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Executive Summary

Overview of Document Contents

The Hawaii State Department of Education submits this document for Phase 2 of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as required by the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), following requirements set forth by the Part B Measurement Table, Indicator 17 for the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). This document is also written for our stakeholders - Hawaii State Department of Education staff, students, parents, community members, partners in other state agencies, and providers. This Phase 2 submission contains the following information:

1. The phased-in implementation and evaluation plan for each improvement strategy; and
2. The new baseline for our State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR), and proficiency targets.

Hawaii Phase 1 submission is available online at this website: http://bit.ly/HIPhaseI. As with Phase 1, we submit a narrative instead of using the U.S. Department of Education's on-line tool for submission to increase accessibility to the content with the aim of increasing understanding of the Phase 2 decisions.

Highlights for the Phase 2 Submission

Guided by the achievement of our State Strategic Plan goals, the Hawaii State Department of Education continues its transformational efforts, manifesting our commitment to prioritize the advancement of teaching and learning for our students with disabilities. As we progress towards full implementation of our chosen improvement strategies for our SSIP, we expect improved educational results and functional outcomes for all students.

The SSIP Phase 2 submission enhances the strategies identified in Phase 1, and reflects our desire to build the capacity of and appropriately resource instructional leaders at the Complex Area and school-level. Our plan to implement and evaluate such strategies will ensure Hawaii addresses the root causes of low performance identified by our Department and Community Stakeholders in Phase 1: Professional Development and Technical Assistance, Early Interventions, Data, and Student, Parent, and Community Engagement.¹

¹ The Phase 1 SSIP submission, page 76, provides a description of the root causes: (1) Professional Development and Technical Assistance for Quality Instruction to Improve Reading: Necessary to support and build teachers' skill-level and provide teachers with necessary tools and resources to improve the use of reading strategies and interventions to address low reading performance, and improve High-Quality Special Education Teacher percentages and teacher retention. (2) Improvements for Early Interventions (Early in grade and in time): Necessary to address the achievement gap with interventions in early grade levels, and providing systemic and staff supports to identify the need for timely interventions to improve reading. (3) Strategies to Improve Student and Parent Engagement: Necessary to engage and form partnerships with students and their parents to better understand students’ needs, address expectations of the Department and the student and family, so families understand their role in supporting students’
The Hawaii State Department of Education expects improved outcomes for all students with disabilities upon full implementation of the following three improvement strategies:

1. Build Capacity and Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities and Complex Area Implementation Teams;
2. Implement and Evaluate Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices for Improving Student Performance as Documented in Complex Area Plans; and
3. Engage Students, Parents and Community Members by Utilizing the Leading by Convening Framework.

Our implementation plan reflects a deliberate approach such that each strategy will be implemented with fidelity and reach full implementation. Implementation will occur in phases and actions are required by both the State-level and Complex Area leadership and staff. Consequently, our evaluation plan reflects our phased-in implementation. We will work together with our stakeholders on implementation and evaluation, refining and improving practices and activities as we move forward.

Summary of Changes Between Phases 1 and 2

Stepping back from Phase 1 and reviewing stakeholder comments, questions, and concerns about the Phase 1 decisions brought pause, and fueled the development of a robust approach to addressing the root causes identified by stakeholders. The results of our the statewide assessment administered in the 2014-2015 school year also brought new realities about what strategies were necessary to materialize positive and sustainable improvements. In sum, the following provides a list of changes between our Phase 1 and 2 submission:

1. Hawaii has revised baselines of our State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR) due to the administration of a substantially different assessment in the 2014-2015 school year. Both the proficiency and growth targets have new baselines. New proficiency targets are submitted. In addition, the calculation of overall median growth percentile (MGP) is now the true median of the three categories of disabilities, instead of the mean of the median of the three categories of disabilities. Also, the SIMR does not refer to an improvement in “reading”, but rather uses the term “English Language Arts” or “ELA” as the new assessment administered in the 2014-2015 school year utilizes that terminology on the assessment. It is also important to note that the English Language Arts assessment includes a reading component, however we will be utilizing the entire English Language Arts assessment score in measuring proficiency.

learning.

(4) Data Improvements to Identify Student Supports Necessary to Improve Reading: Necessary to provide the systemic and staff support to equip stakeholders with data essential to making decisions about student learning to improve reading.

(5) Fiscal Improvements to adequately Fund Improvement Strategies: Necessary to prioritize funding towards improvement strategies and resources that will positively affect reading improvement, and at the same time, ensuring that improvement strategies are fiscally sustainable over time.

This section responds to the “Questions and Answers for Indicators B-17 and C-11”, specifically question #9, providing a “summary page to highlight” changes/revisions made between Phases 1 and 2.
2. Hawaii made enhancements to our chosen coherent improvement strategies as follows:
   
   A. In order to build the capacity of leadership and staff and address the five main root causes and strands of action identified in Phase 1, the Six Priority Strategies and its Complex Area Support Teams Professional Learning Communities are enhanced by the concurrent use of the Complex Area Superintendents Professional Learning Community and the District Educational Specialists Professional Learning Community.

   B. The responsibility for implementation of evidence-based practices will be placed upon the Complex Area Superintendent and the Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT), to which the Six Priority Strategies’ Complex Area Support Team (CAST) members will be an integral part. Under the Complex Area Superintendent’s leadership and guidance, these CAITs will be responsible for the development of Complex Area Plans, and training and coaching school administrators and staff on evidence-based practices.

   C. The “Focused Intervention” described in Phase 1 tentatively provided a Kindergarten through third-grade program to be decided by State Leadership and implemented statewide. Upon closer inspection of Complex Area data, this decision-making authority has rightfully been placed with the Complex Area Superintendent, as this leader possesses the best understanding of the strengths and needs of their students, staff, and schools. The Complex Area Superintendent’s decisions will be documented in their Complex Area Plans. The Deputy Stocktakes utilized with the Six Priority Strategies implementation will also be the mechanism for accountability of implementation of the Complex Area Plan.

   D. The State’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver will be ending in August. The activities identified to implement our chosen strategies will be closely aligned to the implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized.

These changes will more appropriately address the needs identified during the data and infrastructure analysis in Phase 1. More importantly, the strategies chosen and the thoughtful implementation and evaluation will advance our ability to address the strengths and needs of our students with disabilities, the staff that teach and provide services to our students, and our system of support that moves us all towards success.
Message from Kathryn S. Matayoshi, State Superintendent

In 2016, the Hawaii State Department of Education is embarking on a review and extension of its State Strategic Plan. The Department is committed to improving alignment with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and other federal and state requirements. Congress’ deliberate postponement of key implementation requirements in ESEA, as reauthorized, until the 2017-2018 school year, presents an opportunity to leverage collaborative efforts to align IDEA and ESEA programs and services to benefit all student subgroups, which includes students with disabilities.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan process provides for continued collaborative work internally and with our parents and community partners to focus on increasing our capacity to advance the performance of our students with disabilities. This submission provides thoughtful improvements to build our infrastructure to meet our strategic achievement goals for all students, and implement evidence-based practices that improves early literacy for our students with disabilities. We expect the implementation of the strategies chosen will result in increases in the proficiency rates and high levels of growth on the English Language Arts assessment. We have set ambitious yet attainable targets, acknowledging our desire to narrow the achievement gap and measure whether our students are on a pathway to success. It is work that we cannot do alone and we are grateful to all of our stakeholders.

Recognizing leadership as the key component to ensuring implementation fidelity, we are dedicated to enhancing our system of support for our State, Complex Area, and School leaders to support our teachers and the transformative practices in their classrooms. Our desire to improve alignment between Federal and State requirements will increase the sustainability of strategies described in this submission for prolonged benefit to our students, staff, and system. Together, we remain committed to meet the individualized needs of our students with disabilities. Mahalo!
Introduction: The Hawaii State Department of Education Continues Transformational Efforts in Phase 2

Our Theory of Action: Achieve Student Success by Building the State and Complex Area Capacity for Implementing Evidence-Based Practices

Student success will be attained through the actions of capable leadership supported in their authority to manage resources necessary for scaling-up bright spots and removing barriers for implementing evidence-based practices and addressing Professional Development and Technical Assistance, Early Interventions, Data and Student and Parent Engagement needs. The three strategies chosen by State Leadership will manifest the value placed on the decision-making authority of Complex Area Superintendents. The three strategies chosen are as follows:

1. Strategy #1: Build capacity and collaboration for sustainable statewide improvements utilizing State-level Professional Learning Communities and Complex Area Implementation Teams to provide resources and the training and coaching necessary for implementation fidelity of evidence-based practices;
2. Strategy #2: Implement and evaluate the effectiveness of chosen evidence-based practices for improving student performance as documented in Complex Area Plans and resourced, in part, by an established and coordinated State-level system; and
3. Strategy #3: Engage students, parents and community members by utilizing the Leading by Convening framework to address specific issues that affect the Hawaii State Department of Education’s system of support.

Implementing these three strategies will improve the educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, and specifically improve early literacy for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language, which will be demonstrated by increased rates of proficiency on the English Language Arts Assessment for 3rd and 4th graders, and high-levels of growth for 4th graders on the same assessment.

---

3 The following responds to Sub-components 1(a) and 1(d), Infrastructure Development, and 2(b) and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.
Hawaii continues to refine efforts implemented during Race to the Top and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver. In particular, the use of the Six Priority Strategies, which has been developed utilizing various strategies proven to effect positive student and staff results, will be maintained as one part of our comprehensive plan. Advancements at both the State and Complex Area level will be made to improve the educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities.

The Superintendent, Deputy, and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will lead a team of state-level staff to execute the implementation plan set forth. Already in existence, the Professional Learning Communities of the Six Priority Strategies are routinely assembled for each strategy and combined strategies, and will be concurrently implemented with two separate Professional Learning Communities for Complex Area Superintendents and for District Educational Specialists. These Professional Learning Communities will provide a mechanism to develop knowledge of special education strategies and build capacity of Complex Area leaders and their staff.

In order for the information gathered from these Professional Learning Communities and other valuable information to influence positive changes in the classroom, we are requesting each Complex Area Superintendent establish a Complex Area Implementation Team. Currently, some Complex Areas have a Complex Area Implementation Team, called by another name, but function as the entity aligning historically separate programmatic efforts at the Complex Area to address student achievement. The Complex Area Implementation Team will ultimately become the “change agent” responsible for initiating, improving, and sustaining changes at the Complex Area and school-level through training, coaching, and other supports defined by the Complex Area Superintendent designed to build capacity of Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and staff on evidence-based practices to achieve our SIMR targets.

The Complex Area Superintendent will also utilize the Complex Area Implementation Team for assistance with developing Complex Area Plans. Such Complex Area Plans will be utilized to set forth the Complex Area Superintendent’s actions for advancing the achievement of students with disabilities and in particular, improving the early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language to be demonstrated by an increase in proficiency rates. The Complex Area Plan will also reflect the efficient use of State and Complex Areas resources in part through the alignment of efforts to meet requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized, and any other state and federal requirements. All Complex Areas will annually submit a plan. In addition, Hawaii will select targeted Complex Areas to receive increased State support. The Complex Area Plans will be employed as the basis for accountability during Deputy Stocktake meetings with Complex Area Superintendents, identifying bright spots for state-wide scaling up and the State action required to remove barriers impeding implementation of strategies and evidence-based practices.
To support the Complex Area efforts the State leadership and its staff will establish a system of support for evidence-based practices. The support will be dictated by the needs of Complex Area Superintendents. State leadership and its staff will be informed by data gathered on strengths and needs identified at the Stocktakes between the Deputy and Complex Area Superintendent, the various Professional Learning Communities, and within Complex Area Plans.

Understanding that the Hawaii State Department of Education leaders and staff cannot simply address organizational improvements in a vacuum, student, parent, and community engagement is also key to success. The Leading By Convening framework will provide an opportunity to build a partnership and shared commitment to identify issues and work together to support efforts to enhance the State's system of support.

The graphic on the next page provides a visual representation of our theory of action without three main strategies in the columns, and the rows depicting either the State-level or Complex Area specific actions. The graphic provides at the very top of the page the reflection in our theory of action that leadership at the State-level and Complex Area is key to implementation fidelity and providing necessary supports and resources to schools to address Professional Development and Technical Assistance, Early Interventions, Data, and Student and Parent Engagement needs, which are root causes and our strands of action defined in Phase 1.4 We expect that the implementation of the strategies and activities will result in improved educational performance and functional outcomes for all our students. The visual provides the explanation that the measure of effectiveness of the strategies and activities will be the increases in the proficiency rates of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities on the English Language Arts assessment, and 4th grade median growth percentile of these students on the same assessment.

More information about the implementation and evaluation of each of the strategies is provided in the relevant sections below. Each strategy and activities are in different implementation stages, and implementation will be phased-in to ensure readiness for high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability. Consequently, evaluation of implementation and progress towards outcomes and meeting our SIMR will also be phased-in to align with implementation. The evaluation will also test our theory of action and whether it is valid or modifications to the theory of action or the chosen strategies are necessary.

4 See description in footnote 1 or review page 122 in the Phase 1 submission available at: http://bit.ly/HIPhaseI
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SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Improvement Strategies and Activities

Leadership at the State-level & Complex Area is key to implementation fidelity and providing necessary supports and resources to schools to address Professional Development & Technical Assistance, Early Interventions, Data, and Student & Parent Engagement.

If the Department...

Builds Capacity & Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) . . .

Implements & Evaluates Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices for Improving Student Performance as Documented in Complex Area Plans . . .

Engages Students, Parents, & Community Members by Utilizing the Leading by Convening Framework . . .

Complex Area Strategies and Activities

Complex Area Implementation Team

Comprehensive Learning System

SPED Strategy Experts

Complex Area Superintendent

Other Complex Area Staff

Title I Linkers

Selected Complex Areas will be provided with focused support and resources.

Complex Area Plans

SPED Strategies

Early Literacy

Family Engagement Framework

State-level engagement between Department (State-level, Complex Area, and School) and Community Stakeholders

State-level PLCs

State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices

Complex Area Superintendent PLC

District Educational Specialist PLC

Strategies for Special Education

Early Literacy Resources


Hawaii expects that implementation of these strategies & activities will result in improved educational performance and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. To focus the evaluation of the effectiveness of these strategies and activities, Hawaii will measure the increase in the proficiency rates of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Other Health Disabilities (OHD), and Speech or Language Disabilities (SoL) on the English Language Arts (ELA) assessment, and the 4th grade median growth percentile of these students on the ELA assessment.
The Implementation Drivers of Chosen SSIP Strategies\(^5\)

The three chosen strategies will advance educational performance and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, and specifically improve early literacy for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language, which will be demonstrated by increased rates of proficiency on the English Language Arts Assessment for 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) graders, and high-levels of growth for 4\(^{th}\) graders on the same assessment. The three strategies also provide competency, organization, and leadership supports to increase fidelity and sustainability of systemic changes. The chosen SSIP strategies are integrated and compensatory, as successful implementation of one strategy is unachievable without the other. The implementation drivers of each strategy have been defined but will be reexamined and revised as implementation of strategies occur.

**Competency Drivers** - Changes in the quality of professional development, resources, and data will only occur through appropriate training and effective coaching. The State-level Professional Learning Communities and the Complex Area Implementation Teams will be the competency driver for implementation fidelity of evidence-based practices. The State-level Professional Learning Communities will be the mechanism for providing and sharing successful innovative evidence-based practices. The State-level Professional Learning Communities will also be coaching participants. The Complex Area Implementation Teams under the direction of the Complex Area Superintendent will be responsible for taking information learned at the Professional Learning Communities and other information, and deliver coordinated training and coaching to support Complex Area staff, school

---

\(^5\) The following responds to Sub-component 2(a), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool. Information on Implementation Drivers obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen.
administrators, teachers and school staff. The Complex Area Implementation Teams will also provide other support as identified by the Complex Area Superintendent.

**Performance Assessment** - The Six Priority Strategies and its performance management systems laid the foundation for the manner in which accountability and evaluation is conducted. Two of the Six Priority Strategies, the Academic Review Team and Data Teams, along with the rubrics and self-assessments will be utilized to measure the progress and effectiveness of implementation of the Six Priority Strategies. Assistant Superintendents and Complex Area Superintendents will also identify tools to measure implementation of strategies and tools to measure progress towards outcomes and SIMR. Rubrics adapted from the Leading By Convener framework will also be utilized to monitor the efforts of the State-level Professional Learning Communities, the Complex Area Implementation Teams, and the student, parent, and community engagement.

**Organization Supports** - Organization supports are key to ensuring any barriers to implementation of innovations are addressed. Hawaii is fortunate to have a statewide electronic database capturing information on all our students and allowing for such data to be accessible by our instructional leaders and teachers, and Data Team and Academic Review Team members that assist in making school-level and Complex Area-level decisions to guide improvement activities. To promote collaboration between initiatives, the Complex Area Implementation Team, which includes the Academic Review Team and Data Team members in the Complex Area, will examine data to make recommendations to the Complex Area Superintendents on strengths and needs of the Complex Area. Data will also be reviewed to measure implementation progress and effectiveness of the Complex Area Plan initiatives. Positive organizational change will be driven by facilitative administrators, which are: the State-level Professional Learning Communities; the Complex Area Implementation Teams; and the Academic Review Teams. The State-level Professional Learning Communities will also assist with identifying and removing barriers to implementation of systemic innovations, as necessary.

**Leadership Drivers** - Adaptive and technical issues regarding implementation of the chosen strategies will be identified and resolved during Superintendent and Deputy Stocktakes with Assistant Superintendents and Complex Area Superintendents. The Reform Sustainability Network, started by the U.S. Department of Education, highlighted these routines as performance management exemplars for identifying bright spots and removing barriers.

**Integration of Strategies and Improvement Cycle** - These strategies will result in effective systemic change. Hawaii will maintain its “Plan-Do-Check-Act” improvement cycle. The graphic below demonstrates how SSIP strategies are used in feedback loops to ensure continued alignment of policy and practice, and the development and/or maintenance of conditions for implementing and sustaining effective evidence-based practices.

---

6 Appendix A provides more information regarding the Six Strategies and the Academic Review Teams and Data Teams.
Hawaii will continue utilizing its “Plan-Do-Check-Act” Improvement Cycle to increase the effectiveness and sustainability of the strategies chosen, and improve the alignment of policies, structures, procedures, and practices to enable Complex Area Superintendents the ability to implement evidence-based practices. Built into the strategies chosen is a Practice-Policy Communication Cycle such that feedback from the practice-level informs the State’s mandates, allowing for the development and maintenance of conditions that support scaling-up and implementing evidence-based practices chosen by the Complex Area Superintendent. The integrated implementation of the strategies will manifest in positive systems change.
Our Leadership: The Key to Achieving Student Success

Leadership at the State and Complex Area are key to implementation fidelity and providing the necessary supports to schools to address professional development, technical assistance, early interventions, data, and partnership needs. Each State-level leader and our Complex Area Superintendents are committed to implementing the Strategic Plan to achieve student and staff success and build successful systems of support. As the SSIP is aligned to our Strategic Plan, such commitment is also manifested in the SSIP implementation.

The Hawaii State Department of Education remains a unitary system governed by a single State Board of Education, and lead by the Superintendent. We operate a tri-level educational system consisting of the State, Complex Area, and schools.

Note: Part B SPP/APR Indicator/Measurement Table for Indicator 17, provides in relevant part, that Phase II of the SSIP requires the State to include in its submission “Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices . . .” (emphasis added). Further within such document, there are requirements that reference LEAs. Applicability of the requirements of the SSIP specifically in regards to LEAs is a legal fiction in Hawaii given our unitary status. As such, for purposes of Hawaii’s SSIP, requirements made of the LEA have been translated to fit our state’s governance. This document has responded to Indicator 17 by describing the infrastructure changes and strategies necessary for implementation of evidence-based practices by the State and its Complex Areas. Questions regarding the application of LEA requirements of the SSIP to Hawaii’s unitary status should be referred to the Special Projects Office Director (see cover page for contact information).

The Hawaii State Board of Education holds the Superintendent accountable for implementing the Strategic Plan goals and objectives. The Superintendent utilizes Stocktakes with the Deputy and Assistant Superintendents to monitor and evaluate the implementation progress and effectiveness of activities to meet the Strategic Plan goals. The Superintendent oversees the Deputy who is responsible for academic functions. The Superintendent also oversees the Senior Assistant Superintendent responsible for the following offices with operational functions: Office of Fiscal Services, Office of Human Resources, Office of Information and Technology Services, and Office of School Facilities and Support Services. Of relevance to the SSIP, the Superintendent also has the following direct reports: Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance, the Communications Office (Communications and Community Affairs), and the soon-to-be established Community Engagement Office.

7 The following responds to Sub-components 1(c) and 1(d), Infrastructure Development, and 2(a) and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.
The Deputy oversees the academic functions and transformational efforts by utilizing Stocktakes with the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support, and the fifteen (15) Complex Area Superintendents to hold such leaders accountable for implementing the Strategic Plan goals and objectives. Deputy’s direct reports also include: Directors of the Special Projects Office, Office of Coordinated Support, and the School Transformation Branch.

One important change between SSIP Phases 1 and 2 is the appointment of new State-level leaders responsible for overseeing academic functions and reforms. In May 2015, Stephen Schatz was appointed Deputy Superintendent. Besides his teaching and administrative experience, Deputy Schatz managed the Race to the Top grant, guiding the Hawaii State Department of Education out of “high-risk” status by successfully implementing Hawaii’s transformation plan. Deputy Schatz’s focus is on identifying and scaling-up “bright spots”: turn-around moments that have made a positive difference in student, staff, and system success.

