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Agenda

8:30-8:40   Welcome & Introductions
8:40-9:30   Overview of Oklahoma’s School Improvement Process Under ESSA
9:30-11:20  ESSA Tiers of Evidence (includes break)
11:20-11:30 Break
11:30-11:45 Educational Service Provider Selection Rubric
11:45-11:55 Q&A
11:55-12:00 Training Evaluation and Dismissal
Meeting Objectives

• Gain an understanding of the role of local educational service providers within the new Oklahoma school improvement process under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
• Gain an understanding of the ESSA tiers of evidence
• Articulate what local education service providers will need to demonstrate to meet ESSA requirements
• Gain an understanding of the process and rubric that LEAs will use to select educational service providers, including how districts will use funds to support school improvement
Elementary & Middle School Report Card

Four Indicators:
• Academic Achievement
• Academic Growth
• English Language Proficiency Assessment Progress
• Chronic Absenteeism
High School Report Card

Five Indicators:
• Academic Achievement
• Graduation Rate
• Postsecondary Opportunities
• English Language Proficiency Progress
• Chronic Absenteeism
ESSA
School Support Designations

• Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI)
• Additional Targeted Support Improvement (ATSI)
• Targeted Support Improvement (TSI)
Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI)

- Identified from among all schools in the state
- Bottom 5% of school sites
- Any high school with a graduation rate of 67% or below will also be identified as a Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) Site
- Designated every three (3) years
  - Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) Cohort one (2018-2021)
Additional Targeted Support Improvement (ATSI)

- Identified annually
- Uses same methodology as Comprehensive School Improvement
- Divided into student group performance:
  - Economically disadvantaged students;
  - Students with disabilities
  - English Learners (EL)
  - Major racial and ethnic groups
    - American Indian
    - Asian/Pacific Islander
    - Black/African American
    - Hispanic/Latino
    - White
    - Two or more races
Targeted School Improvement (TSI)

• Targeted School Improvement (TSI)
  • Designated annually
  • When at least one student group is in the bottom 5% on two or more indicators in the accountability system
  • First year of designation is 2019-2020
  • Three consecutive years of identification = Comprehensive School Improvement designation
School Support Timeline

- December 13 - Release of preliminarily designated sites
- December 14 - Appeals window opens (10 working days)
- January 14 - Appeals window closes
- January 22-31: Required Regional Meetings for CSI sites
- February: Required Regional Meetings for CSI sites
- March-May: Work on writing Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP)
- May 31: CIP application due in GMS
- May 31: Competitive grant application due in GMS
- June-August: Formulaic and Competitive Funds Awarded; Prepare for Implementation
- August, 2019: Launch Continuous Improvement Plan
All Students Can Grow
All Schools Can Improve

Identify Local Needs
Examine and Reflect
Select Relevant, Evidence-based Practices and Interventions
Plan for Implementation
Implement
School Improvement Process

Step 1: Identify Local Needs by completing a Comprehensive Needs Assessment

- Oklahoma’s Nine Essential Elements
- Stakeholder Surveys
- Multiple Measures of Data including Oklahoma State Testing Program Data
- Assignment of School Support Specialist to Site
### 9 Essential Elements Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OEE 1</strong> Curriculum</td>
<td><strong>OEE 4</strong> School Culture</td>
<td><strong>OEE 7</strong> Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OEE 2</strong> Classroom Evaluation/Assessment</td>
<td><strong>OEE 5</strong> Student, Family, and Community Support</td>
<td><strong>OEE 8</strong> Organizational Structure and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OEE 3</strong> Instruction</td>
<td><strong>OEE 6</strong> Professional Growth, Development, and Evaluation</td>
<td><strong>OEE 9</strong> Comprehensive and Effective Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OEE 1  Curriculum
The school faculty develops and implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional and aligned to state and local standards.

OEE 2  Classroom Evaluation/Assessment
The school faculty uses multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

OEE 3  Instruction
The school faculty provides an instructional program that actively engages all students by using effective, varied and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEE 4</th>
<th>School Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school/district leadership team functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEE 5</th>
<th>Student, Family, and Community Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school/district leadership team works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career and developmental needs of students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEE 6</th>
<th>Professional Growth, Development, and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school/district leadership team provides research-based, results-driven professional development opportunities for staff and implements performance evaluation procedures in order to improve teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEE 7</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school/district leadership team provides instructional decisions focusing on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction and high performance expectations. The school/district leadership team creates a learning culture and develops leadership capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEE 8</th>
<th>Organizational Structure and Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school/district leadership team is organized to maximize use of all available resources to support high quality performance of students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEE 9</th>
<th>Comprehensive and Effective Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school/district leadership team develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive school improvement plan that communicates a clear purpose, direction and action plan focused on teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Improvement Process

Step 2: Select relevant, evidence-based interventions & practices.

ESSA requires that designated sites use Evidence-Based Interventions (EBIs) for improvement. Evidence-based refers to a strategy or intervention that demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes (ESEA section 8101(21)(A)).
School Improvement Process

Step 3: Plan for implementation

- **Spring 2019**
  - Plan, Plan, Plan
  - Get Buy In
  - Professional Learning
  - Coaching & Feedback
  - Develop SMART goals
    - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time Bound
  - Develop Action Plan
School Improvement Process

Step 4: Implementation of Plan

- 2019-2020
  - Instructional Coaching
  - Leadership Coaching
  - Model Teaching
  - Professional Learning
School Improvement Process

Step 5: Examine & Reflect

- Refer back to plan (SMART Goals)
- Monitor implementation
- Ongoing review of data (SMART Goals)
- Celebrate successes
- Revise plan as needed
Funding

• Sites designated as Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) sites will be allocated planning funds for Spring, 2019
• Formulaic funds will be allocated in the summer of 2019 to CSI sites for purchasing necessary resources for the implementation of their plan
• Competitive funds will be awarded in the summer of 2019
  • Approximately \( \frac{1}{3} \) of CSI sites will be awarded competitive funding
  • Will be representative of all school sizes, situations
Objectives

• Understand when and how to apply tiers of evidence under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

• Understand how to navigate the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) to find information for evidence-based practices (EBPs) that relates to the tiers

• Gain exposure to other evidence clearinghouses
Oklahoma School Improvement Process for schools receiving comprehensive (CSI), targeted (TSI) or additional targeted (ATS) support
ESSA Evidence Tiers

Find at least 1 statistically significant and well-designed study for the proposed EBP that meets:

- Tier 1: strong evidence
- Tier 2: moderate evidence
- Tier 3: promising evidence
- Tier 4 logic model

For highest Oklahoma rubric rating for provider selection

CSI/TSI/ATSI requirement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSA Program (unless noted)</th>
<th>Evidence Requirement(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Section 1003: School Improvement</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 intervention must meet Tier I, II, or III in CSI, TSI and ATSI schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A: Schoolwide/Targeted Assistance</td>
<td>External providers must have expertise in using EBPs (Tier I, II, III IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Part A: Effective Instruction</td>
<td>Some requirements for Tier I, II, III, or IV, where evidence is reasonably available (e.g., professional development, induction, and mentoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Part A: Student Support Grant</td>
<td>Some requirements for Tier I, II, III, or IV, where evidence is reasonably available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Part B: 21st CCLCs</td>
<td>Tier I, II, III, or IV evidence, when deemