



# **Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**


**A Rubric-Based Tool to**

**Develop and Implement the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)**

**Achieve an Integrated Approach to Serving All Students**

**Continuously Improve Practice in the SEA**

**Thomas Kerins, Julia Keleher, Carole Perlman, Heather Zavadsky**



This publication is prepared by the BSCP Center under Award #S283B120042 for the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education and is administered by Edvance Research, Inc. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of OESE or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

# **Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

**A Rubric-Based Tool to**

**Develop and Implement the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)**

**Achieve an Integrated Approach to Serving All Students**

**Continuously Improve Practice in the SEA**

**Thomas Kerins, Julia Keleher, Carole Perlman, Heather Zavadsky**

**Building State Capacity and Productivity (BSCP) Center at Edvance Research**

**with Academic Development Institute and Edunomics**

**Version 1.0**



## Table of Contents

### Explaining the Rubric

*Tom Kerins, Sam Redding, Heather Zavadsky* ..... 3

### Performance Management Rubric ..... 5

Part A: Needs Assessment (Data Collection and Analysis) ..... 5

1. Identifying data collection and storage processes ..... 5

2. Identifying and collecting key SEA data on infrastructure and practices ..... 7

Part B: Improvement Plan to Address SEA Infrastructure, Practices, and Technical Assistance .... 12

3. Analyzing data, determining state-identified measurable results,  
strategies, and theory of action ..... 12

Part C: Implement Improvement Plan ..... 20

4. Managing and monitoring implementation ..... 20

Part D: Evaluation ..... 21

5. Planning and collecting data for evaluation ..... 21

6. Communicating evaluation results and revising the plan ..... 23

### Appendix A

OSEP Terminology and Timeline ..... 25

### Appendix B

OSEP Part B and Part C Indicators ..... 28

### Appendix C

Authors' Biographies ..... 31

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to acknowledge the assistance of Samantha Hollins, Director, Office of Special Education Program Improvement, Virginia Department of Education; Allison Layland, Education Specialist, Florida and Islands Regional Resource Center; Sam Redding, former special educator and now a consultant with the BSCP Center; and OSEP staff in reviewing drafts of this publication and giving us their expert advice. We further acknowledge Pam Sheley for editing and designing the final document.

Thomas Kerins, Julia Keleher, Carole Perlman, Heather Zavadsky

## Explaining the Rubric

Thomas Kerins, Sam Redding, Heather Zavadsky

### Introduction

In spring 2014, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) announced that it was beginning to implement a new accountability framework for special education. This framework, known as Results Driven Accountability (RDA), is intended to shift from a compliance to an outcomes focus to improve educational achievement and skills for students with disabilities. While compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is still important, the new framework helps State Education Agencies (SEAs) create a more integrated approach to serving all students, including those with special needs. To build this capacity, states complete and implement a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This plan serves as a new indicator for the state annual performance reports under the IDEA.

### Effective Practice in the SEA

OSEP asks states to report 16 *outcome* indicators, and a 17th indicator to develop and implement the SSIP. *Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency* is a rubric-based tool to guide the SEA in developing and implementing the SSIP. But the rubric-based tool goes beyond guidance to satisfy federal requirements for a plan; it provides essential *implementation* indicators to assist the SEA in fully implementing the most effective practices relative to the elements of the SSIP.

### Background on the SSIP

The SSIP serves as one of seventeen critical indicators within State Performance Plans (SPP), and is designed to focus on state-identified measurable results (SIMR) for students with disabilities and create coordinated, coherent, and efficient support systems to yield greater student improvement. Beginning in February 2015, there are three phases to guide SEAs in the development of their SSIP (<http://dataserver.lrp.com/DATA/servlet/DataServlet?fname=04182013-PartBproposedAPRtable-proposedIndicator17.pdf>):

**Phase 1** requires (a) data analysis of the results of the first 16 indicators, (b) analysis of state infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity, (c) state-identified measurable results for children with disabilities, (d) selection of coherent improvement strategies, and (e) a theory of action.