In July 2015, Suzanne Mulcahy was appointed as the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support. Assistant Superintendent Mulcahy has experience at every level in the system – from Educational Assistant to most recently, Complex Area Superintendent. She is an effective special education teacher and administrator, identifying strengths and needs, and not hesitating to transform systems to benefit student performance. Assistant Superintendent Mulcahy worked quickly at the start of her tenure to manifest her commitment to prioritize special education by formalizing systems of support and Professional Learning Communities for the Complex Area Superintendents and District Educational Specialists.

Both Deputy Schatz and Assistant Superintendent Mulcahy are the decision-makers for the SSIP. At the inception of Phase 2, both have emphasized the value of the Complex Area Superintendents’ authority to identify and implement the evidence-based practices necessary to result in improved student achievement and positive changes at the school and classroom. The chosen SSIP strategies are reflective of such value. Each State and Complex Area leader plays an integral role in the implementation and progress monitoring of the SSIP strategies, and to achieve increased alignment among and between implementation of the SSIP and other Federal and State requirements. The Office of Coordinated Support, which reports to the Deputy, will provide opportunities that promote alignment of initiatives and improve the State system of support.

The roles and responsibilities of leaders and offices will be periodically reviewed and evaluated to ensure efficiency in implementation and progress monitoring. In addition, changes to roles and responsibilities may occur due to a pending reorganization.

---

The following provides a description of the roles each office plays in implementing Hawai‘i’s Strategic Plan and the specific strategies & activities documented in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Deputy Superintendent: Implements Strategic Plan. Holds Stocktake with Assistant Superintendent, Complex Area Superintendents, and Directors to evaluate progress and effectiveness of implementation, and identify paths to scaling-up and addressing barriers to implementation. Decision-maker for implementation of SSIP strategies & activities. Works with Assistant Superintendent of OCISS to facilitate CAS PLC. Oversees implementation of the Six Priority Strategies and CAST PLC.

Assistant Superintendent: Implements Strategic Plan. Works with Deputy Superintendent to facilitate CAS PLC. Oversees implementation of DES PLC. Oversees implementation of three of the Six Priority Strategies and their respective CAST PLCs: Common Core, Formative Instruction and Data Teams; and Comprehensive Student Support System/Response to Intervention. Partially responsible for building the state system of support by making available resources on Special Education and literacy strategies to Complex Area Superintendents.

15 Complex Area Superintendents: Two Targeted Complex Area Superintendents:
- Lela Hayashida, BKM
- Chad Farias, KKP

Instructional leader of Complex Area and implements Strategic Plan in Complex Area. Meets Complex Area Plan submission requirements. Monitors and evaluates implementation of chosen evidence-based practices as described in Complex Area Plan. Selects members and convenes Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT). Scale-up bright spots and address barriers to implementing evidence-based practices.

School Principals: Instructional leader of school and implements Strategic Plan in school utilizing evidence-based practices.

State of Hawaii Board of Education

Kathryn S. Matayoshi
Superintendent

Stephen Schatz
Deputy Superintendent

Amy Kunz
Senior Assistant Superintendent

Office of Fiscal Services (OFS)

Office Human Resources (OHR)

Office Information & Technology Services (OITS)

Office of School Facilities & Student Services

Holds Superintendent accountable for implementing the Strategic Plan and meeting its goals and objectives.

Implements Strategic Plan. Holds Stocktake with Assistant Superintendent & Directors to evaluate progress and effectiveness of implementation, and identify paths to scaling-up and addressing barriers to implementation.

Implements Strategic Plan. Senior Assistant Superintendent oversees operations, and the Assistant Superintendent of each office. These offices will provide support to implementation of the Strategic Plan and the SSIP strategies and activities. In particular, OHR responsible for implementing two of the Six Priority Strategies: Induction and Mentoring, and Educator Effectiveness. OITS manages our statewide databases that holds our student information. OFS does budget and accounting.

Suzanne Mulcahy
Assistant Superintendent
Office of Curriculum, Instruction & Student Support (OCISS)

Shari Dela Cuadra-Larsen
Director
Special Projects Office

Camille Masutomi
Director
Office of Coordinated Support

Shelley Ferrara
Director
School Transformation Branch

Donalyn Della Cruz
Communications Office

TBD Director
Community Engagement

Works with Deputy Superintendent to facilitate CAS PLC. Oversees implementation of DES PLC. Oversees implementation of three of the Six Priority Strategies and their respective CAST PLCs: Common Core, Formative Instruction and Data Teams; and Comprehensive Student Support System/Response to Intervention. Partially responsible for building the state system of support by making available resources on Special Education and literacy strategies to Complex Area Superintendents.
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Our Phase 2 Stakeholders: Engaging Relevant Participants

As final decision-makers, both the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support have utilized recommendations made by Department and Community stakeholders. The difference between the SSIP Phase 1 and 2 tasks prompted an evaluation of whether relevant stakeholders were assisting with the requirement to develop the implementation and evaluation plans. Utilizing the Leading By Convening Circles, we identified the stakeholders necessary to produce this Phase 2 submission and identified their roles in one or more of these categories: Core Team, Key Participants and Key Advisors, Extended Participants and Feedback Networks, and Dissemination Networks.

The Leading By Convening Circles defines these roles as follows:

- Core Team consists of leaders from diverse groups who are committed to the success of the work. Their responsibilities are as follow: Convene the group; Take responsibility for structuring each convening and follow-up; Plan and monitor interaction; Create engagement strategies; Organize activities; Communicate with decision-makers; and Oversee review and evaluation.

- Key Participants and Advisors are groups that have responsibility for, or keen interest in, the issue. Their responsibilities are as follow: Act as regular contacts for information on the issue; Give advice and help the core team sense issues and adapt activities in a variety of contexts; Make opportunities for the work within their networks; Bring their networks into the work of the group; Promote the cross-stakeholder approach to problem identification and problem solving; and Join the core team periodically when their expertise is required on a particular issue.

- Extended Participants and Feedback Networks are individuals who are reached through the organization and networks that are key participants/advisors. They represent individuals who work at the practice, family or individual level. These participants have connectiveness to the issues and to the organizations that are active on the issue. They can bridge between ideas as formulated and ideas as practiced. Their responsibilities are as follow: Volunteer to become involved and represent the perspective of their organization and/or network; Bring the perspective of their role and/or organization into the work; Bring important learnings back to their networks; Identify opportunities within their networks to showcase the learning; Hold both their organizational identity and the group identity while interacting with the group; and Identify other practitioners and family members who may become active.

- Dissemination Networks include participants from all the groups within the circles and all the other groups related to this issue. Their responsibilities are as follow: Receive information;

---

9 The following responds to Sub-components 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d), Infrastructure Development, and 2(b) and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.

Redistribute information through newsletters, news blasts, meetings, etc.; Submit information from newsletters, news blasts, meeting, etc., Customize messages for their particular audience.

The stakeholder Circles for implementation and evaluation of each strategy differs slightly. The Core Team in these strategies remain unchanged from the Core Team identified in Phase 1. The SSIP Core Team continues with the expertise and leadership from: Amy Estes, Maui District Educational Specialist; Yvonne Humble, Leeward District Educational Specialist; and Ravae Todd, Hawaii District Educational Specialist. The SSIP Core Team continues to be supported by the staff in the Special Projects Office.

Knowing an implementation plan cannot be created absent input from individuals tasked with such implementation, the SSIP Core Team recruited Key Participants and Advisors, and established the SSIP Working Group. Like the SSIP Core Team, the SSIP Working Group is comprised of individuals desiring to meet the challenge of identifying and scaling-up bright spots in special education and general education, and working hard to identify solutions. The SSIP Working Group members bring with them experiences as special education teachers, administrators, and Complex Area Staff, and are pictured below:

- Adam Beckwith, Teacher, Lana'i High and Elementary School
- Christina Bryan, Resource Teacher, Hawai'i District
- Lisha Collier, Teacher, Highlands Intermediate
- Christina Ellis, Resource Teacher, Hawai'i District
- Danielle Himalaya, Vice Principal, Makakilo Elementary
- Lynn Holman, Resource Teacher, Hawai'i District
- Kelly Kalinowsky, Student Services Coordinator, Waianae High School
- Chantel Moreno, Teacher, Kualapu'u School
- Michelle Pascual, Teacher, Makakilo Elementary
- Loretta Sherwood-Labrador, Student Services and Reading Facilitator, Kualapu'u School

---

The SSIP Core Team was responsible for convening the SSIP Working Group, and facilitating activities to obtain input and feedback from the SSIP Working Group members on various strategies, and once chosen by State Leadership, developing the implementation and evaluation of such strategies. Information from the SSIP Working Group combined with information from other Key Participants and Advisors, like our Complex Area Superintendents, formed the basis of recommendations the SSIP Core Team made to State Leadership to consider for decision-making. The SSIP Core Team and SSIP Working Group will play an integral role in the overall implementation and evaluation of strategies defined for our SSIP. As relevant, others will join the SSIP Core Team as the organizers and facilitators of the activities for specific strategies. All strategies and activities except for the implementation of the Six Priority Strategies are at Exploration or Installation Stages. As such, the role of stakeholders will be reviewed, and modified as necessary to meet the needs of implementation and evaluation.

For the engagement strategy, the SSIP Core Team has done preliminary work with select members of the Special Education Advisory Council and the Community Children’s Council, but will identify the role groups and relevant stakeholders as we progress through the Leading By Convening tools and framework. The other strategies have more clearly defined stakeholders as specific short- and long-term objectives for such strategies have been approved by State leadership. The Deputy, Assistant Superintendents, and SSIP Core Team will partner with other stakeholders to implement the State-Level Professional Learning Communities. The Complex Area Implementation Team, the other strategy used to build capacity, will serve as the Extended Participants in the implementation of the State-level Professional Learning Communities by informing the work of the convenings and then bringing the innovations and knowledge learned back to their Complex Areas and the schools. The same roles and responsibilities are in place for the implementation of the State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices. The Complex Area Superintendent and the Complex Area Implementation Teams will join the Core Team for the strategy implementation and evaluation the Complex Area Plans, and be the sole members of the Core Team for the implementation and evaluation of the Complex Area Implementation Team. Information gathered at Superintendent and Deputy Stocktakes will be one method to evaluate the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders. The graphic on the next page depicts the roles each stakeholder group will play for each SSIP strategy.

---

12 Information obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen.

Stakeholder Participation in SSIP Improvement Strategies and Activities

The Deputy Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support (OCISS) are the final decision-makers for all matters regarding implementation of SSIP Improvement Strategies and Activities. The Leading By Convening framework (Cashman, et al. (2014)) is used to indicate how we have and plan to engage stakeholders in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the SSIP improvement strategies and activities. As implementation of strategies and activities are phased-in and monitored, stakeholder participation will also be reviewed and revised as necessary. The “Core Team” for the two types of strategies includes the “SSIP Core Team” that was carried over from Phase 1. Given the nature of the work for Phase 2, different stakeholders were recruited for development of the implementation plan, and will be recruited for implementation and evaluation.

Builds Capacity & Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) . . .

The CAS and CAIT members make up the core team to implement this strategy, & complete required activities.

Implements & Evaluates Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices for Improving Student Performance as Documented in Complex Area Plans . . .

The CAS and CAIT members will work with other core team members to implement the Complex Area Plan requirements.

Engages Students, Parents, & Community Members by Utilizing the Leading by Convening Framework . . .

As implementation is currently in the exploration and installation phases, the roles & responsibilities of each partner have not been fully defined. The Deputy Superintendent will be the decision-maker through the process. The shared work with students, parents, & community members will result in an identification of key stakeholders, their level of engagement, and their roles & responsibilities for implementation.
Our Efforts to Align Implementation with Strategic Plan and Implementation Federal and State Programs for Sustainable Improvements\textsuperscript{14}

The Hawaii State Department of Education has defined short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives and outcomes to progress towards full implementation of the SSIP strategies. The strategies will be implemented in stages, considering researched practices identified in Implementation Science,\textsuperscript{15} to ensure the time, effort, and funds expended establish valuable, sustainable, and transformative practices. In addition, such deliberate implementation in stages allows for the Hawaii State Department of Education to take full advantage of the opportunity presented by the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s current focus on holding states accountable to advance equity for low-performing subgroups and students and allowing for flexibility in local innovations and evidence-based practices, provides Hawaii time to solidify alignment, collaboration, and coordination between and among all Federal and State programs and requirements. The Hawaii State Board of Education, also capitalizing on the changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has directed the Hawaii State Department of Education to review its Strategic Plan to ensure that its goals and objectives are current and relevant. Alignment and collaboration towards meeting Strategic Plan goals and objectives to address the needs of our students, and notably the low-performing subgroups defined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which includes special education students, will result in initiatives are supported from the both top-down and bottom-up and sustainable.

The Six Priority Strategies were described in Phase 1 and is currently in its third year of implementation. The Six Priority Strategies were chosen in Phase 1 because it is an established statewide system for improving the performance of all students and its utilization will provide the necessary framework to realize improvement without adding to anyone’s “plates”, which is especially significant for our school leaders and teachers. A description of the Six Priority Strategies can be found in our Phase 1 submission on page 100, available here: http://bit.ly/HIPhaseI, or in Appendix A.

A critique of the selection of the Six Priority Strategies is the perspective that the Six Priority Strategies’ focus on all students’ needs detracts from the ability to address special education and the root causes identified by Stakeholders in Phase 1. In lieu of narrowing the focus of the Six Priority Strategies to address the needs of students with disabilities as proposed in Phase 1, the Six Priority Strategies will now be included in the comprehensive systemic improvement to build the capacity of our leaders and staff to address the needs of students with disabilities and especially to address the early literacy needs of our students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities. The Six Priority Strategies will be maintained as the strategy to build the infrastructure at the Complex Area and schools and capacity of staff to implement the Academic Review Team process.

\textsuperscript{14} The following responds to Sub-components 1(a), 1(b), and 1(d), Infrastructure Development, and 2(b) and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.

\textsuperscript{15} Information on Implementation Drivers obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen.
Common Core State Standards and use of identified state-wide materials, Comprehensive Student Support System and Response to Intervention, Formative Instruction and Data Teams, the Educator Effectiveness System, and Induction and Mentoring. The inclusion of Complex Area leaders and staff in the State-level Professional Learning Communities and the Complex Area Implementation Team will be the mechanism to infuse the implementation of the Six Priority Strategies at the Complex Area level with the activities necessary to address the needs of students with disabilities, and in particular the early literacy needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

In addition, the performance management system and routines described in the Phase 1 submission have been maintained, and will be utilized for the evaluation of the other strategies identified in this Phase 2 submission. This consistency is of importance to the likelihood of increased integration and sustainability of the other strategies: State-level Professional Learning Communities; Complex Area Plans; Complex Area Implementation Teams; State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices, and Student, Parent and Community Engagement.

Alignment between the implementation of activities necessary to improve special education performance and address the early literacy needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities will be further developed at the Complex Area level through the requirements of the Complex Area Implementation Team. The proposed members of the Complex Area Implementation Team include: Special Education Strategy Expert(s); Members of the Complex Area Support Team implementing the Six Priority Strategies; English Learner Strategy Expert(s); Title I Linkers (i.e., staff responsible for implementing Title I in Complex Area); and other Complex Area Staff deemed relevant by the Complex Area Superintendent. The proposed members reflect the major subgroups of students identified in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: students with disabilities, students learning English, and students from low-income families. As such the Complex Area Superintendents and their Complex Area Implementation Teams will be utilizing data on these subgroups to make decisions on strengths and needs, and identified actions will also address the charge of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Under the direction of the Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support, the Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance, the Office of Human Resources, and Directors from the Special Projects Office, the Office of Coordinated Support, and the Student Transformation Branch will be working together to align efforts under the various Federal and State programs and initiatives their office administers. Preliminary discussions regarding the development of a coordinated and possibly consolidated state planning process to address the needs of all students and subgroups of students we are accountable for under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which includes special education students, have been initiated.
The strategies chosen to manifest our theory of action mostly require our leaders and their staff, and our community partners to make behavioral changes that will reap positive results. Being held accountable for and including in the planning process specific metrics measured by the SSIP compels implementation of improvements to teaching and learning for our SIMR students. These behavioral changes may not appear to need fiscal support for sustainability, however, we acknowledge the focus on one area of improvement may lessen the attention on an equally important area. Accountability placed on Complex Area Superintendents is reasonable if State leadership partners with Complex Area Superintendents to ensure proper resources are available to support all Complex Area initiatives, not just the ones for the SSIP. This is especially important as the level of total funding for education as a whole provided by the State Legislature is not expected to increase and have maintained nearly the same levels for the past several years. The strategies identified by the SSIP will target improvements to our SIMR students, but will also support academic achievement for all students. Building a system of support that addresses the needs of all students is the key to sustainability of the required behavioral changes over time.

In addition to behavioral changes, we know the Assistant Superintendents and Complex Area Superintendents will need to secure fiscal supports for the professional development, training and coaching, and materials necessary to realize programmatic improvements. We’ve learned through our experiences with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding and specific Race to the Top funding that infusing State and Complex Areas with capital without a strategic plan for sustainability decreases the probability that the strategy will achieve lasting permanency. Because we are utilizing strategies that target students with disabilities but provide benefit to all students and both special education and general education teachers, State leadership will tap the expertise of our Federal and State program managers to determine allowable and innovative uses of their respective funds to ensure State and Complex Area strategies and initiatives have proper and sustainable fiscal supports. The requirement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for Local Educational Agencies to move towards consolidation of funds justifies the process as it is determined how such funds along with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funding, and other Federal and state funds will be efficiently utilized, within the bounds of the law, to support improvements for students with disabilities and our SIMR students.

16 The Hawaii State Department of Education closely monitors the state funds to ensure we did not reduce the amount of state financial support for special education and related services for children with disabilities below the amount of support for the preceding fiscal year pursuant to Section 612(a)(18) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
Timeline for Implementation and Evaluation of Strategies and Activities at the Complex Area Level

To account for alignment between the SSIP strategies, and the Strategic Plan and other Federal and State programs, the implementation and monitoring of progress towards implementation and achieving SIMR targets will occur in stages. All strategies are not at the same implementation stage. Specific short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives for the implementation of the SSIP activities, and the short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives on the progress towards the SIMR have been defined for each strategy by school year. The short-, intermediate, and long-term outcomes have also been defined for each strategy by school year. In order to make certain Hawaii meets requirements, also identified are the data collection methods, and methods for data analysis for purposes of ensuring that Hawaii is “on the right track”. Since Hawaii will be phasing-in implementation of strategies and activities, Hawaii will also phase-in evaluation of such strategies and activities. The timeline for implementation and corresponding evaluation for each strategy will be reviewed at the end of the 4th quarter, and refined as necessary. As of the 2015-2016 school year, the strategies are in the following implementation stages:

- **State-level Professional Learning Communities:**
  - Complex Area Superintendent and District Educational Specialist Professional Learning Communities: Exploration and Installation Stages
  - Complex Area Support Teams (Six Priority Strategies) Professional Learning Communities: 3rd year of Implementation

- **Complex Area Implementation Team:**
  - Complex Area Support Team includes a Special Education Strategy Expert: Exploration and Installation Stages
  - Complex Area Implementation Team: Exploration

- **Complex Area Plan**
  - Complex Area Plans to be implemented in the 2016-2017 school year will be submitted.
  - Complex Area Plans that incorporate and utilize SSIP strategies and activities for implementation in the 2017-2018 school year and beyond: Exploration

- **State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices:**
  - Exploration and Installation Stages

- **Student, Parent and Community Member Engagement:**
  - Exploration Stage

We will progress to full implementation of strategies with time and through collaborative efforts between State and Complex Area leaders and staff. More information regarding the implementation timeline for each strategy is provided in the description of the strategies in the respective sections below.

---

17 The following responds to Sub-components 1(b) and 1(c), Infrastructure Development, and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.

18 Information on Implementation Stages obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen
Our Focus on Student Achievement and Our State-identified Measurable Result

The Hawaii State Department of Education is committed to improving educational performance and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. For purposes of the SSIP and to meet U.S. Department of Education requirements, we identified and remain committed to the SIMR identified in Phase 1:

- Increase the percentage of 3rd grade and 4th grade students within the eligibility categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Disability, and Speech or Language Disability who are proficient on the statewide assessment for English Language Arts; and

- Increase the median growth percentile of 4th Grade students with disabilities within the eligibility categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Disability, and Speech or Language Disability on the statewide assessment for English Language Arts.

Maintaining our Focus on Addressing Educational and Functional Outcomes

State leadership remains committed to the focus on 3rd and 4th grade as a measure, as it highlights the need to address any achievement gaps established in such grades, and prompts proactive improvements to teaching and learning in earlier grades so the achievement gap narrows and ceases to exists. The focus on our “SIMR students”, our students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities is intentional as this group makes up the majority of all students with disabilities. Improved achievement for this population of students will positively impact the overall special education performance on the statewide assessment as reported in Indicator 3 and result in improved performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Making such improvements are important given Hawaii’s state determination of “Needs Assistance”. An immeasurable benefit in focusing on and improving the literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities is the increase in confidence and success in other core subjects for students, and success for teachers that see data reflect their students’ high-levels of academic achievement.

---

19 This section responds to the “Questions and Answers for Indicators B-17 and C-11”, questions 2 and 11.
20 On the Smarter Balanced Assessment, which was first administered in 2014-2015 school year, the term “English Language Arts” has replaced “reading” as used on the previous state-wide assessment.
21 On the Smarter Balanced Assessment, which was first administered in 2014-2015 school year, the term “English Language Arts” has replaced “reading” as used on the previous state-wide assessment.
The 2014-2015 school year data continues to reflect the need to address the needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities and Other Health Disabilities as students within these disability categories are still the lowest. Additionally, students with the eligibility categories of Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities make up 63.3% off the total special education population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Category</th>
<th>Proficiency Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Disability</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Disability</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Disability</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disability</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Disability</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Disability Categories</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before delving into Phase 2, the SSIP Core Team surveyed both Department and Community stakeholders to gather any questions, comments, or concerns about Phase 1, and to confirm stakeholders had an accurate understanding of Phase 1. One misconception of the SSIP, which is in part based upon the mandate to choose a SIMR described in Phase 1, is that the SSIP is only a plan to address and serve the needs of students in Kindergarten through 3rd and 4th grade, and thus, should not be utilized for understanding the Hawaii State Department of Education’s actions for ensuring improved educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. Furthermore, there is a misunderstanding that the SSIP will only address students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

Contrary to such misconception and misunderstanding, State leadership has chosen the SSIP strategies because of its impact on improving teaching and learning for all students with disabilities. The particular focus on 3rd and 4th grade proficiency and 4th grade growth will serve as a measure to determine effectiveness of the strategies. The SSIP strategies cultivates a system with the capability to address the needs of all students with disabilities notwithstanding their disability categories, and will address achievement of all subgroups identified in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Hawaii is improving its entire system of support for implementation of evidence-based practices and for improved accountability. All students will benefit.
Administration of New Statewide Assessment Prompts New Baselines & Proficiency Targets

The 2014-2015 school year was the first year the Smarter Balanced Assessment was administered as the statewide assessment to determine proficiency levels on the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts, Math, and Science. Hawaii must revise its baseline data given that Hawaii administered a statewide assessment that is substantially different than the assessment administered in the 2013-2014 school year, which was utilized to establish base-line data submitted in Phase 1. To note, we are also referring to the proficiency targets as the “English Language Arts” score as the Smarter Balanced Assessment utilizes this term. Also of importance is noting that within the English Language Arts assessment there is reading strand. Hawaii is using the entire English Language Arts score to determine proficiency; we are not using just the reading strand within the assessment.

New Proficiency Baseline and Targets

Data analysis revealed the new baseline for our SIMR’s proficiency target: 8.33% of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities were proficient on the English Language Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex Area</th>
<th>OHD</th>
<th>SLD</th>
<th>SoL</th>
<th>SIMR</th>
<th># of Students Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FKK</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMR</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMW</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam-Kap</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-W</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas-Kah</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-Kal</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKP</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKKK</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKM</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLLM</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Complexes</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex Area and/or subgroup proficiency level at or above state SIMR (8.33%).
Complex Area and/or subgroup proficiency level below state SIMR (8.33%).
Number of tested students is zero or below 5, data were included on calculations but they are not displayed.
SIMR: Grades 3rd and 4th combined, for all complexes, per disability & the aggregate of the three disabilities.

22 See page 55 of this document for a list of the Complex Area names.
Hawaii has set proficiency targets based on the new baseline. Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent for the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are the final decision makers in this process. Conversations between the SSIP Core Team and select members of the Special Education Advisory Council and the Community Children’s Council resulted in the initial proposals that were approved by State leadership and sent out to all Department and Community stakeholders via a survey for consideration and input. The request and survey were also posted on our website.

These initial proposals reflected the same target setting analysis that was applied to general education whereby the target increase from one year to the next was based upon an application of a statistically significant percentage increase. Proposal #1 reflected the desire to obtain a 2.4% increase of the percent of students proficient per year. Proposal #2 reflected the desire to see greater gains in four years, and provided a 3% annual increase.

On March 11, 2016, the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support attended the Special Education Advisory Council meeting where members expressed concerns that gains are not being achieved fast enough to close the achievement gap. Other stakeholders responding through the survey voiced the opposite concerns, indicating Proposal #1 was sufficient and the percentage increase should be much lower. Stakeholders also mentioned that the percentage increase should reflect the implementation stages and the expectation that the percentage increase would increase incrementally as the years progressed.

Mindful of setting targets that will inspire advancement, State leadership set high expectations for student achievement in order to close the achievement gap and reflect the time, effort, and resources being placed into making these systemic improvements. State leadership believes that the capacity building effort through the use of the State-level Professional Learning Communities and Complex Area Implementation Teams will empower Complex Area Superintendents to choose and provide resources and necessary training and coaching to school administrators and staff to implement evidence-based practices resulting in the achievement of our SIMR targets. The rationale behind the targets tracks the same method used in Phase 1: reduce by half the percent of non-proficient students in our SIMR population by the end of this SSIP process. State leadership set these proficiency targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year SSIP Submitted</th>
<th>Year of Data (&amp; Assessment Administered)</th>
<th>Target Approved by Leadership</th>
<th>Percentage Point Increase From Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Baseline: 8.33%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 These members are Ivalee Sinclair, Martha Guinan, and Susan Wood.
New Growth Baseline

The Hawaii State Department of Education also submits a new baseline for growth to reflect the new administration of a statewide assessment that is substantially different than the assessment administered to establish our baseline. We also submit a new method of calculating the median growth percentile to ensure a sufficient n-size to make such determination.

In Phase 1, it was determined that the growth target would be calculated by averaging the median growth percentile of the three categories of students: Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities (i.e., utilizing the mean of the median). The application of the same process was not statistically valid this year as the Speech or Language Disabilities category is below the appropriate n-size. It is uncertain whether this particular category will always meet the appropriate n-size in the future. As such, instead of using the mean of the median, the median growth percentile will be calculated from this point forward using the median of student growth percentiles for 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

Hawaii has changed its calculation method for determining the median growth percentile, but not the targets that were established during Phase 1. The median growth percentile score of 50 remains an indication of normal growth, and the categories of low, typical, and high growth as described in Phase 1 are maintained. Coincidentally the new baseline is also the same as the target established and reported in Phase 1.

Summary of Baselines and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMR</th>
<th>New Baseline</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency Targets</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Targets</td>
<td>43 MGP</td>
<td>45 MGP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State-level Strategies to Build Capacity and Support Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

Overview: Building Capacity Through State-level Professional Learning Communities and Providing State-level Support for Evidence-Based Practices

Purpose, Objectives, and Outcomes for State-level Strategies

The Hawaii State Department of Education will be utilizing State-level Professional Learning Communities for Complex Area Superintendents, District Educational Specialists, and Complex Area Support Team members for the Six Priority Strategies to build the capacity of participants to initiate, implement, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices. The Hawaii State Department of Education is also establishing a system of support for evidence-based practices making available resources for the Complex Area. The State-level strategies will:

1. Value the leadership and expertise of Complex Area Superintendents by establishing a process to identify and then ensure appropriate State-level supports are available for Complex Area initiatives that address student achievement and in particular, early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

2. Build the capacity of Complex Area leadership and staff to adopt, implement, and sustain evidence-based practices that improve teaching and learning beneficial to our students with disabilities and SIMR students.

3. Identify the State action and the State and Complex Area partnerships necessary to address barriers to Complex Area implementation of evidence-based practices, and identify bright-spots for state-wide scaling-up.

The State-level strategies will address the barriers identified in Phase 1, improving upon professional development and technical assistance, early interventions, and use of data. The overall objective of these State-level strategies is to establish a problem-solving process to routinely identify successful practices and remove barriers to the adoption, implementation, and sustainability of evidence-based practices resulting in the advancement of the educational performance and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, and specifically improving early literacy for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities, which will be
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demonstrated by increased rates of proficiency on the English Language Arts Assessment for 3rd and 4th graders, and high-levels of growth for 4th graders on the same assessment.

**Justification for Chosen State-level Strategies**

Past practices and initiatives proven effective during Race to the Top and our Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver prompted the development of this system of State-level strategies with the capability to address needs of students with disabilities and all student subgroups. The Complex Area Superintendent and District Educational Specialist Professional Learning Community that will enhance the current implementation of the Six Priority Strategies. Combined, these Professional Learning Communities target individuals with the authority to take necessary action for initiating, implementing, and sustaining evidence-based practices. The implementation of the Six Priority Strategies laid the foundation and thus will make fidelity of adoption and implementation of these State-level Professional Learning Communities and the System of Support for evidence-based practices possible. These State-level strategies will be designed to meet the Strategic Plan goals and objectives. The implementation of these State-level strategies will also be aligned with the implementation of other federal and state programs, and in particular, the implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized.

**Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation**

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are the decision-makers for the State-level strategies, and will consider recommendations from the SSIP Core Team, and Key Participants and Advisors defined for each State-level strategy. Information regarding the implementation and evaluation of these strategies will be disseminated to various stakeholders as appropriate through our dissemination networks, which includes efforts by our Communications Office, use of the intranet accessible to only Hawaii State Department of Education employees, and assistance from community and other partners.

Provided below are details about the State-level strategies, which includes: specific short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives for implementation; short-, intermediate, and long-term outcomes, timeline for completion, justification for selection, alignment to other programs and initiatives and responsibilities for ensuring high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability.

---
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SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Implementation of Strategies and Activities

Strategy #1 - Build Capacity to Support Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices
State-level Strategy and Activities

Builds Capacity & Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) . . .

State-level PLCs

Complex Area Superintendent PLC

District Educational Specialist PLC

State Strategies and Activities

Complex Area Support Teams Six Priority Strategies PLCs

Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation

Superintendent

Deputy Superintendent

Oversees all PLCs. Superintendent and Deputy holds Stocktakes with Assistant Superintendents, and Deputy with CAS to evaluate progress towards full implementation; and identify improvements for implementation fidelity and effectiveness.

Assistant Superintendents, Office of Curriculum, Instruction & Student Support; Office of Human Resources

Participate in CAS PLC by identifying bright spots and barriers to implementation. Where relevant, disseminate information gained from CAS PLC to CAIT, other Complex Area staff, and school administrators. Identify staff to participate in CAST PLC. Complete self-assessments and other rubrics to provide information on implementation fidelity.

OCISS AS responsible for assisting Deputy with CAS PLC, and for facilitating DES PLC focusing on achievement of students with disabilities. Will develop rubrics and self-assessments for evaluation. OCISS AS and OHR AS responsible for their own strategies in CAST PLC.

Implementation Drivers for the State-level PLCs

PLCs support and inform CAIT’s coaching on evidence-based practices.
State-level PLCs & other state resources build capacity of CAS, DES & CAST.

All Complex Area Superintendents (CAS) & District Educational Specialists (DES) participate in the PLCs. CAS select staff to join Complex Area Support Teams (CAST).

Deputy Superintendent’s Stocktake with Complex Area Superintendent (CAS), & performance management routines between the CAS and School Principal to exercise leadership to full implementation. Also used to inform the capacity building activities occurring during the State-level PLCs.

Stakeholder Participation in Implementation and Evaluation

Our Stakeholders play various roles in the implementation and evaluation of this SSIP strategy as follows:

Implementation Stages for the State-level PLCs

SY 2015-2016: Six Strategies & CAST PLC in 3rd year of implementation; continue Stocktake, implementation rubrics and self-assessments. Leadership required the inclusion of SPED strategy expert in CAST (i.e., “CAST + 1” and beginnings of CAIT). Exploration, Installation, of CAS & DES PLCs to build capacity. Identify bright spots, and address barriers.

SY 2016-2017: Six Priority Strategies & CAST PLC in 4th year of implementation; continue implementation rubrics and self-assessments. CAS & DES PLCs in 2nd year of implementation. Develop evaluation to measure progress & effectiveness of PLCs.

SY 2017-2018 through 2019-2020: Maintain CAS, DES, and CAST PLCs. Evaluate progress towards implementation and effectiveness. Explore possibility of other PLCs as needed.

Graphic adapted from Leading By Convening
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State-Level Strategy #1 – Building Capacity and Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities

Overall Description of Strategy

The State-level Professional Learning Communities strategy was developed ensuring the elements of Implementation Science were addressed resulted in increased probability for high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability. The purpose of the State-level Professional Learning Communities is as follows:

1. Support Complex Area Superintendents and their staff by building their capacity to initiate, implement, and sustain implementation of evidence-based practices identified in Complex Area Plans;

2. Provide opportunities for Professional Learning Communities participants and State-level facilitators to share and identify evidence-based practices and bright spots that improve teaching and academic achievement, and determine process for adoption and scaling-up within the Complex Area(s) or state-wide;

3. Provide opportunities for participants and State-level facilitators to share and identify barriers to implementation of evidence-based practices and problem-solve to remove such barriers at Complex Area(s) or state-wide;

4. Increase collaboration between and among State leaders and staff, Complex Area Superintendents, District Educational Specialists, and Six Priority Strategies’ Complex Area Support Team members in order to build a stronger system of support; and

5. Assist with the development of competency, organization, and leadership drivers, and performance assessments to support Complex Area Superintendents’ implementation of evidence-based practices to achieve our SIMR targets.

The information and knowledge shared and gained at the State-level Professional Learning Communities will build the capacity of Complex Area Superintendents and support their development and implementation of their Complex Area Plans. We expect efforts to focus on closing the achievement gap, and on achieving SIMR targets.
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Objectives, Outcomes, and Timeline for Completion of State-level Strategy

The State-level Professional Learning Communities is not fully implemented as two of the Professional Learning Communities are still in the Exploration and Installation Stages. The only State-level Professional Learning Community currently being implemented is the Six Priority Strategies Professional Learning Communities, which occur monthly for each strategy, and three times a year for the combined Professional Learning Community. The Complex Area Superintendent and District Educational Specialist Professional Learning Communities is proposed to occur monthly as well since the Complex Area Superintendents meet semi-monthly, and there are monthly mandatory District Educational Specialist meetings. The Complex Area Superintendent convening always proceeds the District Educational Specialists convening as Complex Area leadership hears the information first, and the Complex Area Superintendent can confer and plan with their District Educational Specialists on necessary action.

In any event, implementation and evaluation of the State-Level Professional Learning Communities are driven by achieving the following long-term objectives and outcomes:

- Long-term Objective #1: Formalize Professional Learning Communities for the Complex Area Superintendent, District Educational Specialist, and Complex Area Support Team members implementing the Six Priority Strategies, that are focused on identifying and scaling-up evidence-based practices for advancing the achievement of students with disabilities, and in particular, improving early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

- Long-term Outcome #1: The formal Professional Learning Communities process will improve the fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices by identifying State-action necessary to assist Complex Areas with scaling-up and removing barriers to implementation to achieve the ultimate outcome of increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

- Long-term Objective #2: The State-level Professional Learning Communities will build the capacity of the Complex Area Superintendent and the Complex Area Implementation Team to deliver training, provide coaching, and other support defined by the Complex Area Superintendent to other Complex Area Staff, school administrators, teachers, and school staff on evidence-based practices to advance the achievement of students with disabilities, and in particular, improving the early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language.
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Long-term Outcome #2 – Establish a system to support the Complex Area Superintendent’s implementation of the evidence-based practices described in the Complex Area Plan, by providing information and opportunities to Complex Area Superintendents, District Educational Specialists, and Complex Area Support Team members such that the needs of the Complex Area are addressed through a combination of State and Complex Area resources, to ultimately improve student achievement, increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

By strategically implementing the State-level Professional Learning Communities in phases, we expect to reach the following objectives during the next few school years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Objective</th>
<th>Intermediate Objectives</th>
<th>Long-term Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 2015-2016</td>
<td>School Year 2016-2017</td>
<td>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC (CAST + 1) to review data.</td>
<td>• Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC to review data and identify SPED student needs.</td>
<td>• Formalize PLC for CAS, DES and CAST focused on identifying and scaling up EBPs for advancing achievement of all students with disabilities and in particular, improving early literacy of students with SLD, OHD and SoL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistant Superintendent (AS) of OCISS develop mandatory DES meetings into DES PLC.</td>
<td>• DES PLC focuses on identification and implementation of EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students.</td>
<td>• Build capacity of CAS and CAIT to provide training and coaching of school administrators and staff on EBPs to advance the provision of EBPs in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership facilitates CAS PLC to consider the needs of SPED students in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>• CAS PLC identifies the resources and supports needed by the Complex Areas to implement EBPs to improve the early literacy of SPED students.</td>
<td>During the 2016-2017 school year, further strategies and activities to be implemented, and appropriate evaluation measures, will be defined &amp; developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also expect to obtain the following outcomes as we advance with implementation of the State-level Professional Learning Communities and achieve our SIMR targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Professional Learning Communities (PLC) | • Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies reflect and address the needs of SPED students.  
• Begin integration of SPED specific strategies into Six Priority Strategy implementation. | • PLCs facilitate integration of EBPs that support SPED students into Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.  
• PLCs build their capacity to provide training and coaching of EBPs to CAS and CAIT. | • Improve the quality of teaching and learning for SPED students by ensuring that Complex Areas have EBPs, and the ability to implement them with fidelity, to meet the needs indicated in their Complex Area plan to support early literacy for SPED students. |

**Justification for Chosen State-level Strategy**

The Hawaii State Department of Education has been utilizing Professional Learning Communities since 2010 during the implementation of Race to the Top initiatives. Professional Learning Communities have proven to be a mechanism for addressing and identifying solutions to improve student performance. Because of Hawaii’s unitary status as a single State Educational Agency and Local Educational Agency, we lack the self-governing, locally-funded unit overseeing the schools present in other states. There are pros and cons to our unitary status, but fiscal realities dictate that State-level offices must address the vast differences in the needs of the fifteen different Complex Areas. These State-level Professional Learning Communities have worked with the Six Priority Strategies and other initiatives, and will continue to work as it allows participants the opportunity to learn from the success of their peers and choose strategies and practices that address their own strengths, needs, and demographics.

One example of a successful Professional Learning Community is the “Lab Cohorts”, which was established under Assistant Superintendent Suzanne Mulcahy’s leadership while she was then Complex Area Superintendent of the Kailua-Kalaheo Complex Area. This Professional Learning Community was led by the Complex Area Literacy and Content Specialist Esmeralda Carini and included both general education and special education teachers. Teachers that participated in this Professional Learning Community not only received the support for implementing the strategies learned, but were then able to meet the needs of all students in their classes and especially the needs

---
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of struggling learners such that students demonstrated increased proficiency and growth on the annual state-wide assessment. \(^{31}\)

The success of current practices of the Six Priority Strategies to improve fidelity of implementation of each strategy made enhancing what is currently done with the Six Priority Strategies a natural decision for State leadership. A review of the Six Priority Strategies revealed the importance of this system to build infrastructure, but it was lacking the infusion of special education strategies. To address this, State leadership has developed a Complex Area Superintendent Professional Learning Community and District Educational Specialist Professional Learning Community focused on improving achievement. These Professional Learning Communities will build the capacity of Complex Area Superintendents and District Educational Specialists on special education strategies that will address the systemic causes identified by stakeholders in Phase 1. The Complex Area Superintendent and District Educational Specialist Professional Learning Communities in conjunction with the Professional Learning Communities for the Six Priority Strategies (and a Professional Learning Community for each strategy) is expected to bring uniform understanding of requirements and priorities, allow for sharing and scaling-up of bright spots, and provide the space for problem-solving with State-level leadership and Complex Area Superintendent colleagues.

The State-level Professional Learning Communities will be implemented simultaneously with the strategy establishing the Complex Area Implementation Teams. The information shared and problem-solving that will occur at the Professional Learning Communities will not benefit students without the Complex Area Superintendent’s leadership and the training and coaching that will be done by the Complex Area Implementation Team members to assist Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and staff to adopt and implement the evidence-based practices shared at the Professional Learning Communities.

The Professional Learning Communities, as we have already experienced with the Six Priority Strategies Professional Learning Communities, will also provide an opportunity for State-level leadership and staff to learn about the strengths and needs of Complex Areas and consequently modify or make available resources to aid the adoption or implementation of evidence-based practices. The Professional Learning Communities also serve as a “Practice Policy Communication Loop”, as information obtained at these Professional Learning Communities will also be used to identify changes to policies, structures, and procedures necessary to create conditions favorable for implementing practices that address the needs of our students with disabilities.

The use of State-level Professional Learning Communities will be implemented in alignment and in collaboration with other Federal and State programs. Currently and more actively during the 2016-2017 school year, leaders and program managers from the different Federal and State programs will

\(^{31}\) See more information via a video on the “Lab Cohorts in Kailua and Kalaheo Complex Area” available at: www.vimeo.com/157487975.
gather to determine programmatic and fiscal supports for subgroups highlighted for accountability under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized. Although the specific actions remain to be determined, State leadership expects that collaboration between and among the following offices and their respective programs will enhance the quality of information shared during the Professional Learning Communities, and improve the State’s ability to provide system interventions for removal of barriers experienced by Complex Area Superintendents:

- Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and other curriculum and support services)
- Assistant Superintendent, Office of Human Resources (Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Equity Plan),
- Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Title I – Assessment and Accountability; Data Governance)
- Director of the School Transformation Branch (Title I)
- Director of Special Projects Office (Administration of Federal Programs)

Moreover, as the State is now provided flexibility for improvement activities and use of innovations under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized, the Professional Learning Communities will be utilized as the mechanism to develop innovative ideas for improving subgroup achievement, and this includes addressing the performance of students with disabilities subgroup.

**Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation**

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are final decision-makers. The SSIP Core Team will provide recommendations for consideration by the decision-makers based on the information they developed and gathered from other stakeholders. The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will lead the Complex Area Superintendent Professional Learning Community. The Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will lead the District Educational Specialists Professional Learning Community. The Deputy is responsible for the Six Priorities Strategies’ Professional Learning Community, and the Assistant Superintendents of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support and Office of Human Resources are responsible for their respective strategies; the Office of Curriculum Instruction and Student Support are responsible for the Common Core State Standards, Formative Instruction and Data Teams, and Comprehensive Student Support System; and the Office of Human Resources are responsible for Induction and Mentoring, Educator

---
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Effectiveness, and Academic Review Team. The SSIP Core Team will also be available to assist with convening the participants for these Professional Learning Communities, and work with State-level offices to identify data and respond to other needs of the Professional Learning Communities.

The participants of the State-level Professional Learning Communities, and the Complex Area Implementation Team will be the entities responsible for disseminating information at the Complex Area and school-level. The participants will also provide feedback on the effectiveness of the Professional Learning Communities for the Deputy and Assistant Superintendents to consider as implementation progresses. As we proceed with implementation, the roles of stakeholders will be examined and modified as needed.

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will ensure and solicit assistance from their staff and staff from other offices to:

- Establish protocols and procedures for participants to follow;
- Ensure that the Professional Learning Communities have requisite and valid data to review and base decisions upon; and
- Promote a collaborative culture amongst participants.

The Deputy will hold quarterly Stocktakes with each Complex Area Superintendent to review implementation of the Professional Learning Communities. The State-level Professional Learning Communities will succeed as long as Complex Area Superintendents place value in, participate in, and require participation of their District Educational Specialists and Complex Area Support Team members.

As we proceed with the implementation of the State-level Professional Learning Communities we will ensure that the competency, organization, and leadership drivers and performance assessments are refined as necessary. Current definition of our implementation drivers is as follows:

---
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The other State-level and Complex Area level strategies are being utilized for implementation, and because of this, high-fidelity of implementation is expected.
SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Implementation of Strategies and Activities

Strategy #2 - Implement and Evalues Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices
For Improving Student Performance As Documented in the Complex Area Plan - State Strategy & Activities

State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices

- Strategies for Special Education
- Early Literacy Resources

Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation

Superintendent

Deputy Superintendent

Assistant Superintendent

Complex Area Superintendents

Superintendent and Deputy assess implementation during Stocktake with Assistant Superintendents and CAS to identify improvements for implementation fidelity and effectiveness.

Assistant Superintendent

Complex Area Superintendents

Conduct data review to identify bright spots and areas of low performance. Identify needs to address. Inform state-level of resource needs. Participate in PLCs to obtain practices to support CAIT’s training and coaching functions.

Implementation Stages for the State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices

- SY 2015-2016: OCIISS to offer resources to assist CAS with the implementation (and revision) of SY 2016-2017 Complex Area Plans. OCIISS begins offering training on early literacy to benefit all students. OCIISS explores offering Smarter Ants to Complex Areas for school use.
- SY 2016-2017: Provide Targeted Complex Areas with identified supports necessary for SY 2016-2017 implementation. Possibility installation of use of Smarter Ants. State provide other resources as identified by CAS and CAIT. Develop an evaluation of the resources & support provided to Complex Areas.
- SY 2017-2018 through 2019-2020: Evaluate progress and effectiveness of the resources and support provided to Complex Areas. Explore possibility of other resources and support.

Implementation Drivers for the State-level System of Support for Evidence-Based Practices

- Rubrics and self-assessments to evaluate implementation.
- State-level PLCs address systemic issues.
- Assistant Superintendents use data and information from CAS to determine state support.

Stakeholder Participation in Implementation and Evaluation

Our Stakeholders play various roles in the implementation and evaluation of this SSIP strategy as follows:

Graphic adapted from: http://sisep.tpg.unc.edu/guidebook/level-one/stages-implementation
State-Level Strategy #2 – Developing a State-level System of Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

Overall Description of Strategy

This state-level strategy is being developed utilizing the elements of Implementation Science to improve the probably for high-fidelity adoption, implementation and sustainability. The purpose of this strategy is to provide a system of support by making available resources on evidence based practices addressing special education strategies, early literacy, and other resources as informed by Complex Area Superintendents and their needs assessments in order to improve the quality of teaching and meet the needs of students with disabilities and in particular, the early literacy needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

Objectives, Outcomes, and Timeline for Completion of State-level Strategy

The State-level System of Support for the Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices is not fully implemented and collaboration between and among Federal and State programs occurring in the 2016-2017 school year in conjunction with implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized, will solidify progress towards implementation. The implementation and progress monitoring of the State-level System of Support for the Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices is driven by achieving the following long-term objectives and outcomes:

- Long-term Objective #1: Maintain a system of support by utilizing the Superintendent and Deputy Stocktakes, State-level Professional learning Communities and other feedback loops to obtain information regarding the resources Complex Area Superintendents need to adopt, implement, and sustain evidence-based practices that advance the achievement of students with disabilities, and in particular, improving early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

- Long-term Outcome #1: This system of support will ultimately direct the State’s programmatic and fiscal resources towards evidence-based practices that address needs identified by Complex Area Superintendents in their Complex Area Plans to achieve the ultimate outcome of increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English
Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

- Long-term Objective #2: Identify and make available for use by the Complex Area Superintendents and the Complex Area Implementation Teams, evidence-based practices on special education strategies, early literacy, and Six Priority Strategies.

- Long-term Outcome #2 – Provide State support for the Complex Area Superintendent’s and Complex Area Implementation Team’s efforts in training, coaching, and otherwise meeting the needs of other Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and school staff to improve quality of teaching and learning to ultimately improve student achievement, increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

The Hawaii State Department of Education will be progressing towards these long-term objectives and outcomes by strategically implementing the State-level System of Support for the Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices in phases, and in conjunction with the State-level Professional Learning Communities.

We expect to reach the following objectives during the next few school years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Objective</th>
<th>Intermediate Objectives</th>
<th>Long-term Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</td>
<td>• OCISS evaluates the effectiveness of current early literacy resources and initiatives to meet the early literacy needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>• OCISS develops EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students. OCISS offers training and coaching of EBPs to build the capacity of the CAIT.</td>
<td>• Utilize Stocktakes, State-level PLCs, and other feedback loops to obtain information regarding the resources the CAS need to adopt, implement, and sustain EBPs that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During the 2016-2017 school year, further strategies and activities to be implemented and appropriate evaluation measures will be defined &amp; developed.</td>
<td>• Identify and make available for use by the CAS, CAIT, and other CA staff, EBPs regarding special education strategies, early literacy, and each of the strategies within the Six Priority Strategies that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also expect to obtain the following outcomes as we advance with implementation of the State-level System of Support for the Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices and achieve our SIMR targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</td>
<td>• OCISS provides resources that support early literacy for SPED students.</td>
<td>• CAS, CAIT, and other Complex Area staff are provided EBPs to meet the needs of SPED students to improve early literacy of SPED students.</td>
<td>• Direct state program and fiscal resources towards evidence-based programs that address the needs identified by the CAS in their Complex Area plans to improve teaching and learning and ultimately increase the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL demonstrating proficiency on the ELA and demonstrating high-levels of growth on the ELA in order to narrow the achievement gap. Improve the quality of the training and coaching of school administrators, teachers and staff conducted by the CAS and CAIT, resulting in an improvement in the quality of teaching to meet the individualized needs of SPED students, and in particular, the needs of 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, thereby increasing the amount of students proficient on the ELA and demonstrating high-levels of growth on the ELA to narrow the achievement gap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for Chosen State-level Strategy

Our Phase 1 submission provided that a particular state-defined intervention could be implemented to address the needs of our students with disabilities and obtain our SIMR targets. However, during Phase 2, closer inspection of data revealed a state-defined, top-down intervention would not be feasible and not address specific needs of the fifteen different Complex Areas. Because of Hawaii’s unitary status as a single State Educational Agency and Local Educational Agency, we lack the self-governing, locally-funded unit overseeing the schools seen in other states that would take information from the State Educational Agency and develop customized implementation for their schools. There are pros and cons to our unitary status, but fiscal realities dictate that State-level offices are unable to define and provide separate unique supports to each Complex Area. None of the resources offered will be mandated, however, use of such resources may require specific action or commitments from Complex Area Superintendents for adoption and implementation fidelity.

---
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The Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will identify a protocol for identifying evidence-based practices that it will use to determine what resources to offer to Complex Area Superintendents and Complex Area Implementation Teams members. The protocol will be available for use by other offices and the Complex Area Superintendent to justify the evidence-based practices in the Complex Area Plan. Collaboration with other offices and programs (e.g., Title I, Title II, Title III, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, etc.) will result in the identification of the following types of resources:

- Identify evidence-based practices specific to addressing early literacy and the needs of all students for improving phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension;
- Identify evidence-based practices for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities; and
- Identify evidence-based practices to develop early literacy specifically for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language.

Other needs will be identified as implementation progresses, and alignment between and among Federal and State programs progresses.

**Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation**

Deputy and the Assistant Superintendents of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support, and the Office of Human Resources are the decision-makers for the implementation of the State-level System of Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, with the ultimate role of determining the type of the State-level resources that will be made available. The Complex Area Superintendents have decision-making authority to choose which resource they will use or implement.

The Core SSIP Team will assist with gathering information from Complex Area Superintendents on what resources would be necessary and making recommendations to State-level decision-makers. We will be adding Institutes of Higher Education as Key Participants and Advisors, as we currently have partnerships with the University of Hawaii at Manoa and Chaminade, and are trying to establish partnerships with the University of Hawaii at Hilo and other universities and colleges. Similar to the other strategies, the Complex Area Implementation Teams will gather information on state resources and assist with dissemination at the Complex Area and Schools. The Communications Office will also assist with identifying how to make Complex Areas aware of resources by utilizing such resources like our intranet.

---
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As we proceed with the implementation of the State-level System of Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, we will ensure that the competency, organization, and leadership drivers\(^\text{39}\) and performance assessments are refined as necessary. Current definition of our implementation drivers is as follows:

The State-level Professional Learning Communities and the Complex Area Implementation Teams will ensure that the resources identified by this strategy meets the needs of Complex Areas, schools, and students, and is also implemented and sustained.

\(^{39}\) Information obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen.
Complex Area Strategies to Build Capacity and Support Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

Overview: Building Capacity Through State-level Professional Learning Communities and Providing State-level Support for Evidence-Based Practices

Purpose, Objectives, and Outcomes for Complex Area Strategies

The Complex Area Strategies to Build Complex Area Capacity and Support Implementation of Evidence Based Practices were chosen for the following purposes:

1. Hawaii values the Complex Area Superintendent’s decision-making authority regarding evidence-based practices that are necessary for adoption and implementation in order to address the needs of students with disabilities, and in particular, the early literacy of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities;

2. Establish a Complex Area Implementation Team to strengthen the system of support for schools, assist with planning, and conduct training, coaching, and other activities to improve the fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices made available by the State or identified by the Complex Area Superintendent. The Complex Area Implementation Teams will also increase collaboration among and between Federal and state programs at the Complex Area-level to continue efforts address needs of students with disabilities and other subgroups of students.

3. The Complex Area Plan is used to guide schools within the Complex Area and will guide the decision-making and evaluation process regarding the Complex Area actions to improve student performance. The Complex Area Plan will also be used for accountability discussions during Stocktake meetings between the Deputy and Complex Area Superintendent to identify the Complex Area’s implementation progress and effectiveness and scale-up bright spots and remove barriers.

4. Targeted Complex Areas are selected for receiving increased State supports to improve student performance.

The overall objective of these Complex Area strategies is to build a system of support through the establishment of the Complex Area Implementation Team and build a system of accountability.
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through the Complex Area Plans to empower and support Complex Area Superintendents in identifying, addressing, and evaluating the needs of staff and students to improve the adoption, implementation, and sustainability of evidence based practices to attain SIMR targets and improve performance for all students with disabilities.

**Justification for Chosen Complex Area Strategies**

These Complex Area strategies reflect State leadership’s value in the Complex Area Superintendent’s understanding of the Complex Area’s strengths and needs, and expertise in identifying the actions necessary to advance student achievement. These strategies are also necessary to ensure implementation occurs and is supported at the school-level. To assist the Complex Areas and ensure these strategies do not overburden staff, the State has commenced collaboration between and among federal and state programs to provide information and products to Complex Area Superintendents and Complex Area Implementation Teams that are not separate, and instead are consolidated, where possible. The Complex Area Strategies work in concert with the State-level Strategies as information from the State-level Professional Learning Communities and State-level resources may be used by the Complex Area Superintendent and Complex Area Implementation Teams, and included in the Complex Area Plan.

**Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation**

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support are ultimate decision-makers for this strategy. The Complex Area Superintendent, considering recommendations from the Complex Area Implementation Teams, have decision-making authority over Complex Area actions. The Complex Area Implementation Teams will play a key role in ensuring high-fidelity of adoption, implementation, and sustainability of evidence-based practices at the Complex Area and school-level.

Provided below are details about the Complex Area strategies, which includes: specific short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives for implementation; short-, intermediate, and long-term outcomes, timeline for completion, justification for selection, alignment to other programs and initiatives and responsibilities for ensuring high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability.

---
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SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Implementation of Strategies and Activities

Strategy #1 - Build Capacity to Support Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices
Complex Area Strategy and Activities

Implementation Drivers for the Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT)

- ART, Data Teams, & CAIT assess fidelity.
- State-level PLCs address systemic issues.
- CAS & CAIT to reduce barriers.
- ART, Data Teams & CAIT utilize data based decisionmaking practices.

Complex Area Implementation Team

- SPED Strategy Experts
- Complex Area Superintendent
- Other Complex Area Staff
- Title I Linkers

Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation

Superintendent
- CAIT provides coaching & training to school administrators & staff
- State-level PLCs & other state resources to build capacity of CAIT, & CAIT to inform PLCs of needs to address.

Deputy Superintendent
- Select staff to join CAIT

Complex Area Superintendents
- Deputy Superintendent’s Stocktakes with Complex Area Superintendent (CAS), & performance management routines between the CAS and School Principal to exercise leadership to full implementation.

Stakeholder Participation in Implementation and Evaluation

Our Stakeholders play various roles in the implementation and evaluation of this SSIP strategy as follows:

Implementation Stages for the CAIT

- SY 2015-2016: Continue implementation of CAST. Exploration & Installation of SPED strategy expert with CAST. Explore CAIT.
- SY 2016-2017: Exploration & Installation of CAIT. CAS identify CAIT members. State to develop measures and rubrics to evaluate implementation of CAIT. CAS and CAIT to complete evaluations. If Complex Area ready, implement CAIT.
- SY 2017-2018: Initial Implementation of CAIT led by CAS. CAIT to utilize Implementation Drivers to train and coach. Evaluate progress of implementation and effectiveness.

Graphic adapted from: http://sisep.fpg.unc.edu/guidebook/level-one/stages-implementation
Complex Area Strategy #1 – Building Capacity and Collaboration for Sustainable Statewide Improvements Utilizing Professional Learning Communities and Complex Area Implementation Teams

Overall Description of Strategy

Developing the Complex Area Implementation Team is an essential strategy in the SSIP. These implementation teams follow the elements of Implementation Science and will “help initiate, improve, and sustain at each level and all levels to help assure coherent, consistent, and effective changes to support evidence-based programs and other effective innovations.”

The Complex Area Implementation Teams will address student improvement for students with disabilities and in particular our SIMR population, and address the needs of students within other subgroups as required in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since members will be representative from those and other Federal and State programs. Complex Area Superintendents will convene the Complex Area Implementation Team, which includes Complex Area staff representing the following subgroups and programs: Special Education strategy expert, English Learner strategy expert, Title I linker, representatives from the Complex Area Support Team responsible for implementation of the Six Priority Strategies, and any other Complex Area staff identified by the Complex Area Superintendent. The Complex Area Implementation Team will assist the Complex Area Superintendent by reviewing data, identifying Complex Area strengths and needs, and utilizing the information to aid in the planning and evaluation of the Complex Area Plan. The Complex Area Implementation Teams will be responsible for training, coaching, and providing other supports as defined by the Complex Area Superintendents to support and build the capacity of Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and school staff to implement necessary evidence-based practices.

Objectives, Outcomes, and Timelines for Completion of Complex Area-level Strategy

The Complex Area Implementation Teams are in the Exploration and Implementation Stages. However, some Complex Areas currently utilize an implementation team with the same functions but called by a different name. The implementation and evaluation of the Complex Area Implementation Teams is driven by achieving the following long-term objectives and outcomes:

- Long-term Objective #1: Complex Area Superintendent routinely convenes Complex Area staff, forming the Complex Area Implementation Team, to examine and analyze data, resources, and Complex Area strengths and needs, to produce a Complex Area Plan containing data-based

---
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decisions on Complex Area staff actions necessary to address the needs of students with disabilities and achieve SIMR targets in a manner that reflects collaboration of efforts between and among Federal and State programs and efficiently uses state resources. The Complex Area Implementation Team is also convened regularly to for monitoring the progress and effect of the evidence-based practices contained within the Complex Are Plans.

- Long-term Outcome #1: The convening of the Complex Area Implementation Teams will result in an efficient and collaborative efforts for implementation and evaluation of evidence-based practices designed to increase the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap, and ultimately address the needs of student subgroups identified under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

- Long-term Objective #2: Under the direction of the Complex Area Superintendent, the Complex Area Implementation Team initiates, improves, and sustains, changes at the Complex Area and school-level through training, coaching, and other supports as defined by the Complex Area Superintendent designed to build capacity of Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers and school staff to implement evidence-based practices for improving early literacy utilizing general and special education strategies that advance the performance of students with disabilities and in particular students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

- Long-term Outcome #2 – The Complex Area Implementation Team becomes the “change agent”\textsuperscript{46} responsible for initiating, improving, and sustaining changes at the Complex Area and school-level through training, coaching, and other supports defined by the CAS designed to build capacity of Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and staff on evidence-based practices that will improve quality of teaching and learning to ultimately improve student achievement, increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

The Hawaii State Department of Education will be progressing towards these long-term objectives and outcomes by strategically implementing the Complex Area Implementation Team in phases, and in conjunction with the State-level Strategies.

\textsuperscript{46} Information obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fixsen.
We expect to reach the following objectives during the next few school years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Objective</th>
<th>Intermediate Objectives</th>
<th>Long-term Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School Year 2015-2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Year 2016-2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT)</td>
<td>• Integrate SPED strategy expert into Complex Area CAST (i.e., CAST + 1) for planning and implementation of SY 2016-2017 Complex Area Plan. (First meeting in January 2016.)</td>
<td>• Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert, and possible addition of other CA staff, to further develop the CAIT for aligned planning, training, and coaching of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td>• CAS establishes and routinely convenes CAIT to address implementation of CA Plan and continues to facilitate alignment between/among programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CAIT members establish routines to collaborate, plan, and train and coach school staff on EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students using specific strategies for SPED students and general strategies that advance performance of all ESEA subgroups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also expect to obtain the following outcomes as we advance with implementation of the Complex Area Implementation Team and achieve our SIMR targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School Year 2015-2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Year 2016-2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR: Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT)</td>
<td>• Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies reflect and address the needs of SPED students. • Begin integration of SPED specific strategies into Six Priority Strategy implementation.</td>
<td>• CAS facilitates alignment between/among programs, and encourages use of PLCs, • Complex Area planning addresses the needs of SPED students through collaboration of CAIT members. • CAIT used for training and coaching of EBP for implementation fidelity.</td>
<td>• CAIT supports for planning, and training and coaching are established and welcomed by schools. • Administrators and teachers trained and coached by CAIT demonstrate progress in student achievement for SLD, SoL, OHD students, and all SPED students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification for Chosen Complex Area-level Strategy

Implementation Science identifies Implementation Teams as a necessary component to “initiate, improve, and sustain” change to support evidence-based practices. The Complex Area Implementation Teams are the “change agent” ensuring high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability of evidence-based practices at the Complex Area and school-level to address the attainment of our SIMR targets through training and coaching Complex Area staff, school administrators, teachers, and staff. Under the direction of the Complex Area Superintendent, the Complex Area Implementation Team will address the barriers identified by stakeholders in Phase 1 by designating improvements to address professional development and technical assistance, early interventions and data use and quality.

The Complex Area Implementation Team will also assist in planning, implementing, and evaluating the Complex Area Plans to address student performance of the various student subgroups since members of the Complex Area Implementation Team will include: a Special Education strategy expert, English Learner strategy expert, Title I linker, representatives from the Complex Area Support Team responsible for implementation of the Six Priority Strategies, and any other Complex Area staff identified by the Complex Area Superintendent. This collaboration addresses the critique of the use of the Six Priority Strategies, and ensures that the special education strategy expert is present at discussions and integrated into Complex Area planning and implementation to serve all students. Complex Area Implementation Teams will be expected to leverage resources of their particular programs to meet the needs of students with disabilities and particularly students within our SIMR population.

Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support are ultimate decision-makers for this strategy. The Complex Area Superintendent has decision-making authority and will direct the work of the Complex Area Implementation Teams. The members of the Complex Area Implementation Team will take action to ensure high fidelity of adoption, implementation, and sustainability of evidence-based practices at the Complex Area and school-level. Complex Area Superintendents will participate in self-assessments and other performance assessments to identify progress and effectiveness of implementation. The Deputy will
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utilize Stocktakes to address implementation success and barriers and evaluate the effectiveness of the Complex Area Implementation Team.

Information shared at the State-level Professional Learning Communities will be utilized by members of the Complex Area Implementation Team to achieve the Complex Area Superintendent’s direction regarding strategies to be implemented. The Complex Area Implementation Team will be the entity responsible for disseminating information to the field.

As we proceed with the implementation of the Complex Area Implementation Teams, we will ensure that the competency, organization, and leadership drivers and performance assessments are defined. Current definition of our implementation drivers is as follows:

---
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SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Implementation of Strategies and Activities

Strategy #2 - Implement and Evaluates Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices
For Improving Student Performance as Documented in the Complex Area Plan - Complex Area Strategy & Activities

Implements & Evaluates Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices for Improving Student Performance as Documented in Complex Area Plans...

Selected Complex Areas will be provided with focused support and resources.

If the Department...

Complex Area Plans

Complex Area Strategies & Activities

SPED Strategies

Early Literacy

Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation

Superintendent

Deputy Superintendent

Hold Stocktaktes with CAS to: (1) review data and identified barriers to implementation of Complex Area Plan, and determine bright spots that need to be scaled-up; (2) evaluate progress towards full implementation of Complex Area Plan; (3) identify supports necessary from the State; & (4) identify improvements for implementation fidelity and effectiveness.

Complex Area Superintendents

Utilize members of the CAIT to conduct data review and analysis to identify Complex Area needs. Identify infrastructure needs for implementing evidence-based practices. Identify to identify bright spots and needs for scaling-up bright spots and addressing low performance. Complete the Complex Area Plan and conduct required evaluations.

Assistant Superintendents, Office of Curriculum

Identity & provide evidence-based practices to meet needs of Complex Areas. Provide support to CAS, and DES, CAST, and CAIT PLCs to improve fidelity of implementation. Develop Complex Area Plan that is aligned with other federal programs.

Implementation Drivers for Implementing Evidence-Based Practices Documented in the Complex Area Plan

CAIT provide coaching to implement evidence-based practices in the Complex Area Plan.

CAIT provide training to implement evidence-based practices in the Complex Area Plan.

Complex Area Superintendents identify CAIT members. Assistant Superintendents identify state-level staff to provide resources to Complex Area.

Leadership Drivers

Integrated & Compensatory

Facilitative Administration

Coaching

States-level PLCs address systemic issues.

CAS and CAIT to address implementation.

CAS and CAIT to use data to determine evidence-based practices necessary to include in Complex Area Plan.

Superintendent’s Stocktaktes with Assistant Superintendents (AS), & performance management routines between the Deputy Superintendent, CAS and School Principal to exercise the leadership necessary for full implementation.

Implementation Stages for Implementing Evidence-Based Practices as Documented in Plan

Exploration

Installation

Initial Implementation

Full Implementation


SY 2016-2017: Deputy use Stocktaktes with CAS to monitor and evaluate implementation of Plans. Provide and review state-level supports to Targeted Complex Areas. Develop plan templates, protocols & evaluations for Complex Area Plan in collaboration with other federal programs. CAS to submit SY 2017-2018 plans in alignment with other programs in Spring 2017. SY 2017-2018 through 2019-2020: Deputy Superintendent to use Stocktaktes to monitor implementation of Plans. Complex Areas complete plans and evaluations. Review and revise process.

Graphic adapted from Leading By Convening

Graphic adapted from: http://sisep.fpg.unc.edu/guidebook/level-one/stages-implementation
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Complex Area Strategy #2 – Implements and Evaluates Effectiveness of Chosen Evidence Based Practices for Improving Student Performance as Documented in Complex Area Plans

Overall Description of Strategy

Complex Area Superintendents have been required to develop and submit a Complex Area Plan that addresses action to improve student performance. Beginning with implementation in the 2017-2018 school year, in alignment with the implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, such Complex Area Plan will guide the implementation of evidence-based practices designed to improve performance of students with disabilities and achieve SIMR targets, and designed to improve the performance of other students and subgroups. The implementation and evaluation of the Complex Area Plan will also be part of the Deputy’s Stocktakes with the Complex Area Superintendent, establishing a node of accountability for implementation fidelity, and refining implementation efforts.

All Complex Area Superintendents are required to submit the Complex Area Plan per the Academic and Financial planning and approval requirements. State leadership has and will continue to select Complex Areas targeted for increased support. This year, State leadership chose two Complex Areas: Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui Complex Area under the direction of Complex Area Superintendent Leila Hayashida, and Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa Complex Area under the direction of Complex Area Superintendent Chad Farias.

Objectives, Outcomes, and Timelines for Completion of Complex Area-level Strategy

The Complex Area Plans that will be implemented in the 2016-2017 school year are initially due at the end of March. Complex Area Superintendents were provided with data on their students with disabilities, and specifically the performance of 3rd and 4th grade students on the English Language Arts assessment administered during the 2014-2015 school year, along with other performance indicators and demographics. Upon reviewing the data made available to Complex Area Superintendents, State leadership concluded that no Complex Area is high-performing as the proficiency rates for our SIMR population on the English Language Arts assessment ranged from a high of 15.98% to a low 2.70%. Furthermore, no single performance indicator or demographic can be utilized to explain high or low performance, reflecting the differences among Complex Areas and requiring Complex Area Superintendents to conduct deeper data dives to identify root causes of low performance specific to their Complex Area. The differences also indicates that a top-down, State-
defined solution would be ineffective since a “one size fits all approach” will not serve all Complex Areas; it is best that Complex Areas Superintendents define their own needs and solutions to improve student performance.

The following are excerpts of the data made available to State leadership and Complex Area Superintendents. Data was prepared by Cesar D’Agord, Technical Assistance provider, with the National Center for Systemic Improvement and IDEA Data Center. The charts use the following acronyms and identifiers for each Complex Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex Area</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Special Education Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Farrington-Kaiser-Kalani (FKK)</td>
<td>14,940</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kaimuki-McKinley-Roosevelt (KMR)</td>
<td>13,726</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aiea-Moanalua-Radford (AMR)</td>
<td>14,003</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Leilehua-Mililani-Waialua (LMW)</td>
<td>15,379</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Campbell-Kapolei (Cam-Kap)</td>
<td>15,798</td>
<td>1,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pearl City-Waipahu (PC-W)</td>
<td>13,841</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nanakuli-Waianae (NW)</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Castle-Kahuku (Cas-Kah)</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kailua-Kalaheo (Kai-Kal)</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hilo-Laupahoechoe-Waiakea (HW)</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kau-Keaau-Pahoa (KKP)</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Honokaa-Kealakehe-Kohala-Konawaena (HKKK)</td>
<td>9,056</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui (BKM)</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hana-Lahainaluna-Lanai-Molokai (HLLM)</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kapaa-Kauai-Waimea (Kauai)</td>
<td>8,829</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Charter Schools combined (Charter)</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 166,973 students, 17,723 special education students.
The following chart provides the SIMR calculation for each Complex Area: Proficiency rate on the statewide assessment for English Language Arts (ELA) administered in the 2014-2015 school year for 3rd and 4th Grade students with the eligibility categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Disability, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex Area</th>
<th>3rd and 4th grades combined – ELA Proficiency</th>
<th>3rd Grade ELA Proficiency</th>
<th>4th Grade ELA Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Students Tested</td>
<td>OHD</td>
<td>SLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMW</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kau-Kai</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKK</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas-Kah</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKKK</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-W</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLLM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam-Kap</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKM</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKP</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Complexes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>10.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Complex and/or subgroup proficiency level above state SIMR (8.33%).
- Complex and/or subgroup proficiency level below state SIMR (8.33%).
- Number of tested students is below 5, data included on calculations but not displayed.
- SIMR Levels: Grades 3rd and 4th combined for all complexes, per disability and the aggregate of the three disabilities.
The following chart provides a summary of the key demographics and indicators of performance by Complex Area for the 2014-2015 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMW</td>
<td>15,379</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKKK</td>
<td>9,056</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>11.09%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-Kal</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKK</td>
<td>14,940</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.82%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>14,003</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-W</td>
<td>13,841</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLLM</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.69%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas-Kah</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam-Kap</td>
<td>15,798</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>8,829</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMR</td>
<td>13,726</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKP</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKM</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter CA</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166,973</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HI DOE Strive HI, eCSSS, & eHR for HQ Federal Report
Complex Area Plan submissions will be reviewed by a team lead by the Deputy and includes the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support and individuals from such office, members of the Core SSIP Team, and representatives from other State-level offices. Recommendations for improvement of Complex Area Plans will be identified following the review, and Deputy will be discussing such recommendations with the Complex Area Superintendent during Stocktakes. Deputy will approve the plan for implementation during the 2016-2017 school year, following acceptable revisions, or if the plan already appropriately addresses the needs of students with disabilities and specifically the early literacy needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

The requirements for the development and submission of Complex Area Plans to be implemented in the 2017-2018 school year and beyond will be identified during the 2016-2017 school year in collaboration with the implementation of requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized. The implementation and evaluation of the Complex Area Plans is driven by achieving the following long-term objectives and outcomes:

- Long-term Objective #1: Complex Area Superintendents will convene the Complex Area Implementation Team and annually submit a Complex Area Plan containing data-based decisions on Complex Area staff actions necessary to address the needs of students with disabilities and achieve SIMR targets in a manner that reflects collaboration of efforts between and among Federal and State programs and identifies strategies specific to assisting students with disabilities, particularly students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities, and general strategies to be used for all students that benefit students with disabilities.

- Long-term Outcome #1: The documentation of Complex Area action and strategies will guide implementation, decision-making, and evaluation efforts at the Complex Area and school-levels resulting in improved teaching practices and increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap, and ultimately address the needs of student subgroups identified under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

- Long-term Objective #2: Maintain accountability routine through quarterly Stocktakes between Deputy and Complex Area Superintendent to review the Complex Area Plan and the progress made towards implementing the strategies and other Complex Area action described, and the progress made towards achieving outcomes and increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment.
- Long-term Outcome #2 – The Complex Area Plan and its performance management routines will allow the State to support the leadership of Complex Area Superintendents as they implement evidence-based practices for student advancement, and specifically to obtain our SIMR targets.

The Hawaii State Department of Education will be progressing towards these long-term objectives and outcomes by strategically implementing the Complex Area Plan in phases, and in conjunction with the State-level Strategies. We expect to reach the following objectives during the next few school years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Objective</th>
<th>Intermediate Objectives</th>
<th>Long-term Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Educational Practice to Achieve SIMR: Complex Area Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 2015-2016</td>
<td>School Year 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate protocols and routines to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve early literacy for SPED students in Complex Area planning.</td>
<td>• Deputy or Deputy’s designee(s) identify required elements of Complex area plans for inclusion in planning templates, protocols, and evaluation(s) of the Complex Area plan to integrate EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students into Complex Area planning.</td>
<td>• Complex Area planning integrates EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students using specific strategies for SPED students into planning of general strategies that improve the performance of all ESEA subgroups through collaborative planning with other federal programs (e.g., ESSA) to create alignment and integration with all Complex Area initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize Deputy Stocktakes to review how Complex Area Plan addressing early literacy needs for SPED students.</td>
<td>• Deputy Stocktakes to evaluate effectiveness of Complex Area Plan by identifying areas of strength, and modifications or State supports necessary to improve implementation or effectiveness of EBP.</td>
<td>• Maintain accountability routine through quarterly Deputy Stocktakes to evaluate effectiveness of Complex Area Plan and identify bright spots for scaling-up statewide and barriers requiring state intervention for implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also expect to obtain the following outcomes as we advance with implementation of the Complex Area Plan and achieve our SIMR targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Year 2015-2016</td>
<td>School Year 2016-2017</td>
<td>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Educational Practice to Achieve SIMR: Complex Area Plan</td>
<td>• Complex Area plans consider the early literacy needs of SPED students in implementing the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>• Complex Area plans meet the requirements to include EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students.</td>
<td>• Complex Area plans integrate improvement strategies for SPED students into comprehensive planning for improved early literacy performance of all ESEA subgroups, and in particular, 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deputy Stocktakes prioritize a review and analysis of Complex Area actions to address early literacy needs for SPED students.</td>
<td>• Deputy Stocktakes to serve as a mechanism to identify necessary system interventions to assist CAS with implementation of EBP.</td>
<td>• Stocktakes will identify Deputy’s decisions on State-level actions necessary to support CAS’ leadership and implementation of their Complex Area Plan and addressing improvement to early literacy performance of all ESEA subgroups, and in particular, 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for Chosen Complex Area-level Strategy

The Complex Area Plan will set forth the Complex Area Superintendent’s philosophy, values, and principles that will guide decision-making and evaluations to promote consistent use of resources and implementation of activities. Complex Areas will utilize the Complex Area Plan for school accountability, and in turn, the Deputy will utilize the Complex Area Plans in the same manner for Complex Area Superintendent accountability.

State leadership decided to require the development and submission of a Complex Area Plan to document the evidence-based practices chosen by Complex Area Superintendents. This replaces the top-down, state-identified focused intervention proposed in Phase 1. The decision was made after analysis of 3rd and 4th grade data specific to our SIMR population showed vast differences between the Complex Areas. The decision also reflects State leadership’s overall belief that a decision about implementation is most effective if done at the Complex Area-level as the Complex Area

---
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Superintendent knows their strengths and needs of their administrators, staff, students, and system. The evidence-based practices chosen and implemented will more effectively address the specific leadership, professional development and technical assistance, data, and fiscal needs of the Complex Area and schools.

The opportunity presented by Congress’ deliberate delay of implementation of key requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act allows the Hawaii State Department of Education time to thoughtfully collaborate such that requirements and resources of such law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and other Federal and State programs can be utilized to its fullest extent to support the achievement of students with disabilities and specifically to advance early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities. Collaborating at the State-level and requiring a convening of the representatives of the same programs at the Complex Area level through the Complex Area Implementation Team will ensure this desired collaboration between and among Federal and State programs will be accomplished at the Complex Area, and reflected in the Complex Area Plan.

All Complex Area Superintendents will be required to submit a Complex Area Plan, and Targeted Complex Areas will be slated for increased state support. This targeted process is key to providing the lowest performing areas with sustainable resources and support, similar to the targeted support requirement in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized. The 2014-2015 school year data indicates that between the two Targeted Complex Areas, 5.57% of their 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrated proficiency on the English Language Arts assessment. These two areas are ideal as targeted areas given their unique student demographics and motivated leaders.

**Targeted Complex Area: Ka'u-Kea'au-Pahoa**

Located on the island of Hawaii, Ka'u-Kea'au-Pahoa, includes nine (9) schools, six (6) of them elementary schools. During Race to the Top, Ka'u-Kea'au-Pahoa was identified as one of the “Zones of Innovation”, and thus, infused with funding and resources that successfully built capacity to achieve student, staff, and system success outcomes. Ka'u-Kea'au-Pahoa has the least amount of total students (4,205) compared to other Complex Areas. However, it has the highest percentage of students in the lower socio-economic status (86.1% of the population qualifying for free or reduced meals), which is reflective of the social ills that the Department of Education has little to no control over.

Effective January 1, 2015, Chad Farias, a career educator and administrator, took the helm as Complex Area Superintendent. The position is fitting as Complex Area Superintendent Farias is most knowledgable about his Complex
Area having spent his entire career on Hawaii island and most recently as the Kea‘au Elementary Principal. Under his leadership, Kea‘au Elementary was one of the pioneers in digital learning among its staff and students, elevating student achievement and reducing chronic absenteeism at this school.

The 2014-2015 school year data indicates that Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa is the low performing Complex Area for all indicators, except that its Highly Qualified Teacher numbers for special education teachers is on par with the State’s average. Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa’s data also indicates that none of their 3rd and 4th graders with Specific Learning Disabilities or Other Health Disabilities demonstrated proficiency on the English Language Arts assessment. Nonetheless, Complex Area Superintendent Farias’ expertise, leadership, and knowledge of the Complex Area and community will move the Complex Area to achieve success for its students and staff at Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa. Ravae Todd, who has been an integral part of the SSIP Core Team, is one of the District Educational Specialists under Complex Area Superintendent Farias. Her participation is also key to Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa’s success.

**Targeted Complex Area: Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui**

Located on the island of Maui, Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui includes twenty (20) schools, thirteen (13) of them are elementary schools. Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui has never been previously targeted during Race to the Top or through Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver initiatives. Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui is the third largest complex area with a total of 15,798 students during the 2014-2015 school year. It is the Complex Area with the 2nd largest amount of 3rd and 4th grade students in the Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities (174). In Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui, 53.1% of students fall into the lower socio-economic status, and the rest of the demographics for this Complex Area are within the State’s average. Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui has recently experienced a refreshing change in leadership with Leila Hayashida appointed as Complex Area Superintendent on January 1, 2016. A long-time teacher and administrator, Complex Area Superintendent Hayashida served at various levels of our system: school, Complex Area, and State. During her tenure as the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support, she transformed the delivery of state support resulting in the removal of barriers and improved resources, professional development, and technical assistance provided to build the capacity of Complex Areas and schools leaders, teachers, and school staff in all areas, and particularly in special education. Complex Area Superintendent Hayashida’s vision and leadership will result in successful transformation of Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui.
Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are the ultimate decision-makers for this strategy. The Complex Area Superintendents maintain their authority over the decisions necessary for their respective Complex Areas. Specifically, Complex Area Superintendents, considering recommendations made by the Complex Area Implementation Teams, will be solely responsible for determining the contents of the Complex Area Plans. Unless the development of protocols dictates otherwise, Complex Area Plans will continue to be reviewed by a team lead by the Deputy and includes the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support and individuals from such office, members of the Core SSIP Team, and representatives from other State-level offices. Recommendations for improvement of Complex Area Plans will be developed following the review and Deputy will be discussing such recommendations with the Complex Area Superintendent during Stocktakes.

During the 2016-2017 school year, the Complex Area Superintendents and Complex Area staff in the Targeted Complex Areas will aid in the development of templates, protocols, data, self-assessments, and other documentation and progress measures. The Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support, Special Projects Office, School Transformation Branch, Office of Coordinated Support, and other offices will also take part in the development. The products (e.g., templates, and self-assessments, etc.), and procedures will be vetted by the Complex Area Superintendent Professional Learning Community. Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will be ultimate decision-makers regarding the procedures and requirements.

As we proceed with the implementation of the Complex Area Implementation Teams, we will ensure that the competency, organization, and leadership drivers and performance assessments are refined as needed. Current definition of our implementation drivers is as follows:

---
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56 Information obtained from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website, © 2013 Karen Blase and Dean Fissenn.
Evaluation of State-level and Complex Area Strategies and Activities to Build Capacity and Support Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

Overall Internal Evaluation Process

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are the ultimate decision-makers regarding action(s) warranted by evaluation outcomes. The evaluation of the SSIP and its State and Complex Area strategies to build capacity and support implementation of evidence-based practices will be conducted internally and progress monitoring of activities will occur at various levels of our tri-level system. At the State-level, the Special Projects Director will be responsible for conducting the overall evaluation of the implementation of the SSIP, and for working with the SSIP Core Team, and where relevant the SSIP Working Group, to compile evaluation data and results from the Special Projects Office’s assessment. Other State offices and Complex Areas will submit their performance assessments to the Special Projects Office for inclusion into the evaluation data and will be sent to the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent for use in Stocktakes. Progress monitoring activities at the Complex Area will be conducted by the Complex Area Superintendent and Complex Area Implementation Team.

Evaluation data will be reviewed during Stocktake meetings, which presents a quarterly opportunity for the Deputy to meet one-on-one with Complex Area Superintendents, and the Superintendent to meet one-on-one with Assistant Superintendents to dialogue about the progress towards implementation and outcomes, review data and progress monitoring results, and uncover information not gathered via the formal evaluation tools. The Stocktake meetings end with mutual agreements regarding actions that the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, or Deputy and Complex Area Superintendent will take to improve implementation either by scaling-up bright-spots or removing barriers to implementation. Such agreements will be disseminated by the Office of Coordinated Support to the relevant Assistant Superintendent or Complex Area Superintendent. Information will also be summarized and disseminated to Department and Community stakeholders to inform them of implementation progress and effectiveness, through the SPP/APR information provided to stakeholders, communication methods defined by the Communication Offices, and use of other dissemination networks.

---
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Because the implementation of our strategies is phased-in, so is our evaluation. As of this writing, we have identified the elements required by the U.S. Department of Education for the evaluation, which includes:

1. Short-, Intermediate, and Long-term objectives;
2. Short-, Intermediate, and Long-term outcomes;
3. Data collection methods;
4. Methods of data analysis,
5. The plan for disseminating information from the evaluation to stakeholders.

The Hawaii State Department of Education will refine the process, methods, criteria and questions as strategies are implemented in order to determine whether the state is on the right track to make the changes necessary to achieve the SIMR targets. Furthermore, as we move forward in this process, we will examine and further refine the role of stakeholders and their participation in the evaluation process.

Components of Initial Evaluations

The evaluation tools are designed to test our theory of action and other components of our plan. The following provides the inputs (resources), outputs (strategies and activities), and briefly, the short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes for our SSIP.

