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• Overview
  ▪ Selecting State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) progress data that provide a meaningful assessment of your SSIP work

• Interactive activities
  ▪ Determining appropriate sources of progress-monitoring data for a sample theory of action and for your own state’s SSIP

• Key considerations from OSEP: Q and A with Leslie Fox
Measuring Your SSIP Progress With Progress-Monitoring Data

Use Your Data to Answer the Questions

• Why does it matter?
  ▪ Show the impact of your state’s work
  ▪ Engage and inform within your SSIP team and across stakeholders

• How do you know?
  ▪ Address questions at different levels of your initiative
  ▪ Document or illustrate intended results along the way toward the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), such as
    – Infrastructure or system changes
    – Evidence-based practices implementation
    – Educator changes
    – Family and student outcomes
Types and Sources of Progress Data

• Student-level data? Yes!
• But, also…
  ▪ Family data
  ▪ Educator data
  ▪ Systems data
    – School
    – District
    – State

• Documents or products
• Surveys
• Interviews
• Observations
• Assessments
• Other primary and secondary sources
Selecting the Right Progress Data

• Aligned to your implementation activities, evaluation questions, and intended outcomes
• Valid for what you are intending to measure
• Timely and relevant for decisionmaking
• Accessible and feasible
Align SSIP Progress Data to Your Activities and Intended Outcomes

Ensure data are valid for what you intend to measure
• Use SSIP theory of action or logic model
• Determine your key evaluation questions and related outcomes at each “level” of the model
• Identify measures and sources of data to address each evaluation question
Considering Usability and Feasibility of Progress Data

• Timely and relevant for decisionmaking
  ▪ Will the data be current?
  ▪ Will the data be available in time to inform changes if necessary?

• Accessible and feasible
  ▪ What data can we access within our own agency or obtain from another agency/entity?
  ▪ What elements require a new data collection effort?
  ▪ What existing processes for obtaining, managing, and analyzing data will we leverage?
Whole Group Activity: Sample Theory of Action
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherent improvement strategy</th>
<th>If the SEA</th>
<th>Then the LEA (e.g., teachers and administrators)</th>
<th>Then teachers/support teams</th>
<th>So that</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data-informed dropout risk monitoring</td>
<td>… institutes a comprehensive program to monitor early indicators of dropout risk and support LEA efforts to increase graduation rates…</td>
<td>…will implement procedures and training that support district- and school-based teams to use data on early indicators of dropout for students with disabilities to inform decisionmaking…</td>
<td>… will review student attendance, behavior, and academic data to identify students at risk for dropout…</td>
<td>Graduation rates will improve for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent improvement strategy</td>
<td>Key question at the SEA level</td>
<td>Key question at the LEA level</td>
<td>Key questions at the educator level</td>
<td>So that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout risk monitoring system</td>
<td>… institutes a comprehensive program to monitor early indicators of dropout risk and support LEA efforts to increase graduation rates…</td>
<td>…will implement procedures and training that support district- and school-based teams to use data on early indicators of dropout for students with disabilities to inform decisionmaking…</td>
<td>…will review student attendance, behavior, and academic data to identify students at risk for dropout…</td>
<td>Graduation rates will improve for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How successfully has the SEA instituted the dropout risk monitoring program?</td>
<td>What procedures and trainings have LEAs provided?</td>
<td>How are teachers and teams implementing and monitoring action plans for at-risk students…</td>
<td>How well are teachers and teams identifying students at risk for dropout based on review of data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What improvements have there been in attendance, behavior, and academic data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What improvements have there been in attendance, behavior, and academic data?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Identify Meaningful Progress Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherent improvement strategy</th>
<th>Progress data at the SEA level</th>
<th>Progress data at the LEA level</th>
<th>Progress data at the educator level</th>
<th>Data at the SiMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropout risk monitoring system</td>
<td>How successfully has the SEA instituted the dropout risk monitoring program?</td>
<td>What procedures and trainings have LEAs provided?</td>
<td>How well are teachers and teams identifying students at risk for dropout based on review of attendance, behavior, and academic data?</td>
<td>Graduation rates will improve for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documentation of the program’s development and dissemination to LEAs</td>
<td>• Documentation of LEA procedures • Count of training sessions • Training quality</td>
<td>How well are teachers and teams implementing and monitoring action plans? What improvements have there been in attendance, behavior, and academic data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Record of data reviews to identify students • Action plan documentation • Student-level attendance, behavior, and academic data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Group Activity: Your State’s SSIP
Selecting Your Progress Data

1. Identify one strand of your own state’s SSIP theory of action, with the corresponding activities at the SEA, LEA, and educator levels
2. Determine a key evaluation question for each level of the model
3. Identify relevant measures and sources data to address each evaluation question
Key Considerations From OSEP: Q and A With Leslie Fox
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For More Information

Visit the IDC website
http://ideadata.org/

Follow us on Twitter
https://twitter.com/ideadatacentre

Follow us on LinkedIn
http://www.linkedin.com/company/idea-data-center
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