**Phase 2** requires infrastructure development, support for local educational agency (LEA) implementation of evidence-based practices, and evaluation.

**Phase 3** requires results of ongoing evaluation and revisions to the SSIP.

These three phases can be flexible over the three-year period to help meet states where they are as they work to fully implement their SSIP. Thus, the process is designed with the understanding that each state's approach will represent a different phase of implementation. See Appendix A for an explanation of OSEP terminology and timeline relative to the SSIP.

The implementation of a continuous improvement (performance management) process is critical to the success of the SSIP and includes: an in-depth data analysis, infrastructure analysis, a root cause analysis, identification of improvement areas, and then a theory of action that connects improvement strategies to student outcomes. *Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency* puts in motion a performance management process related to its essential implementation indicators aligned with the SSIP.

### The Building State Capacity and Productivity (BSCP) Center

The Building State Capacity and Productivity (BSCP) Center is one of seven national content centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education and purposed to provide technical assistance to state education agencies. The BSCP Center created this rubric-based, self-assessment tool to help SEAs assess the status of their special

education program and develop and *implement* improvement plans through a guided, strategic process. The BSCP Center's previous publication, *Managing Performance in the System of Support*, is also a rubric-based tool that assists SEAs in improving their systems of recognition, accountability, and support.

### **How to Use this Rubric-Base Tool**

Lack of significant progress for many students with disabilities has created the need to collect, analyze, and respond to more nuanced data on the progress of students with disabilities. Because students with disabilities are often served alongside general education students, this tool is best used by an integrated SEA team that includes, for example, representatives from special education, accountability, school improvement, and Title programs. The SSIP and rubric are vehicles for the SEA to move beyond individual silos into a well-coordinated and aligned system aimed to improve the achievement of, and support provided to, all students.

### **SEA Team Engagement in SSIP**

This rubric-based tool helps an SEA team ensure all programs in the SEA are working in concert to support all students, including students with disabilities. In addition, the tool reflects the idea that stakeholder engagement is critical. The rubric enables SEAs to develop and implement improvement plans (SSIP) in a manner that is aligned with the state's existing reform efforts and to pave a pathway to full implementation of effective practice.

### **Technical Assistance from BSCP Center to SEAs**

SEAs may request technical assistance from the BSCP Center, at no cost to the state, for training and consultation with the use of this rubric and the implementation of improvement plans. The technical assistance extends beyond the preparation of the SSIP and, in fact, may be initiated even after the SSIP has been prepared. The purpose of the technical assistance is to achieve full implementation of effective practices aligned with the elements of the SSIP. The IndiSEA™ online performance management system is provided to the SEA to manage its implementation of the rubric-based indicators of effective practice as found in this document. For more information, contact Lois Myran at [loismyran@ndsupernet.com](mailto:loismyran@ndsupernet.com).



## Performance Management Rubric

For each of these essential *implementation* indicators, please select the description in the cell that best describes your state’s status. Note that in order to attain a score of “III,” the state education agency (SEA) must have met the conditions for getting a score of “II.” Similarly, in order to attain a score of “IV,” the SEA has also met the conditions for attaining scores of “II” and “III.”

The Priority, Opportunity, and Index in the first column enable SEA staff to rate each indicator’s priority (how important it is to complete) and opportunity (how easy it is to accomplish). Both ratings are on a “3” to “1” range. A “3” on opportunity means it is easier to accomplish since additional funds or legislative changes are not necessary. A “3” on priority means it is quite important for the SEA to work on this indicator. The Index Score is obtained by multiplying the opportunity and priority scores. The Index Score provides a way for SEA staff to sort these indicators for their planning in order to gain quick wins. More difficult items, and those of less priority, are still pursued, but the high-priority/high-opportunity items are given precedence.

For an explanation of OSEP terminology and timelines relative to the Results Driven Accountability and the State Systemic Improvement Plan, see Appendix A.

### Part A: Needs Assessment (Data Collection and Analysis)

#### 1. Identifying data collection and storage processes

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Partial Development or Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<b>1.1 SEA determines procedures for collecting, disaggregating, and storing key special education and other data</b>  <b>Rubric Score</b> _____ <b>Priority</b> _____ <b>Opportunity</b> _____ <b>Index</b> _____	There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying, collecting, disaggregating, and storing the data.	The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying, collecting, disaggregating, and storing the data.	The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying, collecting, disaggregating, and storing the data.	The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying, collecting, disaggregating, and storing the data.

**Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Partial Development or Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>1.2 SEA sets timelines for collection of key special education and other data</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures to set timelines for collection of data.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures to set timelines for collection of data.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures to set timelines for collection of data.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of setting timelines for collection of data.</p>
<p><b>1.3 SEA assesses quality of key special education and other data</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing data quality and how the SEA will address any concerns.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing data quality and how the SEA will address any concerns.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing data quality and how the SEA will address any concerns.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing data quality and how the SEA will address any concerns.</p>
<p><b>1.4 SEA identifies data access and security procedures for key special education and other data</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for determining who is given access to data and how security is maintained.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for determining who is given access to data and how security is maintained.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for determining who is given access to data and how security is maintained.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for determining who is given access to data and how security is maintained.</p>

**2. Identifying and collecting key SEA data on infrastructure and practices**

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>2.1 SEA assesses its governance infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current governance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for students with disabilities (SWD).</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current governance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current governance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current governance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>
<p><b>2.2 SEA assesses its fiscal infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current fiscal systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current fiscal systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current fiscal systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current fiscal systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>

**Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>2.3 SEA assesses its internal communication infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current internal communication infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current internal communication infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current internal communication infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current internal communication infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>
<p><b>2.4 SEA assesses its professional development infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current professional development systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current professional development systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current professional development systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current professional development systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>2.5 SEA assesses its technical assistance infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current technical assistance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current technical assistance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current technical assistance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current technical assistance infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>
<p><b>2.6 SEA assesses its accountability/ monitoring infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current accountability/ monitoring systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current accountability/ monitoring systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current accountability/ monitoring systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing capacity of current accountability/ monitoring systems and ability to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>

**Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>2.7 SEA assesses its quality standards infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current quality standards infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current quality standards infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current quality standards infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current quality standards infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>
<p><b>2.8 SEA assesses its data capacity infrastructure and practices</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current data capacity infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current data capacity infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current data capacity infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing capacity of current data capacity infrastructure systems and practices to increase LEA capacity to improve results for SWD.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>2.9 SEA assesses its integration across key departments to support systemic approaches for improvement</b></p> <p><b>Rubric Score</b> _____</p> <p><b>Priority</b> _____</p> <p><b>Opportunity</b> _____</p> <p><b>Index</b> _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing integration across key departments to support systemic approaches for improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing integration across key departments to support systemic approaches for improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing integration across key departments to support systemic approaches for improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assessing and enhancing integration across key departments to support systemic approaches for improvement.</p>

## Part B: Improvement Plan to Address SEA Infrastructure, Practices, and Technical Assistance

### 3. Analyzing data, determining state-identified measurable results, strategies, and theory of action

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.1 SEA includes multiple internal and external stakeholders in data analysis, developing state-identified measurable results, infrastructure analysis, selection of improvement strategies, and developing a theory of action</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for including multiple internal and external stakeholders in development of each component of the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for including multiple internal and external stakeholders in development of each component of the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for including multiple internal and external stakeholders in development of each component of the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for including multiple internal and external stakeholders in development of each component of the SSIP.</p>
<p><b>3.2 Using disaggregation and other data analysis, SEA identifies areas of low performance of SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for using disaggregation and other data analysis to identify areas of low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for using disaggregation and other data analysis to identify areas of low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for using disaggregation and other data analysis to identify areas of low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for using disaggregation and other data analysis to identify areas of low performance of SWD.</p>



Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.3 SEA identifies root causes contributing to low performance of SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying root causes contributing to low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying root causes contributing to low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying root causes contributing to low performance of SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying root causes contributing low performance of SWD.</p>
<p><b>3.4 SEA identifies key areas for improvement in the above infrastructure indicators (2.1–2.9)</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying key areas for improvement in the above infrastructure indicators (2.1–2.9).</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying key areas for improvement in the above infrastructure indicators (2.1–2.9).</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies for identifying key areas for improvement in the above infrastructure indicators (2.1–2.9).</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying key areas for improvement in the above infrastructure indicators (2.1–2.9).</p>
<p><b>3.5 SEA identifies barriers to improvement</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying barriers to improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying barriers to improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying barriers to improvement.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying barriers to improvement.</p>

Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.6 SEA establishes state-identified measurable results</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for establishing state-identified measurable results.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for establishing state-identified measurable results.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for establishing state-identified measurable results.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for establishing state-identified measurable results.</p>
<p><b>3.7 SEA researches and selects evidence-based improvement strategies that target the SIMRs and develops a theory of action for the SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based improvement strategies and developing a theory of action.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based improvement strategies and developing a theory of action.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based improvement strategies and developing a theory of action.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based improvement strategies and developing a theory of action.</p>
<p><b>3.8 SEA aligns and integrates SSIP with other general and special education plans and initiatives</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for integrating SSIP with other general and special education plans and initiatives.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for integrating SSIP with other general and special education plans and initiatives.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for integrating SSIP with other general and special education plans and initiatives.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for integrating SSIP with other general and special education plans and initiatives.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.9 SEA researches and selects evidence-based technical assistance practices for improving outcomes for SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based technical assistance practices for improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based technical assistance practices for improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based technical assistance practices for improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for researching and selecting evidence-based technical assistance practices for improving outcomes for SWD.</p>
<p><b>3.10 SEA uses student outcome data to analyze LEAs’ technical assistance needs and LEAs’ capacity to provide assistance to improve outcomes for SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for using student outcome data to analyze LEAs’ technical assistance needs and LEAs’ capacity to provide assistance to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for using student outcome data to analyze LEAs’ technical assistance needs and LEAs’ capacity to provide assistance to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for using student outcome data to analyze LEAs’ technical assistance needs and LEAs’ capacity to provide assistance to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for using student outcome data to analyze LEAs’ technical assistance needs and LEAs’ capacity to provide assistance to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>

Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.11 SEA uses survey data to analyze their technical assistance to LEAs and LEAs' capacity to provide assistance to schools</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for analyzing LEA and school technical assistance needs and LEA capacity based on survey data.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for analyzing LEA and school technical assistance needs and LEA capacity based on survey data.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies for analyzing LEA and school technical assistance needs and LEA capacity based on survey data.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for analyzing LEA and school technical assistance needs and LEA capacity based on survey data.</p>
<p><b>3.12 SEA develops a technical assistance plan based on data from indicators 3.9–3.11</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for developing a technical assistance plan based on data from indicators 3.9–3.11.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for developing a technical assistance plan based on data from indicators 3.9–3.11.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for developing a technical assistance plan based on data from indicators 3.9–3.11.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for developing a technical assistance plan based on data from indicators 3.9–3.11.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.13 SEA communicates the SSIP, SIMRs, and improvement strategies to relevant internal and external stakeholders, including LEAs, other TA providers, and schools</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for communicating the SSIP, SIMRs, and improvement strategies to relevant internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for communicating the SSIP, SIMRs, and improvement strategies to relevant internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for communicating the SSIP, SIMRs, and improvement strategies to relevant internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for communicating the SSIP, SIMRs, and improvement strategies to relevant internal and external stakeholders.</p>

Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>3.14 SEA has an ongoing process for assessing and improving the effectiveness of its communications with LEAs and those providing technical assistance to LEAs about improving outcomes for SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for developing and using an ongoing process for assessing and improving the effectiveness of its communications with LEAs and those providing technical assistance to LEAs about improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for developing and using an ongoing process for assessing and improving the effectiveness of its communications with LEAs and those providing technical assistance to LEAs about improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for developing and using an ongoing process for assessing and improving the effectiveness of its communications with LEAs and those providing technical assistance to LEAs about improving outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for developing and using an ongoing process for assessing and improving the effectiveness of its communications with LEAs and those providing technical assistance to LEAs about improving outcomes for SWD.</p>
<p><b>3.15 SEA assigns roles and responsibilities for each SIMR and improvement strategy and for monitoring the overall SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assigning roles and responsibilities for each SIMR and improvement strategy and for monitoring the overall SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assigning roles and responsibilities for each SIMR and improvement strategy and for monitoring the overall SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assigning roles and responsibilities for each SIMR and improvement strategy and for monitoring the overall SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assigning roles and responsibilities for each SIMR and improvement strategy and for monitoring the overall SSIP.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<b>3.16 SEA establishes timelines for each improvement strategy in the SSIP</b>  <b>Rubric Score</b> _____ <b>Priority</b> _____ <b>Opportunity</b> _____ <b>Index</b> _____	There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for establishing timelines for each improvement strategy.	The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for establishing timelines for each improvement strategy.	The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for establishing timelines for each improvement strategy.	The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for establishing timelines for each improvement strategy.
<b>3.17 SEA assures adequate resources are available to implement the SSIP</b>  <b>Rubric Score</b> _____ <b>Priority</b> _____ <b>Opportunity</b> _____ <b>Index</b> _____	There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for assuring adequate resources are available to implement the SSIP.	The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for assuring adequate resources are available to implement the SSIP.	The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for assuring adequate resources are available to implement the SSIP.	The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for assuring adequate resources are available to implement the SSIP.

**Part C: Implement Improvement Plan**

**4. Managing and monitoring implementation**

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>4.1 SEA provides technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for providing technical assistance aligned to SIMRs to improve outcomes for SWD.</p>
<p><b>4.2 SEA continuously monitors that SSIP strategies are on schedule and adequately supported</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for monitoring that SSIP strategies are on schedule and adequately supported.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for monitoring that SSIP strategies are on schedule and adequately supported.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for monitoring that SSIP strategies are on schedule and adequately supported.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for monitoring that SSIP strategies are on schedule and adequately supported.</p>



Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<b>4.3 SEA works with LEAs to create their own improvement plans based on the SEA SSIP</b>  Rubric Score _____ Priority _____ Opportunity _____ Index _____	There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for working with LEAs to create their own improvement plans based on the SEA SSIP.	The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for working with LEAs to create their own improvement plans based on the SEA SSIP.	The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for working with LEAs to create their own improvement plans based on the SEA SSIP.	The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for working with LEAs to create their own improvement plans based on the SEA SSIP.

**Part D: Evaluation**

**5. Planning and collecting data for evaluation**

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<b>5.1 The SSIP has an evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies</b>  Rubric Score _____ Priority _____ Opportunity _____ Index _____	There is no formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.	The SEA has developed a formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.	The SEA has implemented a formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.	The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the formal SSIP evaluation plan that includes data collection and analysis strategies.

**Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>5.2 SEA evaluates effectiveness of improvement strategies based on state-identified measurable results in the SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies based on state-identified measurable results in the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies based on state-identified measurable results in the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies based on state-identified measurable results in the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies based on state-identified measurable results in the SSIP.</p>
<p><b>5.3 SEA identifies successful SEA infrastructure improvement strategies and practices based on the SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying successful SEA infrastructure improvement strategies and practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying successful SEA infrastructure improvement strategies and practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying successful SEA infrastructure improvement strategies and practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying successful SEA infrastructure improvement strategies and practices.</p>
<p><b>5.4 SEA identifies successful technical assistance provided to LEAs based on the SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____                      Priority _____                      Opportunity _____                      Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying successful technical assistance provided to LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying successful technical assistance provided to LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying successful technical assistance provided to LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying successful technical assistance provided to LEAs.</p>

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>5.5 SEA identifies successful improvement strategies employed by the LEAs to improve SWD outcomes</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for identifying successful improvement strategies employed by the LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for identifying successful improvement strategies employed by the LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for identifying successful improvement strategies employed by the LEAs.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for identifying successful improvement strategies employed by the LEAs.</p>

**6. Communicating evaluation results and revising the plan**

Priority Score: 3—highest priority, 2—medium priority, 1—lowest priority; Opportunity Score: 3—relatively easy to address, 2—accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1—requires changes in current policy and budget conditions; Index Score: Priority Score x Opportunity Score

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>6.1 SEA communicates evaluation results of the SSIP to relevant internal and external stakeholders (Indicators 5.1–5.5)</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for communicating evaluation results to relevant internal and external stakeholders (Indicators 5.1–5.5).</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for communicating evaluation results to relevant internal and external stakeholders (Indicators 5.1–5.5).</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for communicating evaluation results to relevant internal and external stakeholders (Indicators 5.1–5.5).</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for communicating evaluation results to relevant internal and external stakeholders (Indicators 5.1–5.5).</p>

**Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency**

Essential Indicators	I	II	III	IV
	No Development or Implementation	Limited Development or Partial Implementation	Mostly Functional Level of Development and Implementation	Full Level of Implementation and Evidence of Impact
<p><b>6.2 SEA uses evaluation results to improve and revise the SSIP</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for using evaluation results to improve and revise the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for using evaluation results to improve and revise the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for using evaluation results to improve and revise the SSIP.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for using evaluation results to improve and revise the SSIP.</p>
<p><b>6.3 SEA communicates SSIP revisions to the internal and external stakeholders</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for communicating SSIP revisions to the internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for communicating SSIP revisions to the internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for communicating SSIP revisions to the internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for communicating SSIP revisions to the internal and external stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>6.4 SEA disseminates SEA and LEA practices that contributed to improved outcomes for SWD</b></p> <p>Rubric Score _____</p> <p>Priority _____</p> <p>Opportunity _____</p> <p>Index _____</p>	<p>There are no formal SEA policies and procedures for disseminating successful SEA and LEA practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has developed written policies and procedures for disseminating successful SEA and LEA practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has implemented its written policies and procedures for disseminating successful SEA and LEA practices.</p>	<p>The SEA has an ongoing process for evaluating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and procedures for disseminating successful SEA and LEA practices.</p>

---

## Appendix A

### OSEP Terminology and Timeline

#### Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

#### U. S. Department of Education

### The SSIP and Results Driven Accountability

The purposes of *Systemic Improvement in the State Education Agency*, the rubric based tool, are to:

- Develop and Implement the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
- Achieve an Integrated Approach to Serving All Students
- Continuously Improve Practice in the SEA

To accomplish these three purposes, the authors have attempted to cover the bases of OSEP's requirements for states in moving to results driven accountability with the State Systemic Improvement Plan. At the same time, the authors have stated the indicators in language that reflects best practice and the concepts behind some key OSEP elements without overly burdening the indicators with federal language. Also, the indicators in some cases press beyond the OSEP requirements toward best practice.

The information below describes OSEP's timeline for the SSIP and defines important terms. The BSCP Center encourages state special education directors to follow the guidance that comes directly from OSEP.

#### By February 1, 2015

By February 1, 2015, SEAs must submit Phase I of the SSIP including a detailed analysis that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the state's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve results for children with disabilities.

- **Data Analysis:** A description of how the state identified and analyzed key data, including data from the first 16 indicators and other available data in order to: (1) select the state-identified measurable results (SIMR) for children with disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables. If the state identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the state will address these concerns. If additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze additional data.
- **Analysis of the State's Infrastructure:** An analysis of the state's infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in the LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for student with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement. The state must also identify current state-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned and how they are, or could be, integrated with the SSIP.
- **State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) for Students/Children with Disabilities:** A statement of the results the state intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The state-identified results must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analysis and must be a student level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The state may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate) or a cluster of related results.

- **Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies:** An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the state-identified results. The improvement strategies are focused on how to improve the state infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the state-identified results for students with disabilities. The state must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root cause for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the state-identified measurable results.
- **Theory of Action:** Including action steps, explains how implementing the improvement strategies that the SEA Leadership Team has selected will increase the state's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the state-identified results for children with disabilities. The SEA should weave together the results of its data analysis (including root cause analysis), its infrastructure analysis results and its improvement strategies to formulate a theory of action about why the actions it proposes taking will lead to improved outcomes for children with disabilities. For example, the Virginia SEA has proposed to improve graduation rates for SWD in the disability areas of SLD, OHI, ED, and ID.

This theory of action is the process that leads to SIMR. The goal of the SSIP is to identify proposed results. The improvement of graduation rates in Virginia is an example of a SIMR. This statement reflects the emphasis by OSEP to start moving away from compliance and move toward Results Driven Accountability.

In the Virginia example, staff reviewed all the variables that signal graduation rates, such as the number of disciplinary referrals in a year, attendance rate, and success on the state's 8th grade test to develop hypotheses about what the state could do to assist local staff to make the appropriate changes that could positively affect the graduation rate. To do this, of course, SEA staff have to first clearly define the problem, why is it happening, and then decide what are some potential solutions. The final step is to examine how the solution is working.

### By February 2016

By February 2016 the SEA must submit Phase II of the SSIP that focuses on building state capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of evidence-based practices that will lead to measurable improvement in the state-identified results for children with disabilities. Phase II builds on the data and infrastructure analyses, coherent improvement strategies developed in Phase I. The plan developed in Phase II includes the activities, steps and resources required to implement the coherent improvement strategies, with attention to the research on implementation, timelines for implementation and measures needed to evaluate implementation and impact on the state-identified results for children with disabilities. (February, 2016)

- **Infrastructure Development:** Specify improvements that will be made to the state infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up evidence-based practices to improve the state-identified results for children with disabilities. Identify the steps the state will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the state, including general and special education improvement plans. The section must also identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts. In addition, the state should specify how it will involve multiple offices within the SEA.
- **Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices:** Specify how the state will support LEAs in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the state-identified measurable results for children with disabilities. This section must identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; how the expected outcomes of the improvement strategies will be measured; and timelines for completion. In addition, the state should specify how it would involve multiple offices within the SEA (or other state agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

- **Evaluation:** The evaluation must include short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in state-identified results for children with disabilities. The evaluation must be aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP, including how stakeholders will be involved and the methods that the state will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP. The evaluation must specify how the state will use the information from the evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the implementation of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the state-identified results for children with disabilities and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary, and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

### **By February 2017**

By February 2017, the SEA must begin to submit Phase III evaluation information that would be consistent with the evaluation described in Phase II. The report would focus on assessing and reporting on its progress in implementing the SSIP. This will include data and analysis on the extent to which the state has made progress toward and/or met the state-established short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress in achieving the state-identified Measurable Result for Children with Disabilities. If the state intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the state must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision. Also, the state must provide a rationale for any revisions that have been made or revisions the state plans to make in the SSIP in response to evaluation data and describe how stakeholders were included in the decision-making process.

## Appendix B

### OSEP Part B Outcome Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:
  - A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
  - B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
  - C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:
  - A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
  - B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:
  - A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
  - B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
  - C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:
  - A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
  - B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
  - A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
  - B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
  - C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the state establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.



