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).

The Nevada Department of Education will improve the performance of third-grade students with disabilities in Clark County School District on statewide assessments of reading/language arts through building the school district's capacity to strengthen the skills of special education teachers in assessment, instructional planning, and teaching.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

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).

*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.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: 18/264 = 7%

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

FFY 2018 Target: 28.1 **FFY 2019 Target**: 28.1

FFY 2018 Data: 14.3 **FFY 2019 Data:** None. See NOT

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? No

Did slippage[1] occur? No

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

NOTE: In March 2020, NV applied for and received a U.S. Department of Education ESSA waiver to suspend accountability requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and did not conduct SBAC assessments in Spring 2020 when the assessments were scheduled to be administered. As a result, there are no actual FFY 2019 data to report and, consequently, no basis for determining if NV's FFY 2019 target was met or whether slippage occurred. Both of these questions has been answered "No" although "undetermined" is more accurate.

[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).

COVID-related school closures in Spring 2020 negatively affected NV's ability to collect and report Student Impact Data derived from the CORE Phonics Survey and Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessments. However, NV was able to collect the following additional data that is supportive of and demonstrates progress toward the SiMR.

1. Teacher Impact Data were gathered through a survey in May 2020 to assess the impact of the APT professional learning (training and coaching). Teachers rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of training and coaching they receive from Instructional Interventionists (IIs). The survey assesses teachers' perceived knowledge regarding assessing, planning, and teaching literacy and their perceptions of the capacity of the APT IIs, principals, and the school district to support teachers and the APT project.

2. Principal Impact Data were gathered through a survey in May 2020 to assess the quality, relevance, usefulness and impact of APT Administrators Meetings; administrators' perceptions of the capacity of APT IIs and the school district to support the APT project; administrators' perceptions about teachers' literacy knowledge; and administrators' perceptions about their own knowledge in supporting their teachers.

3. Consistency of Intervention Data were gathered throughout school year 2019-20 until early March 2020 to evaluate the extent to which APT evidence-based practices were used consistently by APT teachers.

4. CORE Phonics Survey data were collected from approximately 1,500 students in 149 APT classrooms in fall and winter in school year 2019-20.

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).

*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).

The SiMR for NV is measured by the SBAC assessment of third-grade students with disabilities (excluding students with speech/language impairments) in APT schools. In March 2020, NV applied for and received a U.S. Department of Education ESSA waiver to suspend accountability requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and did not conduct SBAC assessments in spring 2020 when the assessments are administered. In response to the questions in this prompt:

(1) As a result of the ESSA accountability waiver, NV has no data to report for SBAC performance for FFY 2019, which negatively affected data completeness, validity and reliability.

(2) NV applied for the ESSA accountability waiver because all NV public schools were closed from mid-March until the end of the 2019-20 school year and assessments could not reliably be administered without students in school. In addition and related specifically to the SSIP APT project, NV was not able to collect spring CORE Phonics Survey data so that we could compare fall-to-spring student performance in letter knowledge and word knowledge.

(3) Although SBAC assessment data could not be collected to report actual FFY 2019 SiMR data, NV continued to collect and has included in this report other student assessment data (CORE Phonics Survey data using a fall-to-winter comparison), teacher survey data, administrator survey data, and consistency (fidelity) of intervention data.

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).

*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 new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? No

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

*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 each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

NV has identified three broad APT improvement strategies: (1) Infrastructure Development, (2) Professional Development, and (3) Data Systems Development. Outcomes were established in the April 2016 SSIP report. Some outcomes overlap among strategies, but achievements are only listed once below.

Infrastructure Development -- During 2019-20, these short-term/intermediate outcomes were achieved:
1. 8 highly qualified Instructional Interventionists (IIs) were employed to support teachers, administrators, paraeducators, and the APT Leadership Team to improve and expand the APT model.
2. Federal funds were expended according to approved CCSD budget proposal.
3. 31 CCSD schools participated in the APT project and implemented APT with fidelity.
4. 31 principals signed a Memorandum of Understanding that included commitments for: (a) school participation for the grant period; (b) active teacher participation in training, roundtables, and project evaluation processes; (c) progress monitoring for students with IEPs; (d) release time for teachers to participate in training, site visits, coaching, etc.; and (e) support for IIs within the school building.
5. 100% of administrators reported that IIs have the skills to effectively to support APT teachers.
6. 94% of administrators reported that CCSD has the professional learning capacity to support ongoing implementation of APT.

