

PENNSYLVANIA
Part B

State Systemic Improvement Plan

Phase III, Year 3

April 1, 2019



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
A. Summary of Phase III, Year 3	1
1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR	1
2. The Coherent Improvement Strategies or principal activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.....	1
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.....	4
4. Brief overview of the year’s evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes	6
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.....	10
B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP	12
1. Description of the State’s SSIP implementation progress.....	12
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	12
b. Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.....	17
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation	17
a. How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.....	17
b. How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.....	18
C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes	20
1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan.....	20
a. How evaluation measures align with the theory of action.....	20
b. Data sources for each key measure.....	20
c. Description of baseline data for key measures.....	22
d. Data collection procedures and associated timelines.....	23
e. [If applicable] Sampling procedures.....	23
f. [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons.....	23
g. How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements	23
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary.	23
a. How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR.....	23
b. Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures	24

- c. How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies36
- d. How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation?.....36
- 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?37
- 3. Data on Implementation and Outcomes: Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation.37
 - a. How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP37
 - b. How the stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP37
- D. Data Quality Issues.....39
 - 1. Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR due to quality of the evaluation data.39
 - a. Concerns or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results.....39
 - b. Implications for assessing progress or results39
 - c. Plans for improving data quality.....40
- E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvement.....41
 - 1. Assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements.....41
 - a. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up.....41
 - b. Evidence that SSIP’s evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effect41
 - c. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR.....43
 - d. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets.....49
- F. Plans for Next Year49
 - 1. Additional activities to be implemented in FFY 201849
 - 2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes ...51
 - 3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers.....51
 - 4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance51
- APPENDICES52

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)

<https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/2013B/Indicator17/BaselineAndTargets?state=PA&ispublic=true>

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)

<https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/2014B/Indicator17/HistoricalData?state=PA&ispublic=true>

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)

<https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/2015B/Indicator17/HistoricalData?state=PA&ispublic=true>

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)

<https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/2016B/Indicator17/HistoricalData?state=PA&ispublic=true>

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)

The FFY 2017 SSIP report describes the third year of the SSIP evaluation activities at the State and local level and includes updates through March 2019. Reported are 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 its progress in achieving the SIMR for students with disabilities.

Highlights of the Phase III, Year 3 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;
- Implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies substantially reduced the number of students with disabilities that 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 second year, the *Check & Connect Student Engagement Intervention Model* was the strategy most widely used across SSIP learning sites;
- SSIP learning sites checked the fidelity of implementation of a third Coherent Improvement Strategy. Learning sites used specific instruments that indicated the process and level of implementation, as well as outcomes.
- The National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) highlighted PA's SSIP in its newsletter article, *Data Use Multi-State Spotlight: Using Data MTSS Data to Improve Graduation*, https://ncsi-library.wested.org/system/resources/documents/000/000/231/original/2018-08-08_Multi-State_MTSS_for_Graduation_Outcomes_8-09-18_508.pdf?1534182305
- The 4-year adjusted cohort graduation target for the 12 learning sites was not met for FFY 2017.

A. Summary of Phase III, Year 3

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 the 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 communication tool with stakeholders. The Theory of Action is shared at national, state, and local conferences, trainings, and meetings.

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.

Coherent Improvement Strategies - Update

During Phase III, Year 3 the SSIP learning sites continued to implement the two required Coherent Improvement Strategies: EWS and Family Engagement. In addition, the SSIP learning sites selected a third strategy from the Coherent Improvement Strategies identified in Phase I (see Table A-1) and checked the fidelity of implementation of that strategy. Information about the fidelity of implementation of the third strategy is found in sections A.3 and B.1 of this document. Information about fidelity of implementation of EWS and Family Engagement was reported in Phase III and Phase III, Year 2 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, 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, <i>Check & Connect</i> model	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	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:

Infrastructure Strategy	Updates of Ongoing and Year 3¹ Activities	Next Steps
Alignment to PDE EWS Initiative (Years 1, 2, 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARL and SSIP initiatives continue to collaborate to provide one seamless TA system at two learning sites. • TA is coordinated on an ongoing basis. • Only one training plan is used for both initiatives in participating learning sites. 	The SSIP Core Team is collaborating with the PDE's 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN) consultants attended follow-up monitoring meetings when improvement plans were required for Indicators 1 and 2. • TA was offered to increase graduation rates by using the SSIP Implementation Framework protocol. • A new SSIP presentation was designed to teach LEAs (statewide) how to develop an action plan to increase graduation rates of students with disabilities. 	BSE will continue to refine the 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, and the term "Year 3" refers to Phase III, Year 3 from FFY 2017.

Infrastructure Strategy	Updates of Ongoing and Year 3 Activities (Cont'd)	Next Steps
Alignment to State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) (Year 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPDG 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 will be used by SPDG sites. 	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. 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 (Year 1).
- Local Leadership Teams 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 (Year 1).
- 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 (Years 1, 2, 3).
- Teams analyzed ABC data with a facilitator and identified the students off-track for graduation in their building (Years 1, 2, 3).
- Teams selected Coherent Improvement Strategies to address the needs of their students with disabilities off-track for graduation (Years 1, 2, 3).
- 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.

EBPs Implemented to Date - Update

During Phase III, Year 3, fidelity measures for EWS, Family Engagement, and a third Coherent Improvement Strategy were implemented to ensure adherence to the decision-making process as well as promote utility of strategy implementation.

Phase III, Year 3 data show that fidelity scores continued to be high across implementation sites for EWS measures, embedded Family Engagement Strategies, and data-based decision-making process at team meetings for MTSS Academic and MTSS Behavior interventions.

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

SSIP PaTTAN consultants continue to support the revision of the action plans via face-to-face or virtual meetings, on-site trainings, and guided discussions. A Family Engagement Guidance Document is used to support SSIP learning sites through the revision process.

The fidelity measures below were used by SSIP learning sites to check the fidelity of implementation of a third Coherent Improvement Strategy in Year 3.

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

Alignment of SSIP and SPDG - Update

Pennsylvania's SPDG, *Middle School Success: The Path to Graduation*, or P2G, provides statewide professional development for LEAs to help regional teams identify students off-track for graduation by using EWSs to analyze the same ABC data that SSIP Local Leadership Teams are currently analyzing at the high schools. In addition, teams use data to identify and implement academic and behavioral EBPs aligned to the SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies (i.e., EWS, *Check & Connect*, PBIS, and Family Engagement). SSIP and P2G PaTTAN consultants continue to collaborate on an on-going basis to ensure that lessons learned through the SSIP process are used and implemented as EBPs. The SSIP Implementation Framework/Action Plan was used to design

the P2G action plan to ensure it was evidence-based. During Phase III, Year 3, the consultants assigned to the grant received the following training and technical support:

- Implementation and use of an EWS;
- Coaching in transition planning and the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Indicator 13 Checklist;
- Coaching in *Check & Connect* strategy;
- Coaching in the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM); and
- Professional development in *Leading by Convening*.

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, and measures.

**Table A.2
Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes**

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
<p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP learning sites used an EWS to track and analyze student attendance, behavior, and course performance data (Years 1, 2, 3). • 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). • ABC data were analyzed to determine the influence of the SSIP on graduation trajectory (Years 1, 2, 3).
<p>2. Was the EWS useful in identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building-level data for each of the learning sites were reviewed to determine impact on identification rates and risk factor trends (Years 1, 2, 3). • Teacher surveys were used to gather feedback on EWS implementation. TA on use of EWSs is ongoing with Local Leadership Teams (Years 2, 3).

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
<p>3. Was the Implementation Science identified by NIRN followed by the SSIP learning sites?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of the NIRN drivers selected to effect sustainable impact was evidenced by changes in sites competency, organization, and leadership.
<p>4. Was professional development identified as being of high quality?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on professional development resources, materials, and trainings was collected using teacher surveys (Years 1, 2, 3). • 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).
<p>5. What changes were made to the State, LEA, and school systems as a result of the SSIP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • Increased attention was given to expanding the Family Engagement Strategy based on data analysis, stakeholder input, and other feedback (Years 2, 3).

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
<p>6. To what extent did each Coherent Improvement Strategy impact the number of students with disabilities who are no longer off-track for graduation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
<p>7. Did LEAs have the information, support, and resources necessary to align their efforts to PDE's vision?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP PaTTAN consultants provided 271 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 3). The TA was provided to 279 administrators, 151 specialists, 153 general education teachers, 159 special education teachers, 5 IU Training and Consultation (TaC) staff, 22 licensed professionals, and 36 building staff. • Families and students were also directly trained by SSIP PaTTAN consultants (Year 3). • SSIP information, resources, tools, reports, and presentations are posted and continuously updated on the PaTTAN website for public access (Years 1, 2, 3). • The state's largest professional educational association provided SSIP information and resources to its constituents and stakeholders (Years 1, 2, 3).

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
<p>8. Did PDE leverage resources to improve services for students with disabilities?</p>	<p>The following resources were identified and established to support the work in improving graduation outcomes for students with disabilities (Years 1, 2, 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDE/BSE leadership; • Title I/BSE collaboration; • 11 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.
<p>9. Were LEAs able to facilitate shared leadership toward enhanced collaboration and implementation of EBPs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).

Evaluation Question	Updates: Activities, Measures, and Outcomes
<p>10. Which Coherent Improvement Strategy yielded the most positive results for students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 (Year 3). • Beyond the required EWS and Family Engagement strategies, teams most frequently selected MTSS Academic, MTSS Behavior, and Attendance Strategies and Alternative Programming (Year 3). • ABC data protocol reports indicate that the <i>Check & Connect</i> strategy was the most widely used across sites.
<p>11. Did HUNE (CPRC) develop materials and resources to be shared with LEAs, families, and community organizations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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, https://www.pattan.net/videos/students-voices-hune-youth-program/ (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 were off-track for graduation and implement selected strategies based on student needs.

No changes were made during this reporting year regarding the implementation and improvement strategies. However, in Years 2 and 3, the SSIP was enhanced by working with stakeholders and adopting their recommendation of embedding the Family Engagement strategy into each Coherent Improvement Strategy selected. For additional information, please refer to Section A.3 of this document.

To add to stakeholder input and improve social validity, structured interviews were conducted with 135 students from the 12 learning sites and HUNE to obtain student feedback on implementation. Results showed that 86% of students indicated that the strategies in place to help them graduate were beneficial; 8% thought they might be helpful; and less than 1% reported that the strategies were not helpful. This outcome demonstrated overwhelming student support for their EBPs selected by the learning sites.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State’s SSIP implementation progress

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 3.

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

SSIP Implementation Framework and Action Plans	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 student 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. 	
Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
<p>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.</p>	<p>The SSIP Implementation Framework is available to LEAs in Pennsylvania in need of an evidence-based action plan to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates for students with disabilities.</p> <p>All SSIP learning sites continue to use the SSIP Implementation Framework and Coherent Improvement Strategies with fidelity. Action plans are revised on an ongoing basis based on data.</p> <p>The Family Engagement strategy continues to be fully embedded within each selected Coherent Improvement Strategy at each SSIP site.</p> <p>All LEAs in Pennsylvania also have access to family engagement resources and training materials through the PaTTAN.</p>

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
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>When examining the SSIP’s impact on achieving the FFY 17 target (graduation data from school year 2016-17), it is important to recognize that implementation of the SSIP’s Coherent Improvement Strategies began in the latter part of the 2015-16 school year. Therefore, the impact of this effort to improve this graduation rate is limited to a year and three months of implementation of these strategies.</p> <p>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, and FFY 2017. See detailed reporting in Section C.2.</p>

Fidelity Measures for Coherent Improvement Strategies

- All 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).
- SSIP learning sites utilized the fidelity measures identified in the Phase II submission, Table 3.4 Fidelity of Implementation (Year 2) (pages 36-37).
- 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 (Year 3) (pages 36-37).

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*.

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. Resources are available online at the PaTTAN SSIP webpage, https://www.pattan.net/graduation-post-secondary-outcomes/state-systemic-improvement-plan HUNE students helped with the design and recording of the students' voices video. HUNE students have participated in structured interviews measuring the impact the interventions had on their school experience (Year 3).

SSIP Webpage

The SSIP webpage ([https://www.pattan.net/graduation-post-secondary-outcomes/state-systemic-improvement Plans](https://www.pattan.net/graduation-post-secondary-outcomes/state-systemic-improvement-Plans)) 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, NTACTION, 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.	<p>All LEAs in PA continue to have access to professional development materials in one convenient location.</p> <p>The SSIP webpage complies with ADA website accessibility standards and hosts both current and archived SSIP documents, resources, and reports.</p>

Other Statewide Stakeholders

- All PDE/BSE 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 statewide conferences include SSIP presentations. These presentations include 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 (see Appendix 1).
- 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 technical assistance needed when LEAs are identified as needing an improvement plan under SPP/APR Indicators 1 and 2.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP stakeholders will be informed and have discussions regarding EBPs and data tools to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of students with disabilities.	The four SSIP stakeholder groups (i.e., SSIP Core Workgroup, SSIP Internal Stakeholders, SSIP External Stakeholders, and other statewide stakeholders) continue to collaborate on an ongoing basis to ensure success of Pennsylvania's SSIP.

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 - Academic Recovery Liaisons for 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.	LEAs in Pennsylvania receive aligned TA as a result of the collaboration of multiple bureaus and divisions.

Check & Connect Student Engagement Intervention Model Training

- SSIP PaTTAN consultants participated in and completed the *Check & Connect* train-the-trainer program.
- *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 being trained in the *Check & Connect* train-the-trainer program.

Desired Outcome	Impact to Date
SSIP learning sites will have an EBP to implement when students with disabilities are off-track for graduation.	<p>LEAs in Pennsylvania have access to evidence-based TA, resources, and staff to support students with disabilities off-track for graduation.</p> <p><i>Check & Connect</i> 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.</p> <p><i>Check & Connect</i> 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.</p>

SSIP Evaluation Plan

- BSE continues to engage stakeholders, including SEAP, in the evaluation process.
- BSE continues receiving technical assistance from NTACTION, 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.
- A new publication for families was designed with SEAP’s collaboration (See Update/Impact of Stakeholders on SSIP section below for additional information).
- 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. BSE has been informed that, to date, over 650 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, *Check & Connect*, Family Engagement, and Secondary Transition.

Impact of Stakeholders on SSIP - Update

The 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.

The SSIP Core Team worked with SEAP to design a new publication, *How Can Families Support Students to Graduate? Check the A-B-C's!* The collaboration included:

- The SSIP Coordinator facilitated a feedback discussion with the panel about strategies for families to help students with their ABCs;
- The SSIP Coordinator worked one-on-one with two members for additional feedback;
- A panel member worked with and provided additional feedback from a group of advocates;
- SEAP members created a committee to provide formal feedback in writing; and
- Core Team members presented the final publication in English and Spanish to the panel.

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

For the past four years, 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.

Ongoing 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;
- 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;

- developing a publication for families (in English and Spanish) with proven strategies to increase students' probability of graduating from high school;
- developing a students' voices video with students with disabilities to share what is working for them in schools. Students with disabilities off-track for graduation were part of the design team and were interviewed in the video; 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 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	<p>Ongoing collaboration of BSE with other PDE statewide initiatives to increase graduation rates of students with disabilities.</p> <p>Ongoing collaboration among SSIP Core Team, SSIP PaTTAN consultants, SSIP Local Leadership Teams, stakeholders, and external partners at NTACTION, NCSI, and IDC.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Outcomes, needs assessments, and key actions are documented on meeting templates and data review protocols to strengthen implementation fidelity, enhance communication, and build leadership structures.</p>	<p>SSIP/PDE Collaboration, Annotated Agendas</p> <p>Appendix 1</p> <p>SSIP Implementation Frameworks</p> <p>Implementation Science Tool</p>

Theory of Action Strands	Activities	Data Source / Documentation
<p>Collaboration</p>	<p>Regular two-way communication with SEAP to provide updates and gather input.</p> <p>Strengthened partnership with HUNE. Model implementation, TA, and training at HUNE mirror that of the SSIP learning sites. To enhance this partnership and better connect with and involve key stakeholder groups, 10 HUNE publications and a video were developed for stakeholder groups, LEAs, community agencies, and families. All publications are available on the PaTTAN website in English and Spanish. The video is closed captioned.</p>	<p>SEAP meetings minutes</p> <p>HUNE publications posted at PaTTAN website</p>
<p>Technical Assistance</p>	<p>SSIP PaTTAN Consultant Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 intervention. <p>Professional Development and Trainings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP Core Team and SSIP PaTTAN consultants designed, delivered, and engaged in over 90 seminars, presentations, and trainings related to implementation and Coherent Improvement Strategy selection and application. 	<p>SSIP Implementation Framework/action plans, data collection protocols, fidelity measures protocols</p> <p>Training materials, including PowerPoint presentations (closed-captioned and voiceovers), handouts, activities, SSIP publications, Infographics</p>

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

Not Appropriate.

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

Data Management and Data Analysis Procedures - Update

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.

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. The data are analyzed by 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.

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

- Local Leadership Teams analyzed ABC data and identified those students with disabilities off-track for graduation in their building.
- Teams 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.
- Teams 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.
- Teams continue to collect, analyze, and use key data on an ongoing basis.

b. Evidence of change to baseline data for key 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). Further stakeholder involvement is described in detail throughout this plan.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

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

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	67.90%

FFY 2017 Performance

The four-year adjusted cohort graduation target for FFY 2017 is 66.40%, while the overall graduation rate for the 12 learning sites was 64.16%. Therefore, the target for this indicator was not met. The data for this indicator are lagged one year, and reflect the performance of the learning sites for the 2016-17 school year. To provide perspective, an increase of just *two* graduates across all learning sites would have allowed Pennsylvania to meet the target for this indicator.

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 SSIP learning sites have a combined overall enrollment of students with disabilities of 17%.

Additional root cause data analyses were conducted to examine trends in achieving targets. Students with disabilities dropping out without any risk factors (44 students). Learning sites followed-up with each of these students to learn why they dropped out of school. The most frequent reason provided was to enter the work force.

Implementation science literature indicates that it may take three to five years to fully implement a human services innovation, or EBP (Fixen et al. (2007)²). When examining the SSIP's impact on achieving the FFY 2017 target it is important to recognize that when data were collected for this indicator, implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategies had been provided to students off-track for one year and three months.

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 2006³). 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 NTACTION, 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.

In the 2016-17 school year, the SSIP learning sites continued supporting students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation in FFY 2015 (Group 1) and identified a second cohort of students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation in FFY 2016 (Group 2).

In the 2017-18 school year, the SSIP learning sites continued supporting students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation in Group 1 and Group 2, and identified a third cohort of students with disabilities who were off-track for graduation in FFY 2017 (Group 3).

² Fixsen, D., Naoom, S., Blase, K., & Wallace, F. (2007, Winter/Spring). Implementation: The missing link between research and practice. *The APSAC Advisor*, pp. 4–10.

³ Neild & Balfanz (2006), *An Early Warning System*, Educational Leadership, October 2007, Volume 65, Number 2.

The data in Table C.2 show a 29% improvement rate of Group 1 students moving from off-track status to on-track status from January 2016 through June 2018. These data span two years and three months of SSIP implementation.

Table C.2 Movement of Group 1 Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status				
Students with IEPs	January 2016	June 2016	June 2017	June 2018
On-Track Total	1,912	2,255	2,531	2,671
On-Track Percentage	67%	79%	90%	96%
Off-Track Total	950	592	264	99
Off-Track Percentage	33%	21%	10%	4%

The data in Table C.3 show a 23% improvement rate of Group 2 students identified as off-track in October 2016 moving from off-track status to on-track status through June 2018. These data span two full school years of SSIP implementation.

Table C.3 Movement of Group 2 Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status				
Students with IEPs	October 2016	June 2017	October 2017	June 2018
On-Track Total	1,194	1,508	1,527	1,613
On-Track Percentage	68%	85%	86%	91%
Off-Track Total	571	257	247	161
Off-Track Percentage	32%	15%	14%	9%

The data in Table C.4 show an 18% improvement rate of Group 3 students identified as off-track in October 2017 moving from off-track status to on-track status through June 2018. These data span one full school year of SSIP implementation.

Table C.4 Movement of Group 3 Students from Off-Track Status to On-Track Status		
Students with IEPs	October 2017	June 2018
On-Track Total	1,638	2054
On-Track Percentage	70%	88%
Off-Track Total	709	293
Off-Track Percentage	30%	12%

Implementation data indicate that there were significant decreases in the number of students in Group 1 considered off-track for graduation at all SSIP learning sites. Table C.5 shows change in status by SSIP learning site from initial implementation through June 2018.

Preliminary 2018-19 data for the first half of the school year also indicate continued improvement for Group 1 students across the first half of the school year showing steady decreases in the total percent of students off-track for graduation at each learning site since implementation in January 2016.

Table C.5 Group 1 – Status of Students Off-Track for Graduation by Learning Site						
Learning Site	Percent Off-Track January 2016	Percent Remaining Off-Track June 2018	Percent Decrease in Off-Track	Percent Remaining Off-Track January 2019	Percent Total Decrease in Off-Track Since Implementation	Positive Impact?
1	36	7	29	6	-93	Yes
2	66	11	55	11	-92	Yes
3	35	4	31	4	-96	Yes
4	18	13	5	5	-93	Yes
5	28	11	17	3	-94	Yes
6	37	0	37	0	-100	Yes
7	24	9	15	14	-92	Yes
8	21	16	5	10	-87	Yes
9	19	9	10	2	-98	Yes
10	49	11	38	6	-79	Yes
11	23	11	12	2	-96	Yes
12	59	12	47	6	-86	Yes

Multi-year comparison data indicate that there were significant decreases in the number of students in Group 2 considered off-track for graduation across SSIP learning sites. Table C.6 shows change in status by SSIP learning site from October 2016 through June 2018.

Table C.6 Group 2 – Status of Students Off-Track for Graduation by Learning Site				
Learning Site	Percent Off-Track October 2016	Percent Remaining Off-Track June 2018	Percent Decrease in Off-Track	Positive Impact?
1	74	10	-64	Yes
2	54	19	-35	Yes
3	40	5	-35	Yes
4	20	9	-11	Yes
5	20	4	-16	Yes
6	19	1	-18	Yes
7	31	8	-23	Yes
8	60	20	-40	Yes
9	7	1	-6	Yes
10	50	18	-32	Yes
11	23	8	-15	Yes
12	18	5	-13	Yes

Data indicate that there were decreases in the number of students in Group 3 considered off-track for graduation across SSIP learning sites. Table C.7 shows change in status by SSIP learning site within 2017-18 school year.

Table C.7 Group 3 – Status of Students Off-Track for Graduation by Learning Site				
Learning Site	Percent Off-Track October 2017	Percent Remaining Off-Track June 2018	Percent Decrease in Off-Track	Positive Impact?
1	59	21	-38	Yes
2	28	14	-14	Yes
3	41	3	-38	Yes
4	22	8	-14	Yes
5	33	7	-26	Yes
6	25	10	-15	Yes
7	25	10	-15	Yes
8	58	25	-33	Yes
9	30	19	-11	Yes
10	50	21	-29	Yes
11	16	3	-13	Yes
12	9	4	-5	Yes

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

Preliminary 2018-19 data also indicate continued decrease in risk factors for Group 1 students over time. In total, there has been a 54% decrease in the number of students identified with multiple risk factors since SSIP implementation in January 2016.

Table C.8 Group 1 - Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation January 2016 through June 2018				
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 Multi-Year Implementation	Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors from January 2016 through June 2018	Total decrease in Risk Factors as of January 2019	Positive Impact?
71	39	32	-54%	Yes

Data in Table C.9 indicate that SSIP learning sites continue to experience decreases in the number of students identified with multiple risk factors (i.e., students who remained off-track exhibited fewer risk factors over time).

Table C.9 Group 2 - Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation October 2016 through June 2018			
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 2 Years of Implementation	Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors After 2 Years of Implementation	Positive Impact?
36	12	-24	Yes

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 - Changes in Risk Factors of Students Off-Track for Graduation October 2017 through June 2018			
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 2018	Decrease in the Percent of Students with Multiple Risk Factors After 1 Year of Implementation	Positive Impact?
43	26	-17	Yes

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.

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; and

- SSIP learning sites participated in surveys measuring implementation efficacy. 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.

Data suggest that the positive impact continues and these data parallel last year's data. All SSIP learning sites experienced an overall decrease of off-track students over time. 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. Over 92% 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 Group 2 trends, showing 80-88% of students initially identified by the EWS no longer exhibited poor attendance post intervention. Behavioral risk factors also decreased in both cohorts. Rate changes were most evident in sites implementing both *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. Nonetheless, risk status improved at all learning sites. By year three, all SSIP learning sites had fully established EWSs, coupled with Family Engagement strategies, Culturally Responsive Instruction, and faithful implementation of an additional layer of interventions. Group 3 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. Attendance rates improved across all learning sites. Again, *Check & Connect* and 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 in 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years. 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 Learning Strategy to apply.

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.

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 92% 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.

Leadership: The SSIP PaTTAN consultants employed technical guidance and 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 *Check & Connect* strategy was the most widely implemented. PaTTAN resources and publications were also found to be highly useful.

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

Two SSIP learning sites noted that leadership changes at the schools impacted timelines and ease of implementation, but those issues were alleviated with consultants' support and effective collaboration of key members of the school-based teams.

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. 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. Both programs meet on an ongoing basis to ensure that their initiatives provide a seamless TA system for the learning sites. Data are shared between both programs. When action plans are needed by a learning site, both initiatives participate in their design.

No additional changes were made to the state system.

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 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 impacting 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 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 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 2017-2018 action plans. The action plans were revised as needed throughout the year.
- 100% of the learning sites documented implementation of an EWS in their action plans and establishment of Local Leadership Teams.
- 25% of action plans indicated that additional resources were needed to appoint personnel or redefine personnel roles to support SSIP implementation.
- 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.

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.

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;
- 11 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 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.

Implementation survey results 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, and consultation.

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.

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 2017-18 school year mirrored last year. Table C.11 shows strategy implementation by SSIP learning site.

**Table C.11
SSIP Learning Sites – Coherent Improvement Strategies**

	EWS	MTSS Academic	MTSS Behavior	Attendance Alternative Programming	Culturally Responsive Instruction	Family Engagement	Secondary Transition
Learning Site 1	X		X	X	*	X	X
Learning Site 2	X	X		X	*	X	
Learning Site 3	X			X	*	X	X
Learning Site 4	X	X	X		*	X	
Learning Site 5	X	X			*	X	X
Learning Site 6	X	X	X	X	*	X	
Learning Site 7	X		X	X	*	X	
Learning Site 8	X	X		X	*	X	X
Learning Site 9	X	X	X	X	*	X	
Learning Site 10	X	X	X		*	X	
Learning Site 11	X			X	*	X	
Learning Site 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.

The session strand below on Secondary School Outcomes through Equitable MTSS was included at the 2018 statewide MTSS Forum. The strand provided participants with an opportunity to discuss equity in secondary schools, racial and cultural identity, culturally responsive classroom management, and specific interventions for mentoring and person-centered planning.

MTSS Implementer’s Forum Agenda, October 16-18, 2018

Culturally Responsive Instructional Strategy Strand	
Session Title	Presenters
Keynote: Why Race & Culture STILL Matters in Schools	Dr. Tyrone Howard
Creating access and equity for ALL students	Dr. Tyrone Howard
How to Plan to Increase Graduation Rates and Decrease Dropout Rates in Pennsylvania	Dr. Laura Moran, Diane Funsten
How to Support Positive Racial & Cultural Identity Development in Classrooms	Chemay Morales-James
What does it mean to Be Culturally Responsive via Classroom Management?	Chemay Morales-James
The Road to School Completion: RENEW and <i>Check & Connect</i>	SSIP Learning Site RENEW Team and SSIP Learning Site <i>Check & Connect</i> Team

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, 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 at <https://www.pattan.net/videos/students-voices-hune-youth-program/>

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 2017-2018 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 this phase. Their input was also valuable in the design and review of SSIP publications for LEAs, families, and students.

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

Individual student level data were analyzed in June 2017, June 2018, and will be analyzed again in June 2019 to better understand changes and trends. Data tracking variations in student risk status and graduation status throughout model implementation will determine differential impact of the EWS and applied Coherent Improvement Strategies. Longitudinal data analysis will:

- track students whose risk status changes over time;
- capture unique differences in student risk factors over time; and
- determine direct relationships between the amount, duration, and intensity of model components, student response to interventions, student ABC trends, and graduation outcome.

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.

- 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. 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.

Additional activities used to inform stakeholders of the ongoing evaluation process included:

- networking and collaborating with the SEAP to develop the SSIP evaluation questions;
- reviewing evaluation plan and results;
- publishing and disseminating information in the BSE's *Special Education in Pennsylvania* data booklet;
- using SSIP data meeting protocols with SSIP learning sites as recommended by SEAP;
- involving students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation in the planning of *Students' Voices* and the *Are You On-Track to Graduate? Check your A-B-Cs* publications, and the *Students Voices* video.

- 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:

- Collaborating with the learning sites as they complete the SSIP surveys. The PaTTAN SSIP consultants facilitate the meetings to complete the surveys 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 voice 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.

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

Pennsylvania is moving toward greater stakeholder engagement 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 2017 data, two data related factors identified in FFY 2016 were once again reviewed, and additional root cause analyses were conducted.

Update

Although Early Warning Systems have proven to be an effective strategy for identifying students with disabilities who are off-track for graduation, school personnel have noted that there still are a small number of students with disabilities across the sites that demonstrate no risk factors but unexpectedly leave school prior to graduation. There was concern about these students as well as any potential negative impact that this factor may have on overall reported graduation rates. Data collected indicated that 44 students with disabilities without risk factors dropped out of school. Local Leadership Teams collected and analyzed data related to these students to identify the reason. The top two reasons for leaving school were obtaining a General Educational Development (GED) certificate and work.

Pennsylvania is working intensively to improve graduation rates of students with disabilities in 12 geographically distributed learning sites. The SSIP also includes a component to build capacity to improve state performance on SPP/APR Indicator 1. In Phase I of the SSIP, the state invited LEAs to collaborate in the initiative; LEAs (not the state) selected which specific high school within the LEA would participate. This resulted in a wide range of graduation baseline rates among the sites, from very low to comparatively high. In tracking progress, the state has observed that in some instances the baseline year graduation rate was atypical to trend data for that particular school. Therefore, while evidence of change from baseline for all sites is ultimately reported in the SSIP as a single aggregate percentage rate, each site's progress over time must also be considered on an individual basis.

One of the learning sites was involved in an unanticipated consolidation of LEA high schools at the beginning of the 2017-18 school year. This placed students from the learning site with students from two other high schools, changing the setting in which these students were being served. However, students off track for graduation continued to be identified and interventions continued to be provided. Pennsylvania will be seeking advice from stakeholders, the SSIP external evaluator and IDC regarding how this event should be addressed in future reporting of this SSIP.

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 true impact on the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate will not be seen until the 2019 graduation data are reported, and the impact on the 5-year adjusted cohort rate will not be seen until the 2020 graduation data are reported.

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.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvement

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 the ESEA Title I ARLs 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 will support 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.

Data indicate that all 12 SSIP learning sites are implementing the EWS, Family Engagement Strategy, and data meeting protocol with 100% fidelity. All sites are using fidelity protocols to measure their implementation of additional strategies. Data range from 85%-100%. For those sites not 100% faithful in selected strategy implementation, qualitative review of action plans, data meeting notes, or consultant reports note follow-up or improvement procedure.

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).

EWS

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 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 & 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)

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
<p><u>Goal 1.0:</u> 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.</p>	<p><u>Objective 1.1:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Objective 1.2:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Objective 1.3:</u> Using an EWS, the number of early warning indicators per student with disabilities identified as being off-track will be reduced.</p> <p><u>Objective 1.4:</u> Using an EWS, the percentage of students with disabilities with improved risk status will increase.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 databased 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. • 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
<p><u>Goal 2.0:</u> Learning sites will use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies (Implementation Science, NIRN).</p>	<p><u>Objective 2.1:</u> 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 <i>SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric</i>.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.2:</u> 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 <i>SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric</i>.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.3:</u> 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric</i>. • Using the fidelity measures from the Phase II report, Table 3.4, <i>Fidelity of Implementation</i> (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

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
<p><u>Goal 3.0:</u> Professional development will be of high quality and use adult learning principles.</p>	<p><u>Objective 3.1:</u> 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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
<p><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.</p>	<p><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).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

Table E.1
Goals, Objectives and Achievements (Cont'd)

System and Administration

Goal	Objectives	Achievements
<p><u>Goal 5.0:</u> LEA and school level administrators will become knowledgeable and proficient in the use of the EWS.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><u>Objective 5.2:</u> An increased number of school level administrators will self-report being proficient in using the EWS.</p> <p><u>Objective 5.3:</u> State, LEA, and school level administrators will self-report improved collaboration among stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Family Engagement

Goal	Objective	Achievements
<p><u>Goal 6.0:</u> Family involvement in the education of their children with disabilities will increase.</p>	<p>Objective 6.1: Learning sites will implement the Coherent Improvement Strategy for family engagement with fidelity, as measured by the <i>Enhancing Family Engagement Needs Assessment</i>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP learning sites continue implementing the Coherent Improvement Strategy for family engagement with fidelity. • See Family Engagement E.1.b.

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 initial three-year commitment that spanned FFY 2015 through FFY 2017. SSIP PaTTAN consultants are continuing to support the implementation of the SSIP in the learning sites in FFY 2018. 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.

1. Additional activities to be implemented in FFY 2018 include:

- continue using the SSIP Implementation Frameworks/Action Plans to guide implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies in the SSIP learning sites;
- identify ABC prevention strategies for students with disabilities without risk factors.
- continue supporting students off-track for graduation in Groups 1, 2, and 3.
- continue working with Dr. Joanne Cashman to improve two-way communication with stakeholders;
- 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, NTACTION, 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
- complete Sustainability and Scale-Up plans with the SSIP learning sites.

Activities for Sustaining and Scaling-Up SSIP Strategies Statewide	
<p>SSIP Internal Stakeholders <i>(PDE Bureaus, Offices, Divisions, and PaTTAN Initiatives)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with BSE Compliance Monitoring for Indicators 1 & 2, offering and providing TA to LEAs to increase graduation rates; • Collaborate with P2G initiative to provide TA to PaTTAN consultants and IU TaCs on lessons learned to increase graduation rates; • Support implementation of <i>Check & Connect</i> in the SSIP learning sites, P2G sites, and other LEAs participating in <i>Check & Connect</i> program. • Support and train PaTTAN consultants and IU TaCs assigned to other statewide initiatives (e.g., MTSS-Academic, MTSS-Behavior, Secondary Transition, Family Engagement) to increase graduation rates; • Develop publications and TA materials on how to support ELs with disabilities to stay in school, graduate, and become contributing members of society; • Train HUNE staff to become <i>Check & Connect</i> mentors; and • Coordinate collaboration meetings of PDE Bureaus, Divisions, Programs, and Initiatives to increase graduation rates.
<p>SSIP External Stakeholders <i>(Learning Sites, HUNE, SEAP, National TA Centers)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Sustainability Action Plans for the 12 SSIP learning sites; • Collaborate with SSIP learning sites to co-present at statewide conferences <i>How to Increase Graduation Rates and Reduce Dropout Rates</i>; and • Continue to collaborate with national TA Centers to keep abreast of the latest research and resources to increase graduation rates and reduce dropout rates (e.g., NCSI, NTACTION, IDC).
<p>Statewide Stakeholders <i>(LEAs, Families, Agencies)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations at all PDE/BSE Statewide Conferences on <i>How to Increase Graduation Rates and Reduce Dropout Rates</i>; • Continue capturing and sharing statewide the <i>lessons learned</i> through the BSE partnership with the 12 SSIP learning sites and HUNE, and • Continue collaboration with SPDG staff to ensure that lessons learned through SSIP are embedded in trainings and TA over the next three years (87 middle school building teams, 522 school personnel, 174 administrators, 116 coaches, 25 resources developed for parents, Families to the MAX – Statewide Parent Network, and three partners from Institutions of Higher Education).

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, NTACTION, 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.

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

APPENDIX 1.1

SSIP Presentations and Participation at Conferences

Dates	State Conference	Presenters
<i>For a comprehensive list of SSIP Presentations and Participation at Conferences prior to April 1, 2018 please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report, Appendix 1.1</i>		
April 4, 2018	MTSS Connection for SSIP, MTSS Bootcamp Training, PaTTAN Harrisburg	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
May 22-23, 2018	2018 PA PBS Forum	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
July 11-12, 2018	Title I State Parent Conference	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
July 16-18, 2018	2018 Special Education Leadership Academy	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
July 25-27, 2018	2018 Secondary Transition Conference	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
July 6-9, 2018	2018 National Autism Conference	PaTTAN SSIP consultants
October 16-18, 2018	2018 MTSS Implementers Forum	Various National Presenters
December 10-12, 2018	2018 SAS Institute	PaTTAN SSIP consultant
March 11-13, 2019	2019 PDE Conference	PaTTAN SSIP consultants

APPENDIX 1.2
Presentations at National Conferences and State Meetings

Dates	National Conferences or State Meeting	Presenters
<i>For a comprehensive list of SSIP Presentations at National Conferences and State Meetings prior to April 1, 2018 please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report, Appendix 1.2</i>		
April 18-19, 2018	NCSI - 2018 Spring Leads Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota	SPP/APR State Lead, SSIP Coordinator
October 10-11, 2018	NCSI Graduation & Post-School Outcomes Cross-State Learning Collaborative, Phoenix, AZ	SSP/APR Lead, SSIP Statewide Lead, PaTTAN Consultant, and HUNE
January 29, 2019	IDC: Strengthening the Implementation of Your SSIP Evaluation and Documentation of Results Webinar	SSIP Core Team, SSIP PaTTAN Consultant

APPENDIX 1.3
SEAP and Stakeholder Input Sessions

For a comprehensive list of SEAP and Stakeholder Input Sessions prior to April 1, 2018 please refer to the SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report, Appendix 1.3

April 4, 2018	HUNE Afterschool Program, Updates and Results	HUNE Director, BSE Director, SSIP Coordinator
May 9, 2018	SEAP Meeting – Facilitated discussion/feedback on new publication for families	SSIP Core Team
June 20, 2018	SSIP Internal Workgroup: PDE Collaboration meeting	SSIP Core Team, Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction, Title I, Title III, Migrant Education, Homeless Education, Corrections Education, Refugees Education, PaTTAN SSIP Consultant, PA Part B Data Manager
September 7, 2018	Presentation: Dropout Risk Factors, SSIP Resources for LEAs and Families, Parent Partners and Family Network	SSIP Coordinator
September 10, 2018	Presentation: Graduation Outcomes in PA's State Systemic Improvement Plan, Central PA Training and Consultation Supervisors	SSIP PaTTAN Consultant

APPENDIX 1.3
SEAP and Stakeholder Input Sessions (Cont'd)

September 11, 2018	BSE monthly meeting: Alignment of BSE Compliance Monitoring and SSIP via Indicators 1 and 2 Action Plans	SSIP Core Team
September 27, 2018	SEAP meeting – Facilitated discussion and review of OSEP’s response to FFY 2016 SPP/APR/SSIP	SPP/APR/SSIP Core Team
December 13, 2018	OSEP Monthly TA Call Overview of the Requirements for Indicators 17	SSIP Core Team
January 16, 2019	SSIP Internal Workgroup: PDE Collaboration meeting	SSIP Core Team, BSE, Migrant, Homeless, Title I, Corrections, Refugees, PaTTAN SSIP Consultant, Part B Data Manager
January 2019	Collaboration with Joanne Cashman (NCSI) to design a presentation for the 2 nd Annual PA Leadership Studies Conference using <i>Leading by Convening</i> Resources	SSIP Coordinator, SSIP PaTTAN State Lead
January – February 2019	NCSI Graduation and Post-Secondary Outcomes Collaborative, SSIP Writing Sessions for SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report	SSIP Coordinator
February 14, 2019	OSEP Monthly Technical Assistance Call: Using Active Implementation Frameworks for Evidence-Based Practices	SSIP Core Team
February 26-27, 2019	<i>Check & Connect</i> Comprehension Implementation Training for HUNE Mentors	SSIP PaTTAN consultants
March 2019	Collaboration with Dr. Joanne Cashman for the review and feedback of the draft PA SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report	SSIP Core Team
March 2019	Collaboration with IDC for the review and feedback of the draft PA SSIP Phase III, Year 3 report	SSIP Core Team
March 18, 2019	Meeting with Dr. Joanne Cashman: Sustainability Plan Beyond the SSIP	SSIP Coordinator, SSIP PaTTAN 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 juvenil extracurricular • HUNE: Programa juvenil de verano • HUNE: Participación en la comunidad • HUNE: Participación de la familia • HUNE: Prácticas culturalmente sensibles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
---	---

PaTTAN Blogs and PaTTANpod

- PaTTANpod, *The ABCs of Increasing Graduation Rates*.
- PaTTAN Blog, *Attendance: It's important to be in Class*. Posted at PaTTAN MTSS webpage.
- PaTTAN Blog, *How Can Families Support Student Success?* Posted at PaTTAN MTSS webpage.

SSIP Data Tools to Increase Graduation Rates

The following data tools are available at no cost at www.pattan.net

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.	<p>Local Educational Agencies in Pennsylvania will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize data systems to identify, inform, monitor and increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities. <i>Early Warning System Data Tools. Diagnostic intervention.</i> Implement increasingly intensive evidenced-based methodologies toward improved academic outcomes. <i>MTSS academic support, culturally responsive instruction. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.</i> Implement increasingly intensive evidenced-based methodologies toward improved social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes. <i>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.</i> Promote the implementation of attendance strategies and alternative programming that will increase the likelihood of graduation. <i>Credit recovery, after school/night school, online learning, school re-entry. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.</i> Ensure culturally responsive learning environments and instructional practices. <i>Culturally responsive instructional practices. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.</i> Embrace a philosophy of partnership that empowers families and communities to become more meaningfully involved. <i>Family engagement, mentoring, partnering with federally funded centers - PTIs and CPRCs. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.</i> Provide rigorous and relevant instruction to better engage students in learning and provide the skills needed to graduate and have positive post school outcomes. <i>Transition, college prep courses, career and technical training, life skills training, socially related employment skills. Schoolwide and targeted interventions.</i> 	<p>Pennsylvania will increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities.</p> <p>Pennsylvania will reduce the number of students with risk factors that impact the likelihood of school completion.</p>
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.		
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. CPRC will develop materials and resources to be shared with other community organizations.		
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.		

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