---
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### Logic Model for the Hawaii State Department of Education’s State Systemic Improvement Plan

#### Inputs
- Department stakeholders
- Community stakeholders
- PD/TA and State resources
- SPED Strategies
- Literacy Strategies
- Six Priority Strategies
- PLCs for Six Priority Strategies
- PLCs for Complex Area Supts
- PLCs for District Educational Specialists
- IDEA program & fiscal requirement
- ESEA program & fiscal requirement
- Leading By Convening
- Student and Staff Data Systems
- TA from Cesar IP Agord, NCSI, IDC
- TA from Debra Jennings, USDOE OSEP

#### Activities
- Convene Professional Learning Communities to: (1) build capacity of CAS, DES, and CAST on EBP for Six Priority Strategies, SPED, & Early Literacy and (2) scale-up and remove barriers.
- State-level of Support for Evidence-based Practices on Six Priority Strategies, SPED, Early Literacy, & other CA needs.
- CAS establishes CAIT routines & convenes CAIT to develop & evaluate CA Plan.
- CAIT trains, coaches, & provides other support.
- Develop CA Plan protocols for submission and evaluation.
- Review of data during Stocktakes with CAS for implementation accountability.
- Gather/prepare data for decision-making.
- Collaboration between/ among Federal/State programs.
- Use Leading By Convening to engage stakeholders to address SIMR.

#### Outputs
- Annual development and submission of CA Plan that meets requirements, reflects data-based decisions on EBP that address early literacy of SIMR students resulting in improvement to SIMR, training, coaching & other supports by CAIT, & other CA actions to address SIMR.
- Amount of CA and CAITs using State resources: EBP for Six Priority Strategies, SPED, & Early Literacy.
- Quarterly Stocktakes determine fidelity of implementation of CA Plan and EBP.
- Quarterly Stocktakes identify revisions to Complex Area Plans, chosen EBP, and State support for implementation.
- Efforts to align and coordinate implementation of Federal/State programs resulting in efficient use of programmatic & fiscal resources available to support EBP for SIMR students.
- Document analysis reflects data-based decision-making.
- External support for implementation of EBP.

#### Short-Term Outcomes
- Addressing needs of SPED students is a priority by State and CA.
- CA Plan and reflects SPED needs.
- CAS, DES, CAIT learns and begins to use of EBP to address SIMR students through PLCs.
- Coordinate with Six Priority Strategy implementation to address SPED needs.
- Deputy Stocktake reviews CA actions to address SPED needs.
- State resources assist CA implementation of EBP.
- State aids CA with removal of barriers to implementation.

#### Intermediate Outcomes
- EBP to support early literacy and needs of SIMR students implemented by teachers.
- Improved collaboration between general and SPED, and between/among Federal & State programs.
- Data specific to SIMR and SPED used for decision-making for CA & State actions.
- Convening of CAIT & supports to CA & schools are routine.
- Deputy Stocktake used to identify modifications to CA Plans and CA actions to support SIMR students.
- Bright spots scaled-up.

#### Long-term Outcomes
- All students receive necessary supports.
- Students K-4 obtain supports necessary to demonstrate proficiency and high-levels of growth on the ELA assessment.
- CAIT is “change agent” & support welcomed by schools.
- SPED strategies for early literacy included in CA Plans.
- Deputy Stocktake used to transform CA and inform State practices.
- CA Plan guides implementation, decision-making, and monitoring efforts at the Complex Area and school-levels to improve early literacy for SIMR students.
- Obtain external support for improvements to advance early literacy.
- Monitoring indicates SIMR students improving year to year on ELA performance.
- Address needs of other subgroups of students

#### Impact (SIMR)
- Improve percent of 3rd & 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL demonstrating proficiency on the ELA assessment.
- Improve the Median Growth Percentile for 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL on the ELA assessment.
Data Collection Method and Analysis Utilized to Evaluate Implementation and Outcomes

The progress monitoring tools on the following pages will be utilized to evaluate the State and Complex Area strategies. Progress monitoring measures will be refined as implementation progresses. The tools address the data collection and methods and measures to determine the following:

1. Determine whether the State-Level Professional Learning Communities, State-level System of Support for Evidence Based Practices, the Complex Area Implementation Teams, and the Complex Area Plans for all Complex Areas and for Targeted Complex Areas are being implemented as proposed, which includes a determination of whether short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives are being met. Based upon such determination, the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will review implementation plans and refine or modify to make further progress.

2. Determine whether the State-Level Professional Learning Communities, State-level System of Support for Evidence Based Practices, the Complex Area Implementation Teams, and the Complex Area Plans for all Complex Areas and for Targeted Complex Areas are meeting the proposed short-, intermediate, and long-term implementation outcomes, and allowing the State to reach its SIMR targets for the particular year. Following such determination, review outcomes to determine whether outcomes need to be amended, and if yes, the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will assess whether additional actions are necessary to meet such revised outcomes.

3. Determine whether the State-Level Professional Learning Communities, State-level System of Support for Evidence Based Practices, the Complex Area Implementation Teams, and the Complex Area Plans for all Complex Areas and for Targeted Complex Areas are the strategies necessary to implement our theory of action, whether other strategies are necessary, or whether the theory of action needs to be modified. If modifications are necessary to either the strategies or the theory of action altogether, the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will establish a course of action for implementing such decision(s).

4. Determine whether further alignment and collaboration between and among Federal and State Programs are necessary to improve implementation of the State-Level Professional Learning Communities, State-level System of Support for Evidence Based Practices, the Complex Area Implementation Teams, and the Complex Area Plans for all Complex Areas and for Targeted Complex Areas. The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will define the alignment necessary and hold the respective office accountable for obtaining goals.
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SSIP Phase 2 – Summary for Implementation and Evaluation of Strategies and Activities at the State-Level

The strategies chosen are designed to build the capacity of the Department to improve the performance of all students with disabilities such that we will achieve our SIMR targets. The effective interventions have been defined by the Department’s leadership, and various implementation teams are responsible for implementation fidelity at the State, Complex Area, and School. Each strategy, if implemented with fidelity, will build the infrastructure needed in order to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities such that we achieve our SIMR targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC (CAST + 1) to review data.</td>
<td>Integrate SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC to review data and address the needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC to review data and identify SPED student needs.</td>
<td>PLCs facilitate integration of EBPs that support SPED students into Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>PLCs build their capacity to provide training and coaching of EBPs to CAS and CAIT.</td>
<td>Build capacity of CAS and CAIT to provide training and coaching of school administrators and staff on EBPs to advance the provision of EBPs in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent (AS) of OCISS develop mandatory DES meetings into DES PLC.</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of OCISS facilitates CAS PLCs to consider the needs of SPED students in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies reflect and address the needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>CAS PLC identifies the resources and supports needed by the Complex Areas to implement EBPs to improve the early literacy of SPED students.</td>
<td>CAS, CAIT, and other Complex Area staff are provided EBPs to meet the needs of SPED students to improve early literacy of SPED students.</td>
<td>Improve the quality of teaching and learning for SPED students by ensuring that Complex Areas have EBPs, and the ability to implement them with fidelity, to meet the needs indicated in their Complex Area plan to support early literacy for SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership facilitates CAS PLC to consider the needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>Leadership facilitates CAS PLCs to consider the needs of SPED students in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Leadership facilitates CAS PLCs to implement the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Leadership facilitates CAS PLCs to implement the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Leadership facilitates CAS PLCs to implement the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Direct state program and fiscal resources towards evidence-based programs that address the needs identified by the CAS in their Complex Area plans to improve teaching and learning and ultimately increase the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, thereby narrowing the achievement gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Educational Practice to Achieve SIMR

School Years 2015-2016

Short-term Outcomes

- OCISS evaluates the effectiveness of current early literacy resources and initiatives to meet the early literacy needs of SPED students.
- OCISS provides resources that support early literacy for SPED students.
- OCISS explores specific EBPs to advance early literacy for SPED students.

Intermediate Outcomes

- OCISS develops EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students.
- OCISS offers training and coaching of EBPs to build the capacity of the CAIT.

Long-term Outcomes

- OCISS develops EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students.
- OCISS offers training and coaching of EBPs to build the capacity of the CAIT.

School Years 2015-2016

Short-term Objectives

- Formalize PLC for CAS, DES and CAST focused on identifying and scaling up EBPs for advancing achievement of all students with disabilities and in particular, improving early literacy of students with SLD, OHD and SoL.
- Build capacity of CAS and CAIT to provide training and coaching of school administrators and staff on EBPs to advance the provision of EBPs in schools.

Intermediate Objectives

- Identify and make available for use by the CAS, CAIT, and other CA staff, EBPs regarding special education strategies, early literacy, and each of the strategies within the Six Priority Strategies that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.

Long-term Objectives

- Identify and make available for use by the CAS, CAIT, and other CA staff, EBPs regarding special education strategies, early literacy, and each of the strategies within the Six Priority Strategies that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.
### Data Sources and Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year 2015-2016</th>
<th>School Year 2016-2017</th>
<th>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure of Progress Toward SMP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure of Progress Toward SMP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure of Progress Toward SMP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toward SMP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Toward SMP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Toward SMP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficiency on Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proficiency on Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proficiency on Assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 (baseline)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50, 55, 60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.33% (baseline)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%, 35%, 50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continued use of the Six Priority Strategy implementation rubrics, ART process, and self-assessments by CAS and CAIT to evaluate implementation and effectiveness of the PLCs to support Complex Area initiatives to advance early literacy for SPED students.
- Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and Formative Instruction process at the school.
- SPED student performance data on statewide assessment for ELA, and specifically 3rd and 4th grade proficiency rates of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, and the median growth percentile of students in 4th grade with SLD, OHD, and SoL, provided by Data Governance Office (DGA) to measure progress toward meeting yearly proficiency and growth targets set forth in the SSP.
- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS and AS of OCISS to:
  - Review progress toward meeting yearly SSP growth and proficiency targets;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, the implementation and effectiveness of the PLCs;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, early literacy resources and EBPs available to the Complex Area; and
  - Identify additional Complex Area needs.

- Continued use of the Six Priority Strategy implementation rubrics, ART process, and self-assessments by CAS and CAIT to evaluate implementation and effectiveness of the PLCs to support Complex Area initiatives to advance early literacy for SPED students.
- Identification of self-assessment criteria by Deputy or Deputy's designee(s) to be used in self-assessment tool by the CAS to evaluate the effectiveness of the PLCs and state-level offices to provide and support training and coaching of EBPs that advance early literacy for SPED students.
- Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and Formative Instruction process at the school.
- SPED student performance data on statewide assessment for ELA, and specifically 3rd and 4th grade proficiency rates of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, and the median growth percentile of students in 4th grade with SLD, OHD, and SoL, provided by Data Governance Office (DGA) to measure progress toward meeting yearly proficiency and growth targets set forth in the SSP.
- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS and AS of OCISS to:
  - Review progress toward meeting yearly SSP growth and proficiency targets;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, the implementation and effectiveness of the PLCs;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, early literacy resources and EBPs available to the Complex Area; and
  - Identify additional Complex Area needs.

- Six Priority Strategy implementation rubrics, ART process, and self-assessments by CAS and CAIT.
- Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and Formative Instruction process at the school.
- SPED student performance data on statewide assessment for ELA, and specifically 3rd and 4th grade proficiency rates of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, and the median growth percentile of students in 4th grade with SLD, OHD, and SoL, provided by Data Governance Office (DGA) to measure progress toward meeting yearly proficiency and growth targets set forth in the SSP.
- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS and AS of OCISS to:
  - Review progress toward meeting yearly SSP growth and proficiency targets;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, the implementation and effectiveness of the PLCs;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, early literacy resources and EBPs available to the Complex Area; and
  - Identify additional Complex Area needs.

### OCISS offers early literacy training.

- OCISS offers early literacy training.
- OCISS is providing resources to support early literacy for SPED students (e.g., Smarty Ants, etc.) based on input from the PLCs and CAIT.
- OCISS is offering training and coaching to CAIT on EBPs.

### Executive Summary (Continued from previous page)

- OCISS provides the resources needed to support the CAS and CAIT in implementing the selected EBPs documented in the Complex Area plan.
- PLS offer training and coaching of EBPs to the CAS and CAIT.
- PLS utilize SPED student performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of EBPs and inform planning, resource development, training and coaching.
- PLS offer training and coaching of EBPs to the CAS and CAIT.
### SSIP Phase 2 – Summary for Implementation and Evaluation of Strategies and Activities at the Complex Area

The strategies chosen are designed to build the capacity of the Department to improve the performance of all students with disabilities such that we will achieve our SIMR targets. The effective interventions have been defined by the Department's leadership, and various implementation teams are responsible for implementation fidelity at the State, Complex Area, and School. Each strategy, if implemented with fidelity, will build the infrastructure needed in order to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities such that we achieve our SIMR targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Infrastructure to Achieve SIMR Complex Area Plan</td>
<td>Integrate SPED strategy expert into Complex Area CAST (i.e., CAST + 1) for planning and implementation of SY 2016-2017 Complex Area Plan.</td>
<td>Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies reflect and address the needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert, and possible addition of other CA staff, to further develop the CAIT for aligned planning, training, and coaching of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td>CAS facilitates alignment between/among programs, and encourages use of PLCs, Complex Area planning addresses the needs of SPED students through collaboration of CAIT members.</td>
<td>CAS establishes and routinely convenes CAIT to address implementation of CA Plan and continues to facilitate alignment between/among programs.</td>
<td>CAIT supports for planning, and training and coaching are established and welcomed by schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators and teachers trained and coached by CAIT demonstrate progress in student achievement for SLD, SoL, OHD students, and all SPED students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Educational Priorities to Achieve SIMR Complex Area Plan</td>
<td>Integrate protocols and routines to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve early literacy for SPED students in Complex Area planning.</td>
<td>Complex Area plans consider the early literacy needs of SPED students in implementing the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td>Deputy or Deputy’s designee(s) identify required elements of Complex area plans for inclusion in planning templates, protocols, and evaluation(s) of the Complex Area plan to integrate EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students into Complex Area planning.</td>
<td>Complex Area plans meet the requirements to include EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students.</td>
<td>Complex Area planning integrates EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students using specific strategies for SPED students into planning of general strategies that improve the performance of all ESEA subgroups.</td>
<td>Complex Area plans integrate improvement strategies for SPED students into comprehensive planning for improved early literacy performance of all ESEA subgroups, and in particular, 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stocktakes will identify Deputy’s decisions on State-level actions necessary to support CAS leadership and implementation of their Complex Area Plan and addressing improvement to early literacy performance of all ESEA subgroups, and in particular, 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Changes in Educational Practice to Achieve SIMR: The complex area plans meet the requirements to include EBPs that support early literacy for SPED students.*
### Measures of Progress

**Primary Goal:** Assess and improve the effectiveness of the CAIT and Complex Area plan to increase the number of SPED students meeting the needs of the school.

**School Year 2015-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cont. from previous page</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Year 2015-2016</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Year 2016-2017</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data: Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service and Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic: Growth in Knowledge (Area on the right track)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED strategy expert assists with SPED data review and identification of SPED student needs in Complex Area plan.</td>
<td>Plan identifies a focus area for improvement that targets early literacy for all students based on data and needs assessment.</td>
<td>Six Strategy implementation rubrics and self-assessments by CAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED strategy expert assists in identifying strategies to support SPED students for inclusion in the Complex Area plan.</td>
<td>Plans include evidence-based practices (EBP) to support students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and Formative Instruction process at the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS has begun to explore additional members to the CAIT to further strengthen Six Priority Strategy implementation that meets the needs of SPED students.</td>
<td>The Complex Area utilizes disaggregated student performance data and progress monitoring data in evaluating the effectiveness of the Complex Area plan through the ART process.</td>
<td>SPED student performance data on statewide assessment for ELA, and specifically 3rd and 4th grade proficiency rates of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, and the median growth percentile of students in 4th grade with SLD, OHD, and SoL provided by Data Governance Office (DGA) to assess progress toward meeting yearly SSIP targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan/Program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### School Academic Plans

**Plan/Program:**

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Review of Complex Area plan by Deputy, AS of OCISS, et.al.
- Review of Complex Area plan by Deputy, AS of OCISS, et.al.
- Review of Complex Area plan by Deputy, AS of OCISS, et.al.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

#### Progress Monitoring Data

**Plan/Program:**

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.

- Deputy Superintendent Stocktake with CAS to:
  - Approve, and revise if necessary, Complex Area plan;
  - Evaluate, and revise if necessary, implementation of CAIT and Complex Area plan utilizing evaluation tool;
  - Review progress toward achieving yearly proficiency and growth targets for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL set forth in the SSIP.
Process for Examining Implementation Progress and Effectiveness and Making Modifications to Implementation\textsuperscript{60}

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum Instruction and Student Support are responsible for examining progress monitoring data to determine whether it is necessary to make modifications to the SSIP, theory of action, strategies, implementation, or outcomes. Deputy Schatz’s experience managing the Race to the Top grant and having to work with Assistant Superintendents and Complex Area Superintendents to develop conditions for transformational improvements, identify and remove barriers to implementation, and scale-up success is an asset to the SSIP process and evaluation. Assistant Superintendent Mulcahy’s strength in leading and implementing transformations at the Complex Area and school-level resulting in improved performance and academic growth for students with disabilities benefits the SSIP evaluation process as she can readily assess the effectiveness of implementation and promote changes to accelerate improvements to teaching and learning. The experiences of both Deputy Schatz and Assistant Superintendent Mulcahy will result in a comprehensive evaluation of implementation progress and effectiveness.

Performance assessment data submitted by the Complex Area Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents will be collected by the Special Projects Office and combined with the Special Projects Office’s overall SSIP evaluation data, and prepared for review by the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support. The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are responsible for examining data and making initial changes to the implementation of strategies, the theory of action, or other components of this plan if necessary. The final decisions will occur following the fourth quarter Stocktakes that the Superintendent has with Assistant Superintendents, and the Deputy holds with Complex Area Superintendents. The evaluation data coupled with the information obtained during conversations with Assistant Superintendents and Complex Area Superintendents during deeper data dives will be utilized for final decision-making.

The Hawaii State Department of Education will conduct two distinct evaluation sub-processes that will coincide with the quarterly Stocktakes convened by the Superintendent and Deputy: formative progress monitoring, and a summative evaluation process. The formative progress monitoring will occur during the first, second, and third quarter Stocktakes, with the summative evaluation occurring during the fourth quarter Stocktake. The same evaluation tool will be utilized at each of the Stocktakes. During the first, second, and third quarter Stocktakes, the Superintendent will meet with Assistant Superintendents and the Deputy with Complex Area Superintendents to identify actions necessary by both parties to accelerate or modify implementation of strategies in order to reach desired outcomes. The charts on the next pages provide the tool that will be utilized to prepare for and completed during these Stocktakes.

\textsuperscript{60} The following responds to Sub-components 3(c) and 3(d), Evaluation, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.
The following questions will be utilized to evaluate the fidelity of implementation of the activities chosen to build the capacity of the Complex Areas to improve the performance of all students with disabilities such that we achieve our SIMR targets:

**Questions**

1. How have these EBPs been implemented to improve early literacy for SPED students?
2. Does CAS regularly attend and participate in PLCs?
3. Does DES regularly attend and participate in Complex Area meetings during monthly mandatory DES PLC meetings?
4. Leadership has developed the structure and routines necessary and is beginning to function as a PLC to collaboratively address IDEA compliance issues. CAS PLC, DES PLC.
5. CAS PLC, DES PLC.
6. Leadership has developed the structure and routines necessary and is beginning to function as a PLC to collaboratively address IDEA compliance issues. CAS PLC, DES PLC.

**Score**

- **Implementation Score:**
- **Objective Not Met:**
- **Objective Partially Met:**
- **Objective Met:**

**Evaluator Comments and Recommendations**

This column will be completed by the evaluator for consideration by the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent to identify actions Complex Area Superintendent will take in the next objective(s) to improve fidelity of implementation.

**Note:** This column will be filled out by the Deputy Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent to identify actions Complex Area Superintendent will take to meet objectives or work towards identified needs in respective PLCs, based upon recommendations or other information discussed during Stocktake, and identify action State will take to support CAS implementation.

---

**Data Source and Methodology**

- Has the SPED strategy expert been integrated into the CAST PLC to review SPED student performance data and identify SPED student needs for improved early literacy?
- Does DES regularly attend CAST PLC?
- Does CAST PLC recognize improvements to early literacy for SPED students as a focus area?
- Does CAST PLC consider the needs of SPED students in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies?
- Has the SPED strategy expert been integrated into the CAST PLC to review SPED student performance data and identify SPED student needs for improved early literacy?
- Does DES regularly attend CAST PLC?
- Does CAST PLC recognize improvements to early literacy for SPED students as a focus area?
- Does CAST PLC consider the needs of SPED students in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies?

**Scoring Criteria**

- **Objective Not Met:**
- **Objective Partially Met:**
- **Objective Met:**

**Score**

- **Implementation Score:**
- **Objective Not Met:**
- **Objective Partially Met:**
- **Objective Met:**

**Evaluator Comments and Recommendations**

This column will be completed by the evaluator for consideration by the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent to identify actions Complex Area Superintendent will take in the next objective(s) to improve fidelity of implementation.

