# Introduction

The NYS State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation Plan is presented.  Section 2 presents the evaluation plan to monitor progress toward accomplishing the long-term outcomes of the SSIP project, which includes the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

These plans represent the organization of the SSIP as it is currently envisioned. They are fluid and adaptable to the changing landscape of implementation.  As the SSIP implementation teams embark on new phases of work and making new discoveries, some of the activities and targets may need to be modified.  The task of the team of evaluators at Measurement Incorporated is to partner with the State, regional, and local stakeholders participating in the project to gather timely information to use to improve and refine these plans and instruments to more accurately account for the efforts that are being undertaken to achieve the desired outcomes for the project.

## Section 1

The Strategy Process Evaluation Tables (Tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 9) examine the progress implementing the activities within each SSIP Strategy listed in the Improvement Plan.  These tables list the improvement activities, the desired outputs (products of the activity), the indicators to measure the degree to which the outputs have been achieved, the instruments and methods used to assess the indicators, and the projected timeline for completing those data collection activities.  Based upon the implementation progress observed across all five strategies, one can expect to see progress toward accomplishing a number of the SSIP's desired short-term and intermediate outcomes associated with those strategies.

The Strategy Outcomes Evaluation Tables (Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10) examine the progress toward achieving the desired outcomes associated with each SSIP Strategy.  These tables list the overarching goal, the desired outcomes, the indicators to measure the degree to which the outcomes have been achieved, the instruments and methods used to assess the indicators, and the projected timeline for completing those data collection activities. Based upon the progress observed toward achieving these short-term and intermediate outcomes, one can expect to see progress toward achieving a number of the SSIP's desired long-term outcomes for schools, teachers, and students.

## Section 2

The SSIP Student and LEA Outcomes Evaluation Table (Table 11) examines the progress toward achieving the desired long-term outcomes of the project, including the SIMR. This table lists the desired outcomes, the indicators to measure the degree to which the outcomes have been achieved, the instruments and methods used to assess the indicators, and the projected timeline for completing those data collection activities.

# Section 1

## Evaluation Plan for Strategy I: Organizational Capacity Building

**TABLE 1: Strategy I Process Evaluation: Progress Implementing Activities from the Improvement Plan**

| Activities | Outputs<br>Results of Activities | Performance Indicators<br>to assess Implementation Progress | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods | Timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1.1** Establish and sustain the SSIP Implementation Design Team (SIDT) to lead the SSIP project and model practices | ▪ SIDT is established with a clear mission, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>▪ SIDT convenes frequently to review implementation progress, make decisions, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways that increase their commitment to the work<br>▪ SIDT produces project documents, resources and plans communicating the vision, purpose, and implementation plans for the SSIP | **A** SIDT maintains a member roster which includes well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system<br>**B** SIDT achieves at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>**C** Recommended practices and structures for effective team functioning[1] are well defined and used consistently<br>**D** SIDT convenes at frequent, regular intervals as decided by members<br>**E** Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols)<br>• **Observations**[2]<br>(Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| **1.2** Establish specialized workgroups to help inform the design of the MTSS* | ▪ SIDT establishes three workgroups – Usable Innovations, Data, PD/TA and Coaching – with a clear scope of work, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>▪ Workgroups convene frequently to collaborate, document and communicate updates to SIDT<br>▪ Workgroups produce program design recommendations to the SIDT | **A** Workgroup member roster includes well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system<br>**B** Recommended practices[1] and structures for effective team functioning are well defined and used consistently<br>**C** Workgroups convene at least 2x, monthly<br>**D** Workgroups achieve at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>**E** Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols)<br>• **Observations**<br>(Evaluator) | June 2018<br>*(or when workgroups conclude)* |

---

* **MTSS** = the New York State Systemic Improvement Plan's Multi-Tiered System of Supports Model (NYS SSIP MTSS Model)

[1] Best practices identified in Implementation Science frameworks and Leading by Convening rubrics.

[2] Members of the Evaluation Team from Measurement Incorporated participate on each of the State-level SSIP teams and attend each meeting; they also attend a sampling of the regional-level team meetings as guests. Observational notes gathered from these meetings are used as descriptive evidence to accompany/support the formal record of meeting minutes, where available.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3 Develop and sustain a virtual Community Workspace for SSIP teams to utilize to advance the work | ■ SSIP Google Drive is created with folders for implementation teams<br>■ Guidance documents and technical assistance are created and provided to all SSIP stakeholders<br>■ SSIP project managers, team liaisons and meeting facilitators utilize, and encourage stakeholders to utilize, the Workspace | A Multiple members on SSIP State-level teams have accessed[3] the Workspace<br>B Multiple members on SSIP State-level teams have actively contributed[4] to the Workspace | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting materials referencing active use of the Workspace)<br>• **Google Drive Activity Reports**<br>• **Observation** (sources: member(s) of Evaluation Team in attendance at meetings/ events) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 1.4 Develop and implement a communication system with bi-directional communication pathways | ■ Communication system of bi-directional pathways is installed to (1) reach three groups of stakeholders[5], beyond the Core Group [SSIP Teams] and (2) increase stakeholder commitment and engagement<br>■ Teams of stakeholders accept a shared accountability for developing and contributing to the communication system<br>■ Communication system includes performance indicators that can be monitored | A 100% of members on SSIP teams [Core Group] have received explicit guidance about how, what, and why they need to communicate/engage with other stakeholders' groups beyond the SSIP<br>B There are liaisons linking the SSIP teams on the cascade<br>C Established communication pathways have been used multiple times in both directions<br>D There is evidence that each team has monitored/assessed its use of communication pathways and protocols | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: team guidance documents, meeting minutes/other materials referencing use of communication protocols; Project Manager Communication log)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator)<br>• **Check-in Survey** for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020<br><br><br>Feb 2019 |
| 1.5 Establish and sustain the SSIP **State Leadership Team (SLT)** to review results and learning from the SSIP and to guide SEA policy alignment | ■ SLT is established with a clear mission, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>■ SLT convenes multiple times per year to review implementation progress, consider issues of alignment with other NYSED priorities, make decisions, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways that increase their commitment to the work | A SLT member roster includes well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system<br>B Recommended practices[1] and structures for effective team functioning are well defined and used consistently<br>C SLT convenes at least 3x, annually<br>D SLT achieves at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>E Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |

---

[3] Users who have accessed the Workspace are being defined as those who have received and opened the direct link to the Workspace.

[4] Workspace activity is time stamped and logged by the specific action performed by the user. Member activities fall into two main contribution categories: (1) Adding/Altering Content (creating, uploading, sharing, editing, commenting) and (2) Organizing Content (renaming, moving, copying, or removing items).

[5] Stakeholder groups beyond the Core Group include Key Participants and Advisors, Extended Participants, Dissemination Networks. Source: *Leading by Convening Book*, pp 73-75.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.6 Establish and sustain the Regional Integrated Intervention Teams (RIITs) to support implementation at SSIP Learning Sites | ▪ RIITs are established with a clear mission, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>▪ RIITs convene frequently to review implementation progress, make decisions, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways that increase their commitment to the work<br>▪ RIITs are focused on helping DITs build capacity, through the strengthening of implementation drivers, to support fidelity implementation of the MTSS and Capstone EBPs at the building level<br>▪ RIITs produce field resources, facilitation guides, and workplans involving regular communication with learning sites and multiple on-site visits per quarter | A Member rosters include well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system, as per the guidance from SIDT<br>B Implementation teams are integrated and compensatory: the requisite skills and capacity to support MTSS implementation at the learning sites is distributed across the team<br>C Recommended practices and structures for effective team functioning[1] are well defined and used consistently<br>D RIITs convene at recommended frequency<br>E RIITs achieve at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>F Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols)<br>• **Observations**<br>(Evaluator)<br><br>Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 1.7 Establish and sustain the SSIP District Implementation Teams (DITs) to facilitate SSIP implementation at the building level | ▪ DITs are established with a clear mission, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>▪ DITs convene frequently to review implementation progress, make decisions, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways that increase their commitment to the work<br>▪ DITs are focused on building capacity, through the strengthening of implementation drivers, to support building-level teams, leaders and staff implementing the MTSS and Capstone EBPs<br>▪ DITs help refine/customize implementation guides, and co-create with SITs workplans to support installation and effective implementation | A DIT member rosters include well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system<br>B Recommended practices and structures for effective team functioning[1] are well defined and used consistently<br>C DITs convene at recommended frequency<br>D DITs achieve at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>E Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols; work plans)<br><br>Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |

| 1.8 Establish and sustain the SSIP School Implementation Teams (SITs) to implement effective innovations outlined in the SSIP | ■ SITs are established with a clear mission, set of goals, and a commitment from representatives of key stakeholder groups<br>■ SITs convene frequently to review implementation progress, make decisions, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways that increase their commitment to the work<br>■ SITs are focused on implementing the MTSS with fidelity, and supporting instructional staff in using Capstone EBPs with fidelity | A SIT member rosters include well qualified representatives from multiple stakeholder groups in the system<br>B Recommended practices and structures for effective team functioning[1] are well defined and used consistently<br>C SITs convene at recommended frequency<br>D SITs achieve at least 85% attendance at each meeting<br>E Co-created products have been communicated and made accessible | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols; work plans)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator, RIITs) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.9 SSIP Implementation Teams develop Continuous Improvement Plans to help them monitor performance and build capacity | ■ The SIDT, SLT, RIITs, DITs, and SITs have developed Continuous Improvement Plans involving frequently collected, actionable data that can be used for improving team functioning<br>■ Team performance measures will assess (1) fidelity implementation of meeting structures and protocols; (2) participation and engagement; (3) productivity; (4) growth in capacity and individual competencies; (5) impact and reach<br>■ Capacity assessments are developed for State, regional, and district-level teams to measure use and fidelity of implementation drivers' best practices | A Continuous Improvement Plans were created collaboratively with input from all members of the team<br>B 100% of implementation team members have agreed to the Continuous Improvement Plan<br>C Continuous Improvement Plans document the following: the (five) areas targeted for improvement, evaluation questions, indicators, instruments, data collection processes/methods, and how data results will be shared and used<br>D Each implementation team plans to engage in a short-cycle, team performance review/self-assessment activity at least once, quarterly or annually, depending on meeting schedule<br>E Each team plans to participate in a Capacity Assessment[6] at least once, annually [4.2] | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; member roster; team guidance documents/protocols; work plans)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>June 2019<br>June 2020 |

---

[6] Capacity Assessments measure how well education agencies (districts, REAs, SEAs) are using evidence-based implementation practices as intended to support the use and scale-up of an innovation (the MTSS). Performance indicators are derived from best practices found within the implementation drivers (Competency, Organizational, and Leadership) and other active implementation practices. Source: Dr. Caryn Ward (SISEP/NIRN).

# New York State Education Department State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) – Evaluation Plan

| | | **Annual Document Review**<br>• Review of official NYSED/OSE policy documents/communications related to MTSS implementation and systemic improvement utilizing learning from the SSIP<br>• Inventory of organizational documents, resources, etc. |
|---|---|---|
| **1.2**<br>There is increased system coherence, collective understanding, and shared ownership of the MTSS Model and evidence-based *Capstone Practices* (Literacy, Social and Emotional Development and Learning, and Explicit Instruction) | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report practices related to the MTSS have been aligned with and implemented into their work to a great/moderate extent<br>**B** A majority of SSIP Participants report having a clear understanding of MTSS and Capstone Practices<br>**C** A majority of SSIP Participants report high levels of shared ownership in the implementation process<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment (Type 3)<br>**E** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |
| **1.3** There is increased coordination and reduced duplication of effort in the planning and provision of services to SSIP Learning Sites from State and regional PD/TA Networks | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report the coordination of services to SSIP Learning Sites from State and regional PD/TA Networks has improved to a great/moderate extent<br>**B** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |
| **1.4** There is increased satisfaction among leaders, stakeholder representatives and team members with the organizational structures and processes providing SSIP governance | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report the organizational/teaming structures and processes providing SSIP governance have demonstrated a high/moderate degree of quality/effectiveness | |
| **1.5** There is increased alignment and collective reinforcement of NYSED's priorities and initiatives | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report evidence of efforts to align/integrate NYSED priorities and initiatives to support a focus on MTSS implementation<br>**B** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State-level Capacity Assessment (Type 4) | |

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.6 Adaptive, facilitative policies and plans are in place at the State and regional levels to support sustainability and scale-up of the MTSS | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report a high degree of optimism in the belief that the MTSS can be sustainable and scalable<br><br>**B** There is evidence of plans to support statewide implementation of the MTSS<br><br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State and regional-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |

## Evaluation Plan for Strategy II: Program and Resource Development

**TABLE 3:  Strategy II Process Evaluation: Progress Implementing Activities from the Improvement Plan**

| Activities | Outputs<br>Results of Activities | Performance Indicators<br>to assess Implementation Progress | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1  Define the NYS SSIP MTSS Model | ▪ Usable Innovations Workgroup defines critical components of MTSS and operationalizes the Model for all program leaders, trainers and implementers inside the SSIP Transformation Zone (TZ); SIDT and SLT review and finalize the definition of the MTSS to be implemented in the TZ | A  MTSS has been approved by the SIDT and SLT<br>B  Features and components of the Model are anchored in research<br>C  Features and components of the Model demonstrate appropriate fit/feasibility[11] for application in the TZ<br>D  The MTSS Model includes clearly defined look-fors to help identify fidelity | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>**Observations**[12] (Evaluator) |
| 2.2  Define Capstone Evidence-based Practices (EBPs) to support universal instruction in Literacy, SEDL13 and EI14 within the MTSS | ▪ NYS SSIP TAC Partners contribute expertise about universal (Tier 1) instructional practices to support literacy, SEDL and EI; ensure alignment within the MTSS Model<br>▪ SIDT consults with workgroups, RIITs, and DITs to define capstone practices inside the MTSS Model | A  Capstone EBPs have been approved by the SIDT and SLT<br>B  Features and components of EBPs are anchored in research<br>C  Features and components of EBPs demonstrate appropriate fit/feasibility for application in the TZ<br>D  EBPs include clearly defined look-fors to help identify fidelity | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>**Observations** (Evaluator) |
| 2.3  Create a web-based MTSS Resource Library to store and share resources developed for the SSIP | ▪ SIDT creates and maintains the library with products developed and refined by the SSIP implementation teams<br>▪ SSIP teams will have access and be able to share materials with leaders and staff implementing the usable innovation | A  Resource library is online<br>B  Resource library content reflects comprehensive, up-to-date information in an easily consumable format<br>C  All SSIP implementation teams have received access to the space<br>D  There is evidence of frequent visits from multiple users | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting materials referencing development of the website; previews of content, etc.)<br>**Visitor's Log** |

---

[11] Demonstrates integrity and alignment with existing models, structures, frameworks installed at SSIP Learning Sites (e.g., PBIS infrastructure and practices to support SEDL)

[12] Members of the Evaluation Team from Measurement Incorporated participate on each of the State-level SSIP teams and attend each meeting; they also attend a sampling of the regional-level team meetings as guests. Observational notes gathered from these meetings are used as descriptive evidence to accompany/support the formal record of meeting minutes, where available.

[13] Social Emotional Development and Learning.

[14] Explicit Instruction.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Develop a comprehensive set of implementation tools | ▪ SIDT, in consultation with RIITs and DITs, creates practical, integrated implementation tools, data collection tools, and guidance materials; priority materials will be ready by the kickoff Leadership Institute 2018 | A Implementation tools and guidance are finalized<br>B Implementation tools and guidance are adequate to support initial implementation/ usability testing | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products; reports from Regional and LEA representatives)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator)<br><br>**Check-in Survey**[15] for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams |

## TABLE 4: Strategy II Outcomes Evaluation

**GOAL:** The MTSS becomes the State's work-in-progress definition of an integrated, culturally, and linguistically responsive MTSS to improve educational outcomes for every student

| Outcomes | Performance Indicators<br>to assess progress toward/achievement of Outcomes | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1 The MTSS and implementation tools are compatible with other State and local models, and with improvement processes currently in use (i.e., the MTSS demonstrates a good "fit" with NYS LEAs) | A There is documented evidence of alignment and integration between the MTSS and systems and practices in use at the State and local levels<br>B A majority of SSIP Participants[16] report a high degree of compatibility and integrity between the MTSS and systems currently in place; a majority report little or no barriers to implementation due to lack of "fit"<br>C Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State Capacity Assessment (Type 4)<br>D Score increases in relevant indicators on the DTSDE. | **Annual Participant Survey** of All SSIP Participants<br>• Likert Scale items assessing relevant indicators<br>• Short open response items gathering descriptive data<br>• Disaggregation by stakeholder group/level of the system<br><br>**Annual MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment**<br>• Items/evidence relating to availability and usefulness of resources to support implementation at the site level (as perceived by building-level teams) |
| 2.2 SSIP Learning Sites have improved access to up-to-date implementation resources and contextualized guidance | A A majority of SSIP Participants report having access to implementation resources<br>B A majority of those visiting the resource library report satisfaction with accessibility and content<br>C Resource library shows evidence of consistent updating | **Annual Capacity Assessments**[17] administered to State, regional, and district-level SSIP teams<br>• Items assessing relevant indicators<br><br>**Annual Semi-structured Interviews** with SSIP Participants |

---

[15] The Check-in Survey includes the measurement of indicators related to the productivity of State-level teams developed as part of the Continuous Improvement Plans (part of Activity 1.9 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).

[16] SSIP Participants include members from the four levels of SSIP implementation teams: SLT, SIDT, RIITs, DITs, and SITs.

[17] Self-assessment tools measuring fidelity and strength of implementation drivers, i.e., indicators of the presence of an enabling context to support implementation (Type 4 data).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **D** Resource library visitor's log reflects frequent access from multiple users<br>**E** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | • Descriptive accounts of experiences with SSIP implementation/outcomes from a distributed sample of stakeholders<br><br>**Annual Document Review** |
| 2.3 SSIP Learning Sites have increased their utilization of implementation tools developed by SSIP teams, and are satisfied with practicality and ease of use | **A** A majority of SSIP Participants report utilizing implementation tools and resources made available via the resource library<br>**B** A majority of those utilizing the resources report a high degree of satisfaction with them<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment (Type 3) | • Review of official NYSED/OSE policy documents/communications related to MTSS implementation and systemic improvement utilizing learning from the SSIP<br>• Inventory of tools, guidance documents, online resources, etc. |
| 2.4 Tools such as Practitioner Guides, Implementation Checklists and Practical Performance Assessments have been refined and validated for use in scale up | **A** There is substantial evidence of updates and improvements made to tools and resources<br>**B** A majority of SSIP Participants report a high degree of confidence in the utility and applicability of the tools and resources to support implementation in other sites across the State<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS building-level Self-Assessment (Type 3)<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State and regional-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |

## Evaluation Plan for Strategy III: Professional Development, Technical Assistance and Coaching

**TABLE 5: Strategy III Process Evaluation: Progress Implementing Activities from the Improvement Plan**

| Activities | Outputs<br>Results of Activities | Performance Indicators<br>to assess Implementation Progress | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods | Timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Define the PD and Coaching Delivery Models to use to support implementation of the MTSS | ■ PD-TA-Coaching Workgroup defines the critical components of high-quality PD and coaching to support implementation of the MTSS<br>■ Critical components of the delivery model are operationalized into Practice Profiles to be used by MTSS SSIP trainers/coaches on the RIITs | **A** PD and Coaching Delivery Models are approved by the SLT and SIDT for use in the TZ<br>**B** Features and components of the Models are anchored in research<br>**C** Features and components of models demonstrate appropriate fit/feasibility[18] for application in the TZ<br>**D** The PD and Coaching Delivery Models include clearly defined look-fors to help identify fidelity | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>• **Observations**[19]<br>(Evaluator) | March 2019 |
| 3.2 Develop a Comprehensive Training Plan | ■ Training Model is created to target learning needs of three layers of implementers: State and regional network, district and building leaders/implementation teams, site-level instructional staff<br>■ Plan is created to provide foundational training in Year 5 (2018-19) for the first cohort responsible for initial implementation of the MTSS; the Plan includes the use of needs assessments and evaluation of PD events/activities | **A** Training Model and Comprehensive Planning documents have been reviewed and approved by the SIDT and SLT<br>**B** PD needs assessment and evaluation processes and/or instruments have been designed, are aligned with the Model, and are practical to implement | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>• **Observations**<br>(Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |

---

[18] Demonstrates integrity and alignment with existing PD plans and structures in place inside the TZ

[19] Members of the Evaluation Team from Measurement Incorporated (MI) participate on each of the State-level SSIP Teams and attend each meeting; they also attend a sampling of the Regional-level Team meetings as guests. Observational notes gathered from these meetings are used as descriptive evidence to accompany/support the formal record of meeting minutes, where available.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.3 Develop a Comprehensive Coaching Plan | ■ Coaching Plan is created to support learning needs of three layers of implementers: State and regional network, district and building leaders/implementation teams, site-level instructional staff; the Plan includes the use of needs assessments and evaluation of coaching activities | **A** Comprehensive Planning documents have been reviewed and approved by the SIDT and SLT<br>**B** Coaching needs assessment and evaluation processes and/or instruments have been designed, are aligned with the Model, and are practical to implement | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 3.4 Provide foundational training in Initial Implementation of the MTSS for teams in the TZ | ■ SIDT members and RIITs are provided with quality training based on high priority needs<br>■ District Implementation Teams (DITs), School Implementation Teams (SITs) and leaders are provided with quality training based on high priority needs<br>■ District and building-level instructional staff are provided with quality training based on high priority needs | **A** 100% of members on State and regional level SSIP teams participate in foundational training activities<br>**B** 100% of members on district and building-level SSIP teams participate in foundational training activities<br>**C** A majority of instructional staff at SSIP Learning Sites participate in foundational training activities (in accordance with support plans co-created by RIITs and SSIP Learning Sites) | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: event attendance records, support plans, reports from regional and LEA representatives)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator)<br>• **Check-in Survey**[20] for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020<br><br>February 2019 |
| 3.5 Provide continuous, targeted technical assistance and coaching for teams in the SSIP TZ | ■ RIITs are provided with quality TA and coaching based on identified needs<br>■ DITs, SITs, and leaders are provided with quality TA and coaching based on identified needs<br>■ District and building-level instructional staff are provided with quality TA and coaching based on identified needs | **A** A majority of members on regional-level SSIP teams receive TA/coaching to help them support implementation as per their professional learning plans<br>**B** All district and building-level SSIP teams receive agreed upon dosage of TA/coaching from RIITs to help them support implementation as per the Support Plans, etc.<br>**C** A majority of instructional staff at SSIP Learning Sites receive agreed upon dosage of TA/coaching from RIITs to help them support implementation as per the Support Plans, etc. | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: coaching logs, communication logs, Support Plans, reports from regional and LEA representatives)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator)<br>• **Check-in Survey** for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020<br><br>February 2019 |

---

[20] The Check-in Survey includes the measurement of indicators related to PD/access to continuous learning opportunities for State-level teams developed as part of the Continuous Improvement Plans (part of Activity 1.9 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).

## TABLE 6: Strategy III Outcomes Evaluation

**GOAL:** Staff and leaders at the SSIP schools have increased fidelity implementation of Capstone EBPs to support universal instruction in literacy, SEDL, and EI within the MTSS Model

| Outcomes | Performance Indicators to assess progress toward/achievement of Outcomes | Measurement Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 There is increased collective clarity around, and support for, the PD and Coaching Models implemented by State Technical Assistance Centers and RIITs to provide ongoing, high-quality support for SSIP Learning Sites | A A majority of SSIP Participants[21] report having a clear understanding about how the State, regional, and local PD providers and coaches are supporting professional learning needs required for fidelity implementation of the MTSS <br> B There is evidence of standard, consistently used, research-based training and coaching practices occurring in the TZ, aligned with the PD and Coaching Delivery Models <br> C Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | **Post Event Participant Surveys**[22] for those participating in PD activities <br> • Likert Scale items assessing indicators of high-quality PD <br> • Short open response items gathering descriptive data <br><br> **Annual Participant Survey** of All SSIP Participants <br> • Likert Scale items assessing relevant indicators <br> • Short open response items gathering descriptive data <br> • Disaggregation by stakeholder group/ level of the system |
| 3.2 RIITs increase their understanding and self-efficacy to facilitate implementation of the MTSS Model and Capstone EBPs | A A majority of SSIP RIIT members report increasing their understanding and self-efficacy to facilitate implementation of the MTSS Model <br> B A majority of SSIP RIIT members report increasing their understanding and self-efficacy to facilitate implementation of the Capstone EBPs to support universal instruction in literacy, SEDL, and EI <br> C A majority of SSIP DIT and SIT members report high degree of confidence with the knowledge and capabilities of their RIIT coaches <br> D RIIT leaders (Regional Coordinators) describe growing understanding and efficacy in these areas demonstrated by RIIT coaches | **LEA Support Plans**[23] <br> • School-wide/system-level fidelity assessment scores (e.g., PBIS TFI, BoQ, etc.) <br> • Classroom/practice-level fidelity assessment scores (e.g., Regional Special Education Technical Assistance Support Center (RSE-TASC) EI Walkthrough Tool) <br><br> **Annual MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment** <br> • Items/evidence relating to the PD, TA and coaching to support fidelity implementation at the site level (as perceived by building-level teams) |
| 3.3 Staff and leaders at SSIP Learning Sites increase their understanding, self-efficacy to | A A majority of site-level leaders and SIT and DIT members report increasing their understanding and self-efficacy to implement the MTSS Model | **Annual Capacity Assessments**[24] administered to State, regional, and district-level SSIP teams <br> • Items assessing relevant indicators |

---

[21] SSIP Participants include members from the four levels of SSIP Implementation Teams: SLT, SIDT, RIITs, DITs, and SITs.

