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The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP):
What SAPs and SICCs Need to Know about the First Three Years
As you wait for the webinar to begin, think about the work of your SAP or SICC. How do these questions relate to your role?

- To what extent are you familiar with the move toward Results Driven Accountability (RDA)?
- To what extent is your SAP or SICC involved in the state systemic improvement plan (SSIP)?
- To what extent was your SAP or SICC involved in selecting the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) that is the target of the SSIP?
- To what extent was your SAP or SICC involved in setting targets to be reached in the SSIP?
Results Driven Accountability (RDA): A Balanced Approach

• Dual focus on compliance and results
• State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): the vehicle for change carried out in three phases
• State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR): the focus issue for change
• SSIP Targets: the levels of expected change in the SiMR
Poll 1: To what extent are you familiar with the move toward Results Driven Accountability (RDA)?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Very
Poll 2: To what extent is your SAP or SICC involved in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Very
Poll 3: To what extent was your SAP or SICC involved in selecting the state identified measurable result (SiMR) that is the focus of the SSIP?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Very
Poll 4: To what extent was your SAP or SICC involved in setting targets to be reached in the SSIP?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Very
Today’s session

• Describe the progress on the SSIP in the first three years
• Share the analysis completed by federal technical assistance centers working together
• Help SAPs and SICCs build capacity to support the implementation of their state SSIP by understanding the national picture of implementation

Anne Lucas, DaSy and ECTA
Cornelia Taylor, DaSy and ECTA
Improvement Activities: Focus Areas

Infrastructure Improvement Activities

- Governance: 67%
- Finance: 27%
- Professional Dev/TA: 91%
- Data System: 64%
- Quality Standards: 29%
- Accountability: 42%

Practice Improvement Activities

- Implementation of effective practices: 89%
- Improved outcomes for children and families: 45%

n=55
Top 5 EBPs and Models Implemented by States

- **DEC Recommended Practices**: 44%
- **Family support/engagement practices**: 38%
- **Coaching in Natural Learning Environments model, coaching practices**: 31%
- **Routines-based intervention practices**: 29%
- **Pyramid Model, social emotional practices**: 20%
## Activities to Improve Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of states implementing activities in the area</th>
<th>Number of states that made progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development and TA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data System</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and Quality Improvement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Standards</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of states implementing activities in the area**
- **Number of states that made progress**
States Reporting Progress re: Practices

| Implemented activities to improve practices but **did not** yet see improvements (61%; 30 of 49) | Implemented activities to improve practice and **did** see improvements (39%; 19 of 49) |
Stakeholder groups involved in state SSIPs

- State implementation teams: 87%
- State Interagency Coordinating Councils: 85%
- Subgroups focusing on specific content: 67%
- Local implementation teams: 51%
State Challenges

• Providers’, families’, and local administrators’ attitudes and willingness to participate.
• Personnel turnover and shortages.
• Identifying staff to train other staff on evidence-base practices.
• Funding.
• Conducting evaluation activities, especially measuring fidelity and attributing changes to specific activities.
• Need to increase capacity of data systems.
• Adapting to changes in infrastructure.
• Delays in timelines pushing back on other activities.
• Changes in leadership.
Contact Information

Anne Lucas, ECTA/DaSy
Anne.Lucas@unc.edu

Cornelia Taylor, DaSy/ECTA
Cornelia.Taylor@sri.com
SIMRs-Number and %

SiMRs

- Reading: 35, 58%
- Math: 15, 25%
- Reading & Math: 2, 3%
- Graduation/Post School Outcomes: 7, 12%
- Early Childhood Outcomes: 1, 2%
Implementation:

30 states met timelines for implementing 90-100% of their activities

14 states met timelines for implementing 50-100% of their activities
Capacity Building Through Infrastructure Improvements (n=60)

- LEA capacity building: 95%
- SEA capacity building: 83%
- School-based practitioner capacity building: 77%
- Family capacity building: 37%
- Communication: 28%
Top 5 EBPs or Models Implemented by States

- MTSS: 56
- PBIS: 32
- UDL: 21
- INCLUSIVE PRACTICES: 20
- CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY RELEVANT INSTRUCTION: 11
States Noting Progress within the SSIP

- Progress on Improvement Activities
- Progress on Short AND Long Term Objectives
- Progress on Infrastructure
- Progress toward SiMR Target

Type of Progress

Number of States
Phase I: Part B Stakeholder Engagement

Most Frequent Participants

- Parents
- Parent Training and Information Centers
- Parent advocacy organizations
- LEA representatives (e.g., administrators, educators, and related services personnel)

Unique Participants

- Students with disabilities
- Law centers
- Teacher unions
- Civic organizations
Phase II: Part B Stakeholder Involvement in Implementation of EBPs

SEA Offices, Other State Agencies/Stakeholders Involved in Scaling-Up and Sustaining EBPs (n=60)

- SEA Part B staff: 77%
- SEA general education staff: 65%
- LEA administrators: 50%
- Other: 35%
- Higher education personnel: 35%
- State Advisory Panel: 33%
- National TA providers: 32%
- Parent centers: 27%
- Other state Agencies: 23%
- State regional TA center: 22%
- Could not determine: 12%
- Related service providers: 3%
- None identified: 3%
- State legislators: 2%
Stakeholder Engagement in SSIP Phase III

**Revisions (n=30)**

- Transforming: committing (approaching issues through engagement and consensus building) 27%
- Collaborating: engaging (working together on the issue over time) 57%
- Networking: exchanging (two-way communication) 67%
- Informing: sharing/disseminating (one-way communication) 43%

**Implementation (n=59)**

- Transforming: committing (approaching issues through engagement and consensus building) 24%
- Collaborating: engaging (working together on the issue over time) 73%
- Networking: exchanging (two-way communication) 75%
- Informing: sharing/disseminating (one-way communication) 56%

**Evaluation (n=56)**

- Transforming: committing (approaching issues through engagement and consensus building) 23%
- Collaborating: engaging (working together on the issue over time) 61%
- Networking: exchanging (two-way communication) 71%
- Informing: sharing/disseminating (one-way communication) 50%
Contact Information

Anne Louise Thompson, NCSI
althomp@wested.org
The contents of this document were developed under a grant from the US Department of Education, #H326R140006. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officers: Perry Williams and Shdeh Hajghassamali. (November 2014)
Assessing information after this webinar

• Information from SAPs and SICCs as well as archived webinars with PowerPoint presentations are available at:

https://collab.osepideasthatwork.org/SAP-SICC
Please tell us how we are doing

• Each registered participant will get a short evaluation immediately following this webinar. Please take a few minutes to share your insights.
• SAP SICC Webinar Survey
• Thanks you for your participation today!
Thank you for joining us, everyone. Let me know when you are ready, and I will start the recording.

I would like to turn it over to Stephanie who is our chair this year to get us started. Stephanie?

Thank you, and good afternoon. Thanks for joining us for our quarterly webinar for State Advisory Panel and State Interagency Coordinating Councils. We've got some questions on the screen we wanted you to think about as we prepare for the webinar to start. We are a work group of people from the parent technical assistance centers, the early childhood TA center, and the National Center for Systemic Improvement. We work with states and families, and in our role, to support SICC's and SAP's to do your jobs and have the knowledge and information you need to do that well. We are a volunteer work group. We meet regularly, and a lot of the work we do is to plan these quarterly webinars for you. Again, I want to thank you for joining us today. Today, we are going to spend some time looking at and talking about the State Systemic Improvement Plan and that process and what you need to know as State Advisory Panels and State Interagency Coordinating Council members. We are going to start with some polls to get some information, and as we move into that, we want to start with a few definitions to get you oriented. We know that there is a variety of new panel members, as well as some who have been doing this longer and have more experience or are more familiar with the process. I want to take a look at some things -- you will hear acronyms this afternoon. The first is Results Driven Accountability or RDA, which is what the Department of Education and the Office of Special Education Programs has moved to over the last few years, really focusing not only on compliance but also results, making sure that the work the states have done over the past many years is much more about compliance, but they have made the shift and said we also have to make sure what we are doing is producing the results for children and youth with disabilities. That is the first piece of it. The State Systemic Improvement Plan, you will also hear SSIP, is that vehicle for change, a multi-phased process. What you are going to hear is some of the results. Part of that SSIP process required each of the states and territories for both B and C to define what it was specifically they were going to focus on. That is what they call their state identified measurable result or SiMR. Hopefully, that is not a term that is completely new, but if it is, you are going to learn more, how states have identified their SiMR and how they have set some targets, reporting on how much they are moving the needle and how much of an expected change they have begun to see. You are going to learn today what our TA centers for early intervention, Parts C and B, have done as they have analyzed the reports from states and what changes they are learning from those reports. We are going to go right now into four short polls, and I'm going to turn it over to Joanne.

Thank you, Stephanie. Thanks, everybody, for joining. You are going to recognize these polls because these are the same questions we had on the screen when you joined today. Some of our presenters have a little bit of background as to the extent to which you are grounded in some of this work already.
or how much of a question you might have about some of the things they are going to share with us on this call today. Let's take a look at this first poll. To what extent are you familiar with the drive towards results driven accountability? If you take a look at the right side of your screen, you have four choices. Would you say you have no familiarity, little, some, or very much familiar? We know some of you may just be on the phone and won't be able to make a choice, but if you are on the line and on the computer, please make a choice, and don’t forget to hit that little submit button at the bottom of the screen. Let’s see how we did on this poll. This is a background in how much you know about any of the concepts we are going to be discussing today. Let's see how we did it. It looks like most of the people on the line have some or are somewhat familiar or very familiar with the content. That is great. We want to remember that at least a few people on the line really have no background or little background on this. For our presenters, keep that in mind. I want to ask everybody, we have a good number of people who didn’t give us an answer, so this is very low risk. There’s no way we can identify who said what, but we might have some of those people who were just on the phone, and if that’s the case, that is fine. Make sure you hit that submit button on the bottom of the screen. Let’s go to poll 2. For poll 2, do you want to move the poll? There it is. Now we are going to move on from your familiarity with it to the extent that your SAP or SICC is actively involved in this state systemic improvement plan. We are going to ask you to make your choice on the left side of the screen and hit summit. In your opinion, no right or wrong answer, what has been the extent of your involvement in the SAP or SICC in the development of the state improvement plan? Have we closed the poll yet?

>> We will have the results posted in just a second.

>> One of the things we know is in some states, the SAP or SICC is the major stakeholder group. In others, there are many stakeholder groups, and what we want to do is understand from people on the line, what are the ways in which you have been involved? It looks as though we have quite a number of people who were somewhat involved or very involved, but we also have some people with little or no involvement. We want to remember that. 23 people didn’t answer. Let's try to get a little bit more response. And might be that you are not hitting that submit bottom -- but not the bottom of the screen. Just pay attention to that. Do you want to get that up for us? Poll 3, this is an important one. We’d like to have your feedback on this one, so please make a selection. We are talking about the extent to which you were involved in selecting the focus of the SSIP, whether your state decided to focus on literacy or social -emotional outcomes, or whatever it is that was the focus of the SSIP, to what extent were you involved? Let’s hear what you have to say on that one. Is the poll open -- poll open?

>> Is still open.

>> A little bit on this as we are waiting for those poll results. This all fits together, the extent to which you understand where all of this is going, the extent to which you are involved, the extent to which you know about or were involved in selecting the focus. All of this hangs together and provides a way to understand the relevance of some of the answers you are going to get today. Here are our results again.
A little bit different in terms of actually choosing the state identified measurable result. That is the focus of that state improvement plan. We have pretty well stood out in terms of participation. Some people said they had little participation. Others said they had a great deal of participation, and the other two responses just had a few selections there. The biggest response comes from those who did not select an answer. If you can and you are not just on the phone, please make a selection. Let's go to that last one, Tanner. This one asks about your involvement, about understanding the SSIP, participation in the SSIP, and the focus of the SSIP. This is a little bit more open, and you can respond while I'm talking. This is about selecting the targets. What is the goal? What is the performance level? To what extent have you been involved in helping with those decisions? Let's see what you have to say on that one. These four questions have been put together to really understand the way in which an SSIP or SICC could be involved in the state improvement plan. We want to figure out to what extent you were involved in that plan. Let's look at our responses here, as well. In terms of the target, the performance level that the state was reaching for, and if they had to make any adjustments to that, the level at which you were engaged in going back and looking at those performance levels. We have quite a number on the line who said little or some. We had less who responded more or very. This had a different spot pattern to it, but the biggest response was no response. If we had some information from the rest of the people, and it may be that they are on the phone and can't respond, we would be able to make a little bit more inference from some of those responses, but we have some pretty good inferences from those of you who did respond. Stephanie, I'm going to turn it back to you, and let's see if we can clarify some of this for our respondents and participants today.

>> Thank you for everyone who helped us with those polls. Today's session, for the rest of the hour we have, is this what we hope to accomplish. We hope to spend a little time hearing from presenters as they describe the progress they have seen on the SSIP in the first three years. Each of our presenters is going to share information about the analysis they have done. We hope to help you as SAP members and SICC members, just like you are building your capacity to be more actively be involved in your state, as they continue in this SSIP process, as they continue their implementation efforts so you understand the roles that you can play and how you can be an assistant and support them. With that, we are going to start with our presenters talking about Part C. It's my pleasure to introduce to you Ann Lucas and Cornelia Taylor appeared they both work with the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems, as well as DaSY. I'm going to turn it over to them and have them talk about their work.

>> Thank you for the introduction. Today, I will be presenting the results of our analysis of the Part C State Systemic Improvement plans. I want to highlight that this work was not done alone, that the DaSY and ECTA Center collaborated with the IDEA Data Center, and we worked together to collaboratively collect and analyze the data. I also want to highlight that the data that I'm showing today were based on reviewing the documents that states submitted, describing their phase three. As you likely already know, those documents are available for anyone to read on the 360 website. I would encourage you to go to the site and download your state's systemic improvement plan to review. Your context and knowledge of your state will make your understanding of the plan much richer, and again, these are based on what was written in the documents. Some aspects of the work going on may not be captured. Tanner, slide. This first slide shows the outcome areas selected by states. As you can see, a lot of the
states are blue. Those are states that selected indicator C3A, which is social relationships. The second most frequently selected outcome is C3B, knowledge and skills. The third most frequently selected was purple, which is the family outcome C4C, helping your child develop and learn. Part C programs are required to report on three childhood outcomes and three family outcomes every year as part of their annual performance reporting. The take-home message from this slide is most states are focused on increasing positive social relationships for infants and toddlers with disabilities. Next slide, Tanner. This slide provides information about the types of activities that states are engaged in as they enter the first year of implementation of their states systemic improvement plan. The blue wheel on the left shows six areas of infrastructure, and the percentage of states that are implementing activities within each of those areas of infrastructure. You can see that almost all states, 91% of states, are implementing activities related to professional development. 67 percent of the states are implementing activities related to governance. 64% are improving their data systems to better operate their programs and collect data on the effectiveness of their programs. 42% are working on accountability, and more than 25% on quality standards and finance. I would like to point out that these areas of infrastructure are aligned with the ECTA systems framework, which is a document that lays out these components of infrastructure and what a high quality system would look like. The reason for improving the infrastructure is to better and more effectively provide practices that improve the outcomes for children and their families. You can see in the orange box that 95% -- 89% of states are implementing practices intended to improve those outcomes. In this first year of implementation, we see in the green box of that 45% of states reported some improvement in a child or family outcome from the previous year, and that is the child and family outcome identified for their summer. -- for their SiMR. Next slide. This slide shows the top five evidence-based practices and models being implemented by states. 44% -- let me just point out that many states are implementing practices that would go in multiple bars. For example, we have states that are implementing the pyramid model at the bottom and also have aligned that pyramid model to the recommended practices and may be implementing some of those recommended practices, as well. States are putting together a package of models and practices based on what they see as the needs of the children in their state. The DEC recommended practices are the most frequently used, followed by family support and engagement practices. Family support and engagement practices are a subset of the DDC recommended practices. Almost all the states using the DDC recommended practices are using family support and engagement practices. 31% of states are using coaching and natural learning environments model or coaching practices, and as a piece of information, this is about providers coaching families to work with their children. This is not about coaches coaching providers to work with families. Routines-based intervention practices, 29% of the states are implementing those models, and routine space intervention practices are those that are adapted and integrated into the child's everyday routine and activities, like toileting, mealtime, going to the grocery store, whatever those routines are that are most important for the family. The final 20% of states are implementing the pyramid model or another set of social-emotional practices. Tanner, next slide. I'm handed it over now to Ann Lucas from the early childhood technical assistance Center and the DaSY center. Thank you for your attention.

>> Thank you, Cornelia. I'm glad to be here today. I'm going to pick up where Cornelia left off and talk to you a little bit about whether states are making progress based upon the activities they are implementing related to the infrastructure components of that Cornelia shared with you in an earlier
slide. On this slide, you will see that there’s an orange bar and blue bar for each of the infrastructure components. The orange bar reflects the number of states that are actually implementing activity in that particular area, and the blue bar reflects the number of states and percentage that actually made progress. As you look through these areas, you will see that there’s not a huge amount of difference between the number of states that implement and the ratio or percent that actually made progress. We can see that most states made progress in an area of governance, which is the oversight area of policies and procedures, those types of things that would help to support implementation. There are other areas where states made a little bit more progress related to their data system and finance. Both of those states were around 60%, and in quality standards, it goes down to about 56%, accountability around 57%. You can see that the activities that were implemented are really starting to make a difference. We want to emphasize the fact that infrastructure change takes time, and we expect to see even more progress in the coming several years as states continue to move forward with the activities they have planned. Tanner, let’s move to the next slide. This is a pretty simple slide. Cornelia mentioned to you that there were 49 states that reported that they implemented activities to improve practices. The majority of those states, even though they implemented activities, did not yet see improvements. Whereas 19 of the 49 states, or 39%, did begin to see some improvements based on the activities they implemented to improve those practices. This will also take time, and we are expecting to see more progress as the next several years of implementation proceed. Let’s go to the next slide. This is a pretty consistent slide in terms of data that we have seen over the course of a number of the first several years with development and implementation. We know that there are a lot of states that are using their state interagency coordinating councils as the mainstay colder group where they are sharing and obtaining input from their ICC. That’s 85%, and that has been pretty consistent, beginning when they started the analysis, looking at identifying their SiMR and targets, into the development of their plan in the second year, and also, it’s holding fairly consistent as they started the implementation of their plan this past year. They are also reporting the use of state implementation teams, meaning teams that help guide the work, and to help plan out implementation with those programs and sites that are actually doing some of the implementation. Most of the states, 87%, used those groups. It goes down to about 67% of states where they use subgroups of that focus on a specific content area. For example, a state might have a strand of activities related to professional development, and they might have that specific workgroup around professional development, working on those content areas. They may be focusing on improving child outcome measurement. Then, of course, a number of states, about 51%, use the local implementation teams, meaning teams at the local level that help the local sites help plan their part of the implementation. Let’s go to the next slide, Tanner. Finally, you can see a list of a multitude of challenges that states identified this past year, but I can say that some of the main pieces that states are challenged with is personnel turnover and shortages, and also change in leadership at the part C state level or other leaders within the lead agencies. Those are some key and critical pieces and are difficult for states as they consistently tried to move their plan forward. Another major piece that states identified that seems to be pretty consistent as we ask about the types of TA support that states would need -- they talked about being challenged by the evaluation aspect of their asset. How do we measure our improvements, collect our data, do the analysis, share the data with stakeholders, and obtain that input and make conclusions about our data? We do know that’s an area where a lot of states are challenged. We also know states need to increase the capacity of their data systems, especially in light of the fact that they have to collect a lot of implementation as well as progress data. With that, Tanner,
let's go to the last slide, and if you have any questions, feel free to contact Cornelia or myself. If you have any questions in the chat, we are willing to respond.

>> It looks like we've got a couple of comments in the chat box, and I want to encourage everyone to use the chat box. The first one says, most states selected professional development as an improvement strategy. His professional development sufficient to change practice?

>> Ann, do you want to address that, or do you want me?

>> Why don't you start, and I will jump in?

>> We use the term "professional development" very broadly, as defined in the ECTA framework. Professional development can have various components and various levels of integration across the system. We encourage states to use professional development that includes practitioner coaching and observations and, in fact, have a webinar series available on the ECTA website that talks about practice-based coaching to support states in implementing that, which we know is an evidence-based model for professional development. There are types of professional development that are unlikely to lead to practice change and ultimately outcomes change. In some cases, those are the types of professional development being included in the SSIP's.

>> One thing that I will say is that, as states work on their professional development systems, they are trying to build the capacity of their system to be able to support implementation of practices, but it is not just the professional development system alone that will impact practices. Obviously, developing training resources, doing training, and as Cornelia talked about, implementing coaching structures, those are the pieces together, along with getting supports in place through other key systems components that will help support and ensure effective implementation of practices.

>> Thank you. Another question -- what strategies do you recommend to address personnel turnover?

>> Address it? There's a question of what you are talking about -- is addressing it reducing personnel turnover, or are you talking about strategies to make sure that the initiative can continue to move forward?

>> Very good questions. That is not included in the original question.
To address the idea of reducing personnel turnover, Ann, in thinking about that, I know we have things on the ECTA website related to that, but I don't know what they are.

One of the things I'm thinking about is one aspect will be, which is part of the personal development component of the system framework, it's talking about good systems that support recruitment and retention of practitioners, and that can focus in on having different activities that will not only bring in practitioners at various levels of experience having different or education, but also provide opportunities for career ladders. Those are some different pieces that states can focus on as they are working on improving their recruitment and retention practices within their professional development system. Those are some possibilities. More importantly, if this notion of, when they have personnel turnover, they need to be building into their state systemic improvement plan activities that will ensure as new staff that are on boarded, that they have the opportunities to receive the same type of training, coaching, and support to help ensure that the new practitioners have the same experiences as some of those who have been in the system and may be received initial training related to the practices they want to improve, so there needs to be some means of ensuring that there are activities involved related to that.

If you are at a computer screen and can see it, Cornelia has put a link to the personal development component of the ECTA framework in the chat box for us. Let's move on so we have some time to hear from our next presenter. It's my pleasure to introduce Anne Louise Thompson. She's going to talk about the work that has been done analyzing part B efforts around the SSIP process.