**Note:** This column will be filled out by the Deputy Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent to identify actions Complex Area Superintendent will take to meet objectives or work towards identified needs in respective PLCs, based upon recommendations or other information discussed during Stocktake, and identify action State will take to support CAS implementation.

---

**Professional Learning Communities (PLC)**

- Six Priority Strategy implementation rubrics, ART process, and self-assessment utilized by CAS and CAIT.
- Self-assessments for each individual PLC and the state office (to be identified).
- Structured interview during Deputy Stocktakes (to be identified).
- Analysis of strategies, EBPs, trainings and other resources being provided (to be identified).
- Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and Formative Instruction process at the school.
- SPED student performance data on statewide assessment for ELA, and specifically 3rd grade proficiency rates of students with SLD, OHD, and SoS.
and the median growth percentile of students with SLD, OHD and SoL, provided by the Data Governance Office (DGO) to assess progress toward meeting yearly SSP targets. 

- Other data sources and methodology to be identified as implementation is defined.

- Do the CAST PLC and DES PLC offer training and coaching of EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students to the CAST PLC? 
- Has the CAST PLC identified the resources and supports needed by the Complex area to implement EBPs to improve the early literacy of SPED students?
- Do the PLCs review SPED student performance data, and particularly for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL, to evaluate the effectiveness of the EBPs implemented to inform planning, resource development, training and coaching?
- Have the PLCs established protocols and routines for collaboration and communication between the respective PLCs, CAS, and CAIT to provide the EBPs and the resources necessary to support implementation of the EBPs by the Complex Area?

- Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert into CAST PLC to review data and identify SPED student needs.
- DES PLC focuses on identification and implementation of EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students.
- CAST PLC identifies the resources and supports needed by the Complex Areas to implement EBPs to improve the early literacy of SPED students.
- Strategies at the CAS, DES and CAST PLCs are implemented at the Complex Area.

- PLCs facilitate integration of EBPs that support SPED students into Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.
- PLCs build their capacity to provide training and coaching of EBPs to CAS and CAIT.
- CAST PLC and DES PLC have identified the needs of SPED students in improving early literacy for SPED students, but have not yet identified specific EBPs that support SPED student early literacy.
- DES PLC is exploring specific EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students for consideration by the CAST PLC.
- CAS PLC has not yet identified the needs of the Complex Areas to implement EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students.
- Strategies at the CAS, DES and CAST PLCs are not implemented at the Complex Area, or such strategies are being explored.

- CAST PLC and DES PLC have identified the needs of SPED students and are exploring implementation of specific EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students.
- DES PLC has identified specific EBPs that improve the early literacy for SPED students for integration into CAST PLC planning for implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.
- CAS PLC members have identified the needs of their respective Complex Area to implement EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students based on their Complex Area plans.
- Strategies at the CAS, DES and CAST PLCs are beginning to be implemented at the Complex Area.

- CAST PLC and DES PLC have identified the needs of SPED students and have identified specific EBPs to improve early literacy for SPED students.
- DES PLC and CAST PLC have plans for training the CAST on specific EBPs that improve early literacy for SPED students.
- The CAST PLC collaborates to identify the resources and supports needed to implement EBPs in the Complex Areas based on the needs identified in their individual Complex Area plans.
- Strategies at the CAS, DES and CAST PLCs are beginning to be implemented at the Complex Area.

- Do the PLCs have plans to train and coach the CAST on specific EBPs that advance SPED student performance in early literacy?
- CAS and CAIT not yet providing coaching on EBPs learned at PLC.
- PLGs are beginning to offer training and coaching to CAST and DES PLCs.

- PLGs offer training and coaching of EBPs that advance SPED student performance in early literacy to CAS and CAIT.
- PLGs utilize SPED student performance data, and particularly for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL, to evaluate the effectiveness of the EBPs implemented to inform planning, resource development, training and coaching.
- CAS and CAIT provide coaching on EBPs learned at PLC.
State-Level Resources
Activity: Develop and provide resources to support Complex Areas

- Has OCISS evaluated the effectiveness of current early literacy resources and initiatives to meet the early literacy needs of SPED students to advance early literacy for SPED students?
- Has OCISS provided EBPs to advance early literacy for SPED students for use by the Complex Area?
- Is OCISS providing training and coaching of EBPs that advance early literacy to the CAIT?
- Has OCISS established protocols and routines for gathering ongoing feedback from the Complex Areas to identify effective EBPs and the training and coaching needs of the CAIT in order to support implementation of the EBPs by the Complex Area?
- OCISS develops EBPs to support early literacy for SPED students.
- OCISS offers training and coaching of EBPs to build the capacity of the CAIT.
- CAS, CAIT and other Complex Area staff are provided EBPs to meet the needs of SPED students to improve the early literacy of SPED students.
- OCISS offers early literacy training for all students.
- OCISS begins to provide EBPs to specifically support SPED student early literacy development.
- OCISS is developing training and coaching of the EBPs for the CAIT.
- OCISS offers early literacy training for all students.
- OC ISS provides EBPs to specifically support SPED student early literacy development.
- OC ISS is offering training and coaching of EBPs that advance early literacy for SPED students to the CAIT.

Implementation Score:
Outcome Met? (Yes or No)
Long-term

- Utilize stocktakes, state-level PLCs, and other feedback loops to obtain information regarding the resources the CAS need to adopt, implement, and sustain EBPs that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.
- Identify and make available for use by the CAS, CTA, and other complex area staff, EBPs regarding special education strategies, early literacy, and each of the strategies within the six priority strategies that advance achievement of SPED students, and in particular, improving literacy of students with SLD, OHD, and SoL.

Direct state program and fiscal resources toward evidence-based programs that address the needs identified by the CAS in the complex area plans to improve teaching and learning and ultimately increase the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL demonstrating proficiency on the ELA and demonstrating high-levels of growth on the ELA in order to narrow the achievement gap.
- Improve the quality of the training and coaching of school administration, teachers and staff conducted by the CAS and CTA, resulting in an improvement in the quality of teaching to meet the individualized needs of SPED students, and in particular the needs of 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL, thereby increasing the amount of students proficient on the ELA and demonstrating high-levels of growth on the ELA to narrow the achievement gap.

OCISS provides EBPs to support early literacy for SPED students based on input from the PLCs and CTA, but has not evaluated the effectiveness of these EBPs.
- OCISS is offering training and coaching of EBPs that advance early literacy for SPED students to the CTA, and has evaluated the effectiveness of the training and coaching to support the CAS and CTA in implementing the EBPs.

OCISS provides EBPs to support early literacy for SPED students and has identified effective EBPs for scaling up and additional complex area needs.
- OCISS is offering training and coaching of EBPs that advance early literacy for SPED students to the CTA, and has evaluated the effectiveness of the training and coaching to support the CAS and CTA in implementing the EBPs.

OCISS has evaluated the effectiveness of the EBPs and has identified effective EBPs for scaling up and additional complex area needs.
- OCISS evaluates the effectiveness of the EBPs to meet the early literacy needs of SPED students based on feedback from the CAS and PLCs and has plans to scale up effective EBPs and/or identify additional EBPs that may be utilized.
- OCISS evaluates the effectiveness of the training and coaching of EBPs offered based on feedback from the CAS and PLCs and has plans to modify its training and coaching to meet the needs of the CAS and CTA.

Implementation Score:

Outcome Met? (Yes or No)

Overall Status of Implementation and Achievement of Outcomes:

Target for 3rd and 4th grade proficiency for students with SLD, OHD and SoL in SY ______: __________ Complex Area proficiency rate for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL: __________ Target met? (Yes or No): _______ Target for median growth percentile of 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL in SY ______: __________ Complex Area median growth percentile for 4th grade students with SLD, OHD and SoL: __________ Target met? (Yes or No): _______

Additional Complex Area Needs, CAS Follow-up Items or Actions Needed to Support Implementation:

Additional Complex Area Needs, CAS Follow-up Items or Actions, and/or Revisions to Implementation Activities Needed to Achieve Outcomes:
SSIP Phase 2 – Proposed Evaluation Tool for Implementation of Strategies and Activities at the Complex Areas

The following questions will be utilized to evaluate the fidelity of implementation of the activities chosen to build the capacity of the Complex Areas to improve the performance of all students with disabilities such that we achieve our SIMR targets. The questions are designed to measure the progress of implementation of each of the strategies through the various implementation stages and identify implementation drivers that may be utilized to arrive at full implementation. Progress towards full implementation will be measured annually based on achievement of the short and long-term goals and objectives and outcomes. Use of this tool in School Years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 will be incorporated into the Leadership accountability routines established for the Six Priority Strategies and further evaluation methods will be defined and developed as further activities and strategies are defined.

Complex Area: ________________________________
Reviewer(s): ________________________________
Review Date: _____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source and Methodology</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Implementation Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Evaluator Comments and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex Area Implementation Team (CAIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop and build Complex Area Implementation Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six Priority Strategy implementation rubrics, ART process, and self-assessment utilized by CAS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex Area Superintendents Self-Assessment (to be identified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured interview during Deputy Stocktaking (to be identified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct observations – during Complex Area monitoring visits (monitoring protocol to be identified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of Complex Area Plan and other Complex Area documents (to be identified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the SPED strategy expert been integrated into the CA CAST (and soon to be CAIT)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS considered including the EL strategy expert into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the EL strategy expert been integrated into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS considered including the Title I Linkers into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the Title I Linker been included into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS considered including other Complex Area staff into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS integrated other Complex Area Staff into the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS established protocols and routines for collaboration between and among members of the CAIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS identified processes for determining how members of the CAIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate SPED strategy expert into Complex Area CAST (i.e., CAST + 1) for planning and implementation of SY 2016-2017 Complex Area plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begin exploration of additional members to CAIT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase awareness of SPED student needs in Complex Area planning and implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begin integration of SPED specific strategies into Six Priority Strategy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert does not attend CA CAST regularly, or does not assist in reviewing SPED student data and identifying SPED student needs and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert attends CA CAST regularly and facilitates SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the CAS identified additional CA staff to assist the CAIT in identifying additional SPED students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has explored additional SPED students through collaboration of CAIT members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has identified additional CA staff for the implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert attends CAIT regularly and facilitates SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has explored additional SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progress monitoring of K-4 student literacy development by CAS and CAIT through ART process at the Complex Area and Data Team and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS facilitates alignment between/among programs, and encourages use of PLCs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex Area planning addresses the needs of SPED students through collaboration of CAIT members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAIT used for training and coaching of EBPs for implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continued integration of the SPED strategy expert, and possible addition of other CA staff, to begin developing the CAIT for aligned planning, training and coaching of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS facilitates alignment between/among programs, and encourages use of PLCs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex Area planning addresses the needs of SPED students through collaboration of CAIT members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAIT used for training and coaching of EBPs for implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert attends CAIT regularly and facilitates SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has explored additional SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has identified additional CA staff for the implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert attends CAIT regularly and facilitates SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAS has explored additional SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPED strategy expert attends CAIT regularly and facilitates SPED student data review and identification of EBPs to support SPED students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity: Develop and complete Complex Area Plan

- CAS has established routines necessary to allow for collaboration in planning, training and coaching.
- CAS has established routines necessary to allow for collaboration in planning, training and coaching.
- CAS has established routines necessary to allow for collaboration in planning, training and coaching.
- CAS has established routines necessary to allow for collaboration in planning, training and coaching.

Complex Area Plan:

Six Priority Strategies:

- Does the Complex Area have a process in place to review disaggregated student performance data in order to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve performance of SPED students in early literacy?
- Does the Complex Area have a process in place to review disaggregated student performance data in order to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve performance of SPED students in early literacy?
- Does the Complex Area have a process in place to review disaggregated student performance data in order to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve performance of SPED students in early literacy?
- Does the Complex Area have a process in place to review disaggregated student performance data in order to identify the specific needs of SPED students to improve performance of SPED students in early literacy?

Imaginative protocols and routines that would benefit SPED: protocols and routines that would benefit SPED...
Additional Complex Area Needs, CAS Follow-up Items or Actions Needed to Support Implementation:

Additional Complex Area Needs, CAS Follow-up Items or Actions, and/or Revisions to Implementation Activities Needed to Achieve Outcomes:
For the Stocktakes with the Complex Area Superintendent, Deputy will also involve the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support to specifically review and evaluate the progress on SSIP strategies. The final determination of progress towards implementation and outcomes will be identified in the use of the evaluation tool submitted and reviewed for the fourth quarter Stocktake. In addition to the discussions regarding progress towards strategy implementation and achievement of outcomes that occurred during the formative Stocktakes, Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will examine the Complex Area Superintendent’s progress towards meeting the SIMR by reviewing trend and other data available regarding proficiency and growth of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities.

The Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support will utilize the evaluation data, and information acquired at the Superintendent’s Stocktakes and Deputy’s Stocktakes to determine whether systemic changes to the implementation of the SSIP are necessary. In particular, decisions will be made regarding:

1. Whether the chosen theory of action is effective;
2. Whether the strategies chosen to implement the theory of action are effective; and
3. Whether changes are necessary to the theory of action, chosen State and Complex Area strategies, objectives, outcomes, progress monitoring or other components of the SSIP.

Decisions made by the Deputy and the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support regarding changes to the implementation of strategies, the theory of action, or other components of this plan will be disseminated to Assistant Superintendents and State-level Directors, and through the State-level Professional Learning Communities such that Complex Area Superintendents, District Educational Specialists, and Complex Area Support Team members implementing the Six Priority Strategies will be informed of changes. Changes will also be made available on the intranet such that it is accessible by all staff within the Hawaii State Department of Education. The Complex Area Superintendent may be tasked with disseminating information regarding Complex Area implementation to their respective Complex Area staff, and may request that their Complex Area Implementation Team members disseminate information regarding school-level implementation changes to school administration, and relevant school personnel. Any available information may also be shared with stakeholders in the same manner as data for the SPP/APR is disseminated. The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support may request the Core SSIP Team, the SSIP Working Group or other stakeholders to assist with the dissemination of information. The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support may also convene the the Core SSIP Team, the SSIP Working Group or other stakeholders to develop new implementation and evaluation plans that reflects the changes made to the SSIP in regards to State and Complex Area level action necessary to build capacity and implement evidence-based practices.
SSIP Theory of Action, Phase 2 - Implementation of Strategies and Activities

Strategy #3 - Engages Students, Parents, and Community Members by Utilizing the Leading by Convening Framework


Implementation Drivers for Engaging Stakeholders Utilizing the Leading By Convening Framework

- Coaching to be provided by selected participants.
- "Core Team" and "Key Participants and Advisors" work with the "Extended Participants" & "Feedback Networks" to train on identified strategy.
- Deputy Superintendent identify relevant participants & define roles based on Department & Community shared recommendations.
- Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent to provide leadership and guide "Core Team" activities.

Implementation Stages for Implementing Evidence-Based Practices as Documented in Plan

- Exploration
- Installation
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation

SY 2015-2016: Exploration stage - Identified ways to engage Students, Parents, and Community Members. Chose to use the Leading by Convening framework to guide engagement process towards coalescing around issues, ensuring relevant participation, and working to scale-up bright spots and address barriers to implementing evidence-based practices for student improvement. Identity roles using framework.

SY 2016-2017: Continue installation stage and when ready, initial implementation of strategy to improve students, parents, and community engagement to address SIMR, and may address overall student performance. Develop evaluations and self-assessments using Leading By Convening rubrics.

SY 2017-2018 through 2019-2020: Continue implementation of strategy. Evaluate implementation of strategy and effectiveness and make revisions where necessary.

Graphic adapted from: http://ssip.epa.unc.edu/guidebook/level-one/stages-implementation
State-level Strategy for Engaging Students, Parents, and Community Members Utilizing the Leading by Convening Framework

Engaging Students, Parents, and Community Members: Implementation of State-level Using the Leading By Convening Framework

Overall Description of Strategy

The Phase 1 stakeholders identified the need to engage students, parents, and community members such that their role in supporting and achieving student, staff, and system success would be defined and lead to increased learning opportunities in and outside of the classroom. There have been numerous attempts through focus groups, taskforces, and other initiatives to engage students, parents, and community members, but none have successfully resulted in an agreeable, long-term partnership between those convened. We are currently in the Exploration stages of using the Leading by Convening tools to improve student, parent, and community engagement to sustain a long-term partnership, sharing the commitment to coalesce around an identified issue to determine viable solutions to improving early literacy of students with disabilities, and in particular ensuring 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrate proficiency on the English Language Arts assessment and 4th graders demonstrate high-levels of growth on the same assessment.

Objectives, Outcomes, and Timelines for Completion of the Engagement Strategy

At the beginning of Phase 2, the SSIP Core Team reviewed the Phase 1 submission and its data and infrastructure analysis and in consultation with the SSIP Working Group, developed a proposal for engagement: offering workshops for parents interested in assisting their child and their child’s teachers by learning more about the Common Core State Standards and learn tools to assist in developing their child’s early literacy skills and abilities at home. The idea was presented to leaders within the Hawaii State Department of Education and was supported. The idea was then shared with members of the Special Education Advisory Council where some members voiced their opposition to such workshops providing that parents may not be able to commit time to attend workshops; most members agreed.

---


62 The following responds to Sub-components 1(a) and 1(c), Infrastructure Development, 2(a) and 2(b), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, and 3(a), Evaluation, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.

63 The following responds to Sub-components 1(a) and 1(c), Infrastructure Development, 2(a) and 2(b), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, and 3(a), Evaluation, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.
Considering the time commitment factor, the SSIP Core Team in consultation with the SSIP Working Group and with the support of other offices, resolved to create a guide for students, parents, and community members regarding the different ways to become involved in the education of students and particularly improving early literacy based upon the length of time one had available for such involvement. The guide would also include resources that such individuals could obtain on-line and would be accessible at the individual’s request. Although the proposed guide addressed the time commitment factor raised by Special Education Advisory Council members, the idea for the guide indicating various ways to be involved and obtain information based upon the time one can commit, was also deemed unsuitable.

Due to the inability to come to an agreement with our Community stakeholders on the process for engagement, State leadership decided to take a step back and reflect on the direction we would be taking. Instead of working towards a product, the Special Projects Director proposed and State leadership agreed that the engagement strategy begins with defining the process for engagement. As such, we will be utilizing the 2016-2017 school year to identify how we move forward with relevant stakeholders using the Leading by Convening framework as a guide to our work. Our long-term objectives and outcomes for this strategy is as follows:

- **Long-term Objective:** Convene relevant Department and Community representatives to coalesce around improving early literacy for SIMR students, and then sharing the commitment in identifying solutions for implementation.

- **Long-term Outcome:** This engagement strategy will provide external support for improvements necessary to advance early literacy for students with disabilities, increasing the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap, and ultimately address the needs of student subgroups identified under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
The Hawaii State Department of Education will be progressing towards this long-term objective and outcome by strategically implementing the engagement strategy in phases in conjunction with the State-level Strategies, and utilizing the Leading By Convening tools and framework. We would like the work with stakeholders to further define objectives and outcomes. We envision the timeline towards implementation as provided in the graphic.

**Responsibility for Ensuring High-Fidelity Implementation**

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent for the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support are final decision-makers for this strategy. The SSIP Core Team in conjunction with the Special Projects Office and Community Engagement Office will make up the Core Team for implementation of this strategy. The Core Team will work with and facilitate the work with identified students, parents, and community members to develop a shared commitment to coalesce around and work together to resolve barriers to student success.

Select members of the Special Education Advisory Council and Community Children’s Council have been involved in initial discussions with the SSIP Core Team during the Exploration stage of this strategy. These community stakeholders are: Ivalee Sinclair, Martha Guinan, Susan Wood, and Steven Vannatta. The Core Team will continue discussions with these individuals to determine next steps. Exploration and Installation will continue in the 2016 to identify an agreeable way forward.

Using the Circles provided in the Leading by Convening framework, the work will begin by identifying relevant stakeholders and the roles that these stakeholders will play in the implementation of this strategy. We envision that Department stakeholders will equally be involved in this process with Community stakeholders, which would be individuals, and members of advisory groups, community organizations, advocacy groups, and for-and non-profit organizations.

---

64 The following responds to Sub-components 1(c) and 1(d), Infrastructure Development, 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c), Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices, Part B SSIP Phase II, OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.

We will also identify what successful processes can be utilized and scaled-up. For example, the Community Engagement Office, once fully established will be refreshing the School Community Councils process, and define its use for improvement of students with disabilities and our SIMR students. The School Community Councils are forums for exchanging ideas about how to improve student achievement among the school’s stakeholders: principals, teachers, school staff, parents, students, and community members. They help craft the school's Academic Plan and Financial Plan, which establish the goals and programs for the school, and the available resources. School Community Councils was one mechanism used by the State Legislature in 2004 to ensure that the school community members would have greater influence in public education, and the required convening was codified into law through the “Reinventing Education Act of 2004 (Act 51 as amended by Act 221, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004)”. The purpose of these School Community Councils are:

- Strengthen the ties between school and community;
- Provide a voice for all major stakeholder groups;
- Create opportunities for collaboration and partnership in the educational system; and
- Focus on a shared goal of improving student achievement and system’s accountability.

As the “trustees or facilitators of the school’s vision and mission,” the School Community Council:

- Acts as a caretaker of the school;
- Functions in an advisory role;
- Practices good stewardship and acts as a whole, taking responsibility for communicating with all role groups and for the benefit of all children rather than as individuals representing a role group and specific agendas;
- Approaches issues from a unified perspective;
- Garners community support for major initiatives;
- Focuses decisions based upon what is best for ALL students; and
- Contributes to the share goal of improving student achievement.

