

Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) OSEP Evaluation Tool

Overview

The Part B, SSIP Phase I, OSEP Evaluation Tool is based on the five components described in the Measurement Table under Indicator 17, Phase I. Those components are 1) Data Analysis; 2) Analysis of Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity 3) State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SIMR); 4) Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and 5) Theory of Action.

Each component is composed of different elements that will be analyzed by OSEP staff members to independently rate the quality of each of the components and the overall quality of Phase I of the State's SSIP. Staff will utilize the evaluation tool to indicate how well the State is meeting each of the components by considering the description of each component's elements.

Statutory Requirements Relating to State Performance Plans (SPPs) as Applied to the SSIP

Section 616(b) of IDEA requires that the State provide in the State Performance Plan:

- a) FFY 2013 baseline data expressed as a percentage and aligned with the State-identified Measurable Results(s) (SIMR) for children with disabilities;
- b) Measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as a percentage) for each of the five years for FFY 2014 through FFY 2018, with the FFY 2018 target reflecting measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data; and
- c) A plan that includes a description of how the State will improve performance of the SIMR.

OSEP will notify a State if it determines that any indicator in its SPP, including the SSIP, does not meet statutory requirements. The State will have an opportunity to submit a revised SPP.

Instructions for Completing the Quality Analysis Worksheet

Analysis of each of the five components: The analysis is based on the extent to which each element is addressed and the State describes its process and decisions.

For each component, the required elements and evaluation criteria are listed for the evaluators to consider. OSEP staff members will work independently to conduct the analysis. Each evaluator will look at the areas of strength for that component as well as areas that need improvement. They will each complete the Quality Analysis Worksheet showing their ratings and justifications. The evaluators will meet to discuss and reconcile any discrepancies in their individual conclusions regarding the rating of each component. Once the evaluators agree on the rating they will complete an overall summary. The OSEP State contact will complete the Quality Rating section in GRADS 360 which shows the Quality Rating, the justification for the rating, and an overall summary of areas needing improvement.

SSIP Component Quality Rating Scale:

High Quality: The State addressed all elements within the component. The component is comprehensive and well-developed with the State providing a clear description of its process and decisions within the component. The State used stakeholder engagement, multiple¹ data sources, current research, and evidence-based practices to make decisions and propose improvement strategies. Decisions and proposed improvement strategies align with current State initiatives and take into account current strengths and needs of the State and local educational agencies. Decisions and proposed improvement strategies are logical and supported by evidence-based research and State context.

Adequate Quality: The State addressed all elements within the component. The State provided an adequate description of its process and decisions within the component, though additional explanation is needed to improve clarity. The State used stakeholder engagement, multiple data sources, current research, and evidence-based practices to make decisions and propose improvement strategies, though additional information is needed to ensure comprehensiveness. While State initiatives are taken into consideration the initiatives need increased alignment. To some extent, the State takes into account its strengths and needs and those of local educational agencies. For the most part, decisions and proposed improvement strategies are logical, though additional refinement may be needed. There is cohesion among elements in the component and across the component, though additional connections could be made. The State may choose, but will not be required, to resubmit components of its SSIP deemed less than “High Quality.”

Low Quality: The State does not address all elements within the component. The component is not well developed and lacks clear evidence and details on the process the State used and the decisions made. Limited stakeholder engagement, data sources, and research were used to make decisions. Decisions and proposed improvement strategies do not reflect current State initiatives and do not take into account the strengths and needs of the State or local educational agencies. Decisions and proposed improvement strategies do not appear logical based on the State context. There is limited cohesion among elements in the component and across the components.

¹ Multiple is defined as “more than one” throughout this process.

**Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
OSEP Evaluation Tool**

State:

Evaluator:

Date of Quality Analysis:

Quality Analysis Worksheet

SSIP Phase I Evaluation Tool Quality Analysis Worksheet
Component #1: Data Analysis
<p><u>Component #1 Elements–</u></p> <p>1 (a) A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other data as applicable to determine the SIMR and the root causes contributing to low performance. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State described its process to identify, select, and analyze existing data, including how the State conducted a broad and a more focused data analysis. • The State used multiple data sources in its data analysis to identify root causes contributing to low performance.
<p>1(b) A description of how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables such as LEA, region, race/ethnicity, disability category, and placement, etc. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State disaggregated the data across multiple variables to conduct a focused data analysis.
<p>1(c) A description of any concerns about the quality of the data and if so, how the State will address these concerns. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reviewed the quality of the data and the adequacy of the State’s plan for addressing any data quality concerns.
<p>1(d) A description of how the State considered compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State considered compliance data and the potential effect on improvement.
<p>1(e) If additional data are needed, a description of the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data. OSEP will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State’s plan includes collecting additional data there is a description of the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.
<p>1(f) A description of stakeholder involvement in the data analysis. OSEP will consider the</p>

extent to which:

- Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in the process to select, identify, and analyze existing data.

