

**Connecticut State Department of Education
Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)**



CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report
Indicator 17 – Phase III (Year 5)**

April 2021

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

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

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

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data:

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission?

FFY 2018 Target:

FFY 2019 Target:

FFY 2018 Data:

FFY 2019 Data:

Was the State’s FFY 2019 Target Met?

Did slippage¹ occur?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

If “Yes”, please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

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

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

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

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

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