FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

COLORADO Students** in first grade who are identified at the beginning of the school year as Well Below Benchmark according to the DIBELS Next Assessment, will significantly improve their reading proficiency as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students who are identified at the end of the school year as Well Below Benchmark.

*Based upon the Structured Literacy Project
**Who attend one of the SSIP project schools

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

Yes

If "Yes", provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

he change in the SiMR is related to the reporting expectations in the template.

The previous SiMR was: "Students in kindergarten, first, second, and third grades who are identified at the beginning of the school year as Well Below Benchmark according to the DIBELS Next Assessment, will significantly improve their reading proficiency as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students who are identified at the end of the school year as Well Below Benchmark."

The State will be using the SSIP template provided by OSEP which only has one target available. Since first grade has been in the Structured Literacy Project since the beginning, we are reporting that single target in the template. We are still gathering the other data for grades K, 2, and 3 and this data is still available for our stakeholders and will be utilized when discussing the project.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Baseline Data: 26.34%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 18.50% **FFY 2019 Target**: 18.00%

FFY 2018 Data: 16.00% **FFY 2019 Data:** no data

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? Choose an item

Did slippage[1] occur? Choose an item

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Due to COVID 19, no end of year data was collected in Spring 2020, therefore we are unable to determine if there was slippage.

[1] The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? Yes

If "Yes", describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

At the end of first semester participating first graders (829 students) were administered the Middle-of-Year (MOY) DIBELS Benchmark Assessments. Historically, this data has been used to realign instruction and begin the acceleration of literacy learning during the second semester of the year. On the MOY DIBELS Benchmark Assessment 65% of all first grade students achieved scores in the Benchmark and Above Benchmark ranges while 21% were Well-below Benchmark.

Using the Amplify Progress Planning Tool for mCLASS© DIBELS Next©, that utilizes data from across the nation for a meaningful comparative perspective regarding progress, the Project considered the overall growth at MOY. The data ranges indicating progress in moving students out of Well-Below Benchmark beginning at BOY at 24% is as follows: well above average progress (0-15%), above average progress (15-20%), average progress (20-25%). According to this comparative data, the Project made average progress (21%), which is similar to previous years at MOY.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? No

If "Yes", describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

N/A

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

1) As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was no End-of-the-Year DIBELS Benchmark Assessments administered at the end of the 2019-2020 SY. Individual school success in moving percentages of students out of Well-below Benchmark could not be determined due to the lack of a full year of data. Additionally, there was no READ Act data collection in Spring 2020 resulting in no new data on the identification and numbers of students with Significant Reading Deficiencies (SRD). The SRD data also informs the progress of students participating in the Structured Literacy Project.

2) As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, schools were not in session during the end-of-year data collection window, thus the State was unable to collect any data needed to report end of year progress for this indicator.

3) Although the State was unable to collect data during Spring 2020 due to school closures, the systems to gather the data are still 100% functional so the impact of COVID-19 to the actual function of the data collection process was not impacted. To address potential learning loss due to the continuing impact of COVID-19 during the 2020-2021 SY, the Literacy Specialist and Coaches for the Structured Literacy Project are working with the schools to develop learning recovery plans for the summer of 2021 and during the 2021-2022 SY.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? No

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

N/A

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? Yes

If "Yes", describe each <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The focal point for the plan was an enhanced focus on small group intervention, while maintaining effective first-best Structured Literacy instruction in all K-3 classrooms in participating schools. For the 2019-2020 SY, we limited our Project work to three school districts but increased the number of schools to 28. To best support these 28 schools, we changed the structure of the delivery of coaching to the schools. Instead of coaches being assigned to individual schools, the six Structured Literacy coaches were paired into three teams and each participating district were served by one team of coaches. Each team included one coach taking the lead for coaching and supporting K-3 classroom teachers, while the other coach focused on coaching and supporting all small group intervention. Additionally, this coach also supported special education teacher(s) in 11 schools planning to implement the Structured Literacy Project only in special education settings.