[22] The Post Event Participant Survey measures the presence of research-based indicators of high-quality PD (e.g., practices of trainers, usefulness of resources, etc.) as defined by the PD Workgroup in the PD Delivery Model/Framework (Activity 3.1 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).

[23] Support Plans co-created by the RIITs and learning sites are reviewed to assess progress toward meeting the annual system-level (Type 3), and practice-level (Type 2) goals related to MTSS implementation.

[24] Self-assessment tools measuring fidelity and strength of implementation drivers, i.e., indicators of the presence of an enabling context to support implementation (Type 4 data).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| implement, and use of the MTSS and Capstone EBPs | **B** A majority of instructional staff members report increasing their understanding and self-efficacy to implement the Capstone EBPs to support universal instruction in literacy, SEDL, and EI<br>**C** A majority of RIIT members report a high degree of improvement in the knowledge and efficacy of the SSIP site-level leaders and instructional staff<br>**D** Site-level leaders (District Superintendents, Building Principals) describe growing understanding and efficacy in these areas demonstrated by staff | **Annual Semi-structured Interviews** with SSIP Participants<br>• Descriptive accounts of experiences with SSIP implementation/outcomes from a distributed sample of stakeholders<br><br>**Annual Document Review**<br>• Review of official NYSED/OSE policy documents/communications related to MTSS implementation and systemic improvement utilizing learning from the SSIP<br>• Inventory of PD, TA, coaching plans, documents, resources, etc.<br><br>*In Development*<br>**Practical Performance Assessment for Regional School Improvement Specialist**<br>• SSIP teams are developing a Practice Profile for RIIT coaches, based on the careful documentation of their use of practices rated highly effective and on emerging evidence of impact<br>• From this Practice Profile, the SIDT and RIITs will create a practical assessment to check fidelity implementation of the desired practices of a Regional School Improvement Specialist<br><br>*Ongoing for State, Regional, Local PD related to the MTSS* |
| 3.4 Districts and schools intentionally integrate the Quality PD and Coaching Model designed to support fidelity implementation of the MTSS | **A** There is documented evidence of efforts to align district and building-level plans with the PD and Coaching Delivery Models<br>**B** Plans at all SSIP Learning Sites reflect quality elements consistent with the PD and Coaching Delivery Models to support fidelity implementation of EBPs<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment (Type 3)<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |
| 3.5 LEA leaders participating in the SSIP increase their use of effective leadership practices aligned with the MTSS | **A** A majority of SSIP district and building leaders report increasing their use of effective leadership practices aligned with the MTSS<br>**B** A majority of SSIP site-level staff members report their leaders use effective leadership practices<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3) | |
| 3.6 There is increased quality of on-site PD, TA, and coaching support services provided to SSIP Learning Sites from RIITs | **A** A majority of site-level leaders and staff report the PD, TA, and coaching they've received from the RIITs has been high quality<br>**B** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3) | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.7 RIIT specialists have increased fidelity implementation of the identified facilitation and coaching practices used with teams and staff at SSIP Learning Sites | **A** A majority of SSIP RIIT members report increased use of effective practices facilitating the implementation of the MTSS<br>**B** A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report their RIIT coaches use effective facilitation practices<br>**C** RIIT leaders (Regional Coordinators) describe consistent and effective use of coaching practices demonstrated by RIIT coaches<br>**D** Scores increase/achieve the fidelity threshold on the Practical Performance Assessment for Regional School Improvement Specialists (in development Type 2 measure) |
| 3.8 Staff and leaders at SSIP Learning Sites increase general education-special education (GE-SE) cooperative planning and fidelity use of MTSS data to inform decisions (resource allocation; instruction and services to all students and students in sub-groups; PD and coaching, etc.) | **A** A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report increased/adequate GE-SE cooperative planning time<br>**B** A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report increased use of practices and data gathered by the MTSS Decision Support Data System (DSDS)<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3)<br>**E** RIIT coaches describe evidence of these two elements |
| 3.9 RIITs have increased their capacity to support LEAs in the planning of and progress toward school improvement goals | **A** A majority of RIIT members report increased capacity of their team to support LEAs<br>**B** RIIT members and leaders describe evidence of increased capacity of their team to support LEAs<br>**C** Scores increase on the regional-level Capacity Assessment (Type 4)<br>**D** Aggregated scores increase/achieve the fidelity threshold on the Practical Performance Assessment for Regional School Improvement Specialists (in development Type 2 measure) |

## Evaluation Plan for Strategy IV: Needs Assessment, Improvement Planning and Monitoring

### TABLE 7:  Strategy IV Process Evaluation: Progress Implementing Activities from the Improvement Plan

| Activities | Outputs<br>Results of Activities | Performance Indicators<br>to assess Implementation Progress | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods | Timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4.1** Establish a DSDS and Evaluation Plan for collecting, analyzing and reporting actionable MTSS data | ■ Data Workgroup defines the critical components for the MTSS DSDS to collect based on a Four Type Data Model[25]<br>■ An Evaluation Plan is created, which includes the use of practical, valid and reliable tools; a schedule for collection; and roles and responsibilities for the Learning Site-based Data Mentor/Data Coordinator<br>■ The SSIP DSDS and Data Collection Plans are communicated to the RIITs, DITs, and SITs | A   SSIP DSDS and Evaluation Plan are approved by the SIDT and SLT<br>B   All RIITs have received the data collection plan for the year<br>C   All learning sites have received the data collection plan for the year | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products)<br>• **Observations**[26] (Evaluator)<br>• **Check-in Survey**[27] for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 4.2 Administer Implementation Capacity Assessments to SSIP system-level teams (DITs, RIITs, and SIDT); use data to assess needs, plan, and monitor progress | ■ System-level teams are provided with an orientation to the Capacity Assessment tools and processes<br>■ System-level teams participate in the annual Capacity Assessment led by a trained facilitator | A   DITs collect Type 4 baseline data<br>B   DITs use this data to assess needs, update Improvement Plans/Support Plans and make goals for the year<br>C   RIITs collect Type 4 baseline data<br>D   RIITs use this data to assess needs, update Work Plans and make goals for the year<br>E   SIDT collects Type 4 baseline data<br>F   SIDT uses this data to assess needs, update plans and set goals for the year | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products; record of completed assessments, plans)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually:<br>July 2019 (baseline)<br>July 2020 |

---

[25] Four Type Data Model: *Type 1*: Student-level data (screening, formative, interim, outcome, progress monitoring, diagnostic); *Type 2*: Practitioner data (use and fidelity of EBPs within MTSS); *Type 3*: School-wide MTSS implementation data (infrastructure supports, PD evaluations); *Type 4*: District/system-level capacity data (use and fidelity of EBPs to support MTSS implementation)

[26] Members of the Evaluation Team from Measurement Incorporated participate on each of the State-level SSIP teams and attend each meeting; they also attend a sampling of the regional-level team meetings as guests. Observational notes gathered from these meetings are used as descriptive evidence to accompany/support the formal record of meeting minutes, where available.