The policies developed by the Hawaii State Board of Education and Hawaii State Department of Education to implement School Community Councils are based on three common-sense principles:

- Individuals closest to the students should be more involved in making significant decisions affecting the instructional program of the school.
- A school plan to improve student academic achievement receives more support when people understand and help create that plan.
- When families participate in a variety of ways in their children’s education, including decision-making, their children and the school are more successful.

66 For more information on School Community Councils, please visit our website at: http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ConnectWithUs/GetInvolved/SCCs/Pages/default.aspx
School Community Councils play a vital role in Hawaii’s education system. The School Community Councils process can be considered as we move forward with this engagement strategy.

As we proceed with the implementation of this engagement strategy, we will ensure that the competency, organization, and leadership drivers and performance assessments are refined as necessary. Current definition of our implementation drivers is as follows:

Evaluation of Implementation and Effectiveness of the Strategy to Engage Student, Parents and Community Members

Implementation of this strategy utilizes a phased-in approach and as such, our evaluation will be phased-in as well. As of this writing, we have identified the elements required by the U.S. Department of Education for the evaluation, which includes: Short-, Intermediate, and Long-term Objectives; Short-, Intermediate, and Long-term Outcomes; Data collection methods; Methods of data analysis, and the Dissemination plan. The Hawaii State Department of Education will refine the process, methods, criteria and questions as strategies are implemented in order to determine whether the state is on the right track to make the changes necessary to achieve the SIMR targets. Furthermore, as we move forward in this process, we will further refine the role of stakeholders and their participation in the evaluation process.

In reviewing the Leading by Convening materials, we do know we will would like to adapt the Leading By Convening “Coalescing Around Issues” and “Bringing It Altogether Individual Reflection” rubrics to determine fidelity of adoption and implementation of our engagement. We will specifically be evaluating whether we are moving towards the “Partnership Way” of “leading by convening,

---

incorporating elements and strategies from both top-down and bottom-up models. To determine whether we are “on the right track”, we will be examining whether we are completing the following:

1. Do we have the relevant stakeholders that will assist with improving early literacy for 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities? Have we included: (A) “groups with authority over the issue” and “groups that have influence in the field”; (B) “persons with expertise and/or experience” to share their knowledge and skills” and (C) “representatives of diverse stakeholder groups to engage through consensus to identify issues, solve problems, and take action”?

2. Do we have the requisite expertise, leadership, and resources? When convening the stakeholders, are we: “leading by convening; sharing perspectives among the members of the group; sharing leadership opportunities and responsibilities based on role, expertise and needs of the group in specific contexts or situations; [and] attending to both the human and technical elements of change”?

3. As we convene are the following understandings present: (A) “Decision makers, practitioners, and consumer understand that collective influence has the potential to change outcomes”; (B) “Stakeholders with authority and influence have a role and their interactions produce value”; and (C) Building relationships across roles and levels broadens the area of impact and supports sustainability.”

In addition, we will be examining our “Habits of Interaction”, “Elements of Interaction”, and “Depth of Interaction”, and the elements of each to ensure we are incorporating the “Partnership Way” in our engagement work.

---

As the actual product of the engagement has yet to be determined and implemented, this submissions includes only the short-, intermediate, and long-term objectives and outcomes we expect to achieve in the next few years in regards to engagement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Objective</th>
<th>Short-term Outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate Objective</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcome</th>
<th>Long-term Objective</th>
<th>Long-term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration and identification of use of Leading By Convening.</td>
<td>Learn to use the Leading by Convening process to increase involvement in the engagement strategy.</td>
<td>Convene relevant stakeholders to identify issue(s) and products or initiatives to develop or support through engagement activities to improve SIMR.</td>
<td>Stakeholders are convened and coalesce around issues.</td>
<td>Implementation of the initiative or support provided to improve SIMR.</td>
<td>Improved engagement of students, parents, and community members in improving early literacy for 3rd and 4th grade students with SLD, OHD, and SoL, to demonstrate increased proficiency rates and high-levels of growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial identification of Core Team &amp; Key Participants and Advisors roles.</td>
<td>Initial discussions between Core Team and initial Key Participants to determine use of Leading by Convening framework.</td>
<td>Identify tools to measure progress towards meeting SIMR, &amp; tools to measure progress towards implementing the determined product or initiative. Obtain approval from Deputy &amp; AS of OCISS.</td>
<td>Both Department &amp; community stakeholders are sharing the commitment and leadership to achieve successful engagement.</td>
<td>Both Department &amp; community stakeholders are sharing the commitment to support the products or initiatives chosen.</td>
<td>Demonstrated in student achievement due to implementation of the initiative or support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 2015-2016</td>
<td>School Year 2016-2017</td>
<td>School Year 2017-2018 to 2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Partnership Way” of leadership is utilized with other initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection for such evaluation of the implementation progress and effectiveness will be conducted through several processes. First, we will request that participants complete rubrics, self-assessments, and surveys designed to provide the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support with data necessary to make decisions on implementation progress. We will also identify progress monitoring tools, such as self-assessments and surveys for participants and non-participants to obtain information and data regarding the effectiveness of the engagement strategy, which the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will utilize to determine the effectiveness of this engagement strategy in advancing the performance of our students with disabilities and in particular, the early literacy of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities,
and Speech or Language Disabilities resulting in an increase in the percent of 3rd and 4th graders demonstrating proficiency and the amount of 4th graders demonstrating high-levels of growth on the English Language Assessment. We do know that the shared work defined by participants through this process will identify other progress monitoring tools and relevant data collection methods and analysis.

The Core Team will be responsible for compiling the results of the data collection for use by State leadership. It also is projected that the Core Team will prepare the evaluation data for review by Key Participants in order for such participants to develop recommendations to State leadership on modifications to implementation to improve progress and effectiveness.

The Deputy and Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support will make final decisions using the “Plan, Do, Check, Act” (PDCA) improvement cycle, which is data centric, monitors implementation, and results in improvement of implementation. The “PDCA” will be used to determine and identify changes to implementation of the strategy such that we will ultimately increase the amount of 3rd and 4th grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities demonstrating proficiency on the English Language Assessment, and demonstrating high levels of growth on the same assessment to narrow the achievement gap.

The results of the evaluation and any changes will be disseminated to the dissemination networks defined, and by the Communications Office. The information will also be available to provide to stakeholders during the SPP/APR process.
Ready for Phase 3

The Hawaii State Department of Education expects improved academic achievement and growth for all students with disabilities upon full implementation of our chosen strategies. Our leaders, teachers, and staff will possess the capacity, programmatic and fiscal resources, and the necessary State support to implement evidence-based practices that address educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities and specifically improve early literacy for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Other Health Disabilities, and Speech or Language Disabilities, which will be demonstrated by increased rates of proficiency on the English Language Arts Assessment for 3rd 4th graders, and high levels of growth for 4th graders on the same assessment.

In Phase 3, the Hawaii State Department of Education, consistent with the evaluation described here, will assess and submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report on our progress made in implementing the SSIP. The submission will also include data and analysis on the extent to which our State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the SSIP and our progress in achieving the SIMR. If State leadership determines to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the U.S. Department of Education requires us to describe how the data from the evaluation will support this decision. If State leadership decides to make any revisions, the U.S. Department of Education is requiring a rationale for any revisions that have been made, or revisions the State plans to make in the SSIP in response to evaluation data, and describe how stakeholders were included in the decision-making process.

The Hawaii State Department of Education looks forward to working on Phase 3 and to continue to work towards improved functional and educational outcomes for our students with disabilities.
Appendix A: Description of the Six Priority Strategies

The following is a description of the Six Priority Strategies that was provided within our Phase 1 submission, starting on page 100.

Description of the Six Priority Strategies

To continue to strive to meet the goals within the Strategic Plan, the Hawaii State Department of Education developed Six Priority Strategies to implement its educational reform initiatives. These Six Priority Strategies establish a framework for the delivery of targeted supports to Complex Areas and schools to provide interventions to struggling learners, which includes students with disabilities. Implementation of the Six Priority Strategy is currently in its second year. In the coming third year of implementation, addressing needs of students with disabilities and the needs of teachers that teach students with disabilities will be a priority of implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.

Five of the six strategies within the Six Priority Strategies originated from efforts established during the Race to the Top beginning in 2010. These five are: Formative Instruction and Data Teams; Common Core State Standards implementation; Comprehensive Student Support System; Educator Effectiveness System; and Induction and Mentoring. Only the Academic Review Team strategy is an addition with ESEA Flexibility implementation.

In further detail, the Six Priority Strategies are:

- **Academic Review Teams:** The Academic Review Teams at the Complex Area and school level are charged with planning, doing, checking (monitoring), and taking action (next steps) for strategic projects and initiatives, with regular routines in place that facilitate dialogue and action around student outcomes aligned with the Strategic Plan. These routines are focused on achieving measurable results. The Academic Review Teams are also responsible for monitoring the fidelity of implementation of the Six Priority Strategies.

- **Common Core:** The Common Core State Standards are a set of clear and relevant learning standards in mathematics and English Language Arts to prepare students for college, career and community success. Through this strategy, Complex Area and school staff are provided with strategies for implementing the learning standards in mathematics and English Language Arts to prepare students for college, career and community success. This strategy also builds staff capacity on the use of the curriculum offered for statewide use.

- **Comprehensive Student Support System:** Implementing a proactive student behavior support system that enables students to reach their full potential, with a focus on personalized classroom climate and instruction, family/community networks, crisis assistance and a formalized Response to Intervention – screening, progress monitoring, data-driven decision making and deployment of supports.
- **Formative Instruction/Data Teams**: Teachers use tools, strategies, and resources to determine what students know, identify possible gaps in understanding, modify instruction, and actively engage students in their learning. Data Teams allow teachers to collaborate on ideas and best practices regarding student performance to improve instruction and increase achievement. Schools provide supports and tools to enable this environment.

- **Educator Effectiveness System**: Through this strategy, teachers will receive feedback, support, and evaluation on four components; student growth, student learning objectives, a student survey, and classroom observations conducted by trained evaluators. Sets clear expectations for effective teaching, provides educators with quality feedback and support to improve their effectiveness with students, and informs professional development.

- **Induction and Mentoring**: This strategy establishes a formal system of identifying and cultivating mentors who can assist new teachers, providing professional development and training for each, and establishes a framework for support for teachers in their first three years of practice. The induction program also works to improve the retention of quality teachers in the profession and strengthen teacher leadership.

The Six Priority Strategies are directly aligned to the Strategic Plan’s three main goals of Student Success, Staff Success and Successful Systems of Support. Specifically:

1. **Student Success** – Formative Instruction/Data Teams, Common Core and Comprehensive Student Support System;

2. **Staff Success** - Induction and Mentoring and Educator Effectiveness System; and

Performance Management System and Routines of the Six Priority Strategies

In order to implement and determine fidelity of implementation of the Six Priority Strategies, the Hawaii State Department of Education has evolved a set of vertical and horizontal performance management routines from the Superintendent level to the school level. This includes the use of: Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent Stocktakes; Field Assessments; Implementation Continuums; State Support Teams and Complex Area Support Teams; and the Six Priority Strategies Survey. Each of the components of the performance management system is described below. These performance management processes have created a clear mechanism for feedback as well as appropriate escalation of key issues of implementation. It also allows for a formal mechanism for disseminating information to and collecting information from the field. The utilization of the Six Priority Strategies’ performance management system to improve results of students with disabilities will be further determined during the planning phase of the SSIP and will be indicated in the plan submitted in Phase II.

**Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent Stocktakes**

At the state-level, the Six Priority Strategies are reviewed during the Deputy and Superintendent Stocktakes. Each of the Six Priority Strategies has an implementation plan and is the rotating subject of a cycle of documents and meetings that are designed to monitor outcomes, identify challenges and solutions, keep Hawaii State Department of Education Leadership apprised of progress, and strengthen the Superintendent’s efforts to hold Leadership accountable.

For the 2014-2015 school year, each Complex Area was required to develop an implementation plan for each of the Six Priority Strategies. These plans are grounded in data, focused on action through a delivery chain, and identify critical activities, resources, and expected challenges. The Deputy Superintendent holds quarterly one-on-one stocktakes with each Complex Area Superintendent to review progress against these plans, discuss timely data, and identify necessary action by either party. The stocktake conversations with the Deputy Superintendent, along with the Complex Area Superintendent Evaluations, have focused on:

- Implementation of the Six Priority Strategy for all students and in particular struggling learners,
- Data from the Strive HI Performance System, the accountability system established under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, and
Field Assessment data described below.

Department and Community Stakeholders noted that the desire to use the Six Priority Strategies as the improvement strategy to improve the chosen SIMR would be successful only if the use of the Six Priority Strategies was sanctioned by Hawaii State Department of Education Leadership, and if the state leads for each of the Six Priority Strategies would work on the opportunities, weaknesses and threats identified by Department and Community Stakeholders. The recommendation to use the Six Priority Strategies and the stakeholders’ concerns were raised with Hawaii State Department of Education Leadership. For implementation in the 2015-2016 school year, the Deputy Superintendent has committed to focusing these stocktakes on students with disabilities with the data set focus on performance of students with disabilities. Through these stocktakes, accountability of implementation fidelity and improved performance for students with disabilities will be discussed with Complex Area Superintendents and State Leads and appropriate action for improvement will be identified specifically to build capacity to address the needs of students with disabilities and the teachers that teach students with disabilities. Further refinement on utilization of the stocktakes will be defined in the implementation plan developed during Phase II of the SSIP.

The stocktakes and premise of these routines is to emphasize data-based decision making, which stems from efforts that began with the Race to the Top program. As such, two of the Six Priority Strategies require the implementation of data-based decision making. The first relevant priority is the Academic Review Teams. As part of the Professional Learning Community Framework, Academic Review Teams at the Complex Area and school levels embody the “Plan, Do, Check, Act” (PDCA) process of continuous improvement. An Academic Review Team is charged with planning, doing, checking (monitoring), and taking action (next steps) for strategic projects and initiatives. Key leaders must have regular routines in place that facilitate dialogue and action around student outcomes aligned with the strategic plan. These routines are focused on achieving measurable success. The Academic Review Team must analyze whether strategies and enabling activities are having the desired effect on outcomes. At the school level, the Academic Review Team will systemically and consistently review the extent to which the school is successful in meeting the measures in the academic plan, and take appropriate action as necessary. At the complex level, the Academic Review Team will systematically and consistently review the Kindergarten-12 construct and the extent to which each school in the Kindergarten-12 Complex Area is successful in meeting...
the measures in the Complex Area plan, and take appropriate action as necessary. The Academic Review Team continuum is a tool for assessing the quality of existing routines. Specifically, it focuses on three key elements that should be present in a strong Academic Review Team routine: (1) Routines are focused on a common purpose; (2) Routines identify problems and commit to clear next steps; and (3) Routines encourage learning and collaboration.

The second relevant strategy is Formative Instruction and Data Teams. Each Complex Area has a dedicated individual paid for with state resources to ensure improved Data Teams and use of Formative Instruction at each school. The Data Teams are responsible for consistent collaboration to share ideas and best practices regarding student performance to develop and improve instruction and increase student achievement. Schools are also responsible for using and developing formative assessments and other data indicators to set daily and long-term learning targets, develop success criteria, provide examples of strong and weak work, offer descriptive feedback, and adjust instruction to meet the individual and group learning needs. The schools must also demonstrate that students can articulate learning targets, use feedback about their performance to make corrections, provide feedback to peers, set goals, and keep track of and share their learning.69 The focus set by the Deputy Superintendent during Complex Area Superintendent and State lead stocktakes will positively impact Complex Areas in school routines towards data-driven decision making for improvement of reading results for students with disabilities.

Field Assessments, Field Surveys, and the Implementation Continuums

In regards to implementation of the Six Priority Strategies, Complex Area Superintendents are responsible for leading the school level performance management routines that are grounded in the Academic Review Team process. A significant component of this process is the Field Assessment. For each of the Six Priority Strategies, the Hawaii State Department of Education developed a four-scale Implementation Continuum (Continuums) to guide implementation and progress monitoring. The Continuums were reviewed using a calibration tool and released to the field before the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year. On a quarterly basis, the Complex Area Superintendents assess school progress using the Continuums and submit data through a Field Assessment. The results are analyzed and presented in an easy-to-view snapshot by state, Complex Area, and strategy. Once a year Complex Area Superintendents, CAST members, and State Executive Sponsors respond to a Survey to provide feedback on what is working and what is not. Following the Survey, each Complex Area completes a CAST Self-Reflection to reflect on the CAST structure and operations and identify actions for improvement. This implementation data, survey, and reflections are used as critical feedback to inform conversations at multiple levels about progress, trends, and differentiating support and pressure. Such data is also used in critical data conversations.

69 The following responds to the Implementation Guideline question: What formal mechanisms require LEAs and individual schools to engage in continuous improvement using data-based decision making? Describe how LEAs and individual schools are supported in their efforts. Also responds to the following: Describe how the SEA analyzes data related to student outcomes and/or root causes (e.g., SPP/APR indicators, 618 data, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data, and other EDFACTS data).
Triangulating student outcomes, implementation data, and qualitative feedback to identify challenges and solutions.

**Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation:**

**State Support Team and Complex Area Support Teams**

Technical assistance in implementation of the Six Priority Strategies focuses on building capacity by utilizing a statewide, tri-level approach that acknowledges the distinct roles of the state, Complex Area, and school. At the state level, there is an executive sponsor and state lead for each of the Six Priority Strategies. This group is known as the State Support Team. The State Support Team meets monthly with the Deputy Superintendent to:

- Review progress of implementation;
- Provide feedback to the Deputy Superintendent;
- Discuss areas of caution and concern (i.e., “bright lights” and “red flags”);
- Identify issues needing to be escalated to the Deputy Superintendent;
- Coordinate planning; and
- Identify challenges and solutions across strategies.

The State Support Team supports the efforts of the CAST. Over the last two years, the Hawaii State Department of Education has invested heavily in the CAST, which is comprised of six dedicated staff members to each Complex Area that are responsible for supporting the implementation of each of the Six Priority Strategies.

The responsibility of each CAST member includes supporting schools, training educators, assisting in data and reporting requirements, and ensuring information is communicated through the tri-levels (i.e., the levels of state, Complex Area, and School). There is a dedicated state lead for each strategy that is responsible for convening the 15 CAST members for their strategy (i.e., convening one CAST member from each Complex Area). These meetings are held monthly and provide CAST members with training and information, and affords CAST members with time to problem solve with their peers in other Complex Areas, and provide feedback to the State Leads on implementation challenges and success. The state leads also collaborate with state-level program personnel, and of relevance here, the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support, Special Education Section, and provide such collaborative information to CAST members. In addition to the monthly
trainings, the full CAST (i.e., all CAST members and state leads) is convened quarterly with the Deputy Superintendent, Complex Area Superintendent, and State Support Team to celebrate, reflect, share information, obtain training, and provide feedback. This process facilitates communication, coordination, and collaboration between general education and special education, and other specific student programs. The Complex Area Superintendents with their CAST members and other identified staff members shoulder the bulk of the responsibility for providing technical assistance to schools in implementing each of the Six Priority Strategies. Phase II will define the use of the State Support Teams and CAST.

The Six Priority Strategies received praise in the U.S. Department of Education’s ESEA Flexibility Monitoring Report, and in particular the CAST was highlighted as a key accomplishment. The monitoring team recognized that Hawaii has instituted a series of data collection mechanisms including continuum rubrics, CAST strategy meetings, and stocktake meetings allowing for continuous evaluation and revision of project implementation across all principles of ESEA flexibility based on multiple sources of data. The monitoring team also valued the comprehensive and integrated monitoring process through the use of the CAST, which informs the individualized technical assistance to Complex Areas and schools, as needed.

---

70 The following responds to the Implementation Guideline question: Describe the mechanisms or procedures the SEA has in place to facilitate communication, coordination and collaboration across general education and special education programs within the SEA.

Appendix B: List of Acronyms

The following is a list of acronyms used in this document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Annual Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Complex Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Complex Area Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAITT</td>
<td>Complex Area Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Complex Area Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Children's Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSS</td>
<td>Comprehensive Student Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>District Educational Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCSSS</td>
<td>Electronic Comprehensive Student Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eHR</td>
<td>Electronic Human Resources (system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts (assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDOE</td>
<td>Hawaii State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQT</td>
<td>Highly Qualified Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHE</td>
<td>Institutes for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Local Educational Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE</td>
<td>Least Restrictive Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGP</td>
<td>Median Growth Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCISS-CIB</td>
<td>OCISS- Curriculum and Instruction Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCISS-SES</td>
<td>OCISS- Special Education Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Office of Fiscal Support (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHD</td>
<td>Other Health Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>Office of Human Resources (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>Office of Information Technology Services (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOS</td>
<td>Office of the Superintendent (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSEP</td>
<td>Office of Special Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSFSS</td>
<td>Office of School Facilities and Support Services (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIP</td>
<td>Office of Strategy, Innovation and Planning (Hawaii State Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDCA</td>
<td>Plan, Do, Check, Act process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAC</td>
<td>Special Education Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMR</td>
<td>State-identified Measurable Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoL</td>
<td>Speech or Language Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED or Sp Ed</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>State Performance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Student Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIP</td>
<td>State Systemic Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDOE</td>
<td>United States Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<end>