This new structure, focusing on providing structured literacy in special education settings only, was a change from the "whole K-3 approach" that had been implemented in all other schools since the beginning of the project. In the "whole K-3 approach" schools, each pair of coaches developed schedules allowing for consistent collaboration in the alignment of instruction across all tiers of instruction and focused monitoring of the progress of the most struggling readers, especially those with IEPs, in their classrooms and small group instruction. To enhance our focus on the most challenged K-3 readers in "special education only approach", in collaboration with the districts' Special Education Directors, monthly professional development, specifically designed for special educators, were in addition to the initial Structured Literacy trainings required of all teachers new to the Project.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State <u>continued</u> to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

As expected, implementing the Structured Literacy Project incrementally in grades K-3rd grade over the course of 3 years allowed students to gradually become familiar with Structured Literacy content and skills enabling them to continue through the instructional scope and sequence with adequate prior knowledge. The Project's six embedded coaches now had a total of 172 K-3 classrooms to observe, monitor and support. However, the addition of third grade was also significant in that, most third-grade teachers were not prepared with the knowledge and understanding of morphology that would allow them to design meaningful word analysis and word building activities for their students as expected in the delivery of Structured Literacy at this grade level. In addition, third-grade teachers often lacked knowledge of beginning and primary-level literacy skills that were needed to address skills gaps in struggling third grade readers.

To bridge this gap, additional third-grade trainings were offered during Year 3. As a result of this significant challenge in the Project implementation of the 3rd grade content during first-best instruction, coaches found themselves devoting more than anticipated time in third-grade classrooms. They often found they were unable to devote adequate time to the alignment of instruction and the coaching in Tier 2 and Tier 3 small-group intervention groups in all grades K-3. Newly hired K-3 teachers, reading interventionists and special educators in continuing schools as well as teachers/special education teachers (without prior training) in schools joining the Project, and teachers requesting a 'refresher' training were invited to participate. During these trainings, a total of 162 teachers were trained. Each participated in the 30-hour initial training and received basic Structured Literacy materials allowing them to immediately begin implementation in their classrooms. Coaching continued to be implemented.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

First Grade SiMR discussion: Based on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS Next), Beginning-of-Year (BOY) Assessment reports (2019-2020 SY), 338 first grade students or 40% of all the first graders (836 students) participated in the Structured Literacy Project for one full year, initially enrolling as Kindergartners in the fall of the 2018-19 SY. On the BOY DIBELS Benchmark Assessment, 71% of the students in the first grade matched cohort achieved scores in the Benchmark and Above Benchmark ranges, while 17% were Well-below Benchmark. In the unmatched cohort (836 students), 65% of incoming, participating first grade students achieved scores in the Benchmark and Above Benchmark ranges on the BOY DIBELS Benchmark Assessment, while 24% were Well-below Benchmark. The difference in student scores between matched and unmatched cohorts have remained consistent throughout implementation of the project. This BOY data includes students at 11 schools engaged in the new infrastructure strategy, referred to previously, with a focus on special education teachers.

After initial Project training was provided, coaches immediately began coaching new teachers to implement Structured Literacy in classrooms and intervention groups. Coaches and teachers reviewed student data and Individual Education Programs (IEPs) to familiarize themselves with students' instructional needs. Coaches scheduled observations of small group instruction and began consulting with interventionists and special education teachers regarding their observations and instructional concerns for their assigned students. Early coaching centered on effective use of diagnostic tools and data, resulting in the formation of well-matched instructional groupings based on need and not just grade levels, as well as specific instructional needs of individuals. Additional coaching focused on determining the range of instructional strategies already in use and incorporating high leverage practices as needed.

At the end of first semester participating first graders (829 students) were administered the Middle-of-Year (MOY) DIBELS Benchmark Assessments. Historically, this data has been used to realign instruction and begin the acceleration of literacy learning during the second semester of the year. On the MOY DIBELS Benchmark Assessment 65% of all first grade students achieved scores in the Benchmark and Above Benchmark ranges while 21% were Well-below Benchmark.

Using the Amplify Progress Planning Tool for mCLASS© DIBELS Next©, that utilizes data from across the nation for a meaningful comparative perspective regarding progress, the Project considered the overall growth at MOY. Historically, this data and specific reports were used to realign instruction and begin the acceleration of literacy learning during the second semester of the year. The data ranges indicating progress in moving students out of Well-Below Benchmark beginning at BOY at 24% is as follows: well above average progress (0-15%), above average progress (15-20%), average progress (20-25%). According to this comparative data, the Project made average progress (21%), which is similar to previous years at MOY.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

Observations and experiences within the varied intervention settings in the participating schools produced five common trends. The anticipated outcomes are mastery of the skills, sufficient time provided, and high expectations of all learners. The trends and next steps include:

1. Trend: Intervention staff were not as well-prepared in their understanding of the 'science of reading' and the structure of the English language as expected. Like their classroom counterparts, they have not experienced the level of pre-service and in-service training required to address the complex and intensive needs of the most struggling readers. Next Steps: Professional development for special education teachers covering a range of instructional strategies, i.e., phoneme -grapheme mapping, sound walls, word summing, building word matrixes, etc. and alternate lesson planning and routines. Intensifying and individualize strategies to enhance the outcomes of IEP students with specific reading disabilities.

2. Trend: Intervention and small group schedules did not consistently allow for adequate time to deliver effective Structured Literacy lessons and practice to the degree that is essential to support growth in struggling readers. In some instances, intervention was frequently canceled as staff completed other assigned responsibilities, impacting the consistency and continuity of instruction for student who require daily and consistent instruction to assure reading growth. Next Steps: Continued work with Principals to recognize the importance of identifying individual student needs, adjusting schedules, and prioritizing the dedicated time to provide intensive interventions as required.

3. Trend: While reading was the most common demonstrated need among students identified with mild-moderate disabilities, specially-designed instruction (special education) typically did not include the time and intensity required to further these students' literacy skills. Instructional time was frequently split between multiple IEP Goals in multiple academic areas, leaving little time for intensive literacy instruction and practice. Next Steps: Identification of specially designed instructional strategies to intensify Structured Literacy intervention for students with IEPs identified with specific reading disabilities.

4. Trend: Instructional leaders lacked the understanding of the conditions that must be met to support literacy growth among the most at-risk students, including students with disabilities. Next Steps: Continued work with Principals and University faculty for course learning to address conditions in schools that create barriers for at-risk students to improve reading.

5. Trend: The minimizing effect of low expectations, most specifically for students with disabilities and those with other significant risk factors that might interfere with the acquisition of early foundational reading skills, i.e., poverty, limited early language experiences, etc. permeated the learning environments in which these students participate. Next Steps: Continued work with Principals, Teachers, and Universities to encourage higher expectations of all learners regardless of circumstances.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

No

If "Yes", describe the selection process for the <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

N/A

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the <u>continued</u> evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The Structured Literacy project has worked to develop and provide free, vendor agnostic materials that align with the National Reading Panel's recommendations as well as Colorado's legislation, Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act (READ Act). The Project continues to develop supporting materials and are currently working with University preparation programs to inform course syllabi modifications and create clinical practice opportunities focused on providing structured literacy. Additionally, the Project continues to provide Instructional Coaching for K-3 teachers in participating schools. During the COVID-19 pandemic, intense focus on developing electronic resources for teachers and providing coaching to provide structured literacy in a virtual environment. As a result of this intentional alignment, the anticipated impact to the SiMR continues to be moving students out of well-below benchmark by improving the knowledge and skills of educators to teach foundational reading skills to all students.

Documents supporting the evidence-based practices of the Structured Literacy Project from What Works Clearinghouse and the Collaboration for Effective Educators' Development, Accountability, and Reform
*Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf)
*Instructional Coaching for English Language Arts: Practices and Outcomes (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/infographics/pdf/REL_NEI_Instructional_Coaching_for_ELA.pdf)
*High Leverage Practices in Special Education (https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/high-leverage-practices/)
*Course Enhancement Modules K-5 Reading (https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/cems/reading/)

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)***:***

The Colorado Department of Education uses a Literacy Evaluation Tool (LET) to evaluate comprehensive literacy programs in schools. There are 8 evidence-based components: Universal Instruction, Interventions, Assessment, School Leadership Team, Professional Development, Data-based Decision Making, and Community and Family Involvement. These components help guide literacy initiatives including the Structured Literacy Project. (Rating Scale: 0= No evidence, 1= Basic, 2= Effective, 3= Proficient, 4= Exemplar) The overall goal is to move schools toward exemplar.

During summer (2019) Project schools were evaluated related to commitment and LET growth. Three schools, 2 from a small rural district and 1 charter school, had Proficient/Exemplar ratings and were ready to sustain implementation without active coaching. One district had 9 participating schools across Effective/Proficient/Exemplar ratings and district leadership elected to add all remaining traditional schools to the Project. Another district also expanded the project to include all remaining elementary schools. Finally, a third district added one highly-impacted, urban school along with 11 remaining traditional schools for “special education settings” only. The remaining schools had basic/effective/proficient ratings and, for various reasons, commitment to the Project was low and participation ended.