[27] The Check-in Survey includes the measurement of indicators related to the productivity of State-level teams developed as part of the Continuous Improvement Plans (part of Activity 1.9 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.3 Collect comprehensive site-level data; use data to assess needs, plan, and monitor progress | ▪ SITs collect Type 1, 2, and 3 baseline data; SITs set goals and benchmarks for the year via the Support Plan | **A** All SSIP Learning Sites have collected the critical Type 1 data elements as per the guidance from the SIDT and in accordance with their Support Plans<br><br>**B** All SSIP Learning Sites have collected the critical Type 2 data elements as per the guidance from the SIDT and in accordance with their Support Plans<br><br>**C** All SSIP Learning Sites have collected the critical Type 3 data elements via the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment and in accordance with their Support Plans | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products; record of completed assessments, plans)<br><br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually:<br>March 2019 (baseline)<br><br>March 2020 |
| 4.4 Develop MTSS Data Dashboards | ▪ Implementation teams (SIDT, RIITs, DITs, SITs) have created dashboards to communicate progress using indicator data (capacity, reach, fidelity, impact) | **A** 100% of SSIP Implementation Teams have a functioning Data Dashboard | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting schedule, agendas, minutes; work products; preview of dashboards)<br><br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |

## TABLE 8: Strategy IV Outcomes Evaluation

**GOAL:** SSIP Learning Sites demonstrate progress toward achieving benchmark targets identified for students with learning disabilities, including students in specified sub-groups, laid out in their Support Plans

| Outcomes | Performance Indicators<br>to assess progress toward/achievement of Outcomes | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1 Staff, leaders and stakeholders at SSIP Learning Sites increase access and use of the MTSS DSDS for continuous improvement (i.e., a *Plan, Do, Study, Act* Cycle) | **A** A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report regularly accessing and using data from the SSIP MTSS DSDS<br>**B** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3) | **Annual Participant Survey** of all SSIP Participants<br>• Likert Scale items assessing relevant indicators<br>• Short open response items gathering descriptive data<br>• Disaggregation by stakeholder group/ level of the system<br><br>**LEA Support Plans**[28] |

---

[28] Support Plans co-created by the RIITs and learning sites are reviewed to assess progress toward meeting the annual system-level (Type 3), and practice-level (Type 2) goals related to MTSS implementation

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | D | RIIT coaches describe evidence of increased data use at sites to inform MTSS decision-making and continuous improvement | • School-wide/system-level fidelity assessment scores (e.g., PBIS TFI, BoQ, etc.)<br>• Classroom/practice-level fidelity assessment scores (e.g., RSE-TASC EI Walkthrough Tool)<br><br>**Annual MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment**<br>• Items/evidence relating to data system improvements, and use of data to make informed decisions for students within the MTSS (as perceived by building-level teams)<br><br>**Annual Capacity Assessments**[29] administered to State, regional, and district-level SSIP teams<br>• Items assessing relevant indicators<br><br>**Annual Semi-structured Interviews** with SSIP Participants<br>• Descriptive accounts of experiences with SSIP implementation/outcomes from a distributed sample of stakeholders<br><br>**Annual Document Review**<br>• Review of official NYSED/OSE policy documents/communications related to MTSS implementation and systemic improvement utilizing learning from the SSIP |
| 4.2 Districts' and schools' improvement plans (Support Plans) show increased alignment with the goals of the MTSS implementation | A | There is documented evidence to demonstrate that district and building-level improvement plans are increasingly aligned with the MTSS | |
| | B | Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3) | |
| | C | Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the district-level Capacity Assessment (Type 4) | |
| 4.3 Staff, leaders and stakeholders at SSIP Learning Sites experience increased satisfaction with the DSDS | A | A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report a high degree of satisfaction with the SSIP MTSS DSDS | |
| | B | SSIP site-level leaders and staff describe evidence of satisfactory experiences in this area | |
| | C | RIIT coaches describe evidence of satisfactory experiences at sites in this area | |
| 4.4 SSIP Learning Sites increase their capacity to systematically collect, analyze and communicate to stakeholders MTSS progress and outcome data (student, practitioner, school, district) | A | A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report increased capacity at their school to systematically collect, analyze and communicate to stakeholders MTSS progress and outcome data | |
| | B | RIIT members and leaders describe evidence of increased capacity in this area | |
| | C | Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3) | |
| | D | Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the district-level Capacity Assessment (Type 4) | |
| 4.5 State and regional implementation teams increase their capacity to systematically collect, analyze and communicate to stakeholders MTSS progress and outcome data (LEA, regional, State) | A | A majority of SSIP State and regional-level participants report increased capacity at their agencies to systematically collect, analyze, and communicate to stakeholders MTSS progress and outcome data | |
| | B | SIDT and RIIT members describe evidence of increased capacity in this area | |
| | C | Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the district-level Capacity Assessment (Type 4) | |

---

[29] Self-assessment tools measuring fidelity and strength of implementation drivers, i.e., indicators of the presence of an enabling context to support implementation (Type 4 data).

**Evaluation Plan for Strategy V: SEA-LEA Partnership and Community Engagement**

TABLE 9:  Strategy V Process Evaluation: Progress Implementing Activities from the Improvement Plan

| Activities | Outputs<br>Results of Activities | Performance Indicators<br>to assess Implementation Progress | Measurement<br>Data Collection Methods | Timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1  Engage in ongoing communication with SSIP Learning Sites to help create readiness for implementation | ■ State-level teams and RIITs utilize the bi-directional communication system to discuss readiness factors at the regional and site-levels<br>■ RIITs and learning sites utilize the bi-directional communication system to discuss readiness factors at the site-level | A  Multiple conversations have taken place/ communication exchanged between the SIDT and RIITs about implementation readiness<br>B  Multiple conversations have taken place/ communication exchanged between the RIITs and learning sites about implementation readiness | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting agendas, minutes; communication logs; Support Plans)<br>• **Observations**[30] (Evaluator)<br>• **Check-in Survey**[31] for stakeholders participating on State-level SSIP teams | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020<br><br>February 2019 |
| 5.2  Create a collaborative Partnership Agreement between the State and the SSIP Learning Sites establishing mutual understanding and commitments | ■ SIDT collaborates with stakeholders to design the Partnership Agreement to participate in the SSIP project<br>■ The agreement is formalized and signed in a meeting facilitated by the RIIT; signatures required from the District Superintendent and Building Principal | A  Partnership Agreements have been signed by the District Superintendents and Building Principals at all SSIP Learning Sites | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting minutes; SSIP Project Manager (PM) report) | Upon Completion:<br>June 2018 |

---

[30] Members of the Evaluation Team from Measurement Incorporated participate on each of the State-level SSIP teams and attend each meeting; they also attend a sampling of the regional-level team meetings as guests. Observational notes gathered from these meetings are used as descriptive evidence to accompany/support the formal record of meeting minutes, where available.

