

Evaluation

The evaluation will provide objective measures of the extent to which the project achieves its ultimate vision: Students with specific learning disabilities will experience improved reading achievement through the implementation of research-based practices and systems change at the district level. More specifically, the evaluation will determine (1) the extent to which project outputs have been met (whether the four project goals and their corresponding activities are successfully carried out and implemented with fidelity) and (2) the extent to which the project outcomes related to students, SPDG Partners, parents, and district personnel have been achieved.

The evaluation effort will primarily serve to evaluate current activities and products and inform in a timely and ongoing basis any needed revisions in activities and products. Both qualitative and quantitative data and formative and summative data will be collected and regularly reported to key personnel. Attitudinal (e.g., How satisfied are participants and what are their perceptions of collaboration?), knowledge-based (e.g., How much did participants learn?), and behavioral (e.g., How have participants changed their behaviors?) data will be collected. Evaluation methods will include written questionnaires, focus groups, interviews, observational tools, fidelity of implementation checklists, and “tracking” systems of professional development, technical assistance, and participants. Data on students’ achievement will also be collected.

Formative data will be collected on an ongoing basis (e.g., after each professional development activity) to determine the quality of the activity, aspects that worked well, and areas for improvement. Summary evaluations will be collected annually and will be used to determine intermediate and long-term impact on teachers, students, districts, parents, and others.

At the quarterly ADE/SPDG partners meeting, the evaluator will present formative evaluation data (i.e., the number and quality of project activities that have been carried out to date). The team will discuss what activities and processes are working well and what aspects might need to change. Any available summative data on the objectives and outcomes will also be shared. An annual ADE/SPDG partner meeting will occur at the beginning of every grant year to demonstrate progress, successes, and next steps. The summative evaluation will be written in September of each year (a preliminary version will be written in April and turned into OSEP for its annual report requirement).

The extent to which program activities are implemented with fidelity will be a crucial

component of the evaluation. If district staff members receive training on a particular evidence-based practice, for example, but do not fully and/or appropriately implement the training, then positive outcomes for students and teachers are less likely to occur. In conjunction with WestEd, Arizona will use Practice Profiles based on the work of the State Implementation and Scaling up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) to help create fidelity of implementation checklists for professional development (Is the professional development being implemented/provided with fidelity?) and for new knowledge and skills (To what extent is the information being implemented/used properly in the schools?).

The logic model describes the inputs, outputs, and outcomes of the program. The evaluation plan flows from this logic model. The evaluation component of the logic model identifies the critical questions that should be asked about the inputs, outputs, and outcomes. It identifies the indicators that will be used to answer these questions, and specifies the sources and methods that will be used to collect the indicator data. The evaluation plan will be further refined by the evaluator and the SPDG Management Team as the various components of the SPDG are implemented. The evaluation plan is split into several sections:

- Section 1: Presents the short-term and medium-term measurable outcomes for each of the four goals.
- Section 2: Presents the medium-term and long-term measurable outcomes that will occur as a result of all four goals being implemented together as a system. For example, student achievement is more likely to increase if a district participates in professional development activities related to achievement, receives local level technical assistance on reading instruction and collaboration, and encourages parents to learn about how they can help their child succeed.
- Section 3: Presents the four performance measures that must be evaluated, as specified by the U.S. Department of Education.

Evaluation Plan

Section 1

Goal 1: The Arizona Department of Education will develop online professional development modules, facilitation guides, and additional resources for use by district and school personnel and parents.

Measureable Indicators	Methods and Sources	Timeline
M1.1. Output Tracking: The completion of each module and other materials will be tracked.	Internal project tracking.	Ongoing throughout Year 1.
M1.2. Output Tracking: The developed modules will be of high quality and usefulness.	Content Validity Questionnaire. Each module will be reviewed for quality.	After the development of each module throughout SPDG Year 1.

Goal 2: Three pilot district teams with pilot schools will complete professional development, implement systems changes, and create sustainability plans that will be replicated with their remaining district schools.