Professional Development -- During 2019-20, these short-term/intermediate outcomes were achieved:
1. 97% of APT teachers reported that training was high quality, relevant, and useful.
2. 96% of APT teachers reported that training increased their knowledge and skills of how to assess, plan and teach.
3. 93% of APT teachers reported that coaching was high quality, relevant, and useful.
4. 94% of APT teachers reported that coaching increased their knowledge and skills of how to assess, plan and teach.
5. 97% of APT teachers reported that training and coaching increased their skills to implement APT practices.
6. 100% of administrators reported that professional learning they received increased their knowledge of assessing, planning, and teaching early literacy and increased their capacity to develop and sustain APT.

Data Systems Development -- During 2019-20, these short-term/intermediate outcomes were achieved:
1. 98% of APT teachers reported increased knowledge in using assessments to inform instruction.
2. 98% of APT teachers reported increased knowledge in using CORE data to assess, plan, and teach reading.
3. 95% of APT teachers reported increased knowledge in using progress monitoring data to assess, plan, and teach reading.
4. 92% of APT teachers reported increased knowledge in using Read Well unit test data to assess, plan, and teach reading.
5. The practice of monitoring, diagnosing and adjusting to student needs was used consistently in 58% of observations.
6. 13 evidence-based APT practices were used consistently, on average, in 63% of observations. From July

*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 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):

NV evaluated outcomes for the Infrastructure Development strategy using these methods:
1. Review of job descriptions and applications for II positions demonstrating training and experience necessary for effective performance.
2. Participant interviews, focus groups and surveys.
2.a. In January 2020, 16 APT teachers from a sample of the 31 schools participated in two focus groups. The purpose was to gather feedback to assess APT professional learning and obtain suggestions for improvement. In January 2020, 8 APT principals were interviewed to gather feedback and obtain suggestions.
2.b. In May 2020, 149 teachers were surveyed and 119 responded. In May 2020, 26 administrators were surveyed and 17 responded. Survey data report the percentage of APT teachers or administrators who agreed or strongly agreed with various statements (e.g., 97% of APT teachers reported that training was high quality, relevant, and useful).
3. Reviews of quarterly and annual budget expenditure reports to ensure alignment.
4. Review of APT Leadership Team agendas/minutes
5. Review of Memorandum of Understanding signed by 31 APT school principals to ensure commitment to APT project implementation.

NV evaluated outcomes for the Professional Development strategy using these methods:
1. Participant interviews, focus groups, and surveys. See #2 under Infrastructure Development for details.
2. Participant evaluations of CORE Reading Academies, including a cumulative assessment of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the Academy; the degree to which participants' learning styles were addressed; and qualitative feedback regarding the impact of the training.
3. Participant evaluations of APT II training using a brief online training evaluation form. The evaluation addresses the quality, relevance, and usefulness of each APT training; the degree to which the training impacted the participants' knowledge of the topic; whether participants' learning styles were addressed; and qualitative feedback regarding the impact of the training.

NV evaluated outcomes for the Data Systems Development strategy using these methods:
1. Participant interviews, focus groups, and surveys. See #2 under Infrastructure Development for details.
2. II observations of teacher practices to rate "consistency of intervention" using a Peer Fidelity Tool. The Tool serves as a tracking log for coaching session and the literacy content addressed in coaching contacts. The Tool also serves as a "consistency of intervention" tool and process for measuring the fidelity of intervention of 13 practices consistent with the APT model.
3. CORE Phonics Survey data comparing fall-to-winter data for students' letter knowledge and word reading.

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)**:**

Next steps for the Infrastructure Development strategy and anticipated outcomes are as follows:
1. The APT project will continue to employ highly qualified Instructional Interventionists to support teachers, administrators, paraeducators, and the APT Leadership Team to improve and expand the APT model. We expect that the work of the IIs will continue to be highly rated in surveys and focus groups.
2. The APT project will continue to expend federal funds according to approved CCSD budget proposals and we expect those funds to support next steps in adding schools to the project.
3. The APT project will continue to require a Memorandum of Understanding to be signed by APT school principals and we expect principals to remain highly committed to the project.
4. The APT project will begin work in 2021-2022 to identify and invite approximately 16 new schools who will fully participate in the project beginning in 2022-2023.

Next steps for the Professional Development strategy and anticipated outcomes are as follows:
1. The APT project will continue to provide CORE Reading Academies and we expect APT teachers to continue to report that the training is high quality, relevant and useful; and that the training increased their knowledge and skills of how to assess, plan and teach.
2. The APT project will continue to provide coaching to teachers and we expect APT teachers to continue to report that the coaching was high quality, relevant and useful; and that coaching increased their knowledge and skills of how to assess, plan and teach, as well as how to implement APT.
3. The APT project will continue to provide training and support to school administrators and we expect that administrators will continue to report that the training and support increased their knowledge of assessing, planning and teaching early literacy and increased their capacity to develop and sustain APT.

Next steps for the Data Systems Development strategy and anticipated outcomes are as follows:
1. The APT project will continue to provide training to teachers to focus on using data to assess, plan and teach reading and we expect that teachers will continue to report that the training has increased their knowledge to use assessments, CORE data, progress monitoring data, and Read Well unit test data to assess, plan and teach.
2. The APT project will continue to provide training to teachers on the use of evidence-based practices so that they can use those practices consistently and we expect that "consistency of intervention" data will show that teachers are increasing their consistent use of these practices.
3. APT teachers will continue to implement the APT project and we expect an improvement in the performance of 3rd grade students with disabilities on statewide assessments of reading/language arts.

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):

*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):

NV continues to implement two essential EBPs: (1) implementation of the CORE model for data-based problem solving to plan for and provide reading instruction for students with disabilities and assess progress, and (2) implementation of of the Read Well curriculum to plan for and teach reading.

CORE is an evidence-based professional development framework that supports the implementation of a school's reading curriculum. The CORE framework includes presentation of theory, modeling and demonstration, practice in workshop settings and simulated conditions, structured feedback, and coaching for classroom applications. The CORE Phonics Survey has a central role in the evaluation of student outcomes in the APT project. Read Well is a research-based K–3 reading/language arts curriculum that helps students build the critical skills needed to be successful readers. Read Well complements CORE training and tools.

The role of the EBPs in impacting NV's SiMR is explained in NV's Theory of Action as summarized as follows: "If NDE provides technical support and resources to build CCSD's capacity to strengthen the skills of special education teachers in assessment, instructional planning, and teaching, then third-grade students with disabilities will receive specially designed instruction in reading to meet their unique needs, and then the performance of third-grade students with disabilities on statewide assessments of reading/language arts will improve." The EBPs described above comprise the "technical support and resources" embedded in APT that are intended to impact the SiMR.

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)***:***

Consistency (fidelity) of intervention data are collected by IIs who observe APT teachers and rate the extent to which teachers use 13 practices aligned with the APT model: alignment with NV academic content standards; teacher engagement; organization of classroom materials; alignment with student needs; implementing Read Well consistent with program manual; classroom management reflected in routines, procedures, and transitions; appropriate lesson pacing; varied instructional approaches; student engagement; evidence of monitoring, diagnosing, and adjusting to student needs; teacher to student feedback; explicit instruction; and gradual release model.

Consistency of intervention data were collected during the 2019-20 school year until early March 2020. Once CCSD schools were closed in March 2020, there were no longer means to collect these data. There was a steady increase in the consistency of intervention from 2016-17 through 2018-19, with an average of 45% of practices used consistently in 2016-17, increasing to 56% in 2017-18, and reaching 65% in 2018-19. Through March 2020, though, there was a slight dip in the average frequency of use of the APT teaching practices to 63%. Of the 13 practices rated, teachers demonstrated more consistent use of the practice when compared to the previous school year for 4 practices, and less consistent use for the remaining 9 practices. The practice of alignment with NV academic content standards was observed the most frequently at 89%, along with teacher engagement (82%) organization of classroom materials (77%), and alignment with student needs (76%). Data collected from July to December 2020 showed increases in consistent use of APT practices, to average 67%.

*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):

Teacher training and coaching are the primary components implemented to support knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices (EBPs).

APT offers a five-day CORE Reading Academy to develop the skills of special education personnel tin these areas: word structure, early literacy, phonological awareness, decoding, phonics, blending instruction, multisyllabic word reading, fluency, vocabulary, word instruction, and reading comprehension. Impacted by the COVID school closures in March 2020, only two CORE Reading Academies were offered during the 2019-20 school year, with 32 participants.

During the 2019-20 school year, APT Instructional Interventionists (IIs) provided 31 training sessions covering 12 topics for 162 APT teachers, administrators, and paraeducators. With the exception of the CORE Reading Academies and the Read Well trainings, trainings were open to all teachers in CCSD. Seven of the trainings were offered more than once. Many participants attended more than one training, so the 162 participants in the 31 sessions is a duplicated count.

At the end of the 2019-20 school year, 119 APT teachers responded to a survey to determine the impact of the training. On average, 96% agreed or strongly agreed that APT training increased their knowledge and skills about how to assess, plan, and teach reading. In 2016-17, an average of 85% agreed, an increase of 11 percentage points over a three-year period.

During 2019-20, there were 1,301 coaching contacts between staff and IIs. Most coaching was on-site but

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):

NV has organized stakeholder engagement through the lens of NASDSE's "Leading by Convening" model. We have structured stakeholder involvement depending upon whether the purpose ("depth of interaction") was to inform, network and collaborate, or transform. In the last four years, we have focused on the purpose to transform reading instruction in a total of 31 schools. In these years, the bulk of our work with stakeholders has involved those who are closest to the actual implementation of APT. The primary "transforming" stakeholder group is the APT Leadership Team who are continuously engaged in decision-making regarding ongoing SSIP implementation.

During 2019-20, the APT Leadership Team included 3 CCSD administrators, 3 APT principals, 2 APT IIs, 3 NDE staff (including the state director and assistant director of inclusive education), and the Educational Services Director from Nevada PEP, Nevada's federally funded parent training and information project. The Team meets frequently with a standing agenda to review fiscal matters, grants/contracts, personnel, and the design of the entire APT model, including all SSIP implementation and evaluation data issues. The Team is very much a working team, and nearly all SSIP implementation recommendations and decisions occur at this level. The Team met five times in 2019-20 through February 2020, after which time COVID-19 prevented future meetings. To-date in 2020-21, the Team has met virtually four times, in November, December, January, and March.

A second means of engaging "transforming" stakeholders is through the Communication Protocol that serves as a bidirectional communication between school staff who implement APT and the APT Leadership team. Three times per year in November, February, and May, the Communication Protocol is provided to schools with a deadline for submission. The Protocol asks for responses to three prompts: (1) what successes have you had; (2) what challenges have you had; and (3) is there anything you need from your II or the APT Leadership Team? In 2019-20, because of school closures in March, only the first two Protocols were implemented. In 2020-21, one Protocol has been implemented. As the APT communication protocol is strengthened, APT principals and assistant principals will have an increased role in decision-making regarding ongoing implementation. Feedback from teachers and administrators, through all channels, has a direct impact on choices that are made about needs for training and coaching, and policy choices about uses of resources.

A third means of engaging "transforming" stakeholders is through direct communication with and engagement of parents. APT implementation is a standing topic at the Nevada PEP meetings. Since 2017-18, we have supported "Literacy in the Library" field trips for parents and students to visit their local library. The librarian works directly with students while Nevada PEP staff meet with parents to discuss strategies for helping students become strong readers. During 2019-20 three events occurred before COVID resulted in library closures. When possible, we plan to resume these events.

*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.

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)*:*

The primary purpose of the APT Leadership Team is to identify and solve both specific and systemic challenges with implementing the APT project. Consequently, concerns are expressed by the Nevada PEP representative, APT school principals, APT Instructional Interventionists, as well as CCSD and NDE administrators at each meeting. Every concern is taken seriously, and often a solution is arrived at during the context of a specific meeting. On other occasions, we commit to gathering additional data and/or input from other constituents before implementing a solution. Our meeting minutes identify the concerns that have been raised and the solutions that are planned. The minutes also capture "next steps" for any concerns that will require more intensive or long-term approaches to solve.

Similarly, a primary purpose of the Communication Protocol is to ask staff members and principals at the 31 APT schools to respond to this prompt: "What challenges have you had with implementing the APT initiative since the previous communication protocol? Reflect on possible solutions for these challenges." Schools are also asked to respond to this prompt: "Is there anything that you need from your Instructional Interventionist and/or the APT Leadership team to ensure improved success and outcomes, or do you have anything else that you would like to share?" These prompts invite the expression of concerns from these key stakeholders -- the teachers and principals who directly implement APT. Once the protocol is submitted to the APT Leadership Team, the Team decides whether items merit a systemic response (because other schools may have the same challenges, or could benefit from the same suggestions) or whether an item is best addressed by an immediate contact from the APT staff -- or a combination. A one-page response is provided highlighting solutions to the concerns expressed.

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):

Not Applicable

*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.