

FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)? (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

The State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities and their families is to increase the rate of growth in social-emotional and approaches to learning skills for children with disabilities, birth through age five. The SiMR will be measured by using the child outcome data for both C3 and B7, Outcomes A and B, Summary statement 1.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: C3 A:83%, B:61%
B7 A:75%, B:56%

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

FFY 2018 Target: C3: A:84%
B:62%; B7 A:76% B:74%
FFY 2019 Target: C3: A:85% B:67%; B7 A:76% B:74%

FFY 2018 Data: C3: A 85%, B: 61%; B7 A: 78% B:74%
FFY 2019 Data: C3: A:86%, B: 62%; B7 A: 77%, B:72%

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? Yes

Did slippage¹ occur? No

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

¹The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? Yes

If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The CPS APT Fidelity Rubrics are rated from 1, indicating fidelity “needs improvement,” to 3, indicating fidelity is “in place” with the middle score of a 2 indicating fidelity is “developing.” Teams demonstrate progress towards fidelity while also continuing to receive a score of 2, “developing.” The State anticipates that the APT fidelity score would increase slowly over time. During the first 3 years of a teacher’s implementation of CPS practices and at the current rate of coaching provided by the state-level external coach, the State expects a score of 2. The CPS APT Fidelity Rubrics describe a variety of components needed to implement CPS to fidelity. The measure captures changes in the teaching teams’ philosophical approach as well as how the team uses CPS to assess, plan, and intervene with children.

As described in the Phase III (1) report, three research-based measures were selected to evaluate fidelity of EC PBIS+ implementation at the program and teacher levels: Early Childhood Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ), Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT™) and The Pyramid Infant Toddler Observation Scale (TPITOS™). Collectively, these data allow for an assessment of fidelity of EC PBIS+/Pyramid Model strategies implementation by participating teachers. A description of why the TPOT was selected can be found in the State’s Phase III (1) report. To evaluate the extent to which programs are implementing Program-Wide EC PBIS+ with fidelity, participating programs collected Early Childhood Benchmarks of Quality data beginning in fall 2017. The EC-BOQ evaluates the extent to which a program has nine critical element and 47 benchmarks in place, partially in place, or not in place at all.

Measurements to assess teacher stress (Adherence and Impact Measure [AIM]) and student progress (Child Behavior Rating Scales [CBRS]) were also taken and are described in previous reports.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? Yes

If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Data quality issues persist. With regards to the quality of measures used to assess pre and post training for Tier 1 and training and post- coaching for Tier 2 CPS teacher level data, the Tier 1 and 2 knowledge assessments may not be sensitive to the modifications made to the trainings to ensure the content is more relevant to the birth to five population and for students with disabilities (e.g., children who are nonverbal). Additionally, the standard TK-COT (now AIM) may not be sensitive to the nuances of the modified CPS training and implementation (i.e., implementation modifications for use with children with disabilities) and is certainly not been nuanced enough to capture relevant information regarding teacher stress for those receiving training and coaching to implement pyramid model practices.

To improve quality of the data, increased attention to the use of evidence based measures by state coaches and leads will be provided to programs and teaching staff implementing the tools. Additionally, the State has determined that following the 2nd year of implementation, the AIM may no longer be effective, so use of this tool has been recommended to cease after the first two years of implementation. For continuity, state level coaches will continue to provide technical assistance to use the fidelity measures for Pyramid model implementation and a cycle of key trainings to support learning or refresh learning on program-wide implementation, the Early Childhood Benchmarks of Quality, the Teaching Practice Observation Tool, Practice Based Coaching, the cultural companion to the EC-BOQ, and support to use the behavior incident reporting system in classrooms implementing Pyramid model will be offered on an annual basis.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the reality of classrooms being closed for the third quarter, data was incomplete. The State was not able to collect data measuring end of year progress for classroom implementation of Pyramid Model practices and Collaborative problem solving. Data measuring teacher stress and child progress in classroom routines was also not collected as in previous years. This leaves gaps in data and a limited understanding of whether efforts in this fourth year of implementation led to improved student outcomes from fall to spring and a reduction of teacher stress as a result of shifting mindset, approaching behavior, social-emotional and approaches to learning in a systematic way.

To mitigate the impacts of COVID-19, state leads and coaches continued to provide support virtually to implementation programs. They shared resources and helped identify ways in which implementation could be transitioned to focus more specifically on family concerns, needs for support, and parent coaching and training around pyramid model practices and collaborative problem solving philosophy for viewing behavior challenges as a result of lagging skills.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? Yes

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action

(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Based on stakeholder feedback that the previous theory of action was too broad, the State made changes to encompass the actions, strategies, and impact on students and families given the Oregon EI/ECSE program is a single system of EI and ECSE services for children birth to kindergarten. Because of this seamless system of services, Oregon developed one State-Identified Measureable Result for improving outcomes for children birth to kindergarten that was reported on in Phase I and Phase II.

The State has updated the SSIP theory of action as follows:

If EI/ECSE programs, staff, early learning partners, and families have access to coaching and professional development to implement evidence-based practices (using implementation and improvement science) targeting social-emotional and approaches to learning skills, and if they participate in actively using reflection, assessment, and quality-improvement cycles, then they will know how to measure their own knowledge and skills against the fidelity measures used in implementing the evidence-based practice to advance students social-emotional approaches to learning skills.

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

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

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

The State continues to allocate IDEA discretionary funds to support implementation, training and local level professional development activities for LEAP, Pyramid Model, and Collaborative Problem Solving. These funds will be phased out in the next biennium. Programs will be expected to sustain implementation efforts. Staffing priorities for oversight and support of SSIP implementation activities: 1) Two State specialists oversee the implementation of coherent strategies, and one staff member oversees the annual cross-sector early learning training institute. These three also support the higher education coordinating council and work outlined in the comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD). Additional EI/ECSE Leadership Team members who connect to critical infrastructure components (P-3 Coordinator, and Early Learning and Literacy Specialist) will become more active as positions that have been unfilled are expected to be filled within the year. The need to address the use of other systems improvements and expansion of the coherent strategies used to support growth of the SiMR, will necessitate that all agency staff on the leadership team be required to support efforts outlined in the SSIP. Planning on how to expand support of implementation efforts will take place over the next two cycles and will be outlined in the FY21 report. 2) A review of the CSPD beginning with an annual needs assessment of program staff and administrators of EI/ECSE programs was meant to take place in the spring of 2020. Due to Covid-19, response was limited response and the State determined that activities should be temporarily put on hold as programs were given space and grace to address health and safety measures. In FY20, new surveys will be sent to contractors and staff, a review of competencies and alignment with national standards will be completed over the next two years, and a comprehensive plan to recruit and retain a diverse workforce to support young children in inclusive early learning environments will be developed. An outline of this work and next steps will be included in the FY20 report. 3) The Summer Institute, an intensive cross-sector training opportunity, continued this year in a virtual format. The planning team pivoted plans to offer six intensive courses to Early Learning professionals covering the topics of equity, SEL, teacher wellness and resilience. 4) EcWeb, the existing data system, continues to be improved to include a parent portal and ways to analyze service levels, child outcome data, and service area plans across the state. These improvements will support better analysis of data, increased support of data literacy for families, and increased capacity to support state and local staff to use data to inform decision making and engage in continuous growth and improvement projects. State staff have attended trainings from national TA centers to determine the best way to proceed and will utilize supports from DASy and ECTA to further improve the State data system and integrate improvement activities into the ways in which programs can report implementation data.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

In previous years, the measurement of whether or not an infrastructure improvement was effective or not relied on anecdotal data and information gathered from event evaluations following trainings including the Summer Institute, feedback at meetings and other events with the state interagency coordinating council, and completion of tasks outlined in the work plan. An evaluative tool or scale to measure progress towards the intended goal has not been utilized for the purposes of this effort. In FY 2019, the EI/ECSE Leadership team used the ECTA Systems Quick Start Guide to determine which infrastructure activities needed attention for communication or improvement. This was also done with the idea that using the Systems Implementation Tool could provide our team with a measurement that would allow the State Part C/Part B 619 program quantitative data about improvement for infrastructure components outlined in the SSIP. Further planning with the State Leadership Team, in coordination with the State Interagency Council, will take place over the next two years.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Due to COVID-19, many of the infrastructure improvements will move forward with little to no change to avoid interruptions of support, funding, and professional development. Stakeholder feedback to assess the continuation of the SiMR, target setting, data collection procedures, and planning for future professional development supports to EI/ECSE professionals will begin spring 2021. Many of these opportunities to plan and engage with communities will take place from a distance using a combination of 1:1 meetings, virtual community engagement (meetings, and webinars) with surveys to document impact and gather feedback. As noted previously, the State will also renew efforts to engage other members of the state leadership team and State Interagency Council to take a more active role in implementation and evaluation of activities connected to improving the SiMR.

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

Yes

If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities enter kindergarten in Oregon and are disproportionately placed in segregated spaces or removed from the regular education environment through the use of exclusionary discipline practices. Paired with the knowledge that effective inclusion improves outcomes, these disproportionate segregation levels perpetuates long-standing achievement gaps. Driven by the [Equity Lens](#), the State is committed to the eradication of inequities in the educational system. With the support of OSEP funded TA from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center and the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations, as well as continued TA from Denver University Staff, the State is investing in inclusion through investment of resources to implement the National Indicators for High Quality Inclusion at the state, local and program levels, and expansion of the LEAP preschool model.

In FY19, the State developed a cross-sector Leadership Team, identified Program Coaches, and has supported three Community Inclusion Teams to begin initial implementation efforts for a Statewide Implementation Plan to address High Quality Inclusion. Due to COVID-19, implementation efforts have been slower than expected due to the lack of in-person opportunities for professional development and intensive coaching with preschools who are serving young children. As communities reopen early learning environments, increased emphasis on collaboration across the early learning coaching system will ensure early learning professionals across the system have the support needed to implement the early care and education environment indicators for high quality inclusion. The State has also invested in Technical Assistance from University of Denver, Morgridge College of Education to support implementation of LEAP (Learning Experiences-An Alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents). Currently, sixteen LEAP preschool classrooms are in the Portland area (including three Head Start classrooms, and two classrooms in school based early childhood classrooms). Through this partnership, the State has provided financial support to open three classrooms and is currently supporting one additional classroom in the Columbia River Gorge. The State will use data from this implementation initiative to determine how the methodology may be replicated over time in additional classrooms throughout Oregon. Knowing that inclusion advances student outcomes, the State has determined that the evaluation of these implementation efforts and planning for sustainable implementation will continue to be important moving forward with the SSIP.

Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The State continues to invest in implementation of the Pyramid Model and Collaborative Problem Solving. These approaches are directly related to improving child outcomes outlined in the SiMR and have been effective in advancing child outcomes, reducing teacher stress, and supporting a comprehensive understanding of the practices and assessment tools needed to address the social-emotional needs of young children with and without disabilities. The Pyramid Model is a conceptual framework of evidence-based practices that promote the healthy development of children's social emotional development. The Pyramid Model builds upon a tiered system of support that addresses the needs of all, provided guidance about targeted supports that some children may need to support their learning, and identifies tools and supports for intensive interventions that may be needed for a few children in their early years. Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) is built on the philosophy and belief that challenging behavior is the byproduct of lagging cognitive skills and is best addressed by teaching children the skills they lack. In the CPS model, teams work together to identify the student's specific lagging skills (flexibility/adaptability, frustration tolerance, problem solving, etc.) and possible environmental triggers. The teacher, parent or other adult, brainstorms solutions with the student to create a plan of action together that is realistic and mutually satisfactory.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

During the 2019/2020 school year, a total 35 CPS APT Fidelity Rubrics were completed for 18 teachers implementing CPS in their settings. Also, 83% of teachers in implementation sites remained in the "developing" range across all scored CPS APT Fidelity Rubrics, while 6% of teachers received a first/initial score of "needs improvement" followed by all remaining scores of "developing," and 11% of teachers received a mix of "developing" and "in place" scores (50% "in place" for one teacher and 33% "in place" for another). During the 2019/2020 school year, 12% of teachers in implementation sites received one video fidelity score of "needs improvement" and one fidelity score of "developing." In implementation sites, 88% of teachers received all "developing." For Pyramid Model, multiple fidelity measures are used to measure fidelity of implementation. The EC-BOQ uses a 3-point rating scale to measure implementation progress (in-place, partially in place, not in place). Each program made progress between spring 2019 and spring 2020 ranging from an increase of 11%

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

to 26% growth in elements of the BOQ that were identified as being in place, and a collective reduction of elements not in place by 10%. Data was incomplete due to COVID-19. However, teachers reported that engaging in practice-based coaching has given them new insight into their own practices and growth. The continued support of pyramid model coaches during the COVID closures ensured that teachers and students stayed connected and were able to collaboratively address the social-emotional needs of young children and their families.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

During this cycle, the State streamlined professional development for predictability across the year. The Summer Institute provided a consistent avenue for professional development that allowed those implementing both strategies opportunities throughout the year to participate in Tier One training, and other trainings that focused on resilience, teacher wellness, and equity. The Statewide Coach for Collaborative Problem Solving also met monthly with teams to support learning and skill acquisition for implementing the use of the assessment tools and application of the philosophy program wide. In one program, the Statewide Coach provided training to staff about how Pyramid Model and Collaborative Problem Solving complement one another and can be used together to advance child outcomes. For those implementing the Pyramid Model, Practice Based Coaching, and TPOT reliability trainings were offered in the summer and fall of 2019. Opportunities for the State Coach and Coherent Strategies Specialist were also created to provide support to programs during their Program-Wide Leadership Team meetings. Three coordinated coaching meetings provided time for Pyramid Model programs and coaches to gather and learn from one another and to explore tools and resources to advance coaching skills and support implementation decision making. Practice Based Coaching continued for practitioners implementing Pyramid Model and LEAP throughout the year both in person and virtually. Programs implementing LEAP participated in intensive training at the beginning of the year and mid-year. For the new program in the Columbia Gorge, an implementation Coach from Regional Programs provided support through observation, coaching, and team meetings both in person and virtually. Orientation to the Indicators initiative was provided virtually due to COVID-19. In future years, the State will provide a predictable training calendar to implementing programs so that participants can plan accordingly.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.
(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State continues to inform and involve stakeholders in the decision-making process regarding the on-going implementation of the SSIP through several existing efforts, including the annual Stakeholders meetings, EI/ECSE contractor meetings, State EI/ECSE SEL workgroup, Summer Institute Planning Committee, EI/ECSE Higher Education Collaboration, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), Regional Program, and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) meetings. Among those participating are parents, representatives of school districts, Early Intervention (EI) and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) service providers, education service districts (ESDs), higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies.

Progress of implementation was and continues to be disseminated through these meetings, conference presentations, emails, and meeting website postings. To provide opportunities to inform stakeholder groups who have not been represented on SSIP work teams, the State intentionally selected communication channels that reach targeted stakeholders and public audiences. Stakeholders helped to identify whose input needed to be included in the informational opportunities. The State maximized the use of available communication strategies, including but not limited to:

- Website: The State maintains a dynamic and accessible website to provide current information to districts, families, community members, and the general public [here](#).
- Newsletters: Various offices maintain regularly published newsletters to support district efforts. Additional newsletters have been created by the State CPS Lead and the Pyramid Model State Coach and are distributed monthly.
- Listservs: The Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities maintains a Director's listserv to update district special education directors and EI/ECSE program coordinators on announcements, deadlines, opportunities, and resources. Presentations to the SICC took place three times during FY 2019, and the SSIP and related activities remains a standing agenda item for every meeting. Information regarding SSIP activities were also presented to Oregon's 9 EI/ECSE contractors, and the EI/ECSE state SEL workgroup (described in Phase III-2). During these presentations, participants discussed improvement and implementation data and stakeholders asked questions and offered feedback. Open-ended survey questions were used to gather additional feedback through an alternative mode and help determine next steps and areas of improvement. The following questions were presented to each group: 1) Did we do what we said we would do? 2) Did we get the results we were looking for? 3) What is missing or could be changed at this point? 4) Other observations?
- The Quick Start Guide for Building High Quality State Systems was also used in a meeting of the SICC to evaluate infrastructure components that may be related to SSIP implementation and the SiMR.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes

If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Feedback from 12 surveys show that on a scale of 1-5, 60% of respondents rated the efforts at a 4, stating that they believed efforts remained important to ensuring progress on child outcomes data. In examining the results of the Quick Start Guide tool, the State found that the majority of respondents either "don't know" or are not aware of system components or responded that they did not see evidence of the system component in what was presented or available to them on the various listservs, websites, and social media avenues. Random sampling of the comments in response to the following question: What improvements can be made to the SSIP?

- Examine and learn more about other approaches and data impacting state improvement efforts by exploring and analyzing data from other regions
- Focus on practices that increase family engagement and support
- Look more closely at data in the areas receiving targeted support
- Examine practices that support children birth to three
- Examine effectiveness of implementing both strategies within one program with support of coaching
- Increase engagement and collaborative partnerships across agencies supporting young children
- Utilize technical assistance (TA) from national leaders to support thinking around improved outcomes and the related strategies
- Examine Statewide EI/ECSE System through a continuous growth and improvement lens
- Include data connected to LRE and Inclusion in Regular Education Settings
- Include Removal and Reduction data
- Dedication of funds to support ongoing training and technical assistance
- Increase focus on Evidence Based Practices
- Continue annual cross-sector training institute, and explore virtual options

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State has reported FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State adhered to the evaluation plan described in Phase II, assessed and reported on its progress in implementing the SSIP. As required, the State is now providing OSEP with: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.