIP Regional Access Coaches.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State used the Access for All data dashboards and quarterly reports to consistently monitor stakeholder concerns. The State uses the AALN data reports (produced at the conclusion of each major support activity cycle) to consistently monitor stakeholder concerns.

In addition, stakeholders are provided with a "who to contact" document so they know who to contact for questions/concerns in specific areas, as well as a single email address that any question or concern can be sent to that is checked daily and assigned to the best person to address. Districts have milestone meetings with SSIP Regional Access Coaches twice per month and can contact their additional regional support staff (CORE special education interventionists), the general email address, the project manager, or the CORE interventionist directly with concerns or requests at any time, and they do. The applicable team members followed up with stakeholders through email, phone/zoom calls, and/or in-person. Technical assistance was provided, data reviewed, dashboard features redesigned or added, and data cleaned as concerns were related to data collection, data dashboard functionality, or data accuracy. CORE interventionists, coaches, and other initiative leaders review feedback data with district facilitators and observers through continuous improvement cycles to improve action planning for technical assistance and classroom observations. Technical assistance and coaching sessions are provided to the districts and teachers to strengthen implementation and problem-solve in a truly collaborative manner. The project manager meets weekly with the coaches and CLEE staff, biweekly with the CORE intervention team/lead, and monthly with the full project team, and the CLEE logistics teams meet with the UK evaluation team weekly to raise and solve data issues/needs that arise.

Scheduling was the most frequent improvement theme (12%) shared after the fall CoPs with a desire for CoPs to be held at different

times, different locations whether in-person or virtually, or to be paced differently. This theme dropped 2% in the spring. Several participants shared appreciation to their districts for making changes based on their previous feedback, "It was better having shorter sessions" and "This was the best! It was a smaller group than the last."

While the majority of teachers consistently shared that the Access for All trainings were beneficial, two common themes from the feedback received throughout the year (between 12-15%) centered around a desire for the trainings to not conflict with the planning time that teachers desperately need ("when educators are drowning. We need more time," "need more time for planning," and "more time to look at activities for our classroom") and for the SSIP content to be more directly tied to their day-to-day teaching ("more concrete less theoretical," "grade specific groups to brainstorm ideas," and "I would love activities that focused more on the curriculum"). SSIP leadership desired to continue the success of the first three strategies but make changes to the delivery model to be more responsive to participant requests. The shift to the Access for All Network (AALN) increases direct supports for district leadership to aid them in being responsive to teachers' needs, to increase collaboration between general education and special education, set a Leadership Vision, protect, and increase teachers' effective collaborative planning time, and using HQIM with integrity for students with disabilities. By continuing to implement the first three strategies, but within HQIM as the primary strategy, the SSIP is directly doing what teachers requested; "more applications that shows how to use these strategies and activities within our curriculum," "give more clear and different strategies to implement in the classroom for daily lessons," give us "more time with team members" and our "grade level."

In the last five months, based on the feedback from their teachers, SSIP coaches have reported that District Leaders are changing building level schedules to ensure regular and consistent grade level/content group lesson and unit preparation, providing more special educators with the schedule flexibility to participate in general education unit/lesson planning, increasing access to HQIM and professional development within special education, and reevaluating current HQIM to remove implementation barriers.

Additional Implementation Activities
List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions