PENNSYLVANIA
Part B

State Systemic Improvement Plan

Phase III, Year 4

April 1, 2020

CAPS
Completion for All Pennsylvania Students

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires states to develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) describing how the state will implement the requirements and purposes of the Act and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The SPP includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) which is submitted to United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The SSIP is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-phase plan for improving results for students with disabilities.

Phase I (Submitted April 2015) (PA Phase I SSIP Report)

The Pennsylvania Department of Education's Bureau of Special Education (BSE) collaborated with multiple stakeholders to select a focus for its SSIP. This focus area is called a State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Pennsylvania selected increasing the graduation rate for students with disabilities as its SiMR. Pennsylvania's SSIP is being implemented in 12 secondary learning sites, including the two largest school districts in the state, a cyber-charter school, as well as in suburban and rural areas.

- The BSE, in collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) and stakeholders, identified seven Coherent Improvement Strategies that lead to higher graduation rates.
- The BSE established partnerships with several Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) to implement its SSIP.
- BSE also partnered with the federally funded Community Parent Resource Center, *Hispanos Unidos para Niños Excepcionales* (HUNE). Community and mentoring resources developed through this partnership were shared with other organizations.

Phase II (Submitted April 2016) (PA Phase II Report)

The focus of Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission was on building the State's capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) that will lead to measurable improvement in the SiMR for students with disabilities. Phase II built on the data and infrastructure analyses, Coherent Improvement Strategies, and the Theory of Action developed in Phase I. The Phase II submission also included the SSIP evaluation plan.

Phase III (Submitted April 2017) (PA Phase III Report)

In Phase III, the BSE assessed its Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 progress in implementing the SSIP. This included data collection and analysis of the extent to which the State 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 SiMR for students with disabilities. The document reported on the first year's activities of Phase III.

Phase III, Year 2 (Submitted April 2018) (PA Phase III, Year 2 Report)

The focus of Phase III, Year 2 was on assessing progress in implementation of the SSIP at the State and local level for FFY 2016. This included data collection and analysis of the extent to which the State and the SSIP learning sites 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 SiMR for students with disabilities. The report summarized the second year's activities of Phase III.

Phase III, Year 3 (Submitted April 2019) (PA Phase III, Year 3 Report)

The FFY 2017 SSIP report described the third year of the SSIP evaluation activities at the State and local level and includes updates through March 2019. Reported were data collection and analyses of the extent to which the State and the SSIP learning sites made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the SSIP and progress in achieving the SiMR for students with disabilities.

Phase III, Year 4 (Submitted April 2020)

The FFY 2018 SSIP report describes the fourth year of the SSIP evaluation activities at the State and local level. The report includes updates through March 2020 as well as sustainability and scale-up plans.

Highlights of the Phase III, Year 4 Evaluation

- SSIP learning sites continued to use the SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plans with fidelity;

- SSIP learning sites continued to use an Early Warning System (EWS) to monitor student Attendance Behavior and Course performance (ABC) data to determine which students with disabilities were off-track for graduation;

- Across the 12 learning sites, over 1,100 students with disabilities were identified as off-track for graduation in Year 4;

- Implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies substantially reduced the number of students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation;

- Implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies substantially reduced the number of students with disabilities that had multiple risk factors impacting the likelihood of school completion;

- For a third year, the *Check & Connect Student Engagement Intervention Model* was the strategy most widely used across SSIP learning sites;

- Sustainability plans for the SSIP learning sites were developed with PaTTAN facilitators;

- Longitudinal trends indicated a steady decrease in the number of students off-track for graduation continues to decrease across Groups 1, 2, and 3 and steady increase in fidelity of implementation rates. Both reflected a solid foundation for sustainability of independent model implementation over time to positively impact outcomes for students with disabilities.

- One learning site was part of an unanticipated consolidation of high schools within its LEA. After careful consideration about what action should be taken as a result of this development, it was decided to reset the state's baseline to the current year and to establish the target for FFY 2019 from the new baseline. Accordingly, the state can only report the new baseline for FFY 2018 and FFY 2019 target for this Indicator.

A. Summary of Phase III, Year 4

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR

Pennsylvania's SSIP Theory of Action is the framework for planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating its SSIP efforts. Developed with multiple stakeholders, including SEAP and OSEP, it is utilized on an ongoing basis for communicating essential information about the plan. The Theory of Action was developed simultaneously with the Coherent Improvement Strategies because of the interrelationship between strategies and outcomes. To increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities, students need to be engaged in all levels of school and learning, their performance needs to be monitored, follow-up activities need to occur with students and families when warning signs of disengagement emerge, and schools must focus on successful school completion. A graphic illustration of Pennsylvania's Theory of Action is included in Appendix 2.1 of this report.

Theory of Action - Update

Pennsylvania continues to use the SSIP Theory of Action as a two-way communication tool with stakeholders. The Theory of Action is shared at national, state, and local conferences, trainings, and meetings. The Theory of Action is also used during BSE compliance monitoring follow-up meetings with LEAs in need of improvement plans for the SPP/APR Indicators 1 and 2.

2. The Coherent Improvement Strategies or principal activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies

The identification and selection of the Coherent Improvement Strategies for the SSIP involved multiple stakeholders and activities. Coherent Improvement Strategies were also studied, discussed, and analyzed with national Technical Assistance (TA) centers.

The Coherent Improvement Strategies described in Table A.1 were selected to address identified learning sites' root causes for low or inconsistent performance and ultimately build capacity to achieve the SiMR for students with disabilities. The table shows the connection of each Coherent Improvement Strategy to multiple Pennsylvania initiatives.

All learning sites were required to utilize the Early Warning System and Family Engagement strategies. In Year 3, learning sites selected a third strategy based on local needs.

Coherent Improvement Strategies - Update

During Phase III, Year 4 the SSIP learning sites continued to implement the two required Coherent Improvement Strategies (i.e., EWS and Family Engagement), as well as other EBPs to support students off-track for graduation. In addition, the learning sites continued checking the fidelity of implementation of other Coherent Improvement Strategies being implemented as reported in the Phase III, Year 2 and Phase III, Year 3 reports.

Table A.1 Coherent Improvement Strategies		
Coherent Improvement Strategy	Connection to Current Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Initiatives	Type of Intervention
Utilize data systems to identify, inform, monitor, and increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities.	PDE Educator Early Warning System (EWS) Dashboard Metrics and National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) Data Tools	Diagnostic
Implement increasingly intensive evidence-based methodologies toward improved academic outcomes.	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) academic support, Behavior/culturally responsive instruction	Schoolwide and targeted
Implement increasingly intensive evidence-based methodologies toward improved social, emotional and behavioral outcomes.	MTSS behavior support and social skills, school climate, assignment of adult advocates, culturally responsive practices, behavioral health, *Check & Connect* model, Pennsylvania Equity and Inclusion Project	Schoolwide and targeted
Promote the implementation of attendance strategies and alternative programming that will increase the likelihood of graduation.	Credit recovery, after school/night school, online learning, school re-entry	Schoolwide and targeted
Ensure culturally responsive learning environments and instructional practices.	Culturally responsive instructional practices, Behavior, Pennsylvania Equity and Inclusion Project, MTSS for ELs	Schoolwide and targeted
Embrace a philosophy of partnership that empowers families and communities to become more meaningfully involved.	Family engagement, mentoring, partnering with federally funded centers – Parent Training and Information (PTI) centers and Community Parent Resource Centers (CPRCs)	Schoolwide and targeted
Provide rigorous and relevant instruction to better engage students in learning and provide the skills needed to graduate and have positive post school outcomes.	Secondary transition, college preparation courses, career and technical training, life skills training, socially related employment skills	Schoolwide and targeted

Infrastructure Improvement Strategies - Update

Increasing the graduation rate of students with disabilities continues to be a priority of the PDE. As part of this commitment, PDE has made the following major improvements to the state infrastructure to better support LEAs and build statewide capacity for use of EBPs to improve graduation results for students with disabilities. Making these improvements has helped PDE bureaus, programs, and initiatives collaborate in a more efficient way to provide a seamless TA network to LEAs.

Infrastructure Strategy	Updates to Ongoing and Year 4[1] Activities	Next Steps
Alignment to PDE EWS Metrics (Years 1, 2, 3, 4)	• All learning sites are currently using the PDE EWS Metrics to analyze ABC data. • All learning sites are using their EWSs with fidelity as determined by American Institute of Research (AIR) instrument and analysis by independent evaluator. • The PDE Metrics is available online for all LEAs, community agencies, and families. • Presentations about the SSIP and PDE Metrics continue at all PDE conferences.	BSE will continue to monitor the use with fidelity of the sites' EWSs on an ongoing basis. BSE will continue to share the SSIP and the PDE EWS Metrics at all state conferences.
Alignment to Title I Academic Recovery Liaisons Initiative (Years 1, 2, 3), and PDE's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Team (Year 4)	• ARL and SSIP initiatives collaborated to provide one seamless TA system at two learning sites in Years 1, 2, and 3. • The SSIP team collaborates on an ongoing basis with the PDE ESSA Team.	The SSIP Core Team will continue to collaborate with the PDE ESSA Team to ensure alignment of TA to be provided to schools.
Alignment to BSE Cyclical Monitoring of Indicators 1 and 2 (Years 1, 2, 3, 4)	• SSIP Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN) consultants attended follow-up monitoring meetings when improvement plans were required for Indicators 1 and 2. • During the monitoring meetings, TA was offered to increase graduation rates of students with disabilities. • SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to share the SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plan to Increase Graduation Rates of Students with Disabilities with LEAs.	BSE will continue to refine collaboration among the BSE advisers and SSIP PaTTAN consultants to ensure this strategy is available to LEAs.

---

[1] Throughout this report, the term "Year 1" refers to Phase III, Year 1 from FFY 2015, the term "Year 2" refers to Phase III, Year 2 from FFY 2016, the term "Year 3" refers to Phase III, Year 3 from FFY 2017, and "Year 4" refers to Phase III, Year 4 from FFY 2018.

Infrastructure Strategy	Updates of Ongoing and Year 4 Activities (Cont'd)	Next Steps
Alignment to State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) (Years 3, 4)	• The SPDG, Middle School Success: The Path to Graduation, or P2G, was awarded to PA in the summer of 2017. • The SSIP statewide lead consultant was assigned to the SPDG Core Team to ensure ongoing alignment among initiatives. The SSIP Core Team also conducted multiple trainings and presentations for the SPDG Core Team, SPDG Family Team, and BSE and PaTTAN staff. • The SPDG Core Team designed an action plan with the collaboration of the SSIP statewide lead. This collaboration resulted in an action plan aligned to the current SSIP plan. Lessons learned through the SSIP were put into practice to develop the plan that is used by SPDG sites. • In Year 4, the SSIP Core Team collaborated with the SPDG Core Team to create a session on SSIP and P2G implementation. The session is presented at state conferences in PA. • An increase of requests for Check & Connect training occurred in Year 4. As a result, a new cohort of PaTTAN consultants became Check & Connect trainers to offer training to new and existing LEAs.	BSE will continue to collaborate with the SPDG Core Team to ensure all lessons learned through the SSIP are used as part of the SPDG work.

3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date

SSIP learning sites received ongoing training related to the SSIP Theory of Action and the Implementation Framework. The five phases are as follows:

Phase I: Develop State and Local Leadership Teams;

Phase II: Use and Early Warning System to analyze data of students;

Phase III: Identify Target Areas for Intervention (based on the needs of students with disabilities off-track);

Phase IV: Develop Improvement Plan (or revise current improvement plan); and

Phase V: Implement, Monitor, and Evaluate.

A summary of the process used to address the five phases of the Implementation Framework is as follows:

- The SSIP learning sites selected a team to oversee this initiative. Family members and students with disabilities were strongly encouraged to be part of the teams (Phase I - Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). Ongoing training was provided every year to new team members.

- SSIP learning sites worked with PaTTAN consultants to collect and analyze two years of ABC data on all students in the building. Additionally, data for students with disabilities were analyzed by ethnicity, gender, grade, and English Proficiency status (Phase II - Years 1 and 2).

- Learning sites were required to use the metrics from the PDE EWS Dashboard to analyze the ABC data in a consistent manner across learning sites (Phase II - Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).

- Teams analyzed ABC data with a facilitator and identified the students off-track for graduation in their building (Phase II - Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).

- Teams selected Coherent Improvement Strategies to address the needs of their students with disabilities off-track for graduation (Phase III - Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).

- Teams completed action plans with the selected strategies, practices/interventions, tasks to be completed, person(s) responsible, timelines for implementation, resources needed to support implementation, and date completed/evidence (Phase IV - Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).

- Teams monitored and evaluated progress and revised their action plans to support students with disabilities who remain off-track for graduation (Phase V - Year 4).

EBPs Implemented to Date - Update

During Phase III, Year 4, the Coherent Improvement Strategies were monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure fidelity of implementation and to ensure adherence to the decision-making process as well as promote utility of strategy implementation.

Phase III, Year 4 data show that fidelity scores continued to be high across SSIP learning sites for EWS measures, embedded Family Engagement Strategies, and data-based decision-making process at team meetings for MTSS Academic and MTSS Behavior EBPs. SSIP learning sites reports indicated all team meetings involved a general educator, a special educator, and an administrator. All sites provided evidence of strategies to increase family involvement as per their individual action plans.

Beyond the required EWS and Family Engagement strategies, SSIP learning sites most frequently selected MTSS Academic, MTSS Behavior (e.g., the *Check & Connect* Student Engagement Intervention Model), and Attendance Strategies and Alternative Programming.

Year 4 also focused on sustainability. While PaTTAN consultants continued to provide support and resources to SSIP learning sites, SSIP learning sites assumed independent responsibility for model implementation and Coherent Improvement Strategy fidelity. Results of these efforts and team's self-assessment of sustained practices are discussed in Section E of this report.

Following are examples of fidelity measures used by SSIP learning sites to check the fidelity of implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategies.

Examples of Fidelity Measures Used to Check Fidelity of Implementation of EBPs	
SSIP Learning Site	**Fidelity Measures**
1	*MTSS-Behavior, RENEW* – RIT Fidelity Measure
2	MTSS-Behavior, PBIS Fidelity Measures
3	Secondary Transition Self-Assessment
4	MTSS-Academic, Fidelity of *LANGUAGE! Live* and *TransMath*
5	Secondary Transition Self-Assessment
6	Attendance, Student Reflection Sheet
7	MTSS-Behavior, *Check & Connect* Fidelity Measure
8	Secondary Transition Self-Assessment
9	MTSS-Behavior, *Check & Connect* Fidelity Measure
10	MTSS-Behavior, *Check & Connect* Fidelity Measure
11	MTSS-Behavior, PBIS Fidelity Measures
12	MTSS-Behavior, *Check & Connect* Fidelity Measure

As part of the evaluation process, the independent external evaluator analyzes the results of the fidelity measures used to check the fidelity of implementation of EBPs. In order to see results it is imperative that EBPs are implemented with fidelity and verified by multiple stakeholders.

Alignment of SSIP and SPDG – Update

Pennsylvania's SPDG, *Middle School Success: The Path to Graduation, or P2G,* continues to provide intensive and ongoing statewide professional development for LEAs to ensure that every student graduates from high school, college, career, and community ready. Using evidenced-based instructional and adult learning practices, P2G is a five-year plan designed to build capacity with IU Training and Consultation staff and LEAs to address the academic, behavioral and transition needs of middle school student with disabilities, in particular, students identified with emotional disturbance.

SSIP and P2G PaTTAN consultants continue to collaborate in order to assure best practices via the SSIP process are utilized and implemented as evidenced-based practices (EBPs).

The professional development ensures that:

- LEA teams can identify middle school students with disabilities who are at-risk for dropping out of school;

- LEA teams can use data to identify and implement academic and behavioral evidenced-based interventions;

- school leaders have the competencies to support systems-level change that improves transition planning and reduces drop out;

- students exhibit improvements in attendance, behavior, and course performance;

- parents have increased knowledge and engage in supporting practices that keep students in school; and,

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) prepare pre-service teachers and administrators with these competencies.

4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes

The BSE, with stakeholder input, identified 11 key questions to evaluate the state's progress on an ongoing basis toward reaching the overall goal of decreasing the number of students off-track for graduation and increasing the number of students graduating with a regular high school diploma. Table A.2 displays these evaluation questions with updates, activities, measures, and outcomes.

Table A.2
Evaluation Activities, Measures and Outcomes

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
1. Did the implementation of the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies make a difference in the number of students with disabilities who were identified as off- track for graduation?	• SSIP learning sites used an EWS to track and analyze student ABC data (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP Local Leadership Teams convened at least monthly to review student data and action plans for students determined to be off-track for graduation (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP Local Leadership Teams analyzed ABC data to determine the influence of the SSIP on graduation trajectory (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP Local Leadership Teams conducted data analyses and noted specific follow-up actions, timelines, and point personnel to revisit the progress/achievement of students identified as off-track for graduation (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP Local Leadership Teams continuously collected and analyzed data to examine the number and type of risk factors displayed by students off-track for graduation (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).
2. Was the EWS useful in identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?	• Building-level data for each of the learning sites were reviewed by the SSIP Local Leadership Teams to determine impact on identification rates and risk factor trends (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • Teacher surveys were used to gather feedback on EWS implementation. TA on use of EWSs is ongoing with Local Leadership Teams (Years 2, 3, and 4).

Table A.2
Evaluation Activities, Measures and Outcomes (Cont'd)

Evaluation Question	**Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes**
3. Was the Implementation Science identified by NIRN followed by the SSIP learning sites?	• Application of the NIRN drivers selected to effect sustainable impact was evidenced by changes in sites competency, organization, and leadership.
4. Was professional development identified as being of high quality?	• Feedback on professional development resources, materials, and trainings was collected using teacher surveys (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • Feedback on professional development presentations at all PDE/BSE statewide conferences was collected through evaluation surveys and was analyzed to inform later training (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP PaTTAN consultant meeting notes indicated positive feedback to professional development from stakeholders and Local Leadership Team members. • Action plans and sustainability assessments indicated high utility of trainings on Coherent Improvement Strategies. Specifically, several sites indicated that training in MTSS Behavior and MTSS Academics were useful, beneficial, effective, and valuable in implementation.
5. What changes were made to the State, LEA, and school systems as a result of the SSIP?	• Collaboration within the PDE occurred, including meetings, presentations, and work sessions with multiple PDE program offices. Documentation is maintained by the SSIP Core Team (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • Increased attention was given to expanding the Family Engagement Strategy based on data analysis, stakeholder input, and other feedback (Years 2, 3, and 4). • All SSIP Sites reported continued focus on Family Engagement Strategies. These efforts were described qualitatively as challenging and difficult across sites, but all 12 highlighted this strategy as a priority. • Learning sites paid increased attention to embedding Culturally Responsive Teaching/Instructional Strategies into implementation. • The Student Voices initiative video demonstrated that students were taking ownership of their learning and embracing interventions to stay on track with the ABCs and graduate. This is evidence of a powerful shift in school culture.

Table A.2 Evaluation Activities, Measures and Outcomes (Cont'd)	
Evaluation Question	**Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes**
6. To what extent did each Coherent Improvement Strategy impact the number of students with disabilities who are no longer off-track for graduation?	• Student level data for individuals with disabilities identified by the EWS as off-track for graduation were reviewed and analyzed by Local Leadership Teams at least monthly to determine action plan intervention. Building level data from these meetings and changes in off-track vs. on-track targets were continually collected to identify trends in student risk factors, improvement strategy implementation, and graduation trajectories (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • In addition to data analyses, data team action plans noted specific follow-up actions, timelines, and point personnel to revisit the progress/achievement of students identified as off-track for graduation.
7. Did LEAs have the information, support, and resources necessary to align their efforts to PDE's vision?	• Over 450 administrators, general and special education teachers, service provides, and families participated in SSIP presentations at state and national conferences. • In order to promote sustainability at the school level, consultants have built capacity with the SSIP Local Leadership Teams; therefore, direct support by the SSIP PaTTAN consultants has been reduced with the learning sites. • SSIP PaTTAN consultants also provided over 135 hours of on-site support, plus professional development, implementation guidance, and direct training to the SSIP learning sites in all aspects of model implementation (Year 4). The TA was provided to administrators, specialists, general education teachers, special education teachers, IU Training and Consultation (TaC) staff, licensed professionals, and building staff. • SSIP information, resources, tools, reports, and presentations are posted and continuously updated on the PaTTAN website for public access (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4) • The state's largest professional educational association provided SSIP information and resources to its constituents and stakeholders (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP site sustainability assessments indicated continual use of PaTTAN and PDE resources, publications, and trainings as they move forward with independent implementation. Multiple sites highlighted building level refresher trainings for new staff in response to personnel changes or shifts in roles.

Table A.2 Evaluation Activities, Measures and Outcomes (Cont'd)	
Evaluation Question	**Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes**
8. Did PDE leverage resources to improve services for students with disabilities?	The following resources were identified and established to support the work in improving graduation outcomes for students with disabilities (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4): • PDE/BSE leadership; • Title I/BSE collaboration; • 9 SSIP PaTTAN consultants; • four administrators from the PaTTAN offices; • fiscal support for SSIP learning sites; • fiscal support for HUNE partnership; • fiscal support for external evaluation (Dr. Amanda Kloo); • SSIP webpage resources; • Standards Aligned System (SAS) resources; • SSIP Implementation Framework/SSIP Action Plan; and • PDE Comprehensive Planning Tool.
9. Were LEAs able to facilitate shared leadership toward enhanced collaboration and implementation of EBPs?	• Reports from teams documented contributions and participation of school-building personnel, administrators, and LEA leaders in model implementation, action planning for students remaining off-track, and follow up implementation/response to learning strategies (Year 1). • SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to scaffold direct support to Local Leadership Teams to gradually remove supports to build sustainable independent implementation of the model with fidelity over time (Years 2, 3, and 4). • SSIP local leadership team reports indicated continued collaboration among special education teachers, general education teachers, and one or more administrators at data analysis meetings and action planning. More than half of SSIP sites noted involvement of more than one administrator (e.g. guidance personnel and special education supervisor). • Sustainability assessments reported a continued need for active administrative support and leadership buy-in for consistent continued implementation.

Table A.2 Evaluation Activities, Measures and Outcomes (Cont'd)	
Evaluation Question	**Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes**
10. Which Coherent Improvement Strategy yielded the most positive results for students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?	• Permitting learning sites to select the Coherent Improvement Strategies that would best meet their needs resulted in eight different combinations of these strategies, confounding the ability to measure the effectiveness of any one of them in isolation (Years 3 and 4). • Beyond the required EWS and Family Engagement strategies, teams most frequently selected MTSS Academic, MTSS Behavior, and Attendance Strategies and Alternative Programming (Years 3 and 4). • ABC data protocol reports indicate that the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* strategy was the most widely used across sites (Years 3 and 4). • These trends continue as fidelity data indicate increased comfort with strategy implementation and faithful implementation of program components. • MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* was not only the most widely implemented strategy; its fidelity ratings were also highest across all years for all learning sites. Qualitative reports describe this strategy as being highly useful, easy to implement, accurate and informative to leadership teams.
11. Did HUNE (CPRC) develop materials and resources to be shared with LEAs, families, and community organizations?	• HUNE materials were developed, shared with stakeholder groups and SSIP learning sites, and have been posted on the SSIP website for wide-scale access (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). • All HUNE publications are also available in Spanish. • HUNE also developed a video to capture the voices of the staff, families, and students off-track for graduation, (Year 3).

5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies

The implementation with fidelity of the Coherent Improvement Strategies has been very successful. All SSIP learning sites continue to use an EWS to identify students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation and implement selected strategies based on student needs.

Year 4 focused on school-site independence and equipped learning sites with sustainability tools for continued implementation and build-out of effective model components. PaTTAN consultant reports, school-site action plans/self-assessments, and fidelity data indicate solid implementation of all model components and data collection/analyses procedures. These data point toward long-term use of high leverage practices to positively change the graduation trajectory of students with disabilities over time. School change research is clear that shifts in practice require multiple years of sustained implementation before impacting student achievement. The longitudinal impact will be observed as student cohorts move through multiple years of independent building level implementation.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress

During the first three years of implementation, the BSE collaborated with 12 learning sites to implement the SSIP. In the fourth year, the collaboration with the 12 learning sites continued. However, one of the learning sites (learning site 9) had a significant change; three high schools were consolidated into one. Students in Groups 1, 2, and 3 from the original learning site continued receiving interventions as designed. Model implementation expanded to include all students with disabilities post-consolidation. This increase in population meant that more students were identified as off-track for graduation than previous years. Therefore, longitudinal trends were not measured for this site because the sample of students differed from prior years and did not reflect change over time. Instead, the consolidated site data were analyzed independently of the others. Within year changes were measured for graduation status, risk factors, and implementation fidelity. The change in population, target student numbers, school-based team personnel, and administration/leadership influenced achievement outcomes. This resulted in the decision to set new baseline and targets for graduation rates using Year 4 data as previously set targets were no longer accurate outcome measures. Refer to Section C.2.b.

a. Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed

Pennsylvania has carried out the planned activities described in Phases I, II, and III reports in conformance with the intended timelines. Table B.1 provides evidence, updates, and impact to date of accomplishments and the milestones that have been met during all Phases, including Phase III, Year 4.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">

Table B.1
Updates: Evaluation Topic, Desired Outcomes and Impact to Date

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">

SSIP Implementation Framework and Action Plans

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">

- All learning sites continue to use the SSIP Implementation Framework and action plans using the five-phase model of the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities NDPC-SD.

- All SSIP learning sites select Coherent Improvement Strategies based on students with disabilities off-track needs.

- All SSIP learning sites continue to revise their SSIP Implementation Framework and action plans to embed the Family Engagement strategy within each selected Coherent Improvement Strategy.

</td></tr>
<tr><td align="center">

Desired Outcome

</td><td align="center">

Impact to Date

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

All SSIP learning sites will have an evidence-based protocol that includes Coherent Improvement Strategies, and available personnel and resources to accomplish the goals of their action plan.

</td><td>

The SSIP Implementation Framework is available to LEAs in need of an evidence-based action plan to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates for students with disabilities.

All SSIP learning sites continue to use the SSIP Implementation Framework and Coherent Improvement Strategies with fidelity. Action plans are implemented and based on data.

The Family Engagement strategy continues to be fully embedded within each selected Coherent Improvement Strategy at each SSIP site.