[31] The Check-in Survey includes the measurement of indicators related to the productivity/engagement activities of State-level teams developed as part of the Continuous Improvement Plans (part of Activity 1.9 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.3 | Create a public website for communicating SSIP project information | ▪ SIDT develops content and parameters for the website<br>▪ SSIP interactive website is created and launched | **A** SSIP interactive website is live and accessible to public visitors<br>**B** Website content reflects comprehensive, up-to-date information in an easily consumable format<br>**C** All SSIP Implementation Teams have received the link to the website; stakeholder groups outside the SSIP TZ have received the link with invitation to visit<br>**D** There is evidence of frequent visits from multiple users | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: meeting materials referencing development of the website; previews of content; communications)<br>• **Visitor's Log** | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 5.4 | Develop an MTSS Community of Practice (*SSIP Network Improvement Community*) to support interactive learning about the MTSS in the SSIP TZ | ▪ SSIP Implementation Teams collaborate to create a Network Improvement Community inclusive of practitioners and families participating in the SSIP<br>▪ Activities are planned to build engagement | **A** All RIITs have been invited to participate in an SSIP-related Network Improvement Community<br>**B** All SSIP DITs and SITs have been invited to participate in an SSIP-related Network Improvement Community<br>**C** There is evidence of frequent communication among SSIP teams within each region and between each region<br>**D** There is evidence of planned activities to bring together implementation teams across the TZ to share experiences | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: communication logs; meeting minutes)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |
| 5.5 | Support the organization of District-driven activities to engage parents from the local communities in learning about and contributing to the MTSS movement | ▪ SIDT and RIITs consult with Special Education Parent Centers and other community engagement experts to explore best practices for engaging parents in learning activities<br>▪ SIDT collaborates with RIITs, DITs, and SITs to support activities, evaluate the process and impact of activities, and develop guidance for sustainability and replication | **A** There is evidence that SSIP Implementation Teams are using research-based, expert-informed strategies to engage families<br>**B** All SSIP Learning Sites are offering families opportunities to learn about MTSS | • **Document Review and Analysis** (sources: communication logs; meeting minutes)<br>• **Observations** (Evaluator) | Annually or as needed:<br>March 2019<br>March 2020 |

## TABLE 10: Strategy V Outcomes Evaluation

**GOAL:** Among families and community members from SSIP Learning Sites, there is increased involvement/engagement of families of all cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the special education process and in school decision-making about MTSS

| Outcomes | Performance Indicators to assess progress toward/achievement of Outcomes | Measurement Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|
| 5.1 Among district and school leaders from SSIP Learning Sites, there is increased satisfaction with the RIITs and NYSED in their efforts through the SSIP to help schools improve systems and outcomes for students with learning disabilities | A A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report a high degree of satisfaction with the RIITs and NYSED in their efforts through the SSIP to help schools improve systems and outcomes for student with learning disabilities<br>B SSIP site-level leaders and staff describe evidence of satisfactory experiences in this area | **Post Event Participant Surveys**[32] for those participating in FACE[33] activities<br>• Likert Scale items assessing indicators of high-quality FACE events<br>• Short open response items gathering descriptive data<br><br>**Annual Participant Survey** of All SSIP Participants<br>• Likert Scale items assessing relevant indicators<br>• Short open response items gathering descriptive data<br>• Disaggregation by stakeholder group/ level of the system |
| 5.2 There is increased access to/activity on the SSIP public website | A A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report accessing the SSIP public website<br>B A majority of SSIP site-level leaders and staff report sharing access to the SSIP public website with colleagues, families, and community members<br>C A majority of those visiting the SSIP public website report satisfaction with accessibility and content<br>D SSIP website shows evidence of consistent updating<br>E SSIP website visitor's log reflects frequent access from multiple users<br>F Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>G Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3)<br>H Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | **LEA Support Plans**[34]<br>• School-wide/system-level fidelity assessment scores (e.g., PBIS TFI, BoQ, etc.)<br><br>**Annual MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment**<br>• Items/evidence relating to communication protocols/systems, family and community engagement, and partnership with the State (as perceived by building-level teams)<br><br>**Annual Capacity Assessments**[35] administered to State, regional, and district-level SSIP teams<br>• Items assessing relevant indicators |

---

[32] The Post Event Participant Survey measures the presence of research-based indicators of high-quality PD (e.g., practices of trainers, usefulness of resources, etc.) as defined by the PD Workgroup in the PD Delivery Model/Framework (Activity 3.1 in the SSIP Improvement Plan).
[33] Family And Community Engagement
[34] Support Plans co-created by the RIITs and learning sites are reviewed to assess progress toward meeting the annual system-level (Type 3) goals related to MTSS implementation
[35] Self-assessment tools measuring fidelity and strength of implementation drivers, i.e., indicators of the presence of an enabling context to support implementation (Type 4 data).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.3 Among leaders, practitioners, families and community members from SSIP Learning Sites, there is increased participation in the SSIP MTSS Community of Practice | **A** A majority of SSIP site-level staff and leaders report participating in the TZ-wide SSIP MTSS Community of Practice to share experiences and build meaningful connections<br>**B** RIIT coaches/FACE Representatives, site-level staff, and leaders describe improved efforts to engage families and community members in the SSIP MTSS Community of Practice experience | **Annual Semi-structured Interviews** with SSIP Participants<br>• Descriptive accounts of experiences with SSIP implementation/outcomes from a distributed sample of stakeholders<br><br>**Annual Document Review**<br>• Review of official NYSED/OSE policy documents/communications related to engaging families and community members in MTSS implementation<br>• Inventory of FACE and SEA-LEA Partnership plans, documents, resources<br>• Event attendance records<br>*Ongoing for State, regional, local FACE events related to the MTSS* |
| 5.4 Among families and community members from SSIP Learning Sites, there is increased participation in engagement events/literacy trainings for adult learners | **A** There is documented evidence of increased enrollment and attendance at regional and local FACE events<br>**B** RIIT coaches/FACE Representatives describe increased attendance and improved engagement levels<br>**C** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the school-wide/system-level fidelity assessments (Type 3) identified in Support Plans<br>**D** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the MTSS Building-level Self-Assessments (Type 3)<br>**E** Scores increase in relevant indicator areas on the State, regional, and district-level Capacity Assessments (Type 4) | |
| 5.5 Among families and community members from SSIP Learning Sites, there is increased awareness and understanding of the MTSS and how it supports outcomes for all students and students with disabilities | **A** A majority of family and community members attending FACE events report increased awareness and understanding of the MTSS and how it supports outcomes for all students and students with disabilities<br>**B** A sample of family and community members attending FACE events describe increases in these areas | |