Quality Rating for Component #1

Justification:

- **Areas of strength**

- **Areas that need improvement**

Component #2: Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

Component #2 Elements –

2(a) A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The State engaged in a systematic process to analyze the capacity of the State infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity at the local level in relation to the SIMR.

2(b) A description of the State’s systems infrastructure (at a minimum the governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring). OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The State analyzed all systems within its infrastructure related to the SIMR.

2(c) A description of the current strengths, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement within and across the systems. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The State identified relevant strengths within and across the systems to address the SIMR.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State identified relevant areas for improvement within and across the systems in relation to the SIMR. 	
<p>2(d) The identification of current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives and the extent to which they are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with the SSIP. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State identified both special education and general education initiatives that could impact the capacity of local programs and schools to implement strategies that lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The State analyzed relevant State-level improvement plans and initiatives in relation to the SIMR and described the extent to which they are aligned, or could be integrated, with the SSIP. 	
<p>2(e) A list of representatives (e.g. offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) who were involved in the development of Phase I and will be involved in the development and implementation of Phase II of the SSIP. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevant representatives supported the development of Phase I of the SSIP. The relevant representatives are committed to support the implementation of Phase II of the SSIP. 	
<p>2(f) A description of stakeholder involvement in the analysis of the State’s infrastructure. OSEP will consider the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in analyzing the infrastructure. 	
Quality Rating for Component #2	
<p>Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of strength Areas that need improvement 	

Component #3: SIMR

Component #3 Elements –

3(a) The State has a SIMR and the SIMR is aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator.

3(b) The SIMR is clearly based on the data and State infrastructure analyses. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The SIMR is based on the data and infrastructure analyses.
- The SIMR is aligned with current agency initiatives or priorities.
- The State engaged in a systematic process to select the SIMR.

3(c) The SIMR is a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- Addressing the SIMR will have an impact on improving results for children with disabilities within the State.
- If the States selects a SIMR that focuses on improving a result for a subset of districts/programs or populations, then the State provided an explanation of why improving that result for that subset of districts/programs or population would improve that result on a State-wide basis.

3(d) The State provided a description of stakeholder involvement in the selection of the SIMR. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in selecting the SIMR.

3(e) The State provided baseline data and targets that are measurable and rigorous (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018, with the FFY 2018 target reflecting measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data.

Quality Rating for Component #3

Justification:

- **Areas of strength**
- **Areas that need improvement**

Component #4: Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

Component #4 Elements –

4(a) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies were selected and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The improvement strategies are based on the data and infrastructure analyses.

4(b) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies are sound, logical, and aligned. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The strategies are sound, logical, and aligned with the SIMR and lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).
- Current State initiatives were considered in developing the improvement strategies.

4(c) A description of how implementation of improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build capacity to achieve the SIMR for children with disabilities. OSEP will consider:

- The likelihood that the improvement strategies will address the root causes leading to poor performance.
- The extent to which the improvement strategies are based on an implementation framework and will support systemic change.

4(d) A description of how the selection of coherent improvement strategies include the strategies, identified through the data and State infrastructure analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified measurable result(s) for children with disabilities. OSEP will consider:

- The extent to which the improvement strategies will address the areas of need identified within and across systems at multiple levels (e.g. State, LEA, school) and build the capacity of the State, LEA, and school to improve the SIMR.

- The adequacy of the plan to implement and scale up the improvement strategies.

4(e) A description of stakeholder involvement in the selection of coherent improvement strategies. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- Multiple internal and external stakeholders were engaged in identifying improvement activities.

Quality Rating for Component #4

Justification:

- **Areas of strength**
- **Areas that need improvement**

Component #5: Theory of Action

Component #5 Elements –

5(a) A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies will increase the State’s capacity to lead to meaningful change in LEAs. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- The State has provided a rationale that is logical.
- The illustration shows the relationship between the improvement strategies and their intended outcomes.
- The illustration describes the State’s actions and the consequent actions of the LEAs.

5(b) A description of how the graphic illustration shows the rationale of how implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies will lead to the achievement of improved results for children with disabilities. OSEP will consider:

- The likelihood that the theory of action will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).

5(c) The State describes involvement of multiple internal and external stakeholders in development of the Theory of Action. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in developing the theory of action.

Quality Rating for Component #5	

Justification:

- **Areas of strength**

- **Areas that need improvement**

Overall Rating:

Reviewers should summarize the ratings for each element and designate one of the following categories for the overall rating of the SSIP.

High Quality: All five components of the Phase I SSIP have been rated “High Quality,” as it is described on page 2 of this tool. The State will not be required to resubmit any portion of its SSIP.

Adequate Quality: All five components of the Phase I SSIP have been rated “Adequate Quality” or “High Quality.” The State may choose, but will not be required, to resubmit components of its SSIP deemed less than “High Quality.”

Low Quality: One or more of the SSIP components was rated “Low Quality.” The State must revise and resubmit the SSIP to address the components that were rated “Low Quality.”

Summary Statement:
Recommendation for Overall Rating: