

## ROP State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation Plan

Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Evaluation Questions	Performance Measures	Data Collection
<p><b>CS #1a:</b> Increase teacher competencies in the delivery of evidence-based reading instruction.</p> <p>(Activity includes teacher assessing competencies)</p>	<p>Pre/Post Teacher Survey</p> <p># of teachers</p> <p>% teachers with increased knowledge &amp; skills in EBPs</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing evidence-based reading instruction.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> Teachers implement evidence-based reading instruction.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Increased student proficiency in English reading.</p>	<p>To what extent does teacher knowledge of implementing evidence based practices related to reading increase over time?</p> <p>To what extent do teachers implement evidence-based reading instruction and intervention?</p> <p>To what extent do students increase proficiency in reading?</p>	<p># of teachers with increased knowledge of evidence-based practices in reading.</p> <p>% of teachers implementing Reading EBPs with fidelity.</p> <p>% of students with increased proficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Pre/Post Self-Assessment</p> <p>Observations</p> <p>Interim assessment</p> <p>Beginning and end of year national reading assessment</p>
<p><b>CS #1b:</b> Design and deliver PD &amp; Instructional Coaching on EBPs</p>	<p>Induction/Coaching Program description</p> <p>Schedule of professional development sessions, inclusive of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)</p> <p>Training attendance/materials/evaluation</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices of elements in English reading, instructional strategies, and targeted interventions.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> Teachers implement evidenced-based English reading instruction, practices for instructional strategies, and targeted interventions with fidelity.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Increased student proficiency in English reading.</p>	<p>To what extent did the program provide training and instructional coaching assistance in order to increase teacher knowledge and skills in teaching English reading?</p> <p>To what extent was there increased fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices?</p> <p>To what extent do students increase proficiency in reading?</p>	<p>Consistency in providing instructional coaching of evidenced-based practices.</p> <p>% of teachers who reported that instructional coaching was of high quality.</p> <p>% of teachers who report that they are satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the instructional coaching sessions.</p> <p>% of students with increased proficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Training evaluation summaries</p> <p>Interviews (snapshot)</p> <p>Document review</p> <p>Interim assessment</p> <p>Beginning and end of year national reading assessments</p>
<p><b>CS #2:</b> Selection and implementation of English Reading screening tool (interim assessment)</p>	<p>English Reading screening tool (interim assessment)</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge and skills in the implementation of the English Reading screening/interim assessment.</p>	<p>To what extent did the school support the implementation of the English Reading screening tool (interim assessment)?</p>	<p># / % of decisions regarding the English Reading screening tool/interim assessment.</p> <p>% of teachers implementing the English Reading screening</p>	<p>Documentation of selection of English Reading tool/interim assessment</p> <p>Training evaluation summaries</p>

## ROP State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation Plan

Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Evaluation Questions	Performance Measures	Data Collection
		<p><u>Intermediate Term</u> Teachers implement the English Reading screening/interim assessment at least 3x/year with fidelity.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Students increase reading proficiency as a result of the provision of targeted or intensive intervention based on screening results.</p>	<p>To what extent did the teachers understand how to use the English Reading Screening tool (interim assessment)?</p> <p>To what extent was there increased fidelity in the administration of the English Reading screening tool (interim assessment)?</p> <p>To what extent did students increase reading proficiency as a result of the provision of targeted or intensive intervention based on the screening results?</p>	<p>tool/interim assessment with fidelity.</p> <p>% of type of technical assistance and support related to implementing the English Reading screening Tool.</p> <p>% of students with increased reading proficiency</p>	<p>Observation: Administration fidelity checks</p> <p>Interim assessment</p>
<p><b>CS #3a:</b> Design and deliver PD on standard operating procedures (SOP) for student data review process</p>	<p>Written SOP</p> <p># teachers implementing SOP</p> <p># of training sessions</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes for using student data for identifying struggling learners and monitoring student progress.</p> <p>Teachers have increased knowledge and skills on evidence-based practices for instructional strategies and targeted interventions</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> Teachers use student data for identifying and monitoring student progress</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Increased reading proficiency for students as a result of the use of data for decision-making.</p>	<p>To what extent do teachers support the implementation of the SOP?</p> <p>To what extent do teachers understand how to use SOP for student data review?</p> <p>To what extent was there increased fidelity of implementing evidence-based practices in reading?</p> <p>To what extent did teachers utilize data for decision-making?</p>	<p>% of teachers implementing the reading and intervention program to fidelity?</p> <p># / % of decisions regarding student level instructional needs and supports that are implemented?</p> <p>% of student with increased reading proficiency based on targeted interventions</p>	<p>Document review (SOP)</p> <p>Training evaluation summaries</p> <p>Interim assessment</p>