Measureable Indicators	Methods and Sources	Timeline
M2.1. Output Tracking: The number of PD/TA sessions administered and the number of participants who participated will be tracked.	Professional Development Tracking System. Each training activity will be tracked. Participant sign-in sheets will be collected and participant emails will be entered into the system for evaluation purposes.	On-going.
M2.2 Satisfaction: Participants' satisfaction will be measured with each PD/TA activity.	End-Of-Training Questionnaire. Immediately after the training activity, the participants will be handed a hard copy or emailed a URL for completing this questionnaire.	On-going.
M2.3 Outcomes: Participants' new knowledge and skills that relate to the specific evidence-based practices will be measured.	End-Of-Training Questionnaire. Immediately after the training activity, the participants will be handed a hard copy or emailed a URL for completing this questionnaire.	On-going.
M2.4 Outcomes: Participants' new knowledge from viewing the modules will be measured.	Pre-/Post-Tests on Modules. Immediately before and after viewing a module, the participants will complete a pre-/post-test on the topic of the module.	On-going.

<p>M2.5 Outcomes: Participants' implementation of new skills that relate to the specific evidence-based practices will be measured.</p>	<p>Three-Month Follow-Up Questionnaire. Three months after a PD activity, participants will be emailed a URL for completing this questionnaire to indicate the extent to which they have implemented various skills that they were taught. Participants will receive up to three emails as reminders to complete the questionnaire. Observational tools will also be used for this activity.</p>	<p>On-going.</p>
<p>M2.6 Fidelity of Implementation: The extent to which a given school/classroom is implementing the instructional strategies with fidelity will be measured.</p>	<p>Fidelity of Implementation Checklists. A checklist for assessing the methods and procedures used by the change agents (PD/leadership team, coaches, SPDG Cadre) to promote the use of evidence-based practices.</p>	<p>On-going.</p>
<p>M2.7 Fidelity of Implementation: The extent to which a given school/classroom is implementing the instructional strategies over time with fidelity.</p>	<p>Fidelity of Intervention Checklists. 9-12 months after the start of implementing a given strategy, the appropriate fidelity of implementation tool will be used.</p>	<p>On-going.</p>
<p>M2.8. Outcomes: The degree of collaboration between special education and general education staff members will be measured.</p>	<p>Perception Questionnaire. This questionnaire will be administered to the special education and general education staff members at the pilot schools.</p>	<p>Annually in May.</p>

<p>Goal 3: The Arizona Department of Education will establish a cadre of experts to facilitate professional development and technical assistance to districts statewide.</p>		
<p>Measureable Indicators</p>	<p>Methods and Sources</p>	<p>Timeline</p>
<p>M3.1. Output Tracking: The PD and TA that the cadre provides to districts will be tracked.</p>	<p>Professional Development Tracking System. Each training activity will be tracked.</p>	<p>On-going.</p>

<p>M3.2 The collaboration among SPDG Partners, ESS staff members, and SSI staff members will be measured.</p>	<p>Collaborative Questionnaire. This questionnaire will be administered to SPDG Partners, ESS staff members, and SSI staff members and will ask participants to rate various aspects of collaboration among each other.</p>	<p>Annually in May.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

<p>Goal 4: Pilot practitioners and the ADE/SPDG will establish a Community of Practice (CoP) as a support system to continue their work in scaling up and sustaining improvement efforts.</p>		
<p>Measureable Indicators</p>	<p>Methods and Sources</p>	<p>Timeline</p>
<p>M4.1. Output Tracking: The completion of each CoP activity will be tracked.</p>	<p>Professional Development Tracking System. Each CoP activity will be tracked.</p>	<p>On-going.</p>

<p>Section 2: Outcomes relating to all four goals.</p>		
<p>Measureable Indicators</p>	<p>Methods and Sources</p>	<p>Timeline</p>
<p>M1. In Years 2 -5 of the grant, the percent of parents who report increased parent involvement will be measured (APR8).</p>	<p>The Parent Involvement percent is calculated by Indicator 8 Parent Survey.</p>	<p>Annually in July.</p>
<p>M2. In Years 2 -5 of the grant, the percentage of students with disabilities in the regular classroom will be measured (SPP5).</p>	<p>The Least Restrictive Environment percentages are calculated via the ADE official child count file.</p>	<p>Annually in February.</p>
<p>M3. In years 3 -5 of the grant, student achievement on DIBELS or other progress monitoring tools will be measured.</p>	<p>The reading achievement-related results are calculated from DIBELS or other progress monitoring tools.</p>	<p>Fall and Spring.</p>
<p>M4. In years 3 -5 of the grant, student achievement on the state test will be measured (SPP3).</p>	<p>The reading achievement-related results are calculated from the Arizona state test.</p>	<p>Annually in August.</p>