I want to thank you all for your interest in being on today's call to hear more about the analysis just a little bit about the review of plans under Part B. We did have more than just the center helping us. Next slide, please, Tanner. For reference, there were 35 states in phase one that had a reading center. We had 15 states that started out with a graduation outcome SdMR. There were 17 states with one specific to SdMR. Two states had an early childhood outcome SdMR, and there was one state that combined reading and mathematics. As states move from phase one into phase two and phase three, we did have 11 states that revised their SdMR. While they didn't change topic areas, they did revise them from phase one due to several reasons, such as, they really broadened their SdMR to include all students with disabilities rather than focusing on just one particular disability category. There was a change in state leadership. There was a change in the capacity of the state to address the SdMR they originally identified to, or there was a change in the vision of the leadership of the State Department, which then affected the focus they wanted to put on their SdMR. Those were some of the reasons. Also come in the review of the SSIP, OSEP made recommendations for some states to expand their SdMR. They asked them to expand to a larger grouping. Then there were some states where they changed their assessment procedure, the way in which they evaluated their SdMR. We did have several states that revised their baseline. There were 16 states with revised baseline, and some revised their targets. There were 15 states that revised their targets. With that said, overall, 48% of the states did meet targets. Last year, 45% of the states met their targets, but it is really hard to draw any conclusions because there were so many changes in the revisions of the SdMR's. 52% of the states did not meet their target. It could have
something to do with the revisions that were done from phase one into phase two and phase three. One thing to note at this point is that the review and analysis of the state systemic improvement plans is based on what the state actually put into their plans. There may have been other things they did not report on but we were looking at and analyzing. All of the data has to be taken with some kind of understanding of that. We are presenting to you just what states put into their plan. Next slide, please, Tanner. I'm going to have you focus on the right-hand side of this particular slide. I want to start off by talking about infrastructure improvements that were made. In phase three, states were asked to address improvements to their infrastructure, and if you focus on the right side of the slide, you will see that our analysis revealed that most states' infrastructure improvements were to improve professional development and technical assistance, which is similar to what we saw with Part C. The other categories reveal -- the other category, 13 states or 22%, we found that other category. You will see states in this particular graphic could have selected multiple areas. It wasn't just one particular area they may have been improving upon. Some states put together a variety of different infrastructure areas they were looking to improve on. You can see the third highest was that of data-related infrastructure improvements are 35 states had an infrastructure improvement strategy specific to improving infrastructure in that area. 30 states described for implementing 90% to 100% of their activities. 14 states met timelines for implementing 50% or 100% of their activities. Nine states met less than 50%. Over 15% of the states, a large majority, were implementing exactly what they intended to do. We found there were three states that we could not tell from their report what they were covering in their estimate in terms of what they may have met. Please note that these infrastructure improvements they were working on and addressing were not about student outcomes. This is about effort that went into activities that were occurring. Some states, they may have met their activities because they started something, and it may not be completed until years two and three of that implementation. And just depended on how states identified in that sense, but know that over 50% of the states met all of their activities in that first year. You can go to the next slide, please, Tanner. For phase three, there was an anticipation that infrastructure was to be improved upon. It would build the capacity of various groups of people in the community, and I wanted to highlight for you what we found in the part B in terms of what groupings people were being identified in terms of infrastructure improvement. 57 states reported that improvements were made to enhance the capacity of the local education agency. 50 states were implementing infrastructure improvement that were aimed to improve the capacity of the state education agency. Thirdly, we had 46 states focused on building the capacity of school-based practitioners, and then we had 37% of states addressing building the capacity of families. We did have another area of capacity building that was mentioned, and that had to do with communication systems. 17 states were focused on building capacity in communication among and between different groups. Next slide, please. A review of the state systemic improvement plan by SiMR revealed that states identified a multiplicity of interventions they identified as evidence-based practices. Some of them were more appropriately denominated as models, but we put them all together because states identified them as under evidence-based practices within their improvement plans. Some states used several of these practices to piece together and put together a more comprehensive way of addressing their system. The most commonly cited evidence-based practice across all of the states identified measurable results, regardless of what the topic was, was a multtier topic of support with 31 states selecting that as an evidence-based practice to implement SiMR. Positive behavior interventions was the next most frequently reported practice by 18 states, and the use of Universal design for learning and inclusive practices were identified by 11, respectively. Cultural and linguistics instruction rounded out the top five
of those interventions that were selected by states. The next slide, please, Tanner. I would like to show you about, what is the impact of this work in terms of infrastructure improvement, evidence-based practices? As you will see here, 93% reported achieving what they laid out in the SSIP. The vast majority of these states, 47 states, reported progress towards the short and long-term objectives that were necessary to achieve the SiMR. In their evaluation plan, they identified short and long-term objectives in order to reach their SiMR, and 84% reported that they were making progress towards those objectives. We found that 46 states or 82% of states reported improvements to the state infrastructure that supported achieving the SiMR for sustainability and scaling up, which was a huge importance of the state systemic improvement plan, to identify, what are those things that are going to get us to be sustainable over time and produce outcomes that we can scale up? That was a good thing to see, about 46 states reporting on improvements that helped to move it towards sustainability, that there were slightly fewer states that reported on measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to their targets. 35 states reported on evidence that 35 states reported on evidence that the SSIP evidence-based practices are being implemented with fidelity. We are seeing states reporting on progress moving forward. As Cornelia and Ann noted for part C, we are only in year one of implementation, and in years two and three, we will see much more progress as states are coming up to speed on implementation of their activities. If we can go to the next slide, please, Tanner? I want to tell you a little bit more enclosing about the stakeholder engagement across different phases. Stakeholder engagement for part B and phase one, the most frequent participants in the engagement and of element of the state systemic improvement plan, which goes back to questions JoAnne asked of you at the beginning, engage in and the development of identifying the SiMR, identifying the target, identifying some of the improvement activities, and what we saw was that parent training and information centers, parent advocacy organizations, and local education agency representatives were the most frequent participants and stakeholder engagement in the phase one. We did find some unique participants in a few states. Several states had students with disabilities on their committees. We also saw law centers, representatives from the teachers union, and specific organizations, particularly in the areas of graduation and outcomes. If you can go on to the next slide, please, this is part two. We are moving more into implementation and those involved in scaling up of evidence-based practices in phases two and three. We asked more specifically here than we did in phase three. We may not have as much data. Here you can see 33% of the states, there was no way to tell if the representatives on the list -- you can see some of the representation across the stakeholder groups are individuals that are represented on the advisory panel. They just may not have been the ones who were engaged in the work. To the next slide, please, Tanner? This is where I would like to take a look at what is happening in phase three. There's a lot of information. It's a very heady slide. Let's begin by noticing there are three boxes full of information that look at stakeholder involvement in the SSIP. For phase three, there was engagement in the area of revision to the improvement plan, implementation of the SSIP, and evaluation of the SSIP. You can look at any one of the three boxes, but what I want you to take a look at is, going from the top to the bottom, each box has the same category, and you will see that these are levels or depths of engagement that stakeholders engage in. It then moves down to collaboration. As you move further down, it’s networking. Each box has those same levels. What I want you to take a look at is, look at how the blue bar compares across the charts. This is how they’ve engaged stakeholders at the deepest level, through revision, implementation, and evaluation development. We also saw changes from year 12-year three in the number of states using collaboration. In phase one, we saw a lot more networking and informing. There are deeper levels of work going on between states and stakeholders. This is partly due to the fact that it
takes time for groups to come together. Part B is a little bit similar to Part C -- it's not necessarily the state advisory panel. Most states developed different stakeholder engagement groups. Some of those groups that never work together before, you are going to see deeper levels of engagement, more time spent on relationship building. I wanted to just highlight that we are seeing deeper levels of engagement, and it's occurring across all phases or parts of the phase three. If we can go to the next slide, we want to let you know if there were any questions you might have or further information you would like around the Part B analysis. Feel free to be in touch with me about that. Know that while states have challenges similar to what parts he is experiencing, I didn't know to them here, but let me highlight for you some of the ones that might be similar to Part C and might be of interest to you. Insufficient funds, personnel turnover, which is the same as Part C. They also found that the communication and collaboration between and among different departments in the State Department was a challenge, and they are working on how to get communication going within the State Department. Data collection was the next highest one-day reported on. Not having data collection procedures to be able to collect the data they needed or to be able to report back out on the impacts. Thank you very much for wanting to hear more about part B. Are there some questions I can answer in the brief period of time we have?

