Idaho State Systematic Improvement Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcome State Leadership Strand

Logic Model Strand: State					
1. **Develop resources that support districts to implement evidence-based practices to improve literacy.** 2. **Coordinate activities with TSI schools, in the project, to improve ELA proficiency for students with disabilities.**					
Process Measure: State Team Survey **Outcome Measures: Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up Cohort Leadership Team Survey(s)**					
Process and Outcome Project Measures					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis and Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Outcome **(Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)**	To what extent are district team members aware of and use available resources in ALL Cohort Districts?	80% of project participants report that they are aware of and use project-identified state resources.	**End of Year TA and PD Survey** (Likert-type scale, identify which resources aware of and used, and open-ended questions)	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis of survey resulting in annual data points.
Outcome **(Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)**	To what extent does the ISDE (internal) team support the coordinated activities with TSI/CSI schools within Cohort Districts	% of TSI/CSI identified elementary schools within Cohort Districts participating in the project that receive TA to align and coordinate improvement activities.	Annual proportion of TSI schools within Cohort Districts participating in the Cultivating Leaders project.	Quantitative data point	MTSS Report

Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcome District Strand

Logic Model Strand: District and School					
1. **Deliver ongoing training and technical assistance to improve implementation structures and effectiveness of school-wide literacy programs in participating schools/districts.**					
2. **Cultivating district leadership and high-level team functioning to improve implementation of effective school-wide literacy programs in participating schools.**					
Process Measures: PDSA, PD Survey, and Documented Attendance Outcome Measures: PD Survey, End of Year TA and PD Survey, and MTSS-R					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis and Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Outcome **(Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)**	To what extent are district teams learning about the targeted content? **(Training)**	80% of participants respond that they increased their knowledge of stated learning targets.	**Professional Development Survey** pre/post retrospective survey measuring knowledge gain.	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis of survey, resulting in bi-annual data points.	Evaluation summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome **(Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, & Scale-up)**	To what extent are district teams learning about the targeted content? **(Technical Assistance)**	100% of district teams will have 80% of participants respond that they increased their knowledge of stated learning targets.	**End of Year TA and PD Survey** pre/post survey measuring knowledge gain.	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis of survey, resulting in bi-annual data points.	Evaluation summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome **(Implementation)**	To what extent are district teams improving implementation of effective school-wide literacy components?	60% of districts will have 50% of the items on the effective school-wide reading programs tool (MTSS-R) scored as partially or fully in place.	**MTSS-R** Effective school-wide reading programs tool (MTSS-R) completed annually in the spring by district teams.	Quantitative data analysis of % of items partially or fully in place, resulting % of growth.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder groups and submitted in annual APR

Outcome **(Sustainability)**	To what extent are district teams improving implementation of effective school-wide literacy components?	80% of districts will have 75% of the items on the effective school-wide reading programs tool (MTSS-R) scored as partially or fully in place.	**MTSS-R** Effective school- wide reading programs tool **(**MTSS-R) completed annually in the spring by district teams.	Quantitative data analysis of % of items partially or fully in place, resulting % of growth.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome **(Scale-Up)**	To what extent are district teams improving implementation of effective school-wide literacy components?	100% of districts will have 80% of the items on the effective school-wide reading programs tool (MTSS-R) scored as partially or fully in place	**MTSS-R** Effective school- wide reading programs tool **(**MTSS-R) completed annually in the spring by district teams.	Quantitative data analysis of % of items partially or fully in place, resulting % of growth.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR.
Process **(Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)**	To what extent are district teams utilizing implementation frameworks to implement school-wide literacy programs?	100% of district teams will complete a continuous improvement framework (PDSA) cycle quarterly.	**PDSA** Completed framework (PDSA) cycle documents submitted and reviewed quarterly.	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis of survey, resulting in bi-annual data points.	Evaluation summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process **(All Years)**	How satisfied are district team members with the **training** provided?	80% of participants will report satisfaction with training received.	**Professional Development Survey** End of training evaluation survey (Likert-type scales and open- ended questions)	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis resulting in 1 data point	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome **(Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, & Scale-up)**	To what extent are district teams learning about the targeted content? **(Technical Assistance)**	100% of district teams will have 80% of participants report satisfaction and that training was a good use of time.	**In-District TA Survey** (Likert-type scales and open- ended questions)	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis of survey resulting in bi-annual data points.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process **(All Years)**	What is the attendance rate of district team members in **technical assistance**	100% of district teams in the project will have 80% of participating team members in attendance	**Documented Attendance** Attendance at bi-monthly	% of members that attend meetings	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR

	calls?	on technical assistance calls.	district leadership calls captured in meeting minutes		
Process **(All years)**	What is the attendance rate of district team members in the **trainings** provided?	100% of district teams in the project will have 80% of participating team members in attendance at trainings.	**Documented Attendance** Attendance sheets with signatures for attended, including name, email, and district	% of members that attended trainings	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process (All years)	To what extent is the District team functioning at a high level?	80% of the components on the team survey score a 4 or 5 (almost always & always)	**District Team Survey** Measuring team structure, communication, and focus	Quantitative percentage of items scored 4 or 5 on the survey	Team-level summary report used to improve team functioning

Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcome Coaching/Teaching Staff Strand

Logic Model Strand: Coaching/Teaching Staff
Deliver skill-based and application-based training on reading pedagogy and explicit instruction for teaching reading while building an instructional coaching model for special education teachers.
Process Measures: Professional Development Survey, Documented Attendance, LMS Grade Book, Coaching Logs, Video Uploads   Outcome Measures: Reading Modules 1-20 Survey(s), PD Survey, RESET Rubric, Coaching Fidelity Rubric

Process and Outcome Project Measures

Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis and Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Process **(All Years)**	How satisfied are coaches with the trainings provided?	80% of coaches will report satisfaction with training received.	**Professional Development Survey** (Likert-type scales and open-ended questions)	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis resulting in 1 data point	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process **(All Years)**	What is the attendance rate of coaches at trainings provided?	100% of project identified coaches attend the trainings.	**Documented Attendance** Attendance sheets with signatures for attended, including name, email, and district	% of coaches that attend trainings.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process **(Readiness)**	What is the participation and completion rate of **teachers and coaches** in online modules?	80% of project identified teachers and coaches will complete 100% of the online modules.	**LMS Module Survey** Learning management system tracking of participation & completion	LMS grade book showing percentage of participation & completion each semester (December & May)	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR

Process (Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)	What is the participation rate of **coaches** in in-district TA visits?	80% of project identified coaches will participate in in-district TA visits	**Documented Attendance** District visit notes, attendance, and TA.	% of members that attend meetings.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process (Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)	At what frequency and duration, and what percent of teachers are receiving ongoing coaching?	100% of instructional coaches will submit 7 out of 8 coaching documents (RESET pre/post and coaching logs)	**Coaching Logs** Coaches log entries (date, location, recipient, time spent, mode of support, focus of coaching) uploaded monthly by district coaches	Online coaches log data entered into Excel document	Quarterly status updates from coaches log spreadsheets.
Outcome (Readiness)	To what extent are **teachers and coaches** learning targeted content from online modules?	The online module training provided will have 90% of attendees respond that they understand how to teach the big ideas or strategies of the module.	**Reading Modules Survey(s)** End-of-module retrospective pre- post survey measuring knowledge gain (Likert-type scale)	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report. (December & May)	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome (Readiness)	To what extent are **teachers** and coaches able to apply learning from the online modules?	The online module training provided will have 90% of attendees respond that they have the ability to utilize the big idea or strategy in instruction.	**Reading Modules Survey(s)** End-of-module evaluation survey measuring participants self- report ability to apply the stated learning objectives (Likert scale)	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report. (December & May)	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Process (Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-Up)	What is the submission rate of video- taped lessons by teachers?	100% of teachers will submit 15 video lessons within allotted timeframe.	**Video Uploads** Online database of submitted videos with date and time stamps.	Submission rate calculated based on number of videos submitted within timeframe allotted, reported annually.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR

Outcome (Implementation, Sustainability, Scale-up)	To what extent are **coaches** learning about effective instructional coaching?	80% of coaches will report increased knowledge from training received.	**Professional Development Survey** End-of-training survey measuring retrospective knowledge gain (Likert-type scale)	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome (Implementation)	To what extent are **teachers** able to implement effective explicit instructional strategies?	60% of teachers will have 40% of the items on the RESET rubric scored as partially implemented or implemented.	**I10RESET Rubric** RESET rubric completed and calibrated 2 times per year (fall, spring) by coach and teacher together.	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome (Sustainability, Scale-up)	To what extent are district **coaches** providing instructional coaching with fidelity?	80% of district coaches will have 60% of the items on the instructional coaching fidelity implementation rubric scored as partially or fully implemented.	**Coaching Fidelity Rubric** Instructional coaching fidelity implementation rubric (FIR) completed annually in the spring by a project consultant via onsite observation	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome (Sustainability)	To what extent are **teachers** able to implement effective explicit instructional strategies?	80% of teachers will have 80% of the items on the RESET rubric scored as partially implemented or implemented.	**RESET Rubric** RESET rubric completed and calibrated 2 times per year (fall, spring) by coach and teacher together.	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR
Outcome (Scale-Up)	To what extent are district **coaches** providing instructional coaching with fidelity?	80% of district coaches will have 80% of the items on the instructional coaching fidelity implementation rubric scored as partially or fully implemented	**Coaching Fidelity Rubric** Instructional coaching fidelity implementation rubric completed annually in the spring by a project consultant via onsite observation	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR

Outcome (Scale-Up)	To what extent are **teachers** able to implement effective explicit instructional strategies?	80% of teachers will have 80% of the items on the RESET rubric scored as partially implemented or implemented.	**RESET Rubric** RESET rubric completed and calibrated 2 times per year (fall, spring) by coach and teacher together.	Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic evaluation report.	Summary report shared with internal stakeholder group and submitted in annual APR