Challenge and Opportunity for the 21st Century:

The New Alabama State Systemic Improvement Plan

ADAPTED WITH PERMISSION FROM A PRESENTATION DEVELOPED BY THE SOUTHEAST REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER

SPRING CASE CONFERENCE  FEBRUARY 2014
State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Indicators

- In December 2005, Alabama submitted its first State Performance Plan (SPP) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). In each succeeding year, we reported results and compliance data in the Annual Performance Report (APR) for each of twenty indicators as specified by OSEP.
Where We’ve Been...

- The emphasis from the Office of Special Education Programs has been upon procedural compliance. For the last several years, Alabama has been determined to:

- Meet the Requirements of the IDEA...

- **BUT....**
As Bob Dylan sang back in 1964: “The times, They Are A-Changin..’”
The current SPP period spanned the years from 2005-2012. With the FFY 2012 APR submission in 2014, OSEP will implement a new process rooted in its Results Driven Accountability Process.
Results-Driven Accountability

A new vision that focuses upon both compliance and results...

With this new vision, comes greater expectations, greater accountability, and greater opportunity for all the students we teach.
Statutory Monitoring Focus (20 USC 616(a)(2))

Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities.
In the past, the focus has been upon ensuring that States and LEAs meet IDEA program procedural requirements.
To facilitate the movement from the focus upon compliance to the focus upon Results-Driven Accountability, OSEP has set forth the blueprint for states to identify an improvement area: The new **Indicator 17** or State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).
Why SSIP? Why Now?
Why SSIP? Why Now?

- For over 30 years, there has been a strong focus on regulatory compliance with the IDEA and Federal regulations for early intervention and special education
  - As a result, compliance has improved, but results have not!

- The current environment is characterized by high levels of accountability for performance of all children and youth
  - There are numerous initiatives that target improved results.
  - Let’s build on these initiatives.
OSEP’s Proposed New SPP/APR:

--Combines the SPP/APR
--Includes a comprehensive, multi-year State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
--Collects SPP/APR data through a web-based, on-line submission process (GRADS)
Indicator # 17 - State Systemic Improvement plan

MEASUREMENT: The State’s SPP/APR includes a comprehensive, multi-year State Systemic Improvement Plan, focused on improving results for students with disabilities, that includes the following components, as further defined below:
State Systemic Improvement plan

Indicator # 17 - State Systemic Improvement plan

**Phase I** (which the State must include with its 2015 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2013):

a. Data Analysis;
b. Identification of the Focus for Improvement;
c. Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity; and
d. Theory of Action.
State Systemic Improvement plan

Indicator # 17 - State Systemic Improvement plan

Phase II (which, in addition to the Phase 1 content outlined above, the State must include with its 2016 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2014):

e. Infrastructure Development;
f. Support for local educational agency Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

g. Evaluation Plan.
State Systemic Improvement plan

Indicator # 17 - State Systemic Improvement plan

Phase III (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content outlined above), must include with its FFY 2015 APR submitted in 2017 the results of its ongoing evaluation of the strategies included in the SSIP, including the extent to which the State has implemented them, the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the established goals, and any revisions the State has made in the SSIP in response to its evaluation.
Remember: We are building a new system.

We’re building a dream also. Our dream is improved results for children and youth with disabilities.

....and we are building it in the air.
Phase I Components

Theory of Action

Data Analysis
• In-depth Analysis Related to Primary Concern Area

Infrastructure Analysis
• In-depth Analysis Related to Primary Concern Area

Focus for Improvement

Data Analysis
• Broad Analysis

Infrastructure Analysis
• Broad Analysis
Partnerships are the Key to Success!
In order to achieve the desired outcomes, the SSIP must be aligned with Alabama’s Plan 2020 including vision, mission, and goals.
Our Vision

Every Child a Graduate—Every Graduate Prepared

for College/Work/Adulthood in the 21st Century.
Our first step is to “vision” the desired outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. This gives us a “north star” for outcomes or desired results and allows you to plan with the “end” in mind.

- What’s your vision related to performance on assessment, secondary transition, and post-school outcomes?

--What are other areas that should be considered?
Identify the Focus Area for Improvement

- The primary concern that we have identified in the previous activities becomes our **focus area for improvement**.

- Within the **focus area**, we will need to identify improvement strategies and define the desired results.

The State must demonstrate how addressing this area of **focus for improvement** will build **LEAs’ capacity to improve** the **identified result for students with disabilities**.

Example:
Improving Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities
Conduct an In-depth Data Analysis

- Collect and analyze qualitative data related to the primary concern:
  - Surveys
  - Interviews
  - Focus groups
  - Other
A theory of action is at its core, a simple IF, THEN statement. It makes the connection between what you are doing and what you expect to happen.

A theory of action focuses on how and why the program will produce the change, using “if-then” statements to generate a logical explanation and reveal strategies and assumptions about how resources and activities are used.
Develop a Theory of Action

Improvement Strategy

If we implement a statewide initiative that focuses on effective instructional practices

Build capacity of LEAs to implement initiative

Then students will improve performance on statewide reading assessment

Includes changes in state system
Create a Logic Model

- Next we will develop a logic model that shows the relationship between the activities and the outcomes that Alabama expects to achieve over a multi-year period.

- A logic model visually depicts a program’s components so that planned activities align with desired outcomes.

- Logic models diagram identified problems, root causes and local conditions that facilitate concise and clear communication, planning and evaluation, and allow programs to critically analyze the progress they are making toward their goals.
Logic model in evaluation

What do you want to know? How will you know it?

EVALUATION: check and verify
Our Legacy, Our Time…
Thanks to the Southeast Regional Resource Center for providing information, resources, and support in development of Alabama’s SSIP Presentation.