# Section 2

## Long-term Outcomes Evaluation

### TABLE 11

## SSIP Student and LEA Outcomes Evaluation

| Long-term Outcomes | Performance Indicators to assess progress toward/achievement of Outcomes | Measurement Data Collection Methods |
|---|---|---|
| **SIMR:** For students classified as students with learning disabilities (LD) in SSIP Schools (grades 3-5), increase the percentage of students scoring at proficiency levels 2 and above on the Grades 3-5 English Language Arts State Assessments | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>C  Increased percentage of LD Grade 3 students scoring at levels 2, 3, and 4 on NYS ELA Exam<br>D  Increased percentage of LD Grade 4 students scoring at levels 2, 3, and 4 on NYS ELA Exam<br>E  Increased percentage of LD Grade 5 students scoring at levels 2, 3, and 4 on NYS ELA Exam | **NYS ELA Exams for Grades 3, 4, 5**<br>• Longitudinal comparison (3-4 years)<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by student sub-population<br><br>**Universal Screening[36] Data**<br>• Literacy Screening<br>• Behavior Screening<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by student sub-population |
| **1** An increased percentage of K-5 students with learning disabilities[39] remain in their classrooms for core instruction | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>A  Number of K-5 students identified for Tier 2 academic supports decreases; disaggregate student sub-groups<br>B  Number of K-5 students identified for Tier 2 behavior supports decreases; disaggregate student sub-groups | **Literacy Benchmark Assessment Data**<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by student sub-population |
| **2** K-5 students with learning disabilities increase their performance level on specified benchmark assessments | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>A  K-5 students improve scores on identified literacy benchmark assessments | **School-wide Reports**<br>• Attendance<br>• Referrals, suspensions<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by student sub-population |
| **3** K-5 students with learning disabilities demonstrate increased engagement and improved behavior | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>A  K-5 students increase engagement/participation, as measured by a standard, validated instrument observing student behaviors<br>B  K-5 students receive fewer disciplinary referrals and suspensions<br>C  K-5 students improve attendance | **Progress Monitoring Data** |

---

[36] N.B.: Thresholds to make students eligible to receive Tier 2 supports vary based on the screening instruments and the decision rules utilized by each, unique Learning Site

[39] As determined by the fidelity the23

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4  K-5 students with learning disabilities improve their progress in the general education curriculum | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>A  K-5 students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic supports improve their performance according to Progress Monitoring Reports<br>B  K-5 students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior supports improve their performance according to Progress Monitoring Reports | • K-5 students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic and behavior supports<br><br>**Diagnostic Data**<br>• K-5 students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic and behavior supports |
| 5  Practitioners increase fidelity implementation of Capstone Practices to support universal instruction in literacy, SEDL, and EI<br><br>*\* Practitioners increase fidelity implementation of additional identified academic and behavior EBPs in other Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instructional settings, as per the goals in the LEA's Support Plan (see 9, below)* | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>D  Classroom teachers improve their scores in the implementation of defined literacy practices<br>E  Percentage of teachers implementing literacy practices with fidelity increases (as determined by the instrument's fidelity threshold score)<br>F  Classroom teachers improve their scores in the implementation of defined SEDL practices<br>G  Percentage of teachers implementing SEDL practices with fidelity increases (as determined by the instrument's fidelity threshold score)<br>H  Classroom teachers improve their scores in the implementation of identified EI practices<br>I  Percentage of teachers implementing EI practices with fidelity increases (as determined by the instrument's fidelity threshold score) | **Classroom Observational Walkthrough Tools**<br>• Literacy Fidelity Implementation Observational Tool (\*TBD)<br>• PBIS Walkthrough Tool (\*TBD)<br>• RSE-TASC Explicit Instruction Walkthrough Tool Data<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by region, district, building<br><br>**MTSS Building-level Self-Assessment Data**<br>• SIT<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by Core Component area<br><br>**LEA Support Plan[37] Data**<br>• School-wide programs complementary of the MTSS with system-level fidelity assessments (e.g., PBIS TFI, BoQ, etc.)<br>• Classroom/practice-level initiatives with valid, reliable measures<br>• Student outcome targets with valid, reliable measures<br><br>**Capacity Assessment[38] Data**<br>• State-level team (SIDT)<br>• Regional-level teams (RIITs)<br>• District-level teams (DITs)<br>• Aggregated and disaggregated by Implementation Driver |
| 6  Schools increase fidelity implementation of the MTSS | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>A  Buildings improve their scores in the implementation of the MTSS<br>B  Buildings improve their scores in the implementation of school-wide programs complementary of the MTSS<br>C  Percentage of schools implementing school-wide programs complementary of the MTSS with fidelity increases (as determined by the instrument's fidelity threshold score) | |
| 7  Districts increase their **capacity** to support building-level implementation | **Across All SSIP Districts:**<br>A  Districts improve their scores in the development of capacity to support MTSS implementation | |

---

[37] Support Plans co-created by the RIITs and learning sites are reviewed to assess progress toward meeting the annual system-level (Type 3) goals related to MTSS implementation

[38] Self-assessment tools measuring fidelity and strength of implementation drivers, i.e., indicators of the presence of an enabling context to support implementation (Type 4 data).

| 8 | Districts adopt the MTSS and begin district-wide scale up | **Across All SSIP Districts:**<br>**A** District leaders describe plans to scale up the MTSS district-wide | **Semi-structured Interviews** with SSIP Participants<br>• Descriptive accounts of experiences with SSIP implementation and impacts from a distributed sample of stakeholders |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Schools make progress in the goals outlined in their Support Plans to improve outcomes for K-5 students with learning disabilities | **Across All SSIP Learning Sites:**<br>**A** Buildings make progress on identified Student goals<br>**B** Buildings make progress on identified Practice goals<br>**C** Buildings make progress on identified System goals | Annually:<br>October<br><br>January<br><br>June |

NYS ED .gov
New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity