
Arkansas's
State Personnel Development Grant Proposal

Submitted to:

Office of Special Education Programs

U.S. Department of Education

CFDA # 84.323A

Submitted by:

Arkansas Department of Education

Special Education Unit

February 13, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A. Need for Project	1
B. Significance	10
C. Quality of the Project Design	17
D. Quality of Project Personnel	35
E. Adequacy of Resources	46
F. Quality of the Management Plan	54
G. Quality of the Project Evaluation	81

<u>PRIORITY REQUIREMENT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
(a) Projects funded under this notice must make positive efforts to employ and advance in employment qualified individuals with disabilities in project activities. See Section 606 of IDEA	47
(b) Applicant must describe steps to ensure equitable access to, and participation in its program for students, teachers, and other. program beneficiaries with special needs. See Section 427, GEPA	46 - 50
(c) Projects funded under these priorities must budget for a three-day Project's Directors' meeting in Washington, D.C. during each year of the project.	53 Budget Narrative
(d) The applicant must budget \$4,000 annually for support of the State Personnel Development Grants Program Website currently administered by the University of Oregon (www.signetwork.org).	53 Budget Narrative
(e) Use evidence-based (as defined in this notice) professional development practices that will increase implementation of evidence-based practices and result in improved outcomes for children with disabilities	10 - 80 Significance, Design, & Management
(f) Provide ongoing assistance to personnel receiving SPDG-supported professional development that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity	10 - 80 Significance, Design, & Management
(g) Use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide on-going professional development to personnel, including to personnel in rural areas and to other populations, such as urban or high-need LEAs.	47 - 48 Significance, Design, & Management
(h) If a project receiving assistance under this program authority maintains a Web site, the applicant must describe how the will include relevant information and documents in a form that meets a government or industry-recognized standard for accessibility.	47
(i) State Personnel Development Plan that identifies and addresses the State and local needs for the personnel preparation and professional development of personnel, as well as individuals who provide direct supplementary aids and services to children with disabilities	1 - 16 Needs and Significance
(j) Must award contracts or subgrants to LEAs, institutions of higher education, parent training and information centers, or community parent resource centers, as appropriate, to carry out the State Personnel Development Plan	22, 51-55 Letter of Support Budget Narrative
(k) Not less than 90 percent of the funds the SEA receives under the grant for any fiscal year for the Professional Development Activities	48

A. NEED FOR PROJECT

Demographic Information. Arkansas geography and demographics impact the delivery of educational services. Geographically, Arkansas covers more than 52,000 square miles, which is about the same size as New York or Alabama and a little smaller than Illinois. Demographically, Arkansas' estimated total 2014 population of 2,966,369 residents makes it the 33rd most populous state in the nation (US Census Population Estimates, State Totals, 2014). Arkansas has eight metropolitan statistical areas (MSA), which are composed of 12 of Arkansas' 75 counties. The remaining 63 counties are classified as non-metropolitan, and 21% of the state's residents live in rural communities (towns with population with less than 2,500). Economically, Arkansas' median household income is \$40,768; 19.2% of Arkansas households have an income below the poverty level (US Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey). Statewide the racial composition is 79.9% White, 15.6% Black or African American, 1.0% American Indian and Alaska native, 1.5% Asian, 0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and 1.9% two or more races.

The southeast region of the state, commonly referred to as the Delta area, is comprised of 15 counties. The population of these counties is 322,870, or 10.9% of the overall state population (US Census Bureau, State and county QuickFacts, 2013). The percent of persons living below the poverty level in in the southeast region is 25.1. This is notably higher than the 19.2% of persons living below the poverty statewide (US Census Bureau, State and County QuickFacts, 2013). Compared to the statewide median household income of \$40,768, Delta households, on the whole, are poorer than other areas of the state with a median income of less than \$32,000 for over half of the

counties in the southeast region of the state (US Census Bureau, State and County QuickFacts, 2013). Racial composition in the southeast region is 54.8% White and 42.8% Black or African American compared to 79.9% White and 15.6% Black or African American statewide (US Census Bureau, State and County QuickFacts, 2013).

Organizational structure of the Arkansas public school system. Arkansas hosts 257 Local Education Agencies (LEAs and Charter Schools) and 15 Education Service Cooperatives (ESCs). The ESCs are multicounty intermediate service units in the state's elementary and secondary education system. Created through state statute in 1985, the ESCs are charged to support school districts which choose to utilize their services in (1) meeting or exceeding accreditation standards and equalizing education opportunities; (2) more effectively using educational resources through cooperation among school districts; and (3) promoting coordination between school districts and the Department of Education. Services provided are consistent with the needs identified by school districts and the educational priorities of the state as established by the General Assembly or the State Board of Education (Arkansas Code Annotated (A.C.A.) § 6-13-1002). The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) also promulgates rules governing ESCs.

The ESCs may receive and expend funds from state and federal governments, from LEAs, and other public and private sources. There is statutory provision for infrastructure funding for ESCs, and the ADE provides grants to ESCs for some targeted services, including literacy, math and behavior specialists. Arkansas LEAs may choose not to participate in an ESC, as is the case with the largest LEA, the Little Rock School District (LRSD). In this case, the LRSD provides the majority of its

education support services internally but does utilize some outside services, such as specific professional development offerings, from the ADE.

School-based accountability designations. Under the Arkansas ESEA flexibility waiver (approved by the U.S. Department of Education in 2012 and amended July 2013), the state's accountability system identifies schools in five categories: Exemplary, Achieving, Needs Improvement, Needs Improvement Priority (lowest 5% in the state, referred to as Priority) and Needs Improvement Focus (lowest 30% for Targeted Achievement Gap Group or TAGG which includes students with disabilities, referred to as Focus). Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs) for each school are used to measure proficiency and growth in literacy and math, with graduation rates also considered for high schools.

The five designations support the use of relevant data to inform school improvement strategies. Schools are also provided with additional financial and/or technical assistance resources to move proficiency forward. Of the approximately 1,064 elementary and secondary schools in Arkansas, 37 are identified as Priority schools, and 85 are identified as Focus schools (ADE Data Center). (See the map in Appendix A on page A-1.)

Recognizing that a school's low enrollment of English language learners (ELLs), economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities (SWD) kept the performance data for one or more these groups from being reported, Arkansas was approved to compile and report performance for these three groups of students collectively as the TAGG. Overall, students are not achieving at sufficient rates in either Priority or Focus schools, and a comparison of the performance of All Students and TAGG students

reveals some differences.

In literacy, more than half of the students in the All Students group performed at a proficient level in 19 Priority schools compared to 15 Priority schools for the TAGG. All Students and TAGG students in Priority schools met literacy growth targets at similar rates.

Identification trends for students with disabilities. There were 474,995 students in Arkansas public schools grades K-12 during 2013-2014, and 55,021 students eligible for special education services (11.58% of the total student population). Over the past five years, Arkansas has served a relatively consistent number of SWD, showing only a very slight net increase from 54,826 students in 2009-2010. Over the past five years, Specific Learning Disability and Speech Impairment have remained the disability categories representing the most students and accounted for 18,172 and 14,484 students, or 33% and 26%, respectively. Two disability categories have grown significantly over the past five years. The disability category of Autism has steadily increased by a cumulative 47% over the past five years from 2,466 in 2009-2010 to 3,629 students in 2013-2014. Similarly the disability category of Other Health Impairments has increased by a cumulative 18.5% over the past five years from 8,347 in 2009-2010 to 9,894 students in 2013-2014. Conversely, the disability category of Intellectual Disability has declined over the past five years. It declined 13% from 6,556 students in 2009-2010 to 5,702 students in 2013-2014. These trends are pertinent to challenges facing educators. For example, Specific Learning Disability remains the largest eligibility group in the state, and research suggests that 80-90% of students identified as having learning disabilities also have impairments in reading (Fletcher,

2006).

Academic outcomes and needs for students with disabilities. Statewide literacy assessment data, from the 2012-2013 ADE Annual Performance Report, demonstrates a significant gap in performance between students with disabilities and students without disabilities at all grade levels. Historically, literacy proficiency has been lower than math proficiency. While the percent of SWD who demonstrate proficiency in literacy has steadily increased, from 2007 (20%) to 2013 (33%), the Arkansas target (45%) has not been met. The largest gaps in both reading and math between SWD and students without disabilities occur in the central Arkansas urban area, which includes Little Rock, North Little Rock and the Pulaski County Special School District, and the service areas of the Great Rivers, the Arkansas River, and the Southeast Education Service Cooperatives, areas that include the southeast region of the state, commonly referred to as the Delta. There is concern that a lack of systemic implementation of professional development in evidence-based reading instruction, within an articulated system of supports, continues to impact student learning.

Proficiency scores for SWD in grades 3-5 have remained steady at an average of 39%, but drop in 6th grade to 25% and remain consistently low through high school. It is notable that students with disabilities who were assessed with accommodations on the literacy assessment scored lower than SWD who were assessed without accommodations.

Further analysis indicates that there is also a relationship between discipline and the level of proficiency in literacy. Proficiency levels in literacy for SWD who had disciplinary removals was 19% compared to 36% for SWD who had no disciplinary

removals. Looking at the length of disciplinary removals, students that were removed from the classroom for more than 10 days had the lowest levels of proficiency. The proficiency level in literacy for SWD who had 1-10 days of disciplinary removals was 20% compared to 12% for SWD removed from the classroom for more than 10 days.

Notably, the southeast region of the state (LEAs within the Great Rivers, Arkansas River and Southeast ESCs) evidenced the lowest proficiency level in literacy (13.6%) for SWD across the range of disciplinary removals. Similarly, only 11% of SWD in the LRSD were proficient in literacy across the range of disciplinary removals. Overall, 24% of SWD in the LRSD were proficient in literacy compared to 33% statewide. Combined and individually, these outcomes present unique and urgent considerations for educators in these LEAs, the ESCs and the ADE.

Behavioral outcomes and needs statewide. Student behavioral outcomes in Arkansas signal a need for building capacity in school districts to change the current approach to addressing behavior. Of reported office discipline referrals, about 56% come from disorderly conduct or insubordination (Anderson, Ash, & Ritter 2014), behaviors that disrupt the education of all students. Youth Risk Behavior Survey results (Centers for Disease Control, 2014) comparing Arkansas and the U.S. more generally show that Arkansas is above the national average in serious behavioral issues, such as (a) carrying a weapon on school property, (b) being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property, (c) being in physical fight on school property, (d) not going to school because of safety concerns at school or traveling to or from school, (e) being bullied on school property, and (f) being electronically bullied. Arkansas ranks in the top 15 states for the use of suspension in schools (Losen & Gillespie, 2013) and 11th for the gap

between black and white students, with black students being three times more likely to be suspended than white students. About 1 in 20 students experience out-of-school suspensions (OSS) in a given year. The rate of OSS is as high as 22% in some districts and, for low-achieving students, as high as 43%; further, students with disabilities are especially likely to receive OSS, with disparities ranging up to 19 percentage points (Anderson et al., 2014). Arkansas is one of the 19 states that allows corporal punishment, with 192 of 260 school districts reporting its use (Anderson et al., 2013). Over the last decade and a half, Arkansas schools have reacted to reports of school violence with zero tolerance policies (and are especially sensitive because of the 1998 school shootings in Jonesboro, AR) and as a consequence, are suspending and expelling students. The need for a positive approach to supporting student behavior is great, as the reactive policies are “ineffective in the long run and are related to a number of negative outcomes” such as “elevated rates of school dropout, poor school climate, low academic achievement, and discriminatory school discipline practices” (Evenson et al., 2009). In other words, the attempts to stop school violence with zero tolerance policies have contradictory effects - they actually hurt students and schools rather than help them. Clearly different or alternative responses are needed in schools, especially in work on prevention of behavioral problems among students.

Need for an integrated approach to improving literacy and behavioral outcomes. Given the current academic and behavior data for students across the state, and SWD in particular, there is a need for building capacity across school districts to implement effective evidence-based instruction and interventions in literacy and behavior to move achievement forward for all students, particularly students with

disabilities. Of specific concern to the ADE are the proficiency and disciplinary data in districts representing three ESCs (Great Rivers, Arkansas River, and Southeast) as well as in the Little Rock School District.

A synthesis of research on the development of anti-social behavior, reading difficulties and interventions, and the potentially more powerful preventive effects of combined approaches suggests consideration of an integrated literacy/behavior multi-tiered system of supports (Ervin et al., 2006). There is a documented connection between low academic skills and problem behavior, which increases over time (Fleming, Harachi, Cortes, Abbott, & Catalano, 2004; Morrison, Anthony, Storino, & Dillon, 2001; Nelson, Benner, Lane, & Smith, 2004). Further, students facing challenges in both areas are at higher risk for poor school outcomes (McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun & Cochrane, 2008).

The challenge of undertaking the implementation of a multi-tiered system of support is significant; however, there are successful models of implementation at the state and district levels. For example, evidence from the Michigan Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) yields both motivation and expertise on the implementation of an integrated model that can be scaled statewide (Ervin et al., 2007; McGlinchey & Goodman, 2008).

Opportunities to support, align, and enhance state initiatives. The development of capacity throughout the educational system in Arkansas to implement evidence-based practices is not only foundational, but can be realized by supporting, aligning and enhancing related state initiatives. Opportunities to align initiatives have been identified, and the need for collaborative planning and integrated work is critical.

Additional discussion about efforts to align and braid initiatives is provided in the following section, B. Significance.

Previous Arkansas State Personnel Development Grants. The Arkansas Department of Education, Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) has previously received two grants from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the State Improvement Grant (SIG) 2003-2007 and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) 2009-2014. In making application for a new SPDG in 2015, there are important lessons learned that must inform our work as we move forward.

Both the SIG and the SPDG included training and support for school-based teams in Positive Behavior Support Systems (PBSS), with a SPDG focus on a cadre of Facilitators, and a goal of helping to establish models of evidence-based problem-solving processes, needs assessments and alignment of resources, and multi-tiered systems of support for all students in their schools and districts. On-site evaluations and surveys from participants ranked the trainings and support highly.

Although marked individual growth for a number of Facilitators and some school-based teams was reflected by the evaluation tools such as the SPDG's Implementation Integrity Self-Evaluation and the Positive Behavior Support Systems (PBSS) Facilitator Implementation Survey, training participants abilities to communicate their understandings and/or to effectively discuss or present the implementation process to others in their schools or districts was limited. In addition, literacy training and support was restricted in scope, often focusing on individual teachers or classrooms, sometimes school-wide but rarely at a district level.

A review of the results of SPDG efforts have shown that little district-wide

implementation has occurred, and there has been limited evidence to indicate ESC areas now have the capacity to sustain SPDG PBSS or literacy programs. ESC training efforts were largely limited to summer workshop offerings for individual attendees.

Both the SIG and the SPDG were built around a single model in their approach to implementation. This approach did not have at its center a collaborative partnership across multiple units of the Arkansas Department of Education. Stronger, clearer communication with key players is an essential component of the new grant. This shift in the way Arkansas implements the new SPDG is necessary to produce a greater impact on the capacity of districts and schools to deliver effective instruction to all students, especially those with disabilities, and to sustain this change over time. The AR SPDG proposal demonstrates the state's commitment to continuous, system-wide improvement, built on emergent research in sustainable implementation of scalable initiatives, and the delivery of professional development that adheres to evidence-based standards and practices.

B. SIGNIFICANCE

Over recent decades, federal and state statutes have led to a current context in public education of increasing focus on accountability. This has created heightened awareness and understanding of the need to effectively support school districts to implement and sustain evidence-based systems and practices that yield desired student outcomes. Significant to Arkansas, the current school accountability system (ESEA Flexibility approved by the U.S. Department of Education in 2012, and amended July 2013) is driving changes not only for school districts, but also for the state education

agency. As well, accountability under the Office of Special Education Program's revised accountability framework has driven not only an increased focus on the entitlements under the law, but also an emphasis on results for students with disabilities. While local school districts are working on school improvement strategies, the state education agency is focusing on ways to respond to district needs, to provide state level support that makes a difference, and to address barriers with meaningful and functional policies, services and assistance. Increased use of student performance data in literacy and math, as well as discipline (i.e. in-and out-of-school suspensions and expulsions) are not only collected and reported, but are being scrutinized and analyzed to determine appropriate supports, interventions and innovations that assist schools in closing achievement gaps and creating learning environments that foster improved student outcomes for all students, especially students with disabilities.

At the state level, the following actions have been taken to support higher standards and move student achievement forward:

- The General Assembly has enacted a statute designed to provide early identification and intervention for struggling readers (Act 1294 of 2013);
- The Arkansas State Board of Education has adopted the Common Core State Standards (October 25, 2012);
- The State Education Agency is participating in PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career) as a governing member, providing input in development as well as leadership in its implementation in Arkansas;

- As of September 2013, all Individual Education Programs (IEPs) are standards-based to ensure the instruction received by students with disabilities through their special education program is aligned with College and Career Ready Standards; and
- The Divisions within and across the Arkansas Department of Education (Learning Services and Public School Accountability) are collaborating and aligning resources and initiatives to better support school districts and drive student achievement forward.

This proposal is significant in that data-driven analyses of need across the Arkansas education landscape has led to a theory of change and action planning built upon learning from previous initiatives, emerging research for effective implementation of large-scale initiatives and the importance of aligning resources for maximum impact. Thus, the AR SPDG is built upon four primary considerations:

1. Application of research on implementation and scaling-up of large scale initiatives;
2. A data-driven focus on student performance and subsequent areas of need for improvement;
3. Aligning and braiding initiatives to maximize impact through efficient use of resources; and
4. Learning from previous State Personnel Development Grant outcomes.

Building upon current research and evidence-based practices. The ADE has determined that there is a compelling need to create a multi-tiered system of supports/response to intervention (MTSS/RTI) framework that builds upon current

research of implementation and scaling-up of large-scale initiatives. In addition, the ADE has recognized that there is a need to build professional development protocols that adhere to recognized standards and are implemented with fidelity. Further, the ADE recognizes the inherent efficacy of braiding initiatives that share common features. These considerations, tied to the identification of data-driven priority needs for students with disabilities, led to the specific goals reflected in this proposal, with the ultimate goal of improving both academic and behavioral outcomes for students, especially students with disabilities.

To achieve this goal, the ADE has attended to current research and evidence-based practices to support:

- Developing a clearly articulated system of evidence-based professional development standards and practices that will support state, regional and district level implementation of selected evidence-based practices (Gulamhussein, A. (2013), Guskey, T.R. (2000). Trivette, et al. 2009);
- Developing a clearly articulated framework for implementation from the state through regional and district levels, building upon stages of and drivers for implementation (Fixsen, et al., 2005; Fixsen et al., 2008); and
- Braiding behavior and literacy evidence-based practices across and within a multi-tiered system of supports (Bohanon, H., Goodman, S., & McIntosh, 2009; McIntosh, Horner, & Sugai, 2009).

Subsequently, attention to this research and related evidence-based practices led to the following new or enhanced AR SPDG design features:

- An emphasis on developing state, regional and district *implementation*

capacity;

- An emphasis on *attending to organizational supports* that are required at each level and making necessary adjustments at each level of the system;
- Developing *partnerships across the system*, among the state, regional and district levels;
- A focus on *stages of implementation*, rather than rigid training sequences;
- Developing *communication feedback loops*, where participants inform and impact the delivery of professional development, supports and assistance; and
- Attention to the delivery of professional development that emphasizes *fidelity in adherence to standards and protocols*.

Data-driven focus on student performance and identified needs. Analysis of student assessment data, reported as part of the Arkansas Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Accountability System, shows much room for academic growth and demonstrates the necessity to improve the performance of SWD. School improvement efforts, supported by ADE staff are ongoing.

Embedded within the accountability system, the Teacher Excellence and Support System (TESS) was developed to support high quality classroom instruction and high quality instructional leadership in Arkansas schools. TESS provides a blueprint to operationalize a standardized valid and reliable evaluation and support system, focused on the professional growth of educators as measured by professional practice as well as student growth and achievement. This reflects a theory of change that quality instructional outcomes result from a process of continuous improvement through

experience, targeted professional development, and insights and direction gained through thoughtful, objective feedback. This component of the accountability system supports and aligns with the AR SPDG model of evidence-based professional development.

The Special Education State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is a comprehensive multi-year plan that focuses on improving results for SWD. Data-driven, the Arkansas SSIP targets increasing literacy achievement, focusing on supporting district level implementation of evidence-based practices. Undergirding this focus is the ADE's self-identified need to improve its own capacity to lead meaningful change through effective implementation of evidence-based practices (Fixsen, D.L., Blasé, K.A., Horner, R.H, & Sugai, G., 2008). Annually increasing the percentage of K-5 SWD who score at grade level benchmarks on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) reading assessment is the State Identified Measureable Result for target schools.

Enhancing sustainability through braiding initiatives. Recently, the ADE Assistant Commissioner, Division of Learning Services prioritized efforts to support schools to improve instruction through RTI. The AR SPDG will build upon this ongoing effort and enhance it through the carefully articulated and implemented SPDG professional development/technical assistance (PD/TA) system for MTSS/RTI. The AR SPDG proposal was developed through collaborative planning across multiple ADE units including Special Education, Curriculum and Assessment, Professional Development, School Improvement and Planning, and School Health Services. This collaborative process resulted in a program design supported across the ADE and a

commitment to leverage resources and adhere to common professional development and implementation standards throughout the initiative. Thus, the AR SPDG will rely on unified efforts to braid existing programs and resources. This will improve the efficacy of integrating and aligning practices and/or initiatives that have shared components and/or parallel processes (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; McLaughlin & Mitra, 2001).

Learning from previous State Personnel Development Grants. This proposal builds upon the positive outcomes of the previous SPDG, utilizing personnel at the state, regional and district levels who benefitted from previous professional development and experience, including the behavior and literacy specialists supported by the ADE. The new SPDG will introduce necessary skills, knowledge and supports to move full implementation forward. A significant foundation exists for the implementation of a school-wide positive behavior intervention and support model, providing a base of human resources for ESC and district training and coaching.

Lessons learned from the previous SPDG inform the current proposal. Most significantly is the determination that, without a strategy for sustainable implementation, professional development yields only scattered impact. Significantly, the current proposal addresses the need to build implementation capacity at the state, ESC and district levels in order to sustain an ongoing system of professional development in order to achieve the AR SPDG goals. In essence, the AR SPDG program will lead a restructuring of the RTI discussion in the state and provide a consistent and effective state model or framework for the implementation of MTSS/RTI.

C. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN

The AR SPDG will facilitate the design and implementation of a PD/TA system to support the implementation of a research-based MTSS/RTI at the regional, district and school levels. The priority focus areas for the AR SPDG are as follows: 1) implement effective and efficient delivery of professional development; 2) increase the use of evidence-based professional development practices that will increase implementation of evidence-based practices and result in improved outcomes for children with disabilities; 3) provide ongoing assistance to personnel receiving SPDG-supported professional development that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity; and 4) use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide on-going professional development to personnel, including to personnel in rural areas and to other populations, such as urban or high-need LEAs.

The AR SPDG is aligned with and supports the required Arkansas SSIP, as well as the Arkansas accountability framework under the ESEA Flexibility and TESS. Further, the AR SPDG is aligned with and supports the re-structuring of the emergent state RTI Framework that is driven by both state statute and ADE priorities. See the figure in Appendix A on page A-2.

Implementation of the project as designed requires the efficient and effective use of relevant research and resources, the engagement of committed partners and advisors, committed leadership from the state SPDG implementation team, and reliable support of ADE leadership. Results and lessons learned from the previous AR SPDG, as well as the insight and guidance of recognized experts who have agreed to serve on the AR SPDG national advisory group, informed the direction of the SPDG project.

Core partners. Following are the core partners committed to this project with the ADE: LRSD, the required partner LEA; the American Institutes for Research (AIR); Arkansas State University (ASU), Center for Community Engagement, the Institute of Higher Education (IHE); the Arkansas Disability Coalition and Parent Training and Information Center (PTI); and Public Sector Consultants (PSC).

The LRSD will be a contracted partner and will be the first LEA to participate in the AR SPDG. See the memorandum of agreement (MOA) and letter of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-1. This partnership will be established between the district and the ADE in order to implement and sustain the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI framework, including evidence-based literacy and behavior practices, and to build capacity at the district level to support and sustain these practices over time. As a result of six schools classified in academic distress and pursuant to A.C.A. § 6-15-429 and § 6-15-430, on January 28, 2015, the State Board of Education removed the current Little Rock School District Board, and the district was placed under the authority of the Arkansas Commissioner of Education. Close collaboration among the Little Rock Superintendent, the Commissioner, and others at the ADE has already begun.

AIR, ASU CCE, the PTI, and PSC will provide a vast array of expertise and experience to the benefit the project, and share ADE's vision for and commitment to the success of the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI. See Core Partners, beginning on page 50, in the Adequacy of Resources section for a detailed discussion of the many resources that AIR, ASU CCE, the PTI and PSC will provide the project.

Other key partners. Other key partners important to the implementation and success of the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI include the ESCs, the Arkansas Association of

Educational Administrators (AAEA), the Arkansas Education Association (AEA) and the Arkansas Association of Special Education Administrators (AASEA).

Participating ESCs will commit to partnerships with the AR SPDG, critical to the development of Regional Implementation Teams (RITs). This is a significant design feature, supporting the integration of ADE and district improvement priorities. The investments of AAEA, AEA, and AASEA are crucial to the development of district implementation leadership. These professional education membership groups will be key to an effective communication plan. See table in Appendix A on page A-3.

Project goals and objectives. The three primary goals for this project are to: 1) establish a standards-based and high quality system of PD/TA that builds capacity and supports fidelity in the implementation of evidence-based practices at the regional, district and school levels; 2) provide PD/TA at the regional and district levels that supports the implementation of research-based MTSS/RTI; and 3) provide PD/TA at the regional and district levels to implement integrated MTSS/RTI evidence-based practices in literacy and behavior at the school level to support improved student outcomes in classrooms.

Project objectives are focused on measures of capacity growth over time, increased fidelity in implementation over time, and adherence to standards and protocols for professional development throughout the course of the project. Those participants who effectively implement the identified supports and practices will achieve the intended outcome of sustained implementation of an integrated MTSS/RTI that yields improvement in literacy and behavior at the school, classroom and student levels,

and this success will provide motivation for continued rigorous adherence to program practices.

An overview of the project goals and objectives, within each focus area, in alignment with SPDG program measures follow.

FOCUS AREA: Implement effective and efficient delivery of professional development.	
LOGIC: The AR SPDG will <i>establish a standards-based and high quality system of professional development and technical assistance (PD/TA)</i> in order to build capacity for the implementation of MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior, at the state, regional, and district levels, to impact improved outcomes for students with disabilities.	
GOAL 1: AR SPDG PD provided at the state, regional and district levels will meet annual benchmarks as scored against the OSEP professional development rubrics.	
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.1 By 2020, all AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>state level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.2 By 2020, all AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>regional level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.3 By 2020, all AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>district level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD</p>	<p>OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 1.</p> <p>Projects use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.</p>

practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.

FOCUS AREAS: Increase the use of evidence-based practices that result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Provide ongoing assistance to personnel receiving SPDG-supported professional development that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity. Use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide ongoing professional development to personnel.

LOGIC: The AR SPDG will establish a standards-based and high quality system of professional development and technical assistance (PD/TA) in order to *build capacity for the implementation of MTSS/RTI* for literacy and behavior, at *the regional, district, and building* levels to impact improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

GOAL 2: BY 2020, participants in SPDG PD provided at the state, regional and district levels will demonstrate increased capacity for implementation supports for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.1 By 2020, *state* implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP State Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.2 By 2020, *regional* implementation teams will

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 2.

Participants in SPDG-supported professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG-

<p>demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP Regional Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.3 By 2020, <i>district</i> implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP District Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.4 By 2020 <i>school</i> leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time as measured by the RTI Implementation Fidelity Rubric; teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity consistently by the end of a three-year implementation action plan.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.5</p> <p>The project will use at least 50% of SPDG funds in Year 1, 70% in Year 2, and 80% in Years 3-5 for follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.</p>	<p>supported practices over time.</p> <p>OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 3.</p> <p>Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOCUS AREAS: Increase the use of evidence-based practices that result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Provide ongoing assistance to personnel receiving SPDG-supported professional development that supports

<p>the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity. Use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide on-going professional development to personnel.</p>	
<p>LOGIC: The AR SPDG will establish a standards-based and high quality system of professional development and technical assistance (PD/TA) in order to build capacity for <i>the implementation of (MTSS/RTI) evidence-based practices for literacy and behavior at the district and building levels to impact improved outcomes for students with disabilities.</i></p>	
<p>GOAL 3: By 2020, participants in SPDG PD at the district and school building levels will demonstrate increased competencies in the implementation of MTSS/RTI literacy and behavior instruction and supports.</p>	
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.1 By 2020, school leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time as measured by the PBIS Fidelity Instruments; teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school years.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.2 By 2020, 80% of schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will demonstrate annual reductions in office discipline.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.3 By 2020 building level participants will demonstrate improvement in implementation of literacy components over</p>	<p>OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 2.</p> <p>Participants in SPDG-supported professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.</p> <p>OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 3. Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities</p>

<p>time and will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school years.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.4 By 2020, schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will show increase of at least 8% on grade level benchmarks.</p> <p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.5 By 2020, 80% of trained parents will demonstrate increased understanding of MTSS/RTI essential components.</p>	<p>designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

Project activities. Project activities are presented in relationship to the need, goal areas and expected outcomes, reflecting the logic model developed by the AR SPDG. Although the presentation of the activities suggests sequential events, in reality many activities must be simultaneous and over-lapping. The following table provides an overview of the relationship between identified needs, project goals, activities and expected outcomes of the project activities.

NEED: There is no established evidence-based PD/TA system at the state, regional or district level to support sustained implementation of MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior.

GOAL 1: AR SPDG PD provided at the state, regional and district levels will meet annual benchmarks as scored against the OSEP professional development rubrics.

OUTCOMES: State, regional and district capacity for training and coaching is sustained to support implementation of MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior at the school building level.

ACTIVITIES

- Establish AR SPDG project management structure to implement AR SPDG PD/TA system
 - Develop and implement protocols for roles and functions of AR SPDG State Implementation Team (SIT)
 - Develop and implement assessment for measuring fidelity of SIT protocols
- Establish structure and protocols for roles and functions for PTI, regional and district implementation teams (RIT and DIT)
 - Develop and implement protocols for roles and functions of AR SPDG RIT, DIT and PTI
 - Develop and implement assessment for measuring fidelity of RIT, DIT, PTI protocols
- Develop and implement AR SPDG MTSS/RTI PD/TA Communication Plan to support PD/TA at each level (RIT, DIT, PTI)

- Identify participants/direct receivers
- Establish essential communication goals and timelines
- Identify technologies and pathways to be used
- Ensure accessibility for all communication strategies
- Develop feedback processes
- Define AR SPDG PD/TA protocols and standards
 - Utilize a stakeholder input process for a gap analysis across typical AR PD/TA practices and evidence-based PD/TA standards
 - Utilize gap analysis to inform and support establishment of AR SPDG PD/TA protocols, including:
 - Training protocols
 - Coaching protocols
 - Technical assistance and follow-up protocols
- Implement protocols at each level of the system:
 - State, regional, district, PTI PD/TA for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI essential components
 - Universal screening, Progress monitoring, Data Based Problem Solving, Tiered System of Support for academics and behavior

- State, regional and district PD/TA for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI literacy and PBIS components
- Measure fidelity of implementation of PD/TA components at each level
- Provide necessary supports to sustain implementation at each level

NEED: There is no consistent implementation of research-based MTSS/RTI at the regional or district levels in Arkansas.

GOAL 2: BY 2020, participants in SPDG PD provided at the state, regional and district levels will demonstrate increased capacity for implementation supports for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI.

OUTCOMES: State, regional and district capacity to support implementation of AR MTSS/RTI results in fidelity of implementation at the school building level.

ACTIVITIES

- Develop and implement LEA and ESC project participant application/selection criteria and process
- Adopt and implement state, regional and district implementation capacity assessments
- Develop/adopt/adapt and install AR MTSS/RTI Training Modules (in partnership with AIR, ASU and PTI)
 - On-line modules for overview of essential elements
 - On-site modules for participant knowledge and skill development
 - On-line and on-site modules for parents (in partnership with the PTI)

- On-line and on-site modules for trainers and coaches
- Provide training to identified state, regional and district implementation teams and partners
- Provide training to identified DIT trainers and coaches
- Establish/select and support a cadre of DIT trainers and coaches
- Measure fidelity and impact of DIT training and coaching at all levels
- Measure implementation of AR SPDG MTSS/RTI practices at district and school building levels
- Provide appropriate technical assistance and supports to sustain implementation
- Establish implementers' networks and/or communities of practice

NEED: School level implementation and support, for evidence-based competencies in literacy and behavior instruction and supports, are inconsistent.

GOAL 3: By 2020, participants in SPDG PD at the district and school building levels will demonstrate increased competencies in the implementation of MTSS/RTI literacy and behavior instruction and supports.

OUTCOMES: Implementation, with fidelity, of evidence-based practices in literacy and behavior instruction and supports at the school building level demonstrate improved student outcomes in literacy and behavior.

ACTIVITIES

- Adopt district and school building implementation capacity assessment for evidence-based practices in literacy and behavior
 - District and school building implementation teams develop implementation action plan
- Deliver literacy and behavior training and coaching modules
 - On-line for overview of practices
 - On-line and on-site for knowledge & skill development
- Assess participant district and school capacity for implementation
- Adopt and install implementation fidelity tools
- Provide appropriate technical assistance and supports to sustain implementation
- Establish implementers' networks and/or communities of practice

Logic model. The AR SPDG Project Logic Model describes the flow of inputs, outputs and outcomes that this project is designed to deliver. See **SPDG Logic Model** in Appendix A on page A-5. The design provides support at each level of the structure of the Arkansas public school system. This includes support at the state, regional (ESC), district, school and classroom levels. The design is informed by research on implementation stages and drivers (Fixsen & Blasé, 2008; Fixsen et al., 2008) and the critical need for adherence to evidence-based professional development practices (Trivette, et al., 2009).

Levels of support across the system. Supports at each level of the system are designed to build capacity and competencies necessary to implement evidence-based practices at the school and classroom levels, in order to impact improved outcomes for students, including SWDs. AR SPDG MTSS/RTI Process of Support illustrates the cascading levels of support that lead to short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes and impacts. See the figure in Appendix A on page A-6. While the graphic might suggest static or sequential supports and communication feedback across levels, the implementation is intended to be dynamic, responsive and timely. This is at the heart of the AR SPDG project design.

Communication/data support loops. A successful system of supports across the levels of a public school system, in this case from the state through the regional and district levels, to the school and classroom levels, is contingent on a sound data decision support design, where decisions rely on a continuous flow of data among participants at all levels, the quality and specificity of the data, and the timely and appropriate response to such data. Building upon the premise of policy enabling

practice and practice informing policy (PEP-PIP), the AR SPDG system of supports for this project is constructed around not only PEP and PIP, but ***supports that enable practice and practice that informs supports.***

This conceptual framework means that not only do discrete measures of fidelity and capacity provide feedback to levels of the support system, but also organizational dynamics, including experiential realities; perceptions of district and/or school culture; and practices that create perceived or real barriers. Shared analysis of these conditions is intended to yield rich, meaningful customized technical assistance and follow-up supports from coaches and Regional and District Implementation Teams (RITs and DITs). If there are state level policies or support challenges, the feedback loops are designed to inform practices at this level as well.

Direct and indirect support. The AR SPDG MTSS/RTI provides for direct and indirect support at each level of the system, with support to:

- Implement SPDG PD/TA protocols at the state, regional and district levels;
- Provide PD/TA with fidelity at the state, regional and district levels;
- Build capacity for implementation of evidence-based practices at the regional, district and school levels; and
- Sustain implementation of evidence-based practices at the district and school levels.

Direct receivers include those who are trained and coached at the regional and district levels, creating implementation teams that, in turn, support implementers at the school and classroom levels. Indirect receivers include those supported at the school and classroom levels to implement the targeted practices through training, coaching and

technical assistance from regional and/or DITs. See the table in Appendix A on page A-7.

LEA Cohort Development. In the first year of the project, at least five schools from the LRSD will be selected through an application process. The LRSD is one of the districts not affiliated with a regional ESC. Therefore, members of the State Implementation Team (SIT) will make up much of the RIT and work directly with the LRSD DIT. Training will be inclusive of pertinent LRSD staff at the district and school levels, and within the parameters of optimal training, other LRSD and ESC staff will be included in the training. This inclusion will provide essential knowledge for future cohort trainers and coaches.

An application and selection process for participants beginning in year two (Cohort 2) will add at least five more LRSD schools and other LEAs in partnership with their ESCs. All schools that apply will have to meet the selection criteria, but preference will be given to the eligible applicants with the greatest needs. Based on SSIP data, this includes schools within the Great Rivers, Arkansas River and Southeast ESCs, and based on ESEA accountability data, this would include priority and/or focus schools. At least three RITs (two DITs within each region) will be added in the second year of the project.

In each of the subsequent years, cohort development continues to build capacity for implementation and scaling-up MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior across the participating regions by annually adding other LEAs in partnership with their ESCs, an additional school from each of the prior year participating districts, as well as additional LRSD schools. See the table in Appendix A on page A-12.

This configuration is designed to increase the capacity of participating regions and districts to support implementation with fidelity, increase the competencies of coaches in supporting RITs and DITs, and support the development of school leadership and implementation of identified competencies in classrooms. The long-term outcome is to build capacity across the regions and districts to continue to implement and scale-up MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior beyond the five years of this project. While the parameters of the plan are reflective of a reasonable scope of the program in the first five years, the project is intended to expand the essential understanding and knowledge of evidence-based practices for MTSS/RTI for literacy and behavior beyond the cohort implementation teams and build a base for future cohort applicants, trainers and coaches.

D. QUALITY OF PROJECT PERSONNEL

An exceptional, experienced management team will oversee the management and day-to-day operations of the SPDG.

AR SPDG Staff. Lisa Haley will be the **Principal Investigator** (.15 FTE in kind), and, as such, will manage the AR SPDG. Her responsibilities will include program oversight and fiscal management of grant funds. Ms. Haley has a Master's Degree in Public School Administration and a Bachelor's Degree in Secondary Education, with a K-12 endorsement in special education. Her 26 years of experience in special education ranges from classroom teaching to state level program coordination. Ms. Haley was promoted to the position of Associate Director for the ADE Special Education Unit on July 1, 2014, after serving two and a half years as the state

special education Program Administrator for Monitoring and Program Effectiveness. Prior to her service in the ADE Special Education Unit, Ms. Haley was the Literacy/Math Coordinator for the Arkansas State Personnel Development Grant from October 2004 through January 2012, after spending 11 years in Missouri as a district level special education administrator. Ms. Haley is the Project Director for the OSEP-funded PROMISE grant. See page C-48 in Appendix C. She has been selected to serve on numerous interagency task forces and committees, including the Arkansas Legislative Task Force on Autism, the Arkansas Governor's Developmental Disabilities Council, the Arkansas State Rehabilitation Advisory Council, the State RTI Leadership Team, the State Dyslexia Guide Writing Team, the Arkansas Closing the Achievement Gap Task Force, the Arkansas Adolescent Literacy Intervention Project Leadership Team, and the Specific Learning Disability Resource Guide Writing Team. Ms. Haley has developed training materials for results-driven accountability, IDEA regulatory procedures; standards-based IEPs, the state's newly implemented system of tiered monitoring, data-based decision making, RTI, and strategic instruction model (SIM) learning strategies. Ms. Haley's position and influence will help sustain systemic changes made through the AR SPDG. See Ms. Haley's curriculum vitae (CV) in Appendix C on page C-1.

Jennifer Gonzales will serve as **Project Director** (.80 FTE) and will be responsible for the day-to-day management and leadership of the AR SPDG, including the supervision of other SPDG staff. Mrs. Gonzales has a Master's Degree in Education with over 15 years of educational experience, ranging from elementary classroom teacher to state level coordinator. She currently serves as the ADE SSIP Coordinator and is the Director of the OSEP funded Deaf-Blind Grant. See page C-48 in

Appendix C. Mrs. Gonzales coordinates SSIP efforts with the ADE's strategic plan and facilitates the Special Education Unit's collection and analysis of key data and infrastructure in order to improve strategic planning. Mrs. Gonzales is collaborating with special education consultants to develop a statewide technical assistance dissemination process that builds LEA capacity to implement evidence-based practices. She has experience managing behavior intervention specialists who provide targeted and intensive intervention support to LEAs. Prior to her role as SSIP Coordinator, Mrs. Gonzales spent three and a half years as the Positive Behavior Support Coordinator for the Arkansas State Personnel Development Grant. In this role, her primary focus was multi-tiered RTI systems and data-based problem-solving methods. Mrs. Gonzales has been involved in school improvement efforts across the state and has developed training materials for use with classroom management, positive behavior support, data-based problem solving, and intensive and strategic behavioral interventions. See Mrs. Gonzales' CV in Appendix C on page C-6.

The grant will fund two state **MTSS Coordinators** (2.0 FTE). The MTSS Coordinators will participate on the SIT and RITs and directly support the development of all statewide MTSS/RTI literacy and behavior PD/TA.

One MTSS Coordinator must have successfully provided leadership in MTSS/RTI implementation at the building and district levels and have experience leading MTSS data discussions for school leadership teams, grade level teams and special education classrooms and programs. The MTSS Coordinator must be proficient in coaching and mentoring administrators, must have successfully supervised and supported teaching staff, and must have demonstrated proficiency in utilizing data to

effectively implement an integrated MTSS/RTI model. Coordinator job responsibilities include instructing adult learners in multiple settings (small group, large group, one-on-one) to use summative, formative, and diagnostic assessments in both the academic and behavioral realm; coaching others to deepen knowledge and develop capacity to implement MTSS/RTI; and supervising the work of MTSS District Facilitators. The MTSS Coordinator must have a Master's Degree in School Psychology, Special Education, or a related field, and preference will be given to candidates with five years of experience in Arkansas public schools and a background in implementation science.

One coordinator will specialize in literacy and have the knowledge of current research and effective practices in research-based literacy curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The MTSS Literacy Coordinator's teaching philosophy must support the State Standards for ELA and Literacy. The MTSS Literacy Coordinator's skills must include the ability to provide professional development to all educators and administrators on literacy related assessments, interventions, curriculum, and instruction. Proven experience in adult learning situations, team problem-solving, and coaching will be expected. The MTSS Coordinator must have a Master's Degree in Special Education, Reading or a related field, and preference will be given to candidates with five years of experience in Arkansas public schools and a background in implementation science. Once the grant award is known, recruitment will take place so the MTSS Coordinators can begin work at the beginning of the grant project period.

The grant will fund a **LRSD MTSS Coordinator** (1.0 FTE) to exclusively manage and support LRSD MTSS/RTI implementation and serve as the key contact for the state and DITs. The LRSD MTSS Coordinator must have successfully provided leadership in

the implementation of MTSS/RTI at the school and district levels and have experience leading MTSS data discussions for school leadership teams, grade level teams and special education classrooms and programs. The LRSD MTSS Coordinator must be proficient in coaching and mentoring administrators, must have successfully supervised and supported teaching staff, and must have demonstrated proficiency in utilizing data to effectively implement an integrated MTSS/RTI model. The LRSD Coordinator job responsibilities include scheduling PD/TA, instructing adult learners in multiple settings (small group, large group, one-on-one) to use summative, formative, and diagnostic assessments in both the academic and behavioral realm, and coaching others to deepen knowledge and develop capacity to implement MTSS/RTI. The LRSD MTSS Coordinator must have a Master's Degree in School Psychology, Special Education, Reading or a related field, and preference will be given to candidates with five years of experience in Arkansas public schools, a background in implementation science, and an understanding of LRSD structure, culture and systems. Once the grant award is known, recruitment will take place so that the LRSD MTSS Coordinator can begin work at the beginning of the grant project period.

The grant will also fund an **Administrative Assistant** (1.0 FTE). The Administrative Assistant will be responsible for organizing and maintaining SPDG financial documents and files and day-to-day clerical duties associated with the SPDG, such as answering phones; responding to routine inquiries; scheduling meetings, trainings, and travel arrangements; procuring office supplies and facilitating communication among SPDG staff and others. The Administrative Assistant must have the equivalent of a high school diploma and at least two years experience performing

similar tasks in an office or school setting.

An **ADE Literacy Specialist** (.10 FTE in kind) from the Professional Development Unit in the Division of Learning Services will support the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI project with initial development and/or adoption of training modules, materials and PD for district leadership teams. The literacy specialist's skills include the ability to provide professional development to all educators and administrators on literacy related assessments, interventions, curriculum, and instruction. The specialist has expertise in modeling and coaching educators in literacy practices, assisting educators in analyzing data to plan instruction that meets diverse student needs, and assisting educators in instructional planning using universal design principles.

Dr. Jody Fields will serve as **Data Manager** (.15 FTE in kind). She is currently the Director, IDEA Data and Research, Center for Applied Studies in Education, University of Arkansas Little Rock. She has been the data manager for the ADE Special Education Unit for 11 years and has a thorough understanding of Arkansas data and data reporting processes and systems. Dr. Fields' previous data and research experiences include positions as a Community Resource Associate in Austin, Texas, and the Project Director for the Institute for Child Life Assessment, Studies, and Services at Jackson State University in Mississippi. See Dr. Fields' CV in Appendix C on page C-7.

American Institutes for Research (AIR). The AIR is currently developing RTI training for Arkansas and has agreed to be an active partner for the AR SPDG. In years 1 and 2 of the AR SPDG, AIR efforts will focus on training and coaching for the LRSD, additional LEAs and ESCs, with the focus of training and coaching in Years 3 and 4

transitioning to other regional and district teams. In Year 5, AIR will be less directly involved, as Arkansas educators take the lead to train and coach others, and the state moves toward a sustainable MTSS/RTI program.

Dr. Dia Jackson is leading the AIR team. Dr. Jackson will continue her work in Arkansas as she supports and guides AR SPDG MTSS/RTI state and RITs, serves as a member of the SIT, develops RTI training module content, delivers trainings, and provides on-site and distance TA. Dr. Jackson is a Researcher in the Education Program at the AIR who provides PD/TA to states and school districts in the areas of special education best practices and RTI. She currently leads an RTI personnel development project in the New York City region and provides technical assistance and product development for the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center. See page C-48 in Appendix C. Dr. Jackson earned both a Bachelor's Degree and a Master's Degree from The University of Virginia in 2005 and in 2014 completed her Doctorate Degree in special education at the George Washington University. See Dr. Jackson's CV in Appendix C on page C-12.

Center for Community Engagement at Arkansas State University. The Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) Resource Center at Arkansas State University (ASU) is part of ASU's Center for Community Engagement. The AR SPDG will contract with the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) at Arkansas State University for PBIS support and guidance. The CCE staff will provide training in PBIS to ESC's and LEAs; develop PBIS modules for web-based and face-to-face training;

participate in SIT and RITs; and develop PBIS selection, training, and coaching protocols and fidelity measures.

Dr. David Saarnio (.25 FTE) is the current Administrator of the PBIS Resource Center at ASU. He received his Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Michigan and has expertise in developmental and educational psychology, research methods, and psychometrics, as well as over 15 years of experience with program implementation and evaluation. Dr. Saarnio is a Professor at ASU, Founder and Director of the Center for Community Engagement at ASU, and Founder and Co-Director of the Office of Behavioral Research and Evaluation at ASU. Recent grant funding that Dr. Saarnio has secured includes: Project LAUNCH, a collaboration with the State of Arkansas Division of Behavioral Health Services and MidSouth Health Systems; Safe Schools/Healthy Students, a collaboration with MidSouth Health Systems and four school districts in Craighead County, Arkansas; College Preparatory Academy for the Delta, a collaboration with the ASU College of Education and Behavioral Science; and Craighead County Juvenile Drug Court grant collaboration with Craighead County, Arkansas and MidSouth Health Systems. Dr. Saarnio has been published in numerous journals. See Dr. Saarnio's CV in Appendix C on page C-16.

Other PBIS Center staff will work with the AR SPDG (2.55 FTE and 480 hours of contract work), and also have impressive qualifications. In addition to expertise in PBIS, CCE staff provide consultation in program development and cultural competence, as well as psychometrics, data management, data analysis, and other elements of evaluation. The State Coordinator of CCE is a trained School Psychology Specialist. The Assistant Coordinator has worked in education for over 30 years as both a teacher

and K-6 interventionist. Two staff who provide onsite and off-site training and supports for PBIS are expected to be the initial PBIS trainers and consultants. In addition to regular CCE staff, a consultant with a background in both PBIS and SWIS will assist with web-based training efforts.

Public Sector Consultants. Public Sector Consultants Inc. (PSC) is a private corporation providing research, analysis, and implementation services. The firm's staff has particular expertise in systems design and management, program evaluation, survey research, facilitation, and strategic planning. Jennifer Huisken LaPointe and Craig Wiles, with Public Sector Consultants, will conduct the external evaluation of the AR SPDG. Both Ms. Huisken LaPointe and Mr. Wiles have extensive experience in program design, implementation, and evaluation. Ms. Huisken LaPointe is a senior consultant in the Education Division at PSC with nearly 20 years of education experience and expertise in special education policy and practice, technical assistance systems, personnel development, program design and evaluation, and process facilitation. In her role at PSC, Ms. Huisken LaPointe analyzes education policy and practice issues and provides strategic counsel, system design, and facilitation services. Senior Consultant Craig Wiles has expertise within qualitative and quantitative research methods, including surveys, interviews, focus groups, case studies, and program evaluation. He manages the entire research process, including methodology, instrument development, sampling and data collection, analysis, report writing, and the presentation of findings. See CV for Ms. Huisken LaPointe and Mr. Wiles in Appendix C on page C-19.

National Advisors. Dr. Lucille Eber, Dr. Steve Goodman, Dr. Stephanie Jackson, Ms. Barbara Sims, and Dr. Rebecca Zumeta have agreed to serve on the AR SPGD national advisory team.

Lucille Eber, Ed.D., is the Director of the Midwest PBIS Network, and a collaborative partner with the U.S. Department of Education's National PBIS Center. The National PBIS Center supports state and school district initiatives for students with complex emotional and behavioral challenges. As the Illinois Director of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports for many years, Dr. Eber has facilitated PBIS implementation in over 1,800 schools. Dr. Eber is a former board member of the Illinois Federation of Families, the National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health and the Association for Positive Behavior Supports. She regularly publishes articles on wraparound services, interagency systems of care and school-wide positive behavior supports. See Dr. Eber's CV in Appendix C on page C-25.

Steve Goodman, Ph.D., is the director of Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant and for Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative, a statewide project through the Michigan Department of Education designed to improve student reading and behavior outcomes. He is on the Board of Directors for the International Association for Positive Behavior Support and is an implementation partner with the National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. He has co-authored articles on integrating behavior and academics in a MTSS. See Dr. Goodman's CV in Appendix C on page C-29.

Barbara Sims is Co-Director of the National SISEP Center in the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

She has 30 years experience in education as a teacher, administrator and consultant and has worked in private and public settings, including work at a State Education Agency. Barbara's current focus is the application of implementation research to the education field. See Ms. Sims' CV in Appendix C on page C-31.

Stephanie Jackson, Ph.D., managing director at AIR, directs policy, research, and evaluation studies for federal, state, and private policymakers. Dr. Jackson has more than 30 years of experience in a variety of educational environments, including general and special education settings, magnet schools, charter schools, and institutions of higher education. She has been recognized for her educational leadership in schools and her practical and realistic perspective on the learning of all students, including students with disabilities. In 2010, Dr. Jackson became the project director for the National Center on RTI, which was funded by the OSEP. In this role, she oversaw the technical assistance efforts that helped states build capacity to support districts in implementing RTI. See Dr. Jackson's CV in Appendix C on page C-39.

Rebecca Zumeta, Ph.D., is a senior research analyst at the AIR. She has more than 10 years of experience working in general and special education and currently coordinates technical assistance and product development for A.I.R's National Center on Intensive Intervention. Previously, she worked for the Washington State Department of Special Education providing RTI technical assistance and helped redesign the state's alternate assessment. She has also worked on randomized controlled trials of mathematics interventions at Vanderbilt University and has co-authored several papers and articles on RTI, mathematics intervention, and curriculum-based measurement. She chairs the Professional Development Standards and Ethics Committee of the Council

for Exceptional Children's (CEC) Division for Learning Disabilities, is a member of CEC's Division for Research. See Dr. Zumeta's CV in Appendix C on page C-44.

E. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES

Support of the ADE. The ADE has adequate facilities, technology, equipment, supplies and resources to sustain the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI Project over the five years of the grant funding and continue the program beyond the grant period. Significant personnel and financial investment has been made to support previous SPDG projects and for the delivery of services and supports for special education, as well as the broader education system.

The Special Education Unit (SEU) will support this project and its activities. With primary offices of the ADE and SEU in Little Rock, Arkansas, the agency will provide office space, *which is accessible for individuals with disabilities*, for the project adjacent to the SEU offices. The ADE will provide Internet, email and telephone, teleconferencing and videoconferencing necessary to implement the project. These technologies *assure that personnel can access participation from any area of the state, including rural and high need urban LEAs to implement the project*. The ADE will also make substantial contributions toward equipment, supplies, and other needed technology. An active website, which meets government-wide accessibility standards (Web Accessibility Initiative), is available. All new website materials will be developed in accordance with recognized or government standards and any materials for districts or parents will be available in alternate formats, including, large print, Braille or audio as needed. The ADE is connected to all of the ESCs and LEAs in the state, making conferencing, on-

line coaching and customized technical assistance readily available. The various technologies also provide support for peer networks and communities of practice, planned follow-up activities to support participants and bolster the PD/TA provided throughout the period of the grant.

The Arkansas Internet Delivered Education for Arkansas Schools (IDEAS) portal also will be extensively used to deliver online staff development/SPDG MTSS/RTI offerings, in collaboration with the Arkansas Educational Television Network. The ADE has a contract with Arkansas IDEAS for such purposes.

The ADE has an existing agreement with the Great Rivers ESC to provide business and fiscal management for grant activities including full support of the business and human resource areas. Great Rivers will support Project staff with staff recruitment and employment, payroll - employee benefits, taxes and retirement, purchase of supplies and materials, and payments to sub grantees, general accounting of revenues and expenditures, and managing staff leave and vacation. The ADE and the partner fiscal agent for this project, Great Rivers ESC, encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. In accordance with Section 606 of IDEA, the ADE and Great Rivers ESC will make "positive efforts to employ and advance in employment qualified individuals with disabilities" to work on the AR SPDG project.

The ADE will make personnel contributions to the project (.40 FTE). The Principal Investigator (.15), Ms. Haley will provide program oversight and fiscal management of grant funds. The IDEA Data Manager (.15), Dr. Fields will provide

consultation and support in Arkansas data and data reporting processes. The ADE Literacy Specialist (.10) will provide support in the development and provision of literacy training modules, materials and PD. Beyond articulated FTE as in kind, the ADE is committing on-going involvement of staff in day-to-day consultation with SPDG staff, and participation in the SIT. See personnel loading chart showing staff and consultant availability in Appendix A on page A-13.

The ADE has successfully administered previous SPDG projects, demonstrating capacity to execute a SPDG project. In implementing the proposed SPDG, the ADE will use at least 90 percent of the funds received for PD/TA. The proposed infrastructure for PD/TA builds upon existing structures and staff at the state, regional and district levels, insuring that the evidence-based practices and supporting systems will be sustained beyond the life of the grant.

The ADE also has a history of supporting successful projects after grant funding ends. For example, the AR Co-teaching project, which was an integral part of the previous SIG and SPDG, continues to be 100% funded through Title VIB funds. Technical assistance from this project will be available to schools participating in the new SPDG project, as needed.

Aligning Title VI B resources to maximize impact. Numerous initiatives and resources, funded by Title VIB through the SEU, are available to support the AR SPDG Project. State behavior consultants support schools in meeting the needs of students with disabilities with intense behavioral needs, and behavior consultants will work collaboratively with new AR SPDG staff to align efforts in common schools. The State's consultant for children with Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) will partner with SPDG

MTSS/RTI consultants to support teachers of students with TBI as appropriate. The ADE provides 63% of the funding to support salaries and benefits of staff implementing the AR Deaf-Blind Grant - Children and Youth with Sensory Impairments (CAYSI) through Title VIB; these resources also will be available to participating schools as needed. Arkansas Easter Seals Outreach and Technology and Curriculum Access Center, funded through a combination of state and Title VIB funds, and Educational Services for the Visually Impaired (ESVI), work collaboratively with CAYSI staff in providing services to eligible students and families across the state; these services will also support participating AR SPDG schools as appropriate. Easter Seals Outreach and Technology and Curriculum Access Center will develop PD modules around “access” for all students, especially students with disabilities to enhance MTSS/RTI implementation in participating schools, as well as be a resource statewide. Additionally, PD modules specific to meeting the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities will be developed to support the project.

Use of embedded structures within the state education system. The commitment of the ESCs to build capacity for the MTSS/RTI assures sustainability for the AR SPDG program beyond the funding cycle. The ESCs will involve skilled staff in RITs and partner to develop trainers and coaches from existing staff, supporting sustainability beyond the term of the grant funding. See letter of support in Appendix B on page B-4.

Commitment of partners. Central to the success of the AR SPDG project is the ADE’s collaboration with partners and its engagement of expert national consultants.

Core partners. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) will support training for implementation teams and the development of state, regional and district MTSS/RTI trainers and coaches. This contracted partner will assist the ADE in building in-state capacity for PD/TA. The AIR has decades of experience working on federal, state, and locally funded projects designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, including both students with disabilities and their nondisabled classmates. From 2007 to 2012, AIR operated the National Center on Response to Intervention and now supports the National Center on Intensive Interventions. See letters of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-5.

The Arkansas State University, Center for Community Engagement will be the contracted IHE partner for the AR SPDG. This partnership will support the integrated implementation of training, coaching, technical assistance and related professional development resources for positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS). The Director of the Center will be a member of the SIT and in this capacity will support the braiding of evidence-based practices for PBIS across all activities, at all levels of the project. Expert staff at the Center will develop content materials, train, coach and provide support for data collection for the school-wide information system (SWIS), related fidelity measures and web resources for PBIS practices. (See the MOA and letter of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-8.)

The Arkansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) is funded by a federal grant and operated through the Arkansas Disability Coalition. The goals of the center are to empower parents of children with disabilities as decision makers and advocates for their children, and to promote parent/professional partnerships. The PTI

will collaborate with the SIT to develop training and information modules for on-line and onsite delivery. The modules will provide parents with an understanding of the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI framework, its essential components and the ways in which these components support student progress. These materials will include guiding questions parents should consider when discussing student progress at schools and in classrooms, strengthening parent engagement in the MTSS/RTI process. See the MOA and letter of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-11.

Public Sector Consultants (PSC) will provide third party evaluation services. As the contracted evaluator for the current AR SPDG, the company's involvement supports ongoing successful collaboration. Two evaluators will serve as consultants to the AR SPDG core management team and the SIT.

Other partners. As previously mentioned, the ADE Assistant Commissioner, Division of Learning Services is leading the charge in the development of a statewide system PD/TA system and MTSS/RTI framework. The Assistant Commissioner will be on the SIT and support the AR SPDG by routinely providing project updates to ESCs, the Arkansas State Board of Education and professional education organizations, including the AAEA, the AEA and the AASEA. The Assistant Commissioner will be instrumental in keeping stakeholders informed about PD and TA materials and tools as they are developed and made readily available to all LEAs across the state. See letters of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-13.

Alignment of ADE efforts. The Assistant Commissioner was deliberate in the inclusion of staff from multiple ADE units with other leaders in education in the development of the vision for and design of AR SPDG.

The ADE Professional Development Unit works with many stakeholders to provide quality professional learning opportunities for Arkansas educators. Intensive professional development is offered to support educators with the implementation of comprehensive literacy instruction aligned to State Standards. A literacy specialist will support the AR SPDG by providing literacy PD and TA to targeted AR SPDG MTSS/RTI LEAs.

The ADE School Improvement Unit supports districts and schools in their efforts to improve student achievement. The unit brokers resources aligned to specific district or school needs. The School Improvement Unit will work in close collaboration with the AR SPDG, with ADE School Improvement Specialists serving on RITs. These specialists will ensure alignment of services to schools and districts across ADE initiatives.

The School Health Services Unit at the ADE will support the AR SPDG through the aligned goals of the Arkansas school-based mental health program. Through this program, students and their families may access a full array of mental health services at no cost, and ADE collaboration ensures greater benefits to Arkansas communities.

The ADE Curriculum and Instruction Unit will support the AR SPDG through collaboration with content area specialists in English Language Arts and Dyslexia.

State Stakeholders. The ADE has strong working partnerships with LEAs and state stakeholders. The AR SPDG will communicate and work with the Special Education Advisory Panel, the Arkansas Reading Association, the Arkansas Association for Educational Administrators, the Arkansas Association of Special Education Administrators and the Arkansas Education Association. Addressing the need to

engage communities, businesses and other stakeholders, the AR SPDG will also communicate with the Arkansas Mental Health in Education Association, Arkansas Rehabilitation Services, the Arkansas Community Parent Resource Center, and the Arkansas Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children. See additional letters of support in Appendix B beginning on page B-16.

National Consultants. Dr. Lucille Eber, National Center on Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports at the University of Oregon; Dr. Steve Goodman, the Michigan Integrated Behavior and Learning Initiative (MiBLSi); Dr. Stephanie Jackson, American Institute of Research; Ms. Barbara Sims, State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence-Based Project (SISEP); and Dr. Rebecca Zumeta, American Institute of Research, have agreed to serve on the AR SPDG national advisory team.

Reasonableness of the Budget. The ADE is requesting **\$4,999,996** for the AR SPDG project. As indicated in the budget narrative, Section C attached to Form 424, funds have been budgeted in travel for annual trips to the Project Directors' Meeting in Washington, D.C., and \$4,000 per year has been budgeted in the Other category for support of the State Personnel Development Grant SIGnetwork Website currently administered by the University of Oregon. With the in-kind contribution from the ADE, **\$4,999,996** will provide adequate funds for operational costs, staff, travel, sub-contracts and consultants. The Budget Narrative details projected costs and provides a justification for the amounts budgeted. Because of the ESC's commitment for existing staff to become trainers and coaches and the leverage of ADE resources, the amount requested is adequate to implement the project and achieve project goals.

Sustainability beyond the SPDG funding. The AR SPDG project has been designed with sustainability in mind. Successful implementation of the plan will increase capacity with the state's educational system so that the program can continue to thrive long after the SPDG project and funding ends. With a systemic, statewide personnel preparation and professional development infrastructure, LEA's can continue to effectively support students and staff.

F. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Following an appropriate blueprint is essential for the success of any important and ambitious program. The ADE and its partners are anxious to operationalize the quality management plan developed for the AR SPDG.

Ensuring diversity of perspectives. ADE staff from multiple units, as well as identified project partners have been instrumental in planning the AR SPDG project and key to aligning improvement and accountability goals and targeted outcomes.

One of the first activities of the Core Management Team will be to design and implement a communication plan (Objective 1.1.d). Collecting feedback from key stakeholders is an essential component of this plan, and this feedback will serve as another source for diverse perspectives to positively impact program operations. In addition, all management teams will use survey and evaluation results, as detailed in the evaluation plan, to gain additional understanding from stakeholders and improve the program.

AR SPDG project structure. The AR SPDG MTSS/RTI project organizational structure is built upon the system of supports and the logic model that drives this project. See organizational chart in Appendix A on page A-14; see the process of

support graphic, previously discussed on page 32, in Appendix A on page A-6; and see the logic model graphic, also previously discussed on page 32, in Appendix A on page A-5. The project structure, at each level, (state, regional, district, school building) reflects attention to implementation drivers (Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman & Wallace, 2005). Accountability, management of activities, support for staff, and adherence to provision of supports at each level of the system are built into the management structure. The use of continuous communication feedback loops from one level of the structure to another, providing relevant quantitative and qualitative data for decision-making, is key to the on-going provision of supports at each level.

State Implementation Team oversight. The SIT will consist of the ADE Assistant Commissioner, Division of Learning Services, the project's Principal Investigator, the AR SPDG Core Management Team, ADE staff from multiple units, the data manager and the external evaluator. In addition, the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI Project has secured five national experts to serve in advisory function to the Project. See the table showing roles and functions of AR SPDG staff and consultants in Appendix A on page A-15.

The AR SPDG Project Director will meet at least monthly with the Principal Investigator (Associate Director for Special Education) to review all aspects of program operations, including planned activities, resource allocation, other day-to-day operation issues, and any challenges. The Principal Investigator reports directly to the Assistant Commissioner for Learning Services and will be able to seek timely guidance to resolve pressing issues. This immediate access to leadership in the ADE will be of great assistance in overcoming urgent challenges. The Assistant Commissioner and other

key staff in the Division of Learning Services have been involved in the development of the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI Project and have a vested interest in its success and impact at the district, school, classroom and student levels.

The AR SPDG Project Director will be responsible for reporting to the Principal Investigator on a regular basis, leading the management team in the daily activities of the project design, and assuring that a Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycle (The Active Implementation Hub, Improvement Cycles, 2013) is followed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in guidance and implementation support for all cohort teams. The Director will be responsible for most reporting and communication functions of the project; for assuring that project assessments and measures, as outlined in the evaluation plan, are completed as scheduled; and for supporting all teams to complete all activities in accordance with project timelines.

AR SPDG core management team. The SPDG core management team will include the SDDG Project Director, two SPDG project coordinators, and the Project Training Team.

The AR SPDG Project Training Team will include the following:

- The Director and staff of the Center for Community Engagement at Arkansas State University;
- A researcher with the American Institutes for Research; Dr. Jackson will also support the development of parent training materials with the PTI; these materials will be designed to support parent engagement in the MTSS/RTI process;
- The Parent Trainings and Information Center; and

- An ADE literacy specialist.

The Training Team will be responsible for the development and delivery of all project training and will work collaboratively to support parent training. The team will work directly with RITs to support the development of expert trainers and coaches at the regional level and will provide support for regional teams as they develop trainers and coaches at districts. Further, this team is accountable for all training adhering to and meeting standards and protocols for professional development. In addition, the team is responsible to assure that all training venues and resources are accessible to persons with disabilities. The expertise of Training Team members, as well as their specific responsibilities to the AR SPDG project, is detailed in Section D, Quality of Project Personnel.

The Core Management Team will meet at least weekly throughout the start-up of the project, and then twice a month, or more as needed, as the project progresses. The Core Management Team will create an annual plan and use on-line tools to document, coordinate and manage project activities. The use of various tools for communication, shared work, and follow-up will support effective use of time and talent. Adhering to a Plan-Do-Study-Act continuous cycle, the Core Management Team will create detailed plans that include project design activities and will regularly assess adherence to team protocols and adjust functions across the team as necessary to achieve project goals.

As the project progresses, the team will review all project data, including fiscal reports, fidelity and capacity reports, and participant feedback, as well as formative and summative project data. Program changes will not be made without careful review of all

available data, and the team will be attuned to ecological variables such as political, economic and regulatory or regional issues that may impact the project.

The data manager will facilitate the regular review of state and project data, oversee data dissemination protocols and assure data are protected. The data manager will also compile other data and meet with the Core Management Team as needed.

Evaluators from Public Sector Consultants are contracted through the current AR SPDG, and have had an integral role in the development of the evaluation plan for this project. They will support and facilitate the review of project evaluation data and the interpretation of qualitative project data and will assist in developing appropriate communication strategies to report pertinent data to key stakeholders. Essential to this function is supporting communication loops across and between levels of the system in order to assure the data are timely, accurate, and easily understood by all project stakeholders. Data will drive appropriate and timely responses to improve and support implementation of the project. The evaluators will consult with the Core Management Team monthly, or more if needed, and will provide updates at most SIT meetings.

Working with Regional and local structures. The project is focused on the development of local implementation capacity in order to implement and sustain evidence-based practices in MTSS/RTI in literacy and behavior at the school and classroom levels. The project is built on implementation research and practice that is intended to sustain implementation of these practices, with fidelity, beyond the term of the grant. This underpinning supports the use of existing structures as much as possible. The management challenge is to support the implementation of all identified components of this project at each level.

Regional Implementation Teams. Education Service Cooperatives, partnered with local districts, will be supported to identify and provide organizational supports for a RIT that: 1) is supported by the SIT, and 2) will in turn support DITs. Each RIT will include an identified MTSS Specialist who, along with ESC behavior and literacy specialists and ADE School Improvement Specialist(s) assigned to the region, may become a trainer and/or coach. The AR SPDG Training Team will train RITs.

District Implementation Teams. The development of leadership and implementation supports is built upon the alignment of current priorities in school improvement and identified needs for students with disabilities in the state systemic improvement plan (SSIP). The alignment of ESEA accountability outcomes and special education student achievement targets provide the foundation for district and school building efforts.

District leadership will identify and provide organizational supports for a DIT that: 1) is supported by the RIT, and 2) will in turn support School Leadership Teams. The development of high functioning DITs is critical to the long-term program sustainability. District teams will have knowledge, skills, organizational capacity and defined supports that ensure effective implementation of braided evidence-based practices. Participating district teams will include the District Superintendent or designee, a designated MTSS Specialist, an identified data support team member, district trainers and coaches and key school leadership. Trainers and coaches will be selected from existing district staff. (e.g., regional behavior and academic specialists, and special education supervisors) District team members will be trained and coached

by the RIT. The following table provides an overview of teams at each level of the system.

Functions of Implementation Teams	
Unit	Functions
AR SPDG State Implementation Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advises the SPDG Core Management regarding Project implementation, barrier-busting, communication strategies • Provides input to improve alignment with relevant state initiatives • Uses (protected) data from ESCs, LEAs and school buildings for project improvements and decision-making, as well as reporting.
AR SPDG Regional Implementation Teams at ESCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESC leadership provides vision and supports implementation by supporting staff participation in training, coaching and addressing barriers to implementation. • Implementation team is identified and supported to function within the project, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of MTSS specialists, ○ Provision of training, coaching, content expertise, information, materials and evaluation. • Data sharing is at multiple levels: ESC, district, and school. • The RIT uses (protected) data for decision-making & reporting to stakeholders.
District Implementation Teams at	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership provides vision and alignment with related initiatives, and supports implementation through allocation of resources and removing barriers to implementation.

<p>LEAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation team identified and charged with planning, monitoring, problem solving, and continuous improvement of implementation efforts. • An MTSS specialist is identified. • Data sharing is at multiple levels: ESC, district, and school. • (Protected) Data used for internal decision-making and reporting to stakeholders.
<p>School Building Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal supports implementation with vision and support for necessary structures and functions. • Building leadership team is established. • Team participates in training. • Practices for MTSS literacy & behavior implemented. • Fidelity measures collected and used to improve implementation. • Student outcome data collected and used (SWIS & DIBELS).

Supporting Regional and District Implementation Teams. The AR SPDG project will use both quantitative and qualitative data to track progress across project objectives at each level of the system, at least quarterly intervals. Attention to the various components of implementation drivers (Fixsen et al., 2005) is an important feature of the management process. It requires attention not only to training and coaching, but identification of barriers within the organization itself that may impede implementation and sustainability. The use of defined measures will inform leadership at each level regarding progress made and issues to be addressed. Aligned with the PEP-

PIP cycle of feedback to assure that policies inform practice and practices are informing policies (Fixsen and Blasé, 2009), these measures with related intervals for use are outlined in the evaluation plan.

Implementation design includes continuing support for new practices at each level. To this end, the AR SPDG management team will develop and participate in peer/implementers' networks for members of participating regional and DITs, beginning in the third quarter of Year 2 (Objective 2.2.i). This network will support shared problem solving, clarification of vision and expectations, and build a professional communication system.

AR SPDG Management Supports for Implementation Teams

State Implementation Team (SIT)	Advisory to SPDG Core Management Team; includes Assistant Commissioner for Learning Services, Principal Investigator, Parent Training and Information Center; <i>ADE leadership</i> structure embedded in SIT.
Regional Implementation Team (RIT)	ESC Director designee is team member and reports to Director; Teacher Center Coordinator (TCC) directs PD initiatives at ESC and collaborates with team; <i>State MTSS Coordinator</i> supports functions of the team; regional MTSS specialists linked to peer network across SPDG project; ESC leadership structure embedded in RIT; Director/TCC linked to peer network across SPDG project; Trainers and coaches linked to peer networks. <i>State leadership and core management team support implementation design. All peer networks supported by state core management team.</i>
District Implementation Team (DIT)	District Superintendent designee is team member and reports to Superintendent; Superintendent is linked to peer network across SPDG project; Regional MTSS Specialist supports functions of the team; District leadership embedded in DIT; District MTSS Specialist linked to peer network across SPDG project. Trainers and coaches linked to peer networks. Regional leadership supports implementation design. <i>All peer</i>

	<i>networks supported by state core management team.</i>
LEA Leadership Team	School building Principal or designee is on MTSS implementation team; District leadership supports building implementation team; Principal and building MTSS lead are linked to peer networks across SPDG project. All <i>peer networks supported by state core management team.</i>

Five-Year management overview. The following table is a blueprint for the AR SPDG. Timelines and milestones are included and this table will be used throughout the project to track progress toward achievement of process measures and outcome measures as outlined in the evaluation plan.

Goal 1. AR SPDG PD provided at the state, regional and district levels will meet annual benchmarks as scored against the OSEP professional development rubrics.

Objective 1.1 By 2020, all AR SPDG PD provided at the *state* level will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.

Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
1.1.a Establish project management structure, team protocols, fidelity to protocols	Core Management Team	Structure in place; protocols developed; team assessing its own performance	Q1, Q2				
1.1.b Establish structures and protocols for regional and district implementation teams; develop and implement measures for fidelity to protocols	Core Management Team	Established and fidelity measures in place	Q1, Q2				

1.1.c Establish structures and protocols for the PTI; develop and implement measures for fidelity to protocols	Core Management Team	Established and fidelity measures in place	Q1, Q2				
1.1.d Develop and implement Communication Plan to support PD/TA at each implementation level and with PTI	Core Management Team	Communication Plan active; information is accessible to stakeholders	Q2, Q3				
1.1.e Define SPDG PD/TA protocols and standards and develop stakeholder gap analysis input process	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Stakeholder input completed	Q2, Q3				
1.1.f Establish final PD/TA protocols for training, coaching, TA and follow-up	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Protocols published	Q3, Q4				

1.1.g Implement protocols for all levels of training, coaching, TA for MTSS /RTI	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Protocols utilized for training and coaching	Q4				
1.1.h Fidelity to protocols measured	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Fidelity assessed through observation and participant feedback	Q4	Q4	Q4	Q4	Q4
1.1.i Supports determined and implemented to improve/sustain adherence to protocols and standards	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Assessments analyzed and adjustments made for subsequent training		Q1-Q4			
Objective 1.2 By 2020 all AR SPDG PD provided at the <i>regional</i> level will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
1.2.a SPDG PD protocols implemented at regional level	Management Team, RIT	Protocols utilized for training and coaching	Q4				

1.2.b Fidelity to protocols measured	Management Team, RIT	Fidelity assessed through observation and participant feedback	Q4				
1.2.c Supports determined and implemented to improve and sustain adherence to protocols and standards	Management Team, RIT	Assessments analyzed and adjustments made for subsequent training	Q4				
Objective 1.3 By 2020 all AR SPDG PD provided at the <i>district</i> level will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 & 5.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
1.3.a SPDG PD protocols implemented at district level	RIT, DIT	Protocols utilized for training and coaching	Q4				
1.3.b Fidelity to protocols measured	RIT, DIT	Fidelity assessed through observation and participant feedback	Q4				

1.3.c Supports determined and implemented to improve and sustain adherence to protocols and standards	RIT, DIT	Assessments analyzed and adjustments made for subsequent training	Q4				
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Goal 2. By 2020, participants in SPDG PD provided at the regional and district levels will demonstrate increased capacity for implementation supports for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI.

Objective 2.1 By 2020, *state* implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP State Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.

Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
2.1.a Develop and annually revise the complete LEA project participant application process, including the application form and selection criteria	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Application created and disseminated to LEAs	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3

2.1.b Complete SISEP capacity assessment	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Capacity assessment completed and analyzed	Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4
2.1.c Select and install the essential elements of the AR MTSS/RTI, literacy and PBIS training modules 2.1.c.i for participant knowledge and skill development 2.1.c.ii for parents 2.1.c.iii for trainers and coaches	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	On-line modules installed; On-site modules ready for training events	Q2-Q4	Q1-Q4			
2.1.d. Train PTI staff in MTSS/RTI training modules	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	Training events completed; PD evaluation from participants and observers analyzed	Q4	Q4	Q4	Q4	Q4

Objective 2.2 By 2020, *regional* implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP Regional Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.

NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.

Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
2.2.a Implement the annual LEA project participant application cycle	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT	LEA participants selected		Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3
2.2.b Complete Regional SISEP capacity assessment	RIT	Capacity assessment completed, analyzed, shared with LEA/regional participants	Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4
2.2.c Training in AR MTSS/RTI, literacy and PBIS	Core Management Team	On-line modules installed; On-site modules ready for training events	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3

2.2.d Select trainers and coaches	RIT, DIT	Trainers and Coaches identified and provided with follow-up supports	Q4				
2.2.e Provide training to identified DIT participants	RIT, DIT	Training events completed; PD observations and participant evaluations analyzed	Q4	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3
2.2.f Provide training to targeted trainers and coaches	RIT, DIT	Training events completed; PD evaluated and analyzed for fidelity		Q1 – Q4			
2.2.g Measure fidelity and impact of training and coaching	Core Management Team under the direction of full SIT, RIT	Trainer and coaches analyze impact, determine subsequent supports		Q 2 Q4	Q2 Q4	Q2 Q4	Q2 Q4

2.2.h Measure implementation of integrated MTSS/RTI practices at district and school levels	Core Management Team, RIT	Implementation Fidelity measurements completed		Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3
2.2.i Provide TA and supports to sustain implementation	RIT	TA and supports delivered, impact assessed, follow-up determined, peer networks implemented		Q3- Q4			
Objective 2.3 By 2020, <i>district</i> implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP District Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.							
NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
2.3.a Provide training on MTSS/RTI	RIT	Training events completed; PD evaluation completed	Q4	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3

2.3.b Provide coaching to district teams	RIT	Coaching impact assessed; follow-up determined	Q4	Q1-Q4			
2.3.c Follow-up supports provided	RIT	Impact assessed, coaching/TA evaluated and adjusted	Q4	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3	Q1, Q3
2.3.d District capacity assessed	RIT	Capacity assessment analyzed, shared with district, Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle begins	Q3	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4
Objective 2.4 By 2020 <i>school</i> leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time with 80% implementation fidelity by the end of three-year implementation action plan.							
NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
2.4.a School leadership team receives training, coaching,	DIT	Initial program implementation	Q4	Q1-Q4			

support from district team							
2.4.b RTI implementation fidelity rubric completed	DIT	Rubric results analyzed; action plan created, improvement plan implemented (Plan-Do-Study-Act begins)	Q4	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q3
2.4.c TA and Coaching needs are identified	School leadership team, DIT	Customized supports are provided, including more training, coaching, follow up	Q4	Q3, Q4	Q3, Q4	Q3, Q4	Q3, Q4

Goal 3. By 2020, participants in SPDG PD at the district and school building levels will demonstrate increased competencies in the implementation of MTSS/RTI literacy and behavior instruction and supports.

Objective 3.1 By 2020 school leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time as measured by the PBIS Fidelity Instruments; teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school years.

NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.

Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
3.1.PBIS Self-assessment survey	Core Management Team	Assessment conducted, results reviewed by school leadership team	Q4	Q1, Q4	Q1, Q4	Q1, Q4	Q1, Q4
3.1.b Schools training	Core Management Team	Training is delivered; PD evaluated and training impact is measured	Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4	Q2, Q4
3.1.c Coaching and follow-up TA	Core Management Team, DIT	PBIS fidelity measures implemented; improvement planning completed		Q1-Q4			

Objective 3.2 By 2020, 80% of schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will demonstrate annual reductions in office discipline referrals.

NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.

Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
3.2.a SWIS is installed and supported by district for building PBIS leadership; training in SWIS is provided	DIT	SWIS used as intended; data informs building PBIS team; PBIS implementation improves		Q1	Q1	Q1	Q1
3.2.b SWIS data reviewed regularly; building team achieves fidelity standard	Building Leadership Team; DIT	Number of office discipline referrals reduced		Q1- Q4			
Objective 3.3 By 2020 building level participants will demonstrate improvement in implementation of literacy components over time and teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school							
NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
3.3.a Self-assessment survey for literacy	DIT	Building team reviews data for self-assessment; data informs team planning, additional training,	Q4	Q1	Q1	Q1	Q1

		coaching needs identified						
3.3.b Training is provided	DIT	Implementation of evidence-based practices improves	Q4	Q1-Q4				
3.3.c Coaching and follow-up TA	DIT	Teachers achieve fidelity in use of evidence-based practices		Q1-Q4				
Objective 3.4 By 2020, schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will show an annual increase of at least 8% on grade level benchmarks.								
NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.								
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
3.4.a DIBELS is installed and supported by school and district	DIT	DIBELS implemented school wide as planned		Q1	Q1	Q1	Q1	

leaders							
3.4.b Staff is trained in DIBELS	DIT	DIBELS data informs instructional practices for individual students		Q1- Q4	Q1- Q4	Q1- Q4	Q1- Q4
3.4.c Literacy practices are implemented, with coaching supports as needed	DIT	Teachers demonstrate improvement in use of evidence-based practices		Q1- Q4			
3.4.d DIBELS used with fidelity	School Leadership Team, DIT	Students demonstrate improved achievement		Q2- Q4			
Objective 3.5 By 2020, 80% of trained parents will demonstrate increased understanding of MTSS/RTI essential components							
NOTE: All activities for LRSD begin in Year 1, with first cohort of 5 schools; subsequent cohorts added each year.							
Activities	Responsible Team	Milestones	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
3.5.a Parent training	Core Management Team	Training is delivered; PD evaluated, training impact		Q1 –			

		measured		Q4			
3.5.b Follow-up survey	Core Management Team	Surveys sent, responses received and analyzed, and Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycles		Q1- Q4			

G. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION

Purpose of the evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation will be to provide timely and reliable data that can be used by state, regional and district implementation teams and school leadership teams to make informed decisions during all stages of the project. One of the first tasks of the external evaluator will be to establish data collection and reporting timelines and expectations for team data reporting. For example, an important part of the AR SPDG evaluation data collection and feedback loop will be to develop the electronic survey and group interview protocols. Survey and interview data will provide valuable information about how each team is functioning and how well the system is functioning across each level of implementation (state, regional, district, school). After careful analysis of the data, teams will provide feedback to each other. This feedback loop between teams will routinely inform all aspects of the AR SPDG program.

Survey and focus group data collected will be timely reported to AR SPDG staff and project teams for use to inform decision-making. Evaluation reporting will be an ongoing activity designed with AR SPDG staff and stakeholder input. Interim data reports will be provided throughout the project (e.g. survey frequency reports, focus group summaries, etc.), as data is collected, and will be provided to AR SPDG staff and appropriate leadership team stakeholders. Arkansas State University will manage and collect PBIS programmatic and fidelity data, the AR SPDG staff will manage and collect literacy data and the PTI will manage and collect parent data.

Annual evaluation reporting. All evaluation results will be annually compiled and reported. The results, including progress toward meeting the required SPDG

program measures and targets, will be included in the Annual Progress Report (APR) submitted to OSEP each year of the grant. PSC, the external program evaluators, will have the primary responsibility for the drafting the evaluation section of the report, and the final version of the APR will be shared with AR SPDG partners and other interested stakeholders.

Evaluation tools will elicit both quantitative and qualitative data. However, since the program is intended to develop capacity to implement and sustain evidence-based practices, outcome measures will focus primarily on project impact for the SIT, RITs, DITs and school leadership teams. A secondary focus will be to measure the impact of the implementation of evidence-based practices on student outcomes, using DIBELS for literacy and discipline referrals collected for SWIS.

Appropriate data security measures and informed consent practices will be utilized throughout the evaluation. Participants in the evaluation will be informed of the purpose of each data collection and the ways in which their feedback will be used. They will be made aware of participation risks and informed that confidentiality will be maintained to the greatest extent possible. For both individual surveys and group discussions, individual names will not be used for evaluation reporting, and names will not be linked to specific comments in any evaluation reports. Similarly, standard evaluation security measures will be employed to ensure confidentiality of data collected from PD partners and participants (e.g., electronic storage on secure servers, hard copy data in locked storage). After the following table, that shows systems-level assessment tools to be used to measure and evaluate progress toward project objectives, is a description of all evaluation tools in the project.

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 1.

Projects use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.

GOAL 1: The AR SPDG professional development provided at the state, regional and district levels will meet annual benchmarks as scored against the OSEP professional development rubrics.

Objective	Measurement Tool	Timeline	Data Collection and Reporting
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.1</p> <p>By 2020, all AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>state level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Electronic survey and group Interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Annually in Spring Years 1- 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Online survey completed by SIT members individually• Group interview conducted based on survey results• Results reported to SIT for ongoing planning and implementation decision making

<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.2</p> <p>By 2020, all AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>regional level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic survey and group Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually in Spring Years 1- 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online survey completed by RIT members individually • Group interviews conducted based on survey results • Results reported to RIT for ongoing planning and implementation decision making
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 1.3 By 2020, All AR SPDG professional development provided at the <i>district level</i> will evidence increased implementation of PD practices by meeting at least 50% of the identified OSEP SPDG evidence-based PD components in year 2; 70% in year 3; and 80% in years 4 and 5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic survey and group Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually in Spring Years 1- 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online survey completed by DIT members individually • Group interviews conducted based on survey results • Results reported to DIT for ongoing planning and implementation decision making

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 2. Participants in SPDG-supported professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 3. Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.

GOAL 2: BY 2020, participants in SPDG professional development provided at the regional and district levels will demonstrate increased capacity for implementation supports for the AR SPDG MTSS/RTI.

Objective	Measurement		
	Tool	Timeline	Data Collection and Reporting
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.1</p> <p>By 2020, <i>state</i> implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP State Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Capacity Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Quarter 4 of Year 1 and then twice annually in Years 2-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed by SIT electronically with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator SISEP staff member facilitates completion and observes for implementation fidelity

<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.2</p> <p>By 2020, <i>regional</i> implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP Regional Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-year action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Capacity Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Quarter 4 of Year 1 and then twice annually in Years 2-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed by RIT electronically with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator In Year 1, a SISEP staff member facilitates completion and trains SPDG staff to facilitate. At least 20% of RITs will be observed for implementation fidelity by SIT members.
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.3</p> <p>By 2020, <i>district</i> implementation teams will demonstrate 80% of the implementation components indicated in the SISEP District Capacity Assessment by the end of a three-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Capacity Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Quarter 4 of Year 1 and then twice annually in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed by DIT electronically with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator In Year 1, a SISEP staff

<p>year action plan.</p>		<p>Years 2-5</p>	<p>member facilitates completion and trains SPDG staff to facilitate with the support of the District Capacity Assessment training found on the SISEP website. At least 20% of DITs will be observed for implementation fidelity by RIT members.</p>
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.4</p> <p>By 2020 <i>school</i> leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time with 80% implementation fidelity by the end of three-year implementation action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTI Fidelity of Implementation Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually • Years 1-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed by school leadership teams with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 2.5</p> <p>The Project will use at least 50% of SPDG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually in Spring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed by SPDG Project Director with report provided to

funds in Year 1, 70% in Year 2, and 80% in Years 3-5 for follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.	Spreadsheet	Years 1-5	external evaluator
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	-----------	--------------------

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 2. Participants in SPDG-supported professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.

OSEP PROGRAM MEASURE 3. Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.

GOAL 3: By 2020, participants in SPDG PD at the district and school building levels will demonstrate increased competencies in the implementation of MTSS/RTI literacy and behavior instruction and supports.

Objective	Measurement Tool	Timeline	Data Collection and Reporting
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.1</p> <p>By 2020 school leadership teams will demonstrate improvement over time as measured by the PBIS Fidelity Instruments;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBIS Self-Assessment Survey • PBIS Tiered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually Years 1-5 • Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data submitted by school leadership teams with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator

<p>teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school years.</p>	<p>Fidelity Inventory</p>	<p>Years 1-5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data submitted by school leadership teams with report provided to SPDG staff and external evaluator
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.2</p> <p>By 2020, 80% of schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will demonstrate annual reductions in office discipline referrals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SWIS office discipline referrals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Years 2-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data submitted by schools with annual progress reported to SPDG staff and external evaluator
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.3</p> <p>By 2020 building level participants will demonstrate improvement in implementation of literacy components over time and teams will achieve 80% implementation fidelity within three school</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary Literacy Assessment Tool (PET-R) Secondary Literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Years 2-5 Ongoing Years 2-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data submitted by schools with annual progress reported to SPDG staff and external evaluator Data submitted by schools with annual progress reported to

years.	Assessment Tool (SWEPT)		SPDG staff and external evaluator
PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.4 By 2020, schools within districts that are maintaining fidelity or demonstrating annual improvements in fidelity will show an annual increase of at least 8% on grade level benchmarks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIBELS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Years 2-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data submitted by schools with annual progress reported to SPDG staff and external evaluator
PROJECT OBJECTIVE 3.5 By 2020, 80% of trained parents will demonstrate increased understanding of MTSS/RTI essential components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Follow-up survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed after each training Completed one month after training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data submitted by parents to trainers who submit with annual progress report to SPDG staff and external evaluator Reported to SPDG staff and external evaluators

Implementation Fidelity Evaluation Tools. An electronic survey will be developed by the AR SPDG SIT and annually administered to provide individual feedback from team members and used as a springboard for the group interviews. The content of the interviews will vary from year to year, evolving over the life of the grant to ensure that data remain relevant. For example, surveys and interviews in Year 1 will emphasize the capacity and needs assessment, with surveys in subsequent years focusing on issues related to implementation and sustainability of interventions beyond the life of the AR SPDG. Electronic survey and group interview results will show how well each team is working together and how well it is supporting other implementation and leadership teams. Results will be an important source of data for understanding how well the feedback loops are functioning, and will be instrumental in improving the function of each team and the operation of the entire system. Over time, surveys and interviews will be especially helpful in appropriately leveraging team and individual strengths and addressing challenges.

The **State Capacity Assessment** (SISEP Center) is designed to assess a state's capacity to implement and scale up an evidence-based initiative. The assessment provides key components that measure a state's commitment to implement, to the coordination of implementation, and the use of implementation guidance documents with leadership, and system alignment. The assessment can be used to develop state level capacity action plans.

The **Regional Capacity Assessment** (SISEP Center) is an action assessment. It is designed to help regional leaders better align resources with intended outcomes, and can be used to develop capacity action plans that will support districts

and schools in meaningful ways. This tool is still under development from the SISEP center and the anticipated release is March, 2015. The AR SPDG will do usability testing with this tool for the SISEP Center.

The **District Capacity Assessment** (SISEP Center) helps districts assess the systems, activities and resources needed for the implementation and sustainability of effective innovations, designed to improve student outcomes. The tool also includes a checklist to ensure the assessment is completed with fidelity.

The **Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-wide Reading Programs** (PET-R, University of Oregon) provides scaled scores on 38 items across seven domains: goals/objectives/priorities, assessment, instructional practices and materials, instructional time, differentiated instruction/grouping, administration/organization/communication, and professional development. This collaborative tool stimulates reflection and will guide schools toward targeted implementation of successful program practices.

The **Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-wide Reading Programs (SWEPT, University of Oregon)** provides scaled scores on 38 items across seven domains: goals/objectives/priorities, assessment, instructional practices and materials, instructional time, differentiated instruction/grouping, administration/organization/communication, and professional development. This collaborative tool stimulates reflection and will guide schools toward targeted implementation of successful program practices.

The **PBIS Self-Assessment Survey** (PBIS Center) is used by schools to identify the staff perception of the PBIS implementation status, and improvement areas for

school-wide, classroom, non-classroom and individual student systems. Results of the survey are used to identify action-planning steps for school staff.

The **PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (PBIS Center)** will provide a valid, reliable and efficient measure of the extent to which school personnel are applying the core features of School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS).

The **RtI Fidelity of Implementation Rubric (National Center on RTI)** will be used to monitor school-level fidelity of RTI implementation.

The **RtI Essential Components Worksheet (National Center on RTI)** is a companion to the fidelity rubric and will assist respondents in gathering evidence to be considered when responding to the rubric.

The **Parent Evaluation and Follow Up Survey** is being designed to elicit parent perspectives on the relevance, quality and usefulness of the MTSS/RTI information provided during trainings. A follow-up survey will be sent one month after training that asks parents how the information was applied. This information will be an important source of data from a valuable stakeholder group that is often overlooked.

Student outcome evaluation tools. The **Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS, Dynamic Measurement Group)** are research-based assessments used to measure the acquisition of early literacy skills from kindergarten through sixth grade. DIBELS Next is used to identify students who are at risk of reading difficulty, to monitor student progress, and to guide instruction in order to provide instructional support before a pattern of reading difficulty and failure has been established (Good et al., 2001).

The **School-Wide Information System (SWIS, PBIS Center)** is a secure web-based tool that provides mechanisms for collecting student behavioral data at aggregate and detailed levels to identify discipline issues in schools.

Other evaluation tools. Additional evaluation tools, not tied to specific project objectives, will be used to gather formative data. This formative data will inform multiple aspects of project processes and services.

The Hexagon Tool: Exploring Context (SISEP Center) will be used to systematically evaluate new and existing interventions via six broad factors: needs, fit, resource availability, evidence, readiness for replication and capacity to implement.

The **AR SPDG PD Evaluation Tool** is to be completed after PD is provided by the SIT to RITs. The tool provides feedback about six areas of effective practice (activities to prepare participants, positive social and learning climate, field-relevant information, appropriate practice and application opportunities, reflection and mastery) and will be routinely analyzed and used to improve the quality and impact of PD opportunities.

The **AR SPDG TA Evaluation Tool** is to be used after each TA session provided by the SIT. Results will be routinely analyzed and used to improve the quality and impact of TA.

The **PBIS Implementation Blueprint and Self-Assessment** (PBIS Center) is a systems-level framework designed to support the establishment of the social culture, learning and teaching environment, and individual behavior supports needed by students in order to achieve academic and social success. The tool will be completed by the DIT.

The NCRTI District Capacity and Implementation Rubric and Worksheet

(National center of RTI) is a two-part rubric and worksheet. Recognizing that districts need to build their capacity to adequately support schools before effective district-wide implementation can occur, this assessment is designed for use by individuals responsible for monitoring district capacity to support response to intervention (RTI) implementation and district-wide RTI implementation fidelity and addresses four stages or operation: 1) exploring and adopting, 2) planning, 3) fully implementing and 4) continuously improving.

With the exception of those yet to be developed, the evaluation tools to be used by the AR SPDG are included in Appendix D.