DIBELS trend data was also considered, and the Project was most successful in moving students in the Below Average and Average ranges into the Above Benchmark range. The Project experienced a lower than expected decrease in the number of students in Well-Below Benchmark on the same measures.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

In addition to the multiple TA/PD sessions about Structured Literacy and its delivery methodology, TA and PD also focused on diagnostic tools, identifying individual IEP student needs, adjusting schedules to create better-matched special education intervention groupings, and identifying specially designed instructional strategies to intensify intervention for IEP students identified with specific reading disabilities. PD specifically for special education teachers covered a range of instructional strategies, i.e., phoneme -grapheme mapping, sound walls, word summing, building word matrices, etc. and alternate lesson planning and routines. Coaching focused on intensifying instruction and individualized strategies to improve outcomes of IEP students. Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent cessation of in-person learning, it was impossible to gather fidelity data.

Pivoting to provide TA and PD, the Project's literacy coaches developed prerecorded, grade level Structured Literacy lessons for all teachers to use in virtual learning environments. District A fully incorporated the videos into daily instruction. District B's teachers focused on core instructional reading materials and asked students to view the appropriate grade level Structured Literacy lessons as homework. These two approaches did not allow coaches any time to directly interact with teachers or students. In District C, coaches observed virtual classrooms and small group instructional Structured Literacy sessions, although this approach was impacted by limited access to Internet services among many families in this highly impacted, urban school district.

Finally, new legislative changes to the Colorado READ Act in SB 19-199, now requires school districts to ensure all K - 3 teachers complete evidence-based training in teaching the 5 components of reading.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The primary stakeholders in this project are the embedded literacy coaches, classroom teachers, special education teachers, specialists, interventionists, district leadership, and the principals who oversee the comprehensive literacy programming in the partner schools. Teacher and leader feedback regarding student progress and evaluation of the activities have consistently been essential for strong implementation. These stakeholders are engaged with the embedded project coaches and literacy specialists to fully examine the data and make decisions about next steps for individual teachers as well as school level decisions.

At the beginning of FFY 2019, there were 7 districts with 17 participating schools. Teacher input gathered through survey data at the end of FFY 2018 indicated the most helpful essential elements of the Structured Literacy Project were methodology instruction, collaboration opportunities with colleagues, time for professional learning, the skill set of coaches, consistent process from year to year, and the Project resources. This information guided decisions for ongoing professional development and technical assistance. Additionally, engaging with leadership from the 7 districts determined which were fully committed to the Project, those who were prepared to continue implementing without Project support, and those who preferred a curriculum led approach. Those discussions led to the restructuring of the Project and moved the Project from school-based focus to a District led focus. Empowering district leadership teams to lead instructional decisions in the best interest of their schools aligns with the Quality Schools work of the SEA.

Input from the CEEDAR State Leadership Team and a partner University led to development a Structured Literacy e-learning course available to anyone for free. They are also in discussion about developing clinical practice opportunities for pre-service candidates to have a mentor teacher from a Structured Literacy school.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes

If "Yes", describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

Since beginning the SSIP conversations, stakeholders (e.g., educators, directors of special education, families, SEA leaders) have remained steadfast in their emphasis that students with disabilities are general education students first. They've continued to communicate expectations that improvement strategies remain focused on best first instruction in the general education environment.

Recently, concerns expressed by some stakeholders that the focus of the SSIP should be sharpened to concentrate primarily on Tier III, specially-designed literacy instruction for students with disabilities. After reviewing data, we are most successful in moving students in the Below Average and Average Benchmark ranges into the Above Benchmark range on the DIBELS Benchmark Assessments. Upon further reflection, it is possible that these students are those who may have been identified with a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in the future, and reduction in identification of SLD is one indicator of Project success. However, the Project has continued to experience a lower than expected decrease in the number of students in the Well-Below Benchmark range on the same measures. Other stakeholders continue to believe that consistent alignment of Structured Literacy through all tiers of instruction, coupled with increased teacher effectiveness in the delivery of early intervention that is increasingly intensified is the best approach to addressing the needs of the most challenged readers.

To address the concerns of stakeholders, the Project sharpened the focus on the most challenged K-3 readers in a "special education only" approach. Due to COVID, there is no data regarding the effectiveness of this approach. Further exploration of modifying the SSIP's theory of action to one with this sharpened focus will take place with stakeholders during the 20-21 school year.

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

N/A

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.