## ROP State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation Plan

Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Evaluation Questions	Performance Measures	Data Collection
<p><b>CS #3b:</b> Design and deliver PD on IEP development process</p>	<p># teachers trained in progress monitoring and IEP development</p> <p># of training sessions</p> <p>Training materials</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge and skills on developing appropriate IEP goals aligned to the general curriculum and specially-designed instruction for students with IEPs.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> Teachers implement specially-designed instruction for improving reading skills for students with an IEP.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Students read to learn across the grade-level curriculum and apply their reading skills in their daily routines at home and in the community.</p>	<p>To what extent do teachers implement the strategies discussed on IEP development?</p> <p>To what extent do teachers understand how to use training tips in the development of the IEP process?</p> <p>To what extent was there increased fidelity of implementing evidence-based practices during the IEP development process?</p> <p>To what extent did students increase reading skills to learn across the grade-level curriculum?</p>	<p>% of teachers implementing evidence-based practices on the IEP development and implementation to fidelity</p> <p># / % of decisions regarding IEP development process</p> <p>% of students with disabilities with increased reading proficiency.</p>	<p>Document review (PD design &amp; IEP)</p> <p>Training evaluation summaries</p> <p>Interview/survey (teachers and parents)</p> <p>Interim assessment</p> <p>Beginning and end of year national reading assessment</p>
<p><b>CS #3c:</b> Implement student data review process incorporated into the IEP development process</p>	<p>Written SOP (CS #3a)</p> <p>Student data review and IEP development Training materials</p> <p># teachers trained</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> Teachers have increased knowledge and skills in the student data review and the IEP development process.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term:</u> Teachers implement the student data review and IEP development process.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> Students read to learn across the grade-level curriculum and apply their reading skills in their daily routines at home and in the community.</p>	<p>To what extent do teachers understand how to use student data review and incorporate information into the IEP process?</p> <p>To what extent do teachers use student data information in developing IEPs?</p> <p>To what extent has the student data review and IEP development process increased student proficiency in reading?</p>	<p># / % of decisions regarding student level IEPs based on the student data review process?</p> <p>% of teachers utilizing student data reports in developing IEPs.</p> <p>% of students with disabilities with increased proficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Document review (IEP)</p> <p>Training evaluation summaries</p> <p>Interview/survey (teachers and parents)</p> <p>Interim assessment</p> <p>Beginning and end of year national reading assessment</p>

## ROP State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation Plan

Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Evaluation Questions	Performance Measures	Data Collection
<p><b>CS #4:</b> Revise MOUs with Head Start Program for collaborative Early Literacy activities and data sharing for MOE's Student Information System (SIS)</p>	<p>MOU with Head Start</p>	<p><u>Short Term</u> MOE and the Head Start program have increased knowledge and skills in the implementation of collaborative early literacy activities and data sharing.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> MOE and the Head Start program work collaboratively to implement early literacy and data sharing activities.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> MOE has MOU with Head Start Program to support early literacy development in preschool.</p> <p>Increased early literacy skills of Head Start and preschool children.</p>	<p>To what extent is collaborating occurring between MOE and Head Start to address literacy skills for young children?</p> <p>To what extent are MOE and Head Start staff implementing the activities as outlined in the MOU?</p> <p>To what extent has the collaboration increased the early literacy skills of Head Start and preschool children entering school at MOE?</p>	<p>% of early literacy activities coordinated.</p> <p># of request for professional development activities approved and implemented?</p> <p>% of parents report understanding the importance of early literacy development?</p>	<p>Interviews/survey (Head Start staff/teachers, MOE teacher, parents)</p> <p>Evaluation summaries of collaborative activities</p> <p>Data elements shared between the Head Start program and MOE</p> <p>Interim assessment</p> <p>Beginning and end of year national reading assessment</p>