>> We have one question in the chat box, and I'm not sure if it is for you as a presenter or for our participants, but it says, which stakeholders in your state could support the SSIP implementation but have not been involved yet? You may have some thoughts about that, but if any of our participants have some ideas and want to chime in, if they have thought of some other stakeholders they listen to some of that would be great to share, as well.

>> One thing I would like to say, we did start to notice as we moved to implementation, the stakeholder groups started to change, and OSEP recommended that there be more ad hoc groups or groups change based on the content expertise needed. We are starting to see content groups or implementation groups that are bringing in new people that might have more content expertise, whether they are even now you see here -- evaluators. We had organizations that related to those topical areas. From universities, we saw more university involvement than phase one.

>> Thank you. We have all probably seen that a little bit. No one else has chimed in. What you will see now on your screen is a slider that gives you a link. Its access to today's webinar as well as archived webinars. I think we are just about ready to wrap up. As Tanner transitions the slide for us, what we are going to do, we have a survey we would like you to complete for us. Take a couple minutes. You've got a link there. We are going to put that in the chat box, as well. We would like to ask you to go ahead and complete that today if you can. We believe the platform opened for about five more minutes of that link and the chat box will be available to you. We will also distribute the link to everyone who registered after the webinar so that if you have multiple people who watched it with you, if you could distribute that to everyone who participated, we really want your feedback and thoughts about today's webinar. It helps us as we plan what we want to do in 2018 and going forward, making sure we try to meet your needs as SAP and SICC members. I want to thank our presenters for being with us today. I would like to
think the worker members who have worked to help put this together and the support we get from OSEP, Carmen Sanchez, as well as Perry Williams, who I believe is not with us. Thank you, and all of you as participants, thank you for joining us. I hope everyone has a very happy holiday season and a happy 2018, and please complete the survey. We need your input. The link is there in the chat box.