13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:
  - A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
  - B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
  - C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.
15. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
16. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
17. State Systemic Improvement Plan

### **OSEP Part C Outcome Indicators**

1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
  - A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
  - B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
  - C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:
  - A. Know their rights;
  - B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
  - C. Help their children develop and learn.
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:
  - A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
  - B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the state) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.
- 9. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).
- 10. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
- 11. State Systemic Improvement Plan

---

## Appendix C

### Biographies of Authors

**Dr. Thomas Kerins** spent 28 years at the Illinois Office of Education and left as Assistant State Superintendent for Standards, Assessment and School Improvement. In fact, he was Illinois' first director of testing. He then spent 5 years at the Springfield Illinois school district with the same responsibilities. During that time he also was an adjunct professor at the University of Illinois teaching research to future school administrators. After retiring from the school district Dr. Kerins worked for an information systems consulting firm to conceptualize and then write an annual document reporting the status of special education students in Illinois, including their academic progress. Since that time Dr. Kerins has worked at the Academic Development Institute in cooperation with the Building State Capacity and Productivity Center. Among his tasks there has been working with state education agencies to help them form plans to support the schools that are their most needy. He received a BS in Sociology and a Masters in Education Research from Loyola University and a doctorate from the University of Illinois in administration and evaluation.

**Dr. Julia Keleher** has dedicated nearly 20 years of her life to education and has experience at the federal, state and local levels. Julia has been a classroom teacher, guidance counselor and school administrator. She has led the design and implementation of initiatives related to the use of formative assessments, data driven instructional planning, and leadership development. While working at the US Department of Education (ED), Julia provided state and local education agencies with technical assistance to support the development of high quality, compliant school improvement programs. Julia earned her BA in Political Science and MS Ed in Psychological Services from the University Pennsylvania. She completed her MBA in June 2013 and holds a doctorate degree from the University of Delaware. Julia is an adjunct faculty at the George Washington University and teaches courses in the Business School and the Graduate School of Education and Human Development

**Dr. Carole Perlman** directed student assessment programs for the Chicago Public Schools for two decades, retiring as school improvement coordinator. Her recent research focuses on how states can most effectively target their resources to best serve districts and schools in greatest need of assistance. Dr. Perlman has served on numerous state and federal advisory panels and is the recipient of outstanding publication awards from the American Educational Research Association. A past president of the National Association of Test Directors and board member of the National Council on Measurement in Education, she holds a B.S. in mathematics, an M.S. in statistics, and a Ph.D. in public policy analysis from the University of Illinois.

**Dr. Heather Zavadsky** is a Research Scientist for the Building State Capacity and Productivity Center (BSCP) at Edvance Research and director of EdPractice Connect, an organization created to improve education systems through practical, field-based research and evaluation. Focus topics covered over her twenty-five years of research include systemic district reform and turnaround, effective human capital strategies, district data and accountability systems, and special education. She recently published her second book on district reform for Harvard Education Press (HEP) entitled "School Turnarounds: The Essential Role of Districts," and her current focus is on restructuring district central offices to better support school improvement. Prior to her research career, Zavadsky taught for six years in the area of special education, and tutored students with autism. In addition to her masters in special education, she is trained and certified as a principal and superintendent.

Please visit:  
[www.BSCPCenter.org](http://www.BSCPCenter.org)



**IndiSEA** is a trademark of Edvance Research, Inc. and the Academic Development Institute, used by permission for work in the Building State Capacity and Productivity Center.



### **Building State Capacity and Productivity Center**

**The Building State Capacity and Productivity Center (BSCP Center) focuses on helping state education agencies (SEAs) throughout the country, as they adapt to reduced fiscal resources and increased demands for greater productivity. As State Departments of Education are facing a daunting challenge of improving student performance with diminishing financial resources, the BSCP Center provides technical assistance to SEAs that builds their capacity to support local educational agencies (LEAs or districts) and schools, and to the 21 regional and content comprehensive centers that serve them, by providing high quality information, tools, and implementation support. The partners in the BSCP Center are Edvance Research, Inc., the Academic Development Institute, and the Edunomics Lab (Georgetown University).**