Culturally Responsive Teaching and Instructional Strategies continue to be prioritized in model implementation at the 12 SSIP learning sites.

All LEAs in Pennsylvania also have access to family engagement resources and training materials through the PaTTAN and HUNE.

</td></tr>
</table>

Student Data Collected and Analyzed by SSIP Learning Sites and BSE

The following data were collected and analyzed:

- Four-year and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates of students with disabilities.

- Group 1 data– This group is comprised of students with disabilities who were identified as off-track for graduation in January 2016 (Phase III, Year 1 report). ABC data are collected and analyzed on a regular basis to determine whether adjustments are required.

- Group 2 data – This group is comprised of students with disabilities identified as off-track for graduation in October 2016 (and not part of Group 1). Group 2 was created by analyzing ABC data in the same way as Group 1.

- Group 3 data - This group is comprised of students with disabilities identified as off-track for graduation in October 2017 (and not part of Groups 1 or 2). Group 3 was created by analyzing ABC data in the same way as Groups 1 and 2.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP learning sites, the State Education Agency (SEA), and community agencies will have the tools needed to identify students with disabilities on-track and off-track for graduation, as well as the opportunity to intervene with students who may need additional support.	PDE/BSE, LEAs, and community agencies in Pennsylvania have access to evidence-based data tools to support the attendance, behavior, and course performance of all students, including students with disabilities.
	When examining the SSIP's impact on achieving graduation targets, it is important to recognize two characteristics of the data set. First, graduation target data included in the Phase III, Year 4 report are lagged one year, and reflect 2017-18 data and implementation outcomes of the learning sites. Second, because implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategies began in the latter part of the 2015-16 school year, the impact on graduation rates is mitigated by the length of treatment, ranging from 2.5 years of implementation to 1 year of implementation depending on cohort.
	Group 1 data is the most robust to date showing multi-year trends for students with disabilities identified as off-track for graduation and participating in multiple levels of EWS and EBPs across a portion of FFY 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018. Full model implementation has been in effect for Group 1 students at the 12 SSIP learning sites for 3.5 years. See detailed reporting in Section C.2.
	Group 2 data include the first full school year of SSIP implementation for students with disabilities identified as off-track for graduation in FFY 2016 and span three complete years (FFY 2016, FFY 2017, FFY 2018). See detailed reporting in Section C.2.
	Group 3 data show implementation outcomes for FFY 2017 and FFY 2018. See detailed reporting in Section C.2.

Fidelity Measures for Coherent Improvement Strategies

- SSIP learning sites used the *Early Warning Implementation and Monitoring System (EWIMS)* instrument developed by American Institute for Research (AIR) to ensure that the EWS strategy was being implemented with fidelity (Year 1).

- In Year 2, SSIP learning sites measured fidelity of implementation of the two required Coherent Improvement Strategies identified in the Phase II submission, Table 3.4 Fidelity of Implementation (pages 36-37).

- In Year 3, each SSIP learning site measured fidelity of implementation of a third Coherent Improvement Strategy, in addition to EWS and Family Engagement strategies, using protocols identified in the Phase II submission, Table 3.4 (pages 36-37).

- In Year 4, SSIP learning sites continue using implementation science to ensure fidelity of implementation Years 1, 2, 3, and 4).

Desired Outcome	**Impact to Date**
SSIP learning sites will follow the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) implementation science guidelines to ensure that Coherent Improvement Strategies are implemented with fidelity.	All SSIP learning sites continue to conduct fidelity checks and revise action plans based on data. Learning sites have the instruments and tools needed to determine if the Coherent Improvement Strategies are implemented with fidelity.

Partnership with HUNE

- BSE continues the partnership with HUNE.
- HUNE is using an EWS developed by NDPC-SD and NTACT to identify students with disabilities served by the agency who are off-track for graduation.
- There are 10 HUNE publications in print and posted online for LEAs, community agencies, and families. These publications are also available in Spanish.
- HUNE developed and recorded a video to capture the *Voices of the Families, Students Off-Track for Graduation, and Staff.*
- HUNE is planning to create a Tool Kit for students off-track.

Desired Outcome	**Impact to Date**
The SEA will partner with HUNE to serve students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation, focusing on those who are Hispanic.	HUNE and BSE have published multiple resources for families and community organizations in English and Spanish. HUNE students helped with the design and recording of the students' voices video. HUNE students participated in structured interviews measuring the impact the interventions had on their school experience (Year 3).

SSIP Webpage

The SSIP webpage, Increasing Graduation Rates, continues to host multiple documents, including the SSIP Phase I, II, and III Reports. Other documents, resources, and training materials include:

- Multiple SSIP resources about the seven Coherent Improvement Strategies, with voiceovers, closed captioning, and transcriptions;
- SSIP publications for families that contain proven ABC strategies to increase the students' chances of graduating from high school;
- All HUNE publications, including the Spanish translations;
- Information/links to OSEP funded national centers (e.g., NCSI, NTACT, NDPC-SD, IDEA Data Center (IDC));
- Videos that capture the voices of staff, families, and students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation; and
- PaTTAN SSIP consultants' contact information.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP learning sites will have the resources needed to implement EBPs to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of students with disabilities.	All LEAs in PA continue to have access to professional development materials in one convenient location. The SSIP webpage complies with ADA website accessibility standards and hosts both current and archived SSIP documents, resources, and reports.

Other Statewide Stakeholders

- All PDE/BSE 2018-19 and 2019-20 (year-to-date) statewide conferences included SSIP presentations. These presentations (see Appendix 1.1) included an SSIP overview, specific steps to implement the Coherent Improvement Strategies with fidelity, and how to design an action plan to increase the graduation rates for students with disabilities off-track for graduation.
- SSIP statewide presentations and guided discussions also studied the process for identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation.
- BSE Compliance Monitoring continues to refine the PaTTAN TA needed when LEAs are identified as needing an improvement plan under SPP/APR Indicators 1 and 2.

Infrastructure
BSE continues to collaborate with other PDE bureaus, divisions, and programs to align the initiatives supporting increasing graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates. Some examples of the collaboration include networking with the following: • Bureau of Teaching and Learning - Title I Priority schools; • Bureau of Teaching and Learning - Migrant, Homeless, and Foster Care programs; • Corrections Education - Education for Students Incarcerated program; and • Bureau of Teaching and Learning, PDE EWS Educator Dashboard Metrics. Information about the PDE Dashboard Metrics is found in Pennsylvania SSIP Phase II submission, Table 3.6 (page 42).

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
PDE bureaus, divisions, and programs will share resources to align programs and initiatives to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of all students, including students with disabilities.	LEAs in Pennsylvania receive aligned TA as a result of the collaboration of multiple bureaus, divisions, and initiatives. Two-way communication is used with stakeholders to improve outcomes for student with disabilities off-track for graduation.

MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect Student Engagement Intervention Model* Training
• SSIP PaTTAN consultants participated in and completed the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* train-the-trainer program. • MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* training opportunities continue to be offered statewide to support SSIP sites. The training opportunities are also available to other LEAs. • SSIP PaTTAN consultants support the training and coaching of P2G consultants. • P2G consultants are trained in the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* train-the-trainer program. • A new cohort of PaTTAN consultants has been trained in the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* train-the-trainer program.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP learning sites will have an additional EBP to implement when students with disabilities are off-track for graduation.	LEAs in Pennsylvania have access to evidence-based TA, resources, and staff to support students with disabilities off-track for graduation. MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* continues to be the most widely implemented EBP across SSIP learning sites. Fidelity data indicate it is implemented faithfully and accurately and provides usable data to school-based teams. MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* fidelity data continue to exceed the standard across all SSIP learning sites. SSIP Local Teams use accurate data collection, analysis at team meetings, and meaningful data usage as intervention strategies for students off-track for graduation.

SSIP Evaluation Plan
• BSE continues to engage stakeholders, including SEAP, in the evaluation process. • BSE continues to receive technical assistance from NTACT, NCSI and IDC. • Data collection and analysis are ongoing and continue to be a priority for BSE and the SSIP learning sites. • The SSIP Core Team collaborates with the SSIP external evaluator on a continuing basis.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP learning sites will have EBPs to implement when students with disabilities are off-track for graduation.	LEAs in Pennsylvania have access to evidence-based TA, resources, and staff to support students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation.

b. Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities

Refer to Table A.2 and Section B.1.a.

2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation

a. How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

The SEAP continues to serve as the state's primary stakeholder group for advising on the Part B SPP/APR, including the SSIP. Panel members are actively engaged in the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

Some examples of how stakeholders continue to be informed and actively participate in all aspects of the SSIP, including the SSIP evaluation, are as follows:

- SEAP members attend OSEP-sponsored national and regional meetings and institutes with state staff on topics related to SPP/APR/SSIP (e.g., OSEP Leadership Conferences, IDC Interactive Institutes, and NCSI Graduation Collaborative Meetings).

- SEAP meetings regularly include a presentation by the SPP/APR/SSIP team to discuss with the members and solicit their input regarding data, performance, evaluation, dissemination, and ongoing improvement activities.

- SEAP disseminated the family publication to their constituents beyond the 12 learning sites.

- In addition to SEAP, the BSE collaborates and networks with the SSIP learning sites and HUNE to support implementation of the SSIP on an ongoing basis.

While the SEAP members have extensive reach through their networks, the SSIP Core Team also continues to conduct direct outreach to the learning sites and use the networks in the school communities to convey the focus of the SSIP and the benefit of the EBPs. The working relationship between the SSIP team and the SEAP is a two-way interaction that supports learning, facilitates spread of ideas, and communicates progress in practice on the SiMR.

Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA)

PSEA continues to make SSIP training materials available to its 180,000 members. Hundreds of general and special education teachers and administrators have received online training on the SSIP, demonstrated understanding on an assessment, and received Act 48 credits toward their professional certificates.

PSEA currently links its website to the PaTTAN training calendar so their members may benefit from professional development opportunities, such as SSIP, EWS, MTSS Academic, MTSS Behavior, Family Engagement, and Secondary Transition.

Impact of Stakeholders on SSIP - Update

Ongoing two-way communication of the four SSIP stakeholder groups (i.e., SSIP Core Workgroup, SSIP Internal Stakeholders, SSIP External Stakeholders, and Statewide Stakeholders) continues to leverage resources to improve services for students with disabilities.

b. How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP

BSE has collaborated with Dr. Joanne Cashman of NCSI for the stakeholder's component of this document. BSE uses multiple resources recommended by NCSI, including the *Leading by Convening: A Blueprint for Authentic Engagement* publication.

Strategies used by BSE to ensure that stakeholders have a voice and have been involved in decision-making include the following:

- ongoing collaboration and networking with SEAP, HUNE, and the SSIP learning sites, using presentations and facilitated discussions;

- using stakeholder engagement as a strategy for the success of the SSIP. Results of the evaluation are shared with SEAP and stakeholders on an ongoing basis;

- sharing evaluation findings with stakeholders on an ongoing basis to inform decisions;

- using the *Leading by Convening* framework to analyze the depth of interaction of stakeholders, moving the interaction from sharing information to collaborating and networking; and

- presenting to key leaders in other agencies to open opportunities for greater collaboration, especially around issues that have both academic and non-academic aspects and impacts.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan

a. How evaluation measures align with the theory of action

The alignment of the evaluation measures to the Pennsylvania SSIP Theory of Action was described in detail in Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission. The Theory of Action is found in Appendix 2.1 of this report.

The evaluation plan involves data collection, analysis, and application to determine implementation effectiveness and refinement based on those results. It is directly aligned to the four Theory of Action strands: Leadership, Collaboration, Technical Assistance, and Accountability. Reviewing and analyzing evidence from each strand ensures fidelity and effectiveness of model implementation to positively impact graduation rates of students with disabilities in Pennsylvania. Key measures for each are described below.

b. Data sources for each key measure

Table C.1 Theory of Action Strands, Activities and Data Source/Documentation		
Theory of Action Strands	**Activities**	**Data Source / Documentation**
Leadership	Ongoing collaboration of BSE with other PDE statewide initiatives to increase graduation rates of students with disabilities.	SSIP/PDE Collaboration, Annotated Agendas
	Ongoing collaboration among SSIP Core Team, SSIP PaTTAN consultants, SSIP Local Leadership Teams, stakeholders, including families and students, and external partners at NTACT, NCSI, and IDC.	Appendix 1
	All SSIP learning sites established Local Leadership Teams that convened in large and small groups at least twice per year for action planning using the SSIP Implementation Framework, then as often as monthly to review data based on EWS and Coherent Improvement Strategies implementation.	SSIP Implementation Frameworks action plans
	Outcomes, needs assessments, and key actions are documented on meeting and data review protocols to strengthen implementation fidelity, enhance communication, and build leadership structures.	Data team meeting protocol

Table C.1 Theory of Action Strands, Activities and Data Source/Documentation (Cont'd)		
Theory of Action Strands	**Activities**	**Data Source / Documentation**
Collaboration	Regular two-way communication with SEAP to provide updates and gather input. Strengthened partnership with HUNE. Model implementation, TA, and training at HUNE mirror that of the SSIP learning sites. To enhance this partnership, better connect with, and involve key stakeholder groups, 10 HUNE publications and a video were developed for stakeholder groups, LEAs, community agencies, families, and students. All publications are available on the PaTTAN website in English and Spanish. The video is closed-captioned.	SEAP meetings minutes HUNE publications and video posted at PaTTAN website
Technical Assistance	SSIP PaTTAN Consultant Support • SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to provide direct onsite support to learning sites in all aspects of model implementation, including data collection and review, professional development in strategy implementation, leadership development, data-based decision-making, action planning, and research-based methods for MTSS for academic and behavioral interventions. Professional Development and Trainings • SSIP Core Team and SSIP PaTTAN consultants designed, delivered, and engaged in multiple seminars, presentations, and trainings related to implementation and Coherent Improvement Strategy selection and application (See Appendix 1).	SSIP Implementation Framework/action plans, data collection protocols, fidelity measures protocols Training materials, including PowerPoint presentations (closed- captioned and voiceovers), handouts, activities, SSIP publications, Infographics

Table C.1 Theory of Action Strands, Activities and Data Source/Documentation		
Theory of Action Strands	**Activities**	**Data Source / Documentation**
Accountability	Graduation Data • Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities is collected annually to determine whether the SSIP targets are being met. Graduation Trajectory Data for Students with Disabilities • Local Leadership Teams review ABC data multiples times per year to determine which students with disabilities are off-track for graduation and plan for implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategies to intervene. • Changes in the proportions of students determined to be on-track versus off-track are reviewed to assess the model's progressive impact on the long-term goal of increasing the graduation rate of students with disabilities.	PA Information Management System (PIMS)
	Fidelity of Implementation Data • Fidelity measures were developed or selected for overall model implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies to identify not only the level of sophistication of implementation, but also to identify areas of need/support. • The SEA continues to hold LEAs accountable for effectively implementing EBPs to measure outcomes. BSE continues working to align the SSIP with Pennsylvania's ESSA Consolidated State Plan.	EWSs, SSIP Implementation Frameworks/Action Plans, Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission, Table 3.4 (pages 36-37)

c.   Description of baseline data for key measures

Refer to Section C.2.b.

d. Data collection procedures and associated timelines

Data collection procedures and associated timelines were established during Phase II and were conducted in accordance with the timelines developed. Additional information is found in Section C.2.b.

e. [If applicable] Sampling procedures

Not Applicable.

f. [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons

See section C.2.b.

g. How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements

Data Management and Data Analysis Procedures

School level SSIP Local Leadership Teams continue to document and analyze EWS data on structured data meeting protocols used across sites to discuss overall implementation, changes/trends in off-track to on-track students, and implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategies. While there has been attrition with school personnel or new team members joining the SSIP Local Leadership Teams, the data meeting protocols continue to provide a consistent and efficient way to analyze data. All sites submitted samples of their data team meeting protocols for review.

School level SSIP Local Leadership Teams continue to document and analyze overall implementation data using a structured SSIP Implementation Framework report that is shared with SSIP PaTTAN consultants and updated continuously as action plans are executed.

SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to document and report on implementation data and school site needs and progress using a structured meeting agenda and reporting template of data meetings.

The SSIP Core Team and the SSIP external evaluator continue to review all data as part of the overall data management plan.

2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

a. How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR

Key data are reviewed on a continuous basis to ensure successful implementation of the SSIP. Multiple teams, including the BSE, SSIP Core Team, SEAP, SSIP learning sites' Local Leadership Teams, SSIP PaTTAN consultants, HUNE, as well as the SSIP external evaluator, analyze the data.

Following is a summary of the process used by Local Leadership Teams to review key data with and by the SSIP learning sites:

- analyzed ABC data during each marking period and identified those students with disabilities off-track for graduation in their building. The frequency of these meetings varied by learning site depending on local needs;

- reviewed the Coherent Improvement Strategies and selected a third strategy, in addition to the EWS and Family Engagement, to address the needs of their students with disabilities off-track for graduation;

- completed and/or revised their action plans incorporating the selected strategies, practices/interventions, tasks to be completed, person(s) responsible, timelines for implementation, resources needed to support implementation, and date completed/evidence. Teams continue to embed the Family Engagement strategy into each Coherent Improvement Strategy selected; and

- continue to collect, analyze, and use key data on an ongoing basis.

b. Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures

As described in section B.1, one of the learning sites had a significant change; three high schools were consolidated into one. As a result, the new consolidated high school experienced a complete change in administration, a tripling in teaching and support staff and an expanded student population, most of whom had not been exposed to the SSIP. This increase in population meant that more students were identified as off-track for graduation than previous years. Therefore, longitudinal trends could not be measured for this site. The change in population, target student numbers, school-based team personnel, and administration/leadership influenced achievement outcomes. This required a change in baseline and targets for graduation rates using Year 4 data, as previously set targets were no longer accurate outcome measures.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results Indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input for the establishment of targets is described in the SSIP, Phase I report (page 3). The state's Special Education Advisory Panel provided specific input for setting the target for FFY 2019.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data: 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rates

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥		64.90%	64.90%	64.90%	66.40%	
Data	64.90%	64.01%	64.08%	65.78%	64.16%	63.76%

FFY 2019 Target

FFY	2019
Target ≥	63.95%

FFY 2018 Performance

At the beginning of the 2017-18 school year, one of the learning sites participating in the SSIP was combined with two other high schools within the LEA to form a single consolidated high school. PaTTAN consultants provided training to the new faculty and administration regarding the SSIP. All additional students with disabilities were classified using the early warning system to identify those students on-track and off-track for graduation, and implementation of the plan continued.

After consulting with NTACT staff with knowledge and experience in improving graduation rates in other states, and with the external evaluator for this project, it was decided that the change in setting for this learning site was sufficient to require baseline to be reset to the current year and to establish the target for FFY 2019 from the new baseline. The performance of 63.76% reflects the combined 4-year cohort rate for all learning sites, including the new consolidated site. As FFY 2018 is the new baseline year, a comparison to a target is not appropriate.

Pennsylvania's SSIP continues to be implemented in 12 secondary learning sites, including the two largest school districts in the state, a cyber-charter school, as well as in suburban and rural areas. The special education cohort for SSIP learning sites comprises 19% of the overall 4-year graduation cohort for the twelve sites.

SSIP Evaluation Questions – Updates

To operationalize the Theory of Action strands, stakeholders collaborated in developing 11 key SSIP evaluation questions. Data were collected, analyzed, and used to answer each evaluation question. The results and updates are reported below.

Question 1

Did implementation of the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies make a difference in the number of students with disabilities who were identified as being off-track for graduation?

A student has a 75% chance or higher of dropping out of school if the student is off-track in one of the following indicators: attendance, behavior, and course performance (i.e., failing English or mathematics) (Neild & Balfanz 2006[2]). These key indicators can assist school personnel and decision makers in identifying students off-track for graduation and intervening early to provide interventions and supports to students most at risk of imminently leaving school.

Based on these research findings and additional recommendations from the NDPC-SD and NTACT, all the Pennsylvania SSIP learning sites incorporated an EWS to identify students who were off-track for graduation in attendance, behavior, and course performance. After identifying those students, evidence-based Coherent Improvement Strategies were provided to support students based on their needs and to intervene early.

Longitudinal Trends by Intervention Group

In the 2018-19 school year, the SSIP learning sites continued supporting students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation in FFY 2015 (Group 1), FFY 2016 (Group 2), and FFY 2017 (Group 3).

As discussed in Section B of this report, one of the learning sites had a significant change – three high schools were consolidated into one. Students in Groups 1, 2, and 3 from the original learning site continued receiving interventions as designed. Model implementation included all students with disabilities post-consolidation. The increase in population meant more students were identified as off-track for graduation than previous years. Therefore, longitudinal trends were not measured for this site because the sample of students differed from prior years and did not reflect change over time. Instead, the consolidated site data were analyzed independently of the others. Within year changes were measured for graduation status, risk factors, and implementation fidelity. The change in population, target student numbers, school-based team personnel, and administration/leadership influenced achievement outcomes. This resulted in the decision to set new targets for graduation rates using Year 4 data to set baseline as targets were no longer accurate outcome measures.

The data in Table C.2 show the longitudinal improvement rate of Group 1 students with disabilities moving from off-track status to on-track status from January 2016 through June 2019. These data span three years and five months of SSIP implementation. In January 2016, 34% of students with IEPs were identified as off-track for graduation. By the end of 2019, however, only 8% of those

---

[2] Neild & Balfanz (2006), *An Early Warning System*, Educational Leadership, October 2007, Volume 65, Number 2.

students remained off track for graduation. Overall, 92% of Group 1 students with IEPs were on-track to graduate by the end of 2019. Over three years, the SSIP equipped schools to identify more at-risk students early, provide high quality intervention, and track progress often to positively influence their path toward graduation.

Table C.2 Longitudinal Trends Movement of Group 1 Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**January 2016**	**June 2019**
On-Track Percentage	66%	92%
Off-Track Percentage	34%	8%

The data in Table C.3 show parallel improvement trends for Group 2 students. Across 3 full years of SSIP implementation, the proportion of students on-track for graduation increased to 80%-- an 11% increase from baseline.

Table C.3 Longitudinal Trends Movement of Group 2 Students from Off-Track Status To On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**October 2016**	**June 2019**
On-Track Percentage	69%	80%
Off-Track Percentage	31%	20%

Table C.4 shows positive change in graduation trajectories for Group 3 students identified as off-track in October 2017 as well. By June 2019, 72% achieved on-track status, decreasing total off-track percentages reduced by 5%. These data span two full school years of SSIP implementation.

Table C.4 Longitudinal Trends Movement of Group 3 Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**October 2017**	**June 2019**
On-Track Percentage	67%	72%
Off-Track Percentage	33%	28%

Longitudinal Trends by SSIP Learning Site

Longitudinal implementation data indicate that there were few Group 1 students remaining off-track after multiple years of SSIP implementation, January 2016-June 2019. (Learning site 9 not included in longitudinal analysis.)

Table C.5 Group 1 - Percentage of Students Remaining Off-Track for Graduation in 2019		
SSIP Learning Site	**Percentage of Group 1 Students Remaining Off-Track**	**Positive Impact?**
1	4%	Yes
2	5%	Yes
3	2%	Yes
4	7%	Yes
5	7%	Yes
6	0%	Yes
7	3%	Yes
8	5%	Yes
10	1%	Yes
11	6%	Yes
12	0%	Yes

Likewise, fewer Group 2 students remained off-track after multiple years of SSIP implementation, October 2016-June 2019. (learning site 9 not included in longitudinal analysis.)

Table C.6 Group 2 - Percentage of Students Remaining Off-Track for Graduation in 2019		
SSIP Learning Site	**Percentage of Group 2 Students Remaining Off-Track**	**Positive Impact?**
1	0%	Yes
2	10%	Yes
3	13%	Yes
4	13%	Yes
5	5%	Yes
6	0%	Yes
7	11%	Yes
8	20%	Yes
10	3%	Yes
11	6%	Yes
12	0%	Yes

Even after only 2 years of implementation there were fewer Group 3 students remaining at-risk at all learning sites over time. (Site 9 not included in longitudinal analysis.)

Table C.7 Group 3 - Percentage of Students Remaining Off-Track for Graduation in 2019		
SSIP Learning Site	**Percentage of Group 3 Students Remaining Off-Track**	**Positive Impact?**
1	15%	Yes
2	1%	Yes
3	0%	Yes
4	15%	Yes
5	1%	Yes
6	0%	Yes
7	15%	Yes
8	1%	Yes
10	0%	Yes
11	15%	Yes
12	1%	Yes

Longitudinal Trends in Student Risk Factors

Data in Table C.8 indicate that Group 1 students identified as off-track for graduation exhibited fewer risk factors after multiple years of intervention.

Table C.8 Group 1 – Longitudinal Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation January 2016 through June 2019			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors Prior to Implementation	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors After 3.5 Years of Implementation**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors from January 2016 through June 2019**	**Positive Impact?**
65%	22%	43%	Yes

Over time, the most notable positive changes were evident in Attendance, followed by Academics (i.e., Course Performance), then Behavior.

Data in Table C.9 indicate that Group 2 students identified as off-track for graduation exhibited fewer risk factors after multiple years of intervention.

Table C.9 Group 2 – Longitudinal Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation October 2016 through June 2019			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors October 2016	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors After 3 Years of Implementation**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors After 3 Years of Implementation**	**Positive Impact?**
44%	10%	34%	Yes

For Group 2, the most notable positive changes were evident in Attendance, followed by Academics (i.e., Course Performance), then Behavior.

Data in Table C.10 indicate that Group 3 students who remained off-track from October through June of the 2017-18 school year exhibited fewer risk factors over time.

Table C.10 Group 3 – Longitudinal Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation October 2017 through June 2019			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors October 2017	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors After 1 Year of Implementation June 2019**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors After 1 Year of Implementation**	**Positive Impact?**
39%	18%	21%	Yes

In contrast to Groups 1 and 2, Group 3 decreased Academic (i.e., Course Performance) risk factors first, then Attendance, and finally Behavior.

Conclusion: The implementation of the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies made a difference in the number of students with disabilities who were identified as being off-track for graduation and reduced the number of risk factors observed in a large proportion of students with notable decreases in multiple risk factors which research has shown typically to be treatment resistant and hard to influence.

Highlights of Group 1 Change

Group 1 students participated in multiple levels of EWS and EBPs across 3.5 years of SSIP implementation (January 2016-June 2019). Longitudinal analysis of multi-year trends suggests that the highest rates of change for students with disabilities identified as off-track for graduation occurred in learning sites with the following characteristics:

High Fidelity of Implementation

- 100% fidelity of action plan completion
- 100% fidelity of EWS implementation
- 100% participation in Culturally Responsive Instruction strategies
- Documented focus on implementation of the Family Engagement EBP every reporting period.

Consistent Leadership

- low administrative turn over
- few personnel changes
- stable personnel assignments
- high consistency in data team membership year to year
- participation of an administrator, general educator, and special educator at each data meeting every reporting period

Specific EBP Implementation

- highly faithful implementation of the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* EBP
- pairing of the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* EBP with the MTSS Behavior: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) EBP

Within-Year Trends by Treatment Group

The change in structure and population of learning site 9 post-consolidation necessitates analyzing 2018-19 within-year outcomes to establish new baseline comparisons for growth. These data also inform site action plans for sustainability and scale-up as leadership teams move toward independent model implementation.

The data in Table C.11 show that 85% of Group 1 students were on track by the end of the 2019 school year. Moreover, the number of students originally identified as off-track for graduation decreased from 44% to 15% due to positive impact of the SSIP model on student achievement.

Table C.11		
Group 1 - 2018-19 Baseline Data Movement of Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**2018**	**2019**
On-Track	56%	85%
Off-Track	44%	15%

Table C.12 reports an increase of 18% of Group 2 students on track for graduation during 2018-19.

Table C.12		
Group 2 - 2018-19 Baseline Data Movement of Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**2018**	**2019**
On-Track	61%	79%
Off-Track	39%	21%

Table C.13 shows a 17% increase of Group 3 students on-track for graduation 2018-19. While the proportion of students with IEPs remaining off-track by year's end is higher than Group 1 or Group 2, it is not unexpected as the length of the intervention has been much shorter for these students,

Table C.13		
Group 3 - Baseline 2018-19 Data Movement of Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	**2018**	**2019**
On-Track Percentage	48%	65%
Off-Track Percentage	52%	35%

Within-Year Change by Learning Site

The data in Tables C.14 - C.16 display within year change in the number of Groups 1, 2, and 3 students identified as off-track for graduation.

Table C.14		
Group 1 – Percentage Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4		
SSIP Learning Site	**Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4**	**Positive Impact?**
1	6%	Yes
2	9%	Yes
3	19%	Yes
4	0%	Yes
5	23%	Yes
6	0%	*Yes
7	28%	Yes
8	28%	Yes
9	27%	Yes
10	39%	Yes
11	14%	Yes
12	100%	Yes

*No students were identified as off track by the EWS.

Table C.15		
Group 2 – Percentage Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4		
SSIP Learning Site	**Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4**	**Positive Impact?**
1	7%	Yes
2	22%	Yes
3	11%	Yes
4	6%	Yes
5	27%	Yes
6	9%	*Yes
7	5%	Yes
8	4%	Yes
9	31%	Yes
10	52%	Yes
11	27%	Yes
12	33%	Yes

Table C.16		
Group 3 – Percentage Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4		
SSIP Learning Site	**Change in Number of Students Identified as Off-Track Across Year 4**	**Positive Impact?**
1	2%	Yes
2	36%	Yes
3	12%	Yes
4	23%	Yes
5	15%	Yes
6	6%	Yes
7	7%	Yes
8	8%	Yes
9	28%	Yes
10	10%	Yes
11	16%	Yes
12	20%	Yes

Within-Year Reduction in Student Risk Factors

Data in Table C.17 indicate that Group 1 students identified as off-track for graduation exhibited fewer risk factors across Year 4.

Table C.17			
Group 1 –Baseline Within Year Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation In Year 4			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Positive Impact?**
47%	21%	44%	Yes

Group 2 students also exhibited less risk status in response to SSIP implementation in Year 4 (Table C.18).

Table C.18 Group 2 –Baseline Within Year Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation In Year 4			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Positive Impact?**
56%	22%	34%	Yes

Data in Table C.19 indicate that Group 3 students who remained off-track at the conclusion of Year 4 exhibited fewer risk factors over time.

Table C.19 Group 3 – Baseline Within Year Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation June 2018 to June 2019			
Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors	**Percent of Students Off-Track for Graduation with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors**	**Positive Impact?**
48%	31%	17%	Yes

Year 4 data show that SSIP implementation has a positive impact even across one academic year. Changes in student risk factors are particularly important considering how difficult it is to positively impact those characteristics in such a short period of time. In total, these data suggest that SSIP sites are well equipped to continue independent implementation and sustain the model.

Question 2

Was the Early Warning System (EWS) useful in identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?

The EWS was again an invaluable Coherent Improvement Strategy for identifying students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation. As a result, SSIP learning sites observed the following outcomes:

- An overall decrease in students off-track across time;

- Rate of change data show that, across all SSIP learning sites, a considerable number of students identified by the EWS moved from off-track to on-track across years of implementation;

- Students identified through the EWS for academic risk factors in Mathematics or English/Language Arts showed less risk over time, as did students with both academic and behavioral risk factors;

- All sites use the EWS to monitor student ABC performance data to determine which students with disabilities are off-track for graduation. These data are reviewed by SSIP Local Leadership Teams to determine which evidence-based intervention strategy would help change student graduation trajectory.

- Implementation data indicate that all learning sites implemented the EWS with fidelity, consistency, and accuracy; and

- Qualitative learning site evaluation data, survey responses, and meeting notes describe the EWS as valuable, informative, essential, useful, effective, and helpful.

Both longitudinal data and Year 4 data suggest that the positive impact continues across and within years. All SSIP learning sites experienced an overall decrease of off-track students. The SSIP learning sites report all Implementation Frameworks/Action Plans, data team meeting protocols, and fidelity measures are in place.

Students identified through the EWS for academic risk factors in Mathematics or English/Language Arts showed less risk over time, as did students with academic risk factors and behavioral concerns. Of all risk factors, attendance concerns were substantially reduced across multiple years of implementation and attendance rates improved across all learning sites. 97% of Group 1 students identified as off-track for graduation due to attendance problems were identified early and moved to on-track after implementation. Similar patterns were evident in both Group 2 and Group 3 trends, showing over 90% of students initially identified by the EWS no longer exhibited poor attendance post intervention. Students identified as at-risk due to academic and behavioral concerns showed fewer risk characteristics over time moving to on-track for graduation after intervention. Rate changes were most evident in sites implementing both MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* and PBIS strategies. Sites implementing either the PDE EWS or a commercially available program experienced greater decreases in risk than those that developed their own system. In Year 4, all SSIP learning sites implemented Family Engagement strategies with the EWS, embedded Culturally Responsive Instruction into the model, and added an additional layer of research-based improvement strategies into the intervention framework. Paired MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* and MTSS Behavior: PBIS interventions were highly effective and impactful in changing students' trajectories.

The *Early Warning Implementation and Monitoring System* from the AIR was used to measure fidelity at SSIP learning sites. Data from all learning sites were analyzed and showed that the system was used as intended to inform strategy selection decisions for students identified as off-track for graduation.

The information gained from the data analysis for the EWS and Coherent Improvement Strategies guides the implementation of the action plans, as well as helps sites monitor progress and determine which students are responding to the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies.

Data analysis indicates that each of the 12 SSIP learning sites are fully established in implementing the EWS, embedding Family Engagement Strategies, and, in addition, applying one or more of the seven Coherent Improvement Strategies.

All sites use ABC and EWS data to identify students off-track for graduation. All sites use ABC and EWS data to choose which Coherent Improvement Strategy to use.

Data meeting protocols and fidelity checks indicate all sites have action planning measures in place.

Conclusion: The EWS was useful in identifying students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation.

Question 3

Was the Implementation Science identified by NIRN followed by the SSIP learning sites?

The implementation drivers needed to effect sustainable change are evident in implementation of the SSIP, including Competency, Organization, and Leadership.

Competency: The SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to provide both direct and indirect coaching to SSIP learning sites through on-site TA, facilitation and mentoring of Local Leadership Teams, professional development/training and web-based resources to guide implementation. Intensity and duration of direct support was scaffolded across time to build the capacity of teams to independently sustain the model with less reliance on consultants. For example, facilitation of data team meetings by PaTTAN consultants has been reduced and replaced by local team leadership.

Organization: At the systems level, the EWS includes comprehensive data tools to track student ABC statistics as well as progress monitoring tools for intervention programs and student progress.

- PaTTAN also established an extensive website with SSIP materials for teachers, schools, LEAs, consultants, community agencies, families, and stakeholders, ranging from print resources to video resources to reports.

- Data protocol records from meetings indicate that across SSIP learning sites, individuals in administrative roles participated in over 90% of the meetings to discuss off-track student progress and performance. In the instances when administrators were unable to participate, meeting notes indicated which team members in attendance assumed leadership responsibilities to communicate/follow up on results with the administrative team.

- Year 4 sustainability assessment data indicate that 11 of 12 learning sites consider their implementation of the EWS to be fully operational or exemplary.

Leadership: The SSIP PaTTAN consultants employed strategies to help systems become more adaptable and flexible. See Leadership outcomes discussed in section C.1.b.

Conclusion: The Implementation Science identified by NIRN was followed by the SSIP learning sites.

Question 4

Was professional development identified as being of high quality?

Surveys were conducted to determine the scope and quality of the TA provided by the SSIP PaTTAN consultants. As in previous years, results indicated that professional development was not only exemplary, but also accessible, relevant, and useful. Again, respondents rated on-site coaching of highest quality and resources for data-based decision making as most beneficial. Training on EWS implementation was noted as most useful and the MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* strategy was the most widely implemented.   PaTTAN resources and publications were also found to be highly useful. A new cohort of PaTTAN consultants became trainers for MTSS Behavior: Check & Connect in order to provide training for new LEAs or refreshers for existing LEAs.

Evaluations of professional development reported that on-site consultation was exemplary as were trainings, workshops, and educational materials provided by SSIP PaTTAN consultants.

Information gathered from evaluations of presentations at local, state, and national conferences was used to improve dissemination and communication efforts with partners and stakeholders invested in PDE's vision for students with disabilities.

Conclusion: Professional development was identified as being of high quality.

Question 5

What changes were made to the State, LEA and school systems as a result of the SSIP?

State: Ongoing collaboration and alignment of initiatives within PDE's bureaus, divisions, and programs continue to be a priority. Changes made to the state system as a result of the SSIP include:

- SSIP alignment with the PDE EWS Educator Dashboard Metrics (Years 1, 2, 3, and 4). SSIP learning sites collect, analyze, and use ABC data on an ongoing basis to identify students with disabilities off-track for graduation.

- SSIP alignment with Title I Academic Recovery Liaisons (Years 1, 2, and 3). Both programs met on an ongoing basis to ensure that their initiatives provided a seamless TA system for the learning sites. Data were shared between both programs. When action plans were needed by a learning site, both initiatives participated in their design. In year 4, SSIP continued working with ESSA team to ensure alignment.

- alignment of SPDG and SSIP (Years 3 and 4) to offer middle and high school educators and administrators intensive, ongoing professional development and coaching to increase the likelihood that every student graduates from high school college and career ready.   The alignment with the SPDG supports the scale-up of the SSIP activities beyond the initial 12 learning sites.

LEA and School Systems – SSIP learning sites continue to use the SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plan to document the implementation with fidelity of the SSIP process. SSIP learning sites also continued to embed Family Engagement Strategies into the implementation process.

Conclusion: _Changes made in previous phases and Phase III, Year 4 to the State, LEA, and school systems as a result of the SSIP remain in effect._

Question 6

To what extent did each Coherent Improvement Strategy impact the number of students with disabilities who are no longer off-track for graduation?

Data reported in the tables in this section indicate that the Coherent Improvement Strategies are positively influencing students with disabilities by reducing the number off-track for graduation.

Refer to Section E.1.b. for a summary of the impact of each Coherent Improvement Strategy being implemented.

Data on the impact of the Coherent Improvement Strategies on reducing the number of students off-track for graduation are found in Section C.2.b of this document.

Conclusion: _The EWS is effective for identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation. Permitting learning sites to select the Coherent Improvement Strategies that would best meet the needs of their students with disabilities off-track for graduation resulted in eight different combinations of these strategies, confounding the ability to compare the effectiveness of any one of them in isolation._

Question 7

Did LEAs have the information, support, and resources necessary to align their efforts to PDE's vision?

SSIP Local Leadership Teams continue to use the SSIP Implementation Framework to guide data reviews and develop action plans.

- 100% of SSIP learning sites completed 2018-19 action plans. The action plans were revised as needed throughout the year.

- 100% of the learning sites documented implementation of an EWS, layers of various improvement strategies, leadership teaming, and data-based decision-making in their action plans.

- Action plans consistently indicated that additional personnel resources and more consistent administrative support were needed for effective SSIP implementation.

- As in years past, 100% of action plans documented that Local Leadership Team personnel participated in professional development opportunities offered by PaTTAN, the BSE, and PDE related to SSIP implementation and/or the use of Coherent Improvement Strategies.

- Year 4 sustainability assessment data indicate that learning sites consider frequent personnel & staff changes the biggest limitations to fully operationalizing the SSIP model effectively.

Technical Assistance - SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to facilitate and guide SSIP Local Leadership Team meetings and provide additional support and resources as needed to help learning sites reach sustainability of this model. Consultants also facilitate the collection of data efforts, the fidelity of implementation measurement, and informational surveys. In order to promote sustainability at the school level, consultants have built capacity with the SSIP Local Leadership Teams; therefore, support by the SSIP PaTTAN consultants has decreased.

Statewide meetings of all SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue monthly. Agenda notes detail current SSIP activities at each SSIP learning site, deadlines and action items for upcoming activities, highlights of data reviews for each SSIP learning site, key professional development of dissemination activities, and needs/roles/responsibilities for the next month of implementation.

Conclusion: SSIP learning sites have the information, support, and resources necessary to align their efforts to PDE's vision.

Question 8

Did PDE leverage resources to improve services for students with disabilities?

The following resources continue to be utilized by PDE to improve graduation outcomes for students with disabilities:

- PDE/BSE leadership;
- Title I/BSE collaboration;
- 9 SSIP PaTTAN consultants;
- four administrators from the PaTTAN offices;
- fiscal support for SSIP learning sites;
- fiscal support for HUNE partnership;
- fiscal support for external evaluation;
- SSIP webpage resources;
- Standards Aligned System (SAS) Resources;
- SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plan;
- SSIP data tools;
- PDE Comprehensive Planning Tool; and
- training and TA for the PDE Educator Dashboard EWS Metrics.

Conclusion: PDE leveraged resources to improve services for students with disabilities.

Question 9

Were LEAs able to facilitate shared leadership toward enhanced collaboration and implementation of EBPs?

Each SSIP Local Leadership Team completed Data Meeting Protocols at building-level meetings to review and analyze EWS data for students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation and then determine action plan interventions. Again, this year, all Year 4 protocols indicated that building-level and LEA leaders, special education teachers, and general education teachers engaged in the process collaboratively, participated in the meetings, contributed to decisions, and shared leadership roles.

Survey results, meeting notes, and action plans again highlighted qualitative responses indicating increased collaboration among learning site personnel using key phrases such as: equipped, cooperation, shared, collaboration, team meeting, planning, ongoing, conversation, resources, teaming, relationships, flexibility, decisions, support, ready and consultation.

Longitudinal analyses across 4 years of implementation indicated that sites which experience higher rates of impact & greatest change in risk status documented participation/attendance of at least one administrator, one special education teacher, and one general education teacher at each data-decision meeting.

Conclusion: SSIP learning sites were able to facilitate shared leadership toward enhanced collaboration and implementation of EBPs.

Question 10

Which Coherent Improvement Strategy yielded the most positive results for students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?

Multiple forms of outcome and progress data continue to be collected and reviewed to determine the success and sophistication of SSIP implementation.

MTSS Behavior: *Check & Connect* continues as the most widely implemented and most effective Coherent Improvement Strategy with students identified as off-track for graduation. Strategy implementation across sites in the 2018-19 school year mirrored Years 1-3. Table C.11 shows strategy implementation by SSIP learning site.

Table C.20 SSIP Learning Sites – Coherent Improvement Strategies							
SSIP Learning Site	EWS	MTSS Academic	MTSS Behavior	Attendance Alternative Programming	Culturally Responsive Instruction	Family Engagement	Secondary Transition
1	X		X	X	*	X	X
2	X	X		X	*	X	
3	X			X	*	X	X
4	X	X	X		*	X	
5	X	X			*	X	X
6	X	X	X	X	*	X	
7	X		X	X	*	X	
8	X	X		X	*	X	X
9	X	X	X	X	*	X	
10	X	X	X		*	X	
11	X			X	*	X	
12	X	X	X	X	*	X	

Culturally Responsive Instructional Strategies

Culturally Responsive Instructional Strategies were the focus of professional development and implementation protocols this year. SSIP learning sites were supported in implementing Culturally Responsive Instructional strategies through the MTSS Behavior and SSIP initiatives. Training materials, resources, and fidelity measures are available to all LEAs.

For schools to be culturally responsive in their programming and instruction so that optimal achievement might occur for all students, it is important to assess existing practices. In Year 5, the tool, *Equity in Special Education Placement: A School Self-Assessment Guide for Culturally Responsive Practice* will be administered. This instrument will provide an assessment of equitable practice, and guidelines and tools will be available to assist schools that may be falling short in certain areas.

The sessions below on using an Early Warning System and Increasing Graduation Rates and Post- Secondary Outcomes were included in the MTSS 9th Grade Academy Series. The sessions provided participants an opportunity to discuss the research and benefits of using an Early Warning System and to share tools and resources that were effective with the SSIP learning sites that can be implemented in other settings.

October 2, 2019 MTSS 9th Grade Academy Series	
Session Title	Presenters
Early Warning Systems (EWS)	Dr. Robert Balfanz, Johns Hopkins University
Increasing Graduation Rates and Post-Secondary Outcomes	SSIP PaTTAN Consultants

A publication developed by and for students, CAPS: Are you on-track to graduate? Check your A-B-C's!, and a publication developed by and for families, CAPS: How can families support students to Graduate? Check the A-B-C's!, have been utilized in multiple ways at the SSIP learning sites and HUNE. For example, the publications are shared during IEP meetings with students and families, some sites have distributed the student publication in the orientation packet for incoming students and the family publication during family/parent conferences, and all of the sites have made the publications into posters. The posters are placed in prominent areas or in the counselor or main office where meetings are held when consulting with students and families.

Conclusion: The EWS has demonstrated its effectiveness in identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation. Permitting learning sites to select the Coherent Improvement Strategies that would best meet their needs resulted in eight different combinations of these strategies, confounding the ability to compare the effectiveness of any one of them in isolation.

Question 11

Did HUNE (CPRC) develop materials and resources to be shared with LEAs, families and community organizations?

Appendix 2 lists the publications developed by HUNE and shared with LEAs, families, students, and community organizations. All publications are available in Spanish.

HUNE developed a students' voice video in the 2017-2018 school year to capture the voices of HUNE staff, families, and students. The students with disabilities who participated were identified as off-track by graduation using the NDPC-SD EWS and the metrics from the PDE Dashboard. The video is closed-captioned and it is available here.

Conclusion: HUNE developed materials and resources that are shared with LEAs, families, and community organizations.

c. How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies

Implementation progressed as planned and no changes to the model, framework, or Coherent Improvement Strategies were needed during the 2018-19 school year.

- All SSIP learning sites are successfully implementing the EWS, collecting and analyzing ABC data, convening leadership team meetings, and implementing selected Coherent Improvement Strategies.

- Stakeholder input was extremely beneficial in enhancing family engagement components of the model during Phase III. Their input was also valuable in the design and review of SSIP publications for LEAs, families, and students.

- It is important to note that although the structure/population of learning site 9 changed because of multi-school consolidation, all components of SSIP model implementation and improvement strategy application stayed the same.

d.	How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation

Individual student level data were analyzed for Groups 1, 2, and 3 to better understand changes and trends. Data tracking variations in student risk status and graduation status throughout model implementation helps to determine differential impact of the EWS and applied Coherent Improvement Strategies. Analyzing longitudinal data has assisted schools and informed our next steps in SSIP implementation in the following areas:

- Track students whose risk status changes over time as a student may be on track at the beginning of the year, but that status can change as risk factors fluctuate.

- Capture unique differences in student risk factors over time. For example, a student may be failing a mathematics due to incomplete assignments as a result of poor attendance. Another student may also fail mathematics, have good attendance but have difficulty mastering the content and completing assignments.

- Determine direct relationships between the amount, duration, and intensity of model components, student response to interventions, student ABC trends, and graduation outcome. After students have been identified and an intervention is being implemented, it is imperative to have regular data team meetings to monitor student progress and follow up as needed with individual students who are not progressing. A root cause analysis is then conducted to determine the lack of student progression (e.g., student is frequently absent, lack of fidelity of implementation, having ample resources, etc.).

Stakeholder input to this process is invaluable and will continue to evolve, focusing attention to refining improvement strategies related to family engagement and culturally responsive practices. The SSIP team is also collaborating with external partners at NCSI for innovative ways to communicate data to stakeholders with utility, transparency, and accessibility. The unknown impact of COVID-19 makes planning next steps uncertain.

e.	How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path

Sections A, B, C, and E of this report demonstrate that the activities proposed in Phases I, II, and III were completed and the short-term intended outputs have been accomplished. Supports, resources, materials, and TA continue to evolve based on SSIP learning sites successes and hurdles and stakeholder input to the implementation process.

3. Data on Implementation and Outcomes: Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation.

a. How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

As indicated in sections B.2.a and B.2.b, the SEAP serves as the state's primary stakeholder group for advising on the SSIP, including the ongoing SSIP evaluation. The SSIP Core Team meets regularly with SEAP to provide updates on this Indicator and to obtain input for suggestions for improvement. For specific examples of how stakeholders have been informed and actively participated in all aspects of the SSIP, including the SSIP evaluation, please refer to the above-mentioned sections. Important for Year 4, stakeholder input was gathered from SEAP in obtaining their recommendation for the target for this Indicator for FFY 2019.

b. How the stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

In addition to SEAP's essential advisory role with the SSIP, stakeholders in the learning sites, including families, youth, and local practitioners, are involved in front line and ongoing local program activities. The SSIP must impact these stakeholders' beliefs and behaviors to influence outcomes in sustainable ways.

This section describes some of the ways in which these stakeholders play active roles in evaluation. Please refer to sections B.2.a, B.2.b, and C.3.a for additional information regarding how stakeholders have had a voice and have been involved in decision-making regarding the SSIP.

The following are examples of specific strategies used to engage stakeholders throughout the project:

- Collaborating with the learning sites as they complete the SSIP surveys and protocols. The PaTTAN SSIP consultants facilitate the meetings with each Local Leadership Team.

- Students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation helped with the content to create a student voice publication, which highlighted strategies that they believed, had the most positive impact. The title of the publication is *Are You On-Track for Graduation? Check your A-B-C's*.

- Involving students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation in a video to capture students' voices as to what is working for them in school.

- Collaborating with families in development of the ABC Strategies for Families publication. Multiple family teams helped with the design and drafts. SEAP also had the opportunity to provide feedback at their monthly meetings, as well as in writing.

- Using the SSIP statewide presentations, publications, resources, and webpage to keep stakeholders informed of the implementation of the SSIP, EBPs, and the SSIP evaluation process.

Using engagement as a strategy (*Leading by Convening*). BSE continues to analyze the way BSE is communicating with stakeholders in order to plan how to improve the communication from one-way to two-way communication, and from informing to networking to collaborating.

Three publications (*i.e., Strategies for Families; School Attendance: Strategies for Schools, Families, and Youth;* and *How Can Families Support Students to Graduate? Check Your ABCs)* were designed to provide families with strategies they could use at home to support the attendance, behavior, and course performance of their students. The publications are distributed at all national, state, and local meetings and are available online at the SSIP webpage.

Pennsylvania continues its partnership with NCSI to build connections with stakeholders and foster authentic engagement through *Leading by Convening*.

Pennsylvania continues the stakeholder engagement from previous years in communicating evaluation results and actively participating with stakeholders. Work is guided by the stakeholder-developed rubric developed through NCSI as a *Leading by Convening* approach to the SSIP. The operational decisions are leadership behaviors that challenge participants to deeply engage.

D. Data Quality Issues

1. **Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR due to quality of the evaluation data.**

    a. Concerns or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results

    There are presently no major concerns or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results. As the SSIP Core Team analyzed FFY 2018 data, the primary data related factor identified in FFY 2017 (the consolidation of one learning site with other high schools in the LEA) was once again reviewed, and impacted baseline and the target for FFY 2019.

    b. Implications for assessing progress or results

    Graduation data are lagged to align with federal SPP/APR reporting requirements. SSIP student level interventions began in spring 2016, and the groups reported in this document are composed of students in grades 9-12 that cross cohorts. Therefore, the impact on the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for most learning sites will not be seen until the 2019-20 graduation data are reported. The consolidation of one learning site with two other high schools within its LEA will have an undefined effect on the impact for that site.

    c. Plans for improving data quality

    Pennsylvania will continue evaluating each part of the SSIP, as described in Phase II, Component 3, and will make adjustments as warranted to improve data quality.

<div style="background-color:#2e74b5; color:white; text-align:center; padding:10px;">

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvement

</div>

Data on implementation and outcomes appear in Section C of this report. Additional information regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements is reported in this section.

1. Assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements

a. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up

PDE continues to implement the following changes to the state infrastructure to better support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up:

- alignment of the PDE Educator EWS Initiative and Pennsylvania's Part B SSIP;

- alignment of SPP/APR Indicators 1 (graduation rates), 2 (dropout rates), and 17 (SSIP) through compliance monitoring and SSIP Action Plans; and

- alignment of SPDG and SSIP to offer middle and high school educators and administrators intensive, ongoing professional development and coaching to increase the likelihood that every student graduates from high school college and career ready. The alignment with the SPDG supports the scale-up of the SSIP activities beyond the initial 12 learning sites.

b. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effect

EBPs continue to be implemented with fidelity and are having the desired effect. It is important to note that although the population and structure of learning site 9 changed due to multi-school consolidation, SSIP model implementation did not change. All aspects of the EWS, coherent Improvement Strategies, teaming, and data decision making continued as designed

Data indicate that all 12 SSIP learning sites are implementing the EWS, Family Engagement Strategy, and data meeting protocol with a high level of fidelity. All sites are using fidelity protocols to measure their implementation of additional strategies. Results range from 85%-100%, all meeting threshold standards for reliability. For sites not reaching 100%, fidelity action plans, data meeting notes, and site reports note improvement in procedures. For these sites, changes in personnel/staff/leadership impacted implementation fidelity.

Following is a summary of the implementation of each Coherent Improvement Strategy. Fidelity of implementation was measured for the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies at each SSIP learning site to identify not only the level of sophistication of implementation, but also to identify areas of need. The complete list of fidelity measures is found in Table 3.4 of the Phase II report (pages 36-37).

Early Warning System

All SSIP learning sites continue to execute the five steps of the EWS with fidelity. Evidence validating implementation was documented in previous reports. The process was as follows:

- Learning Sites developed SSIP action plans using the Implementation Framework.

- Teams used EWSs to identify students with disabilities off-track for graduation.

- For fidelity of implementation, learning sites used the (EWIMS) tool with the PaTTAN consultant assigned to them.

- Teams examined evidence for each of the steps of the instrument and determined whether this was evidence of implementation with fidelity.

- Results from all learning sites were reviewed and analyzed by the SSIP external evaluator for validation.

- In addition, implementation with fidelity of the EWS strategy was monitored using the action plans, which include tasks to be completed, Family Engagement for the EBPs, person(s) responsible, timelines for implementation, resources needed to support the intervention, and date(s) to be completed.

MTSS Academic

- Fidelity of MTSS implementation for Academic is being measured using state-approved scoring guidelines for *Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTII) Implementation for Students with Learning Disabilities Determination*. These guidelines require that school-based teams provide adequate evidence that a multi-tiered system of intervention and progress monitoring aligned to research-based data decision-making practices has been implemented to identify students at-risk for academic failure.

- Fidelity measurement tools for other academic indicators are based on which program was implemented (e.g., *LANGUAGE Live*! and *TransMath*).

MTSS Behavior

- Fidelity of MTSS implementation for Behavior is being measured using the *Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ)*. This tool is used to assess the implementation of *Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support*. Local Leadership Teams consider whether elements of the model are in place, not in place, extent of action planning, implementation strengths, and what areas of implementation need improvement.

- Fidelity measurement tools for *Check & Connect* and other behavioral indicators varied depending on which strategy was implemented (see Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission, Table 3.4) (pages 36-37).

Attendance Strategies and Alternative Programming

- Attendance strategies are being measured using the EWS and the *Check and Connect* fidelity measures.

- The *Governor's Prevention Partnership Tool* (Connecticut) continues to be available to identify and analyze current practices, assess needs, and plan for enhanced implementation of effective school attendance, engagement, and achievement programming (see Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission, Table 3.4) (pages 36-37).

Cultural Responsiveness

- The *School Culture and Climate Survey* (Mid-Atlantic Equity Center) is available to identify and analyze current practices, assess needs, and plan for enhanced implementation (see Pennsylvania's SSIP Phase II submission, Table 3.4) (pages 36-37).

- PaTTAN-developed surveys, measuring teacher, student, and family responses to school culture and climate, are available for use when determining fidelity of implementation.

Family Engagement

- Data indicate that facilitators at all SSIP learning sites distributed, reviewed, and explained family engagement strategies with Local Leadership Teams, LEA family resource personnel, and stakeholder groups.

- SSIP PaTTAN consultant records also show that Family Engagement Survey results were reviewed with and explained to all learning site partners.

- All SSIP learning sites embedded the Family Engagement EBP within each Coherent Improvement Strategy selected for their students off-track for graduation.

Secondary Transition

- PaTTAN's *Self-Assessment of Current Transition Practices Elements of Effective Transition Practices* is available to assess the fidelity of this strategy.

c. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR

SSIP Goals and Related Measurable Performance Objectives

Progress continues as planned toward the long-term goals and related short-term objectives identified in Phase II for achieving the SiMR.

The goals and related measurable performance objectives in Table E.1 were identified as part of the design of the evaluation. Specifically, these goals and measurable performance objectives assist in determining both efforts and effects of implementation.

The positive short-term outcomes from SSIP learning sites have motivated other schools and LEAs and validated the importance of using evidence-based data tools and strategies when working with students with disabilities off-track for graduation. Therefore, the SSIP learning sites and other LEAs are inclined to utilize the SSIP Implementation Framework, data tools, and resources.

The lessons learned throughout this process continue to help in the scaling up efforts in trainings, presentations, and resource development.

Increased interest in using the SSIP protocol to improve graduation rates is evidenced by the number of LEAs that have expressed a desire for TA and support.

Table E.1 Goals, Objectives and Achievements		
Early Warning System (EWS)		
Goal	*Objectives*	*Achievements*
Goal 1.0: An EWS will be used by each learning site to identify students with disabilities with the risk factors that impact the likelihood of school completion.	Objective 1.1: Using an EWS, each learning site team will collect, review, and interpret student data in order to assign interventions from the Coherent Improvement Strategies and monitor student progress. Objective 1.2: Using an EWS, the percentage of students with disabilities identified as being off-track will decrease as a result of implementing the selected Coherent Improvement Strategies. Objective 1.3: Using an EWS, the number of early warning indicators per student with disabilities identified as being off-track will be reduced. Objective 1.4: Using an EWS, the percentage of students with disabilities with improved risk status will increase.	• All SSIP learning sites are implementing the EWS and systematically collecting and monitoring student ABC data. • All SSIP learning sites have established Local Leadership Teams that convene data-based decision-making meetings to review EWS and ABC data, select which research-based Coherent Improvement Strategies are likely to reduce student risk, and plan for implementation and progress monitoring to keep students on track for graduation. • All SSIP learning sites have been trained in faithful implementation of the seven Coherent Improvement Strategies and retrained/refreshed as needed. • All SSIP learning sites have successfully implemented and used EWSs and at least two additional EBPs to improve ABCs. • All SSIP learning sites have embedded family engagement within each Coherent Improvement Strategy selected.

Table E.1 Goals, Objectives and Achievements (Cont'd)		
Implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies with Fidelity		
Goal	*Objectives*	*Achievements*
Goal 2.0: Learning sites will use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies (Implementation Science, NIRN).	Objective 2.1: By the end of the first year of implementation (FFY 2015) for each improvement strategy, 50% of the evidence-based professional development domains (i.e., selection, training, coaching, performance assessment, and facilitative administrative support/systems intervention) will score either a 3 or 4 using the *SPDG Evidence- Based Professional Development Components Rubric*. Objective 2.2: By the end of the second year of implementation (FFY 2016) for each improvement strategy, 75% of the evidence-based professional development domains (i.e., selection, training, coaching, performance assessment, and facilitative administrative support/systems intervention) will score either a 3 or 4 using the *SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric*. Objective 2.3: By the end of the second year of implementation (FFY 2016) for each improvement strategy, 90% of those individuals executing the coherent improvement strategy operations guidelines will score at least an 80% on its fidelity of implementation measurement tool.	• SSIP learning sites continue to use EBPs to support the attainment of identified competencies. • SSIP learning sites continue to engage in internal and external professional development in Implementation Science, NIRN, and the Coherent Improvement Strategies. • SSIP learning sites have been trained in faithful implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies. In FFY 2016, 92% of the evidence-based professional development domains (i.e., selection, training, coaching, performance assessment, and facilitative administrative support/systems intervention) scored either a 3 or 4 using the *SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric*. • Using the fidelity measures from the Phase II report, Table 3.4, *Fidelity of Implementation* (pages 36-37), it has been determined that all SSIP learning sites have engaged in evidence-based professional development to implement the Coherent Improvement Strategies with 100% fidelity. • All learning sites review and respond to fidelity data related to model implementation, strategy use/intervention delivery, and decision- making to impact student graduation trajectories.

Table E.1 Goals, Objectives and Achievements (Cont'd)		
High Quality Professional Development		
Goal	*Objective*	*Achievements*
Goal 3.0: Professional development will be of high quality and use adult learning principles.	Objective 3.1: By the end of the first full year of implementation, 80% of the professional development will be rated by participants as being of high quality and using adult learning principles.	• Ongoing coaching and support to teachers in providing the Coherent Improvement Strategies to their students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation. • SSIP PaTTAN consultants provide on-site coaching, facilitation, guidance, and resources to teachers and Local Leadership Teams at all learning sites. Over time, PaTTAN consultants have been decreasing their support in order to build capacity at the school level and move toward sustainability. • Teacher survey data indicated that 100% of respondents at all SSIP learning sites highly valued consultant support and found on-site coaching as well as learning strategy materials to be of greatest value for implementation. • All SSIP professional development opportunities are aligned with adult learning principles and effective instructional methodologies that promote concept attainment and concept mastery.

Table E.1		
Goals, Objectives and Achievements (Cont'd)		
Coaching		
Goal	*Objective*	*Achievement*
<u>Goal 4.0</u>: Coaches (SSIP PaTTAN consultants) will support teachers in providing the Coherent Improvement Strategies to their students with disabilities identified as being off-track.	<u>Objective 4.1</u>: Coaches and teachers will implement the Coherent Improvement Strategies with fidelity, as measured by the appropriate instrument for each strategy listed in Phase III, Table 3.4 report (pages 36-37).	• Local Leadership Team materials indicate that building administrators as well as LEA direct services personnel participated in model implementation, action planning, data-based decision-making, and professional development opportunities at all learning sites.
System and Administration		
Goal	*Objectives*	*Achievements*
<u>Goal 5.0</u>: LEA and school level administrators will become knowledgeable and proficient in the use of the EWS.	<u>Objective 5.1</u>: An increased number of State, LEA, and school level administrators involved in the SSIP will self-report knowing how to use the EWS. <u>Objective 5.2</u>: An increased number of school level administrators will self-report being proficient in using the EWS. <u>Objective 5.3</u>: State, LEA, and school level administrators will self-report improved collaboration among stakeholders.	• Fidelity surveys indicated that both LEA and school level administrators were involved in EWS implementation at all SSIP learning sites. • All fidelity surveys indicated that both LEA and school level administrators participated in the EWS implementation review process at all SSIP learning sites. • All fidelity surveys indicated that both LEA and school level administrators were engaged in EWS teaming at all SSIP learning sites. • Longitudinal analysis showed that sites with the highest change rates and decreases in the number of students identified as off track for graduation were those where an administrator attended/participated in leadership and data team meetings.

Table E.1 Goals, Objectives and Achievements (Cont'd)		
Family Engagement		
Goal	*Objective*	*Achievements*
Goal 6.0: Family involvement in the education of their children with disabilities will increase.	Objective 6.1: Learning sites will implement the Coherent Improvement Strategy for family engagement with fidelity, as measured by the *Enhancing Family Engagement Needs Assessment.*	• SSIP learning sites continue implementing the Coherent Improvement Strategy for family engagement with fidelity. • See Family Engagement E.1.b. • Sustainability assessments report that while strategies for family engagement are implemented with reliability, this strategy is the most challenging for learning sites to address and evaluate.

d.   Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See Section C.2.b.

F. Plans for Next Year

The BSE will continue implementing the SSIP as designed in Phases I, II, and III. Because of the positive results achieved, all SSIP learning sites agreed to extend their participation beyond their four-year commitment that spanned FFY 2015 through FFY 2018. SSIP PaTTAN consultants are continuing to support the implementation of the SSIP in the learning sites in FFY 2019. A sustainability plan was designed and is currently being implemented with each SSIP learning site to support the efforts after the on-site TA is no longer needed.

In addition to collecting data in the fall, winter, and spring, we now track data of students participating in Extended School (ESY) programs graduating in August, and students delaying graduation until August in order to complete the required credits.

1. Additional activities to be implemented in FFY 2019 include:

- continue using the SSIP Implementation Frameworks/Action Plans to guide implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies in the SSIP learning sites;

- continue supporting students off-track for graduation in Groups 1, 2, and 3;

- continue working with stakeholders to improve two-way communication;

- continue embedding and refining the Family Engagement EBP within each Coherent Improvement Strategy selected for students with disabilities off-track for graduation;

- continue supporting the alignment of the SSIP with the SPDG and ESSA;

- continue the partnership with HUNE to support building capacity in agencies and families;

- continue to communicate on an ongoing basis with OSEP, NTACT, IDC, and NCSI staff, as well as the SSIP external evaluator, to plan and monitor next steps in SSIP implementation;

- continue distributing statewide printed and digital publications and SSIP training materials; and

- revise, if needed, sustainability and scale-up plans with the SSIP learning sites.

Activities for Sustaining and Scaling-Up Statewide, 2019-20 and Beyond

SSIP Learning Sites

- Continue ongoing support to learning sites and data collections of students with disabilities off-track for graduation;
- collect data for Groups 1-2-3 in January, June, and August 2020;
- support implementation of Sustainability Plans;
- conduct Data Team Meeting Protocol fidelity measures in February 2020;
- survey learning sites to learn more about graduation audits during the school year to make sure all students who are supposed to graduate complete the school year successfully, and
- share results with stakeholders.

National Partners

- Continue collaboration with the following national partners: NCSI, NTACT, and IDC;
- present on SSIP at the Council for Exceptional Children national conference in February 2020; and
- present at all PDE sponsored state conferences (PDE/Special Education, PA PBS, Special Education Leadership, Secondary Transition, and Autism); and
- partner with P2G and other state initiatives on the presentation.

BSE Cyclical Monitoring

- Continue providing TA to LEAs needing improvement plans for Indicators 1 and 2.

Check & Connect

- Provide Check & Connect Training for sites that have requested it;
- create new cohort of Check & Connect trainers with consultants from multiple PaTTAN initiatives;
- support IUs/Schools in School Improvement as needed; and
- participate in online support from the University of Minnesota for PaTTAN consultants as they continue to train LEAs statewide. This support focuses on fidelity of implementation.

Ongoing Projects/Updates

- The 9th Grade Academies were established to create smaller communities and ease the transition from middle to high school. SSIP consultants collaborated with the MTSS Academic initiative consultants to coordinate activities.

  - National experts provided training to LEAs on utilizing an early warning system to identify students on- or off-track for graduation; and

  - PaTTAN consultants introduced evidence-based practices and coherent improvement strategies based upon the Theory of Action developed for this SSIP.

- Investigating Equity Self-Assessment Tool for SSIP learning sites – Culturally Responsive Coherent Improvement Strategy.

2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes

BSE will continue implementing the planned evaluation activities described in Phase II, Component 3.

3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers

BSE has not identified barriers to be addressed at this time, and will continue implementing the planned evaluation activities described in Phase II, Component 3.

4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Pennsylvania will continue collaborating with the national TA providers, particularly NCSI, NTACT, and IDC, to apply research and utilize EBPs to improve results for students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation. Ongoing communication with OSEP's state lead and other OSEP experts is key to the SSIP implementation.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">

APPENDICES

1.1 SSIP Presentations and Participation at Conferences

1.2 National Conferences and State Meetings

1.3 SEAP and Stakeholders Input Sessions

2.0 Statewide Building Capacity - SSIP Publications and Resources

2.1 Pennsylvania SSIP Theory of Action

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">

APPENDIX 1.1
SSIP Presentations and Participation at Conferences

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">

For a comprehensive list of SSIP Presentations and Participation at Conferences prior to April 1, 2019, please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report, Appendix 1.1.

</td></tr>
<tr><th align="center">Dates</th><th align="center">State Conference</th><th align="center">Presenters</th></tr>
<tr><td>April 6, 2019</td><td>The 2nd Annual PA Leadership Studies Conference: Are You Managing or Engaging Stakeholders? A Blueprint for Authentic Stakeholder Engagement</td><td>PaTTAN SSIP consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>May 14-15, 2019</td><td>Pennsylvania PBS Implementers Forum: SSIP Presentation</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>May 14-15, 2019</td><td>Pennsylvania PBS Implementers Forum: Check and Connect Presentation</td><td>SSIP Learning site team</td></tr>
<tr><td>June 10, 2019</td><td>Central Region TaC Supervisors Meeting, PaTTAN Harrisburg: Graduate Outcomes: Updates on SSIP and P2G</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>July 22-25, 2019</td><td>Special Education Leadership Academy</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultants</td></tr>
<tr><td>July 17-19, 2019</td><td>Secondary Transition Conference</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultants</td></tr>
<tr><td>August 5-8, 2019</td><td>Autism Conference</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>September 9, 2019</td><td>Central Region TaC Supervisors Meeting, PaTTAN Harrisburg: Graduate Outcomes: Updates on SSIP and P2G</td><td>SSIP PaTTAN consultant</td></tr>
</table>

Dates	State Conference	Presenters
October 2, 2019	Early Warning Systems (EWS)	Dr. Robert Balfanz, Johns Hopkin University
October 2, 2019	Increasing Graduation Rates and Post-Secondary Outcomes	SSIP PaTTAN consultant
November 6, 2019	Tri-State Council / University of Pittsburgh: Secondary Transition, Career Readiness, and P2G, and Increasing Graduation Rates	SSIP PaTTAN consultant and PaTTAN Secondary Transition/P2G consultant
November 15, 2019	Attendance/Child Accounting Professional Association Conference, Hershey, PA: How to Plan to Increase Graduation Rates in Pennsylvania	SSIP PaTTAN consultants
November 26, 2019	Special Education Advisory Council for Lincoln Intermediate Unit, New Oxford, PA: How to Plan to Increase Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities	SSIP PaTTAN consultant
January 13, 2020	Central Region TaC Supervisors Meeting, PaTTAN Harrisburg: Question and Answer Session on SSIP and P2G	SSIP PaTTAN consultant

APPENDIX 1.2
Presentations at National Conferences and State Meetings

For a comprehensive list of SSIP Presentations at National Conferences and State Meetings <u>prior to April 1, 2019,</u> please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report, Appendix 1.2.

Dates	National Conferences or State Meeting	Presenters
June 5-6, 2019	NCSI – 2019 Spring Leads Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota Presentations: • PA SSIP Phase III, Year 3 Update • PA Check & Connect Implementation • PA Stakeholders – Leading by Convening Framework	SSIP Coordinator, PaTTAN consultant
July 26, 2019	OSEP Leadership Conference: State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs): Look How Far We've Come	Gregg Corr, Leslie Fox, Alecia Walters
August 19, 2019	SSIP Core Team SSIP meeting with new BSE State Director and Assistant Director	SSIP Core Team
September 12, 2019	PA-B: DMS/SSIP Call, DMS Notice 2019-2020 and SSIP 2019 Review	OSEP Staff, SSIP Core Team
October 10, 2019	SSIP Evaluation meeting with NTACT and Independent Evaluator, Charlotte, NC	Dr. Matt Klare, Dr. Loujeania Bost, Dr. Amanda Kloo, SSIP Core team
December 9-11, 2019	NCSI National Convening on Systems Transformation	IDEA Part B State Director, Assistant Bureau Director, SPP/APR Lead, SPDG Lead
February 5-8, 2020	CEC Conference 2020, Portland, OR: Developing a Plan to Increase Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities	PaTTAN consultant
February 10, 2020	NCSI SSIP Writing Open Door call	SPP/APR State Lead, Part B Data Manager, SSIP Lead, Research and Evaluation Consultant
February 19, 2020	NCSI SSIP Writing Open Door call	IDEA Part B State Director, SPP/APR State Lead, Part B Data Manager, Research and Evaluation Consultant
March 5, 2019	PA-B: 2019-20 SSIP Review Prior to Submission	IDEA Part B State Director, OSEP Staff, SSIP Core Team

APPENDIX 1.3 SEAP and Stakeholder Input Sessions		
For a comprehensive list of SEAP and Stakeholder Input Sessions <u>prior to April 1, 2019</u> please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report, Appendix 1.3.		
Dates	**National Conferences or State Meeting**	**Presenters**
April 17, 2019	SEAP: Part B School Age APP/SPP/SSIP	SSIP Core Team
May 1, 2019	SEAP: SPP/APR/SSIP presentations. Dropout Risk Factors research and resources developed in English and Spanish as part of the SSIP Initiative to support families and community agencies.	SSIP Core Team
September 26, 2019	SEAP: Part B School Age APP/SPP/SSIP, Feedback from OSEP for indicators 1-17.	SSIP Core Team
December 4, 2019	SSIP and PDE Collaboration, Harrisburg, PA: PDE Collaboration: Increasing Graduation Rates	PaTTAN consultant
March 17, 2020	SEAP: Stakeholder input for target setting	SPP/APR State Lead, SSIP Lead, Research and Evaluation Consultant

APPENDIX 2.0
Statewide Building Capacity - SSIP Publications and Resources

SSIP publications, resources, and training materials are found at www.pattan.net, Graduation/Post-Secondary Outcomes, State Systemic Improvement Plan. Training materials are closed captioned, transcribed, and some resources include voice-over narratives.

NCSI highlighted Pennsylvania's SSIP in its newsletter article, *Data Use Multi-State Spotlight: Using Data MTSS Data to Improve Graduation Rates, August 2018.*

PDE highlighted the SSIP in the *Special Education in Pennsylvania: A Focus On Data-Driven Programs and Services, 2017-2018* publication.

SSIP Resources / Publications for Families and Community Agencies

- CAPS Strategies for Families
- CAPS School Attendance: Strategies for Schools, Families, and Youth
- Are you On-Track to Graduate? Check your A-B-C's!
- How can families support students to graduate? Check the A-B-Cs!
- HUNE: After-School Program
- HUNE: Community-Based Engagement
- HUNE: Culturally Responsive Practices

- HUNE: Family Engagement
- HUNE: Summer Youth Program
- HUNE: Alignment of HUNE Youth Programs to PA Core Standards
- HUNE: Increasing Graduation Rates
- HUNE: Early Warning Systems (EWS) to Increase Graduation Rates of Students with Disabilities
- HUNE: Early Intervention
- HUNE: Students' Voices

Recursos en Español

- CAPS: Estrategias para las familias
- CAPS: La asistencia escolar, Estrategias para las escuelas, las familias y los jóvenes
- ¿Estás en camino a graduarte? ¡Marca las Casillas del A-B-C!
- ¿Cómo pueden las familias apoyar a los estudiantes para que se gradúen? ¡Marque las Casillas del A-B-C!
- HUNE: Programa juvenile extracurricular
- HUNE: Programa juvenile de verano
- HUNE: Participación en la comunidad
- HUNE: Participación de la familia
- HUNE: Prácticas culturalmente sensibles

- HUNE: Alineación de los programas juveniles de HUNE a los estándares fundamentales de Pennsylvania
- HUNE: ¿Cómo aumentar los índices de graduación de los estudiantes que tienen discapacidades?
- HUNE: Cómo usar un Sistema de alerta temprana (EWS, por sus siglas en inglés) para aumentar los índices de graduación de los estudiantes con discapacidades
- HUNE: Intervención temprana: El papel que juegan las familias en apoyar el desarrollo del lenguaje oral
- HUNE: Escuchando las voces de los estudiantes: Voces de la juventud de HUNE

PaTTANpod

- PaTTANpod, *The ABCs of Increasing Graduation Rates*.

SSIP Data Tools to Increase Graduation Rates

The following data tools are available at no cost on the PaTTAN website.
1. Early Warning System Data Analysis Team Meeting Protocol
2. Early Warning System Data Analysis Protocol for Individual Students
3. SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plan
4. PDE Dashboard Early Warning System Metrics

In addition to the publications, posters of the following publications were designed and distributed in English and Spanish to the SSIP learning sites, PDE, PaTTAN, and HUNE:
1. Are you On-Track to Graduate? Check your A-B-C's!
2. ¿Estás en camino a graduarte? ¡Marca las Casillas del A-B-C!
3. How can families support students to graduate? Check the A-B-Cs!
4. ¿Cómo pueden las familias apoyar a los estudiantes para que se gradúen? ¡Marque las Casillas del A-B-C!

Appendix 2.1
Pennsylvania SSIP Theory of Action

Pennsylvania State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action

Vision: All students with disabilities will be academically, behaviorally, and socially-emotionally engaged in order to stay in school, graduate, and become contributing members of society.

Strands of Action	If PDE	Then	Then	Then
Leadership	Communicates its vision effectively and provides guidance and general supervision in a timely and responsive manner.	LEAs will have the information, support, and resources necessary to align their efforts to PDE's vision. LEAs will have uniformly high expectations for all students with disabilities.	*Local Educational Agencies in Pennsylvania will:* 1. Utilize data systems to identify, inform, monitor and increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities. *Early Warning System Data Tools. Diagnostic intervention.* 2. Implement increasingly intensive evidenced-based methodologies toward improved academic outcomes. *Schoolwide and targeted interventions.* *MTSS academic support, culturally responsive instruction. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.*	Pennsylvania will increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities.
Collaboration	Partners with LEAs, federally funded TA providers, PTIs/CPRCs and other state and local agencies that serve students with disabilities and their families.	PDE will leverage resources to improve services for students with disabilities.	3. Implement increasingly intensive evidenced-based methodologies toward improved social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes. *MTSS behavior support and social skills, school climate, assignment of adult advocates, culturally responsive practices, behavioral health, mentors, Check and Connect. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.* 4. Promote the implementation of attendance strategies and alternative programming that will increase the likelihood of graduation. *Credit recovery, after school/night school, online learning, school re-entry. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.*	Pennsylvania will reduce the number of students with risk factors that impact the likelihood of school completion.
Technical Assistance	Promotes professional learning opportunities to effectively prepare and empower stakeholders to support students with disabilities.	LEAs will facilitate shared leadership toward enhanced collaboration and implementation of evidenced-based practices. CRC will develop materials and resources to be shared with other community organizations.	5. Ensure culturally responsive learning environments and instructional practices. *Culturally responsive instructional practices. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.* 6. Embrace a philosophy of partnership that empowers families and communities to become more meaningfully involved. *Family engagement, mentoring, partnering with federally funded centers - PTIs and CPRCs. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.*	
Accountability	Holds LEAs accountable for effectively implementing assessment and evaluation practices to measure outcomes.	LEAs will have systems that lead to improved results for students with disabilities and protect the rights of students and families.	7. Provide rigorous and relevant instruction to better engage students in learning and provide the skills needed to graduate and have positive post school outcomes. *Transition, college prep courses, career and technical training, life skills training, socially related employment skills. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.*	

Evaluation: Data Collection – Data Analysis – Data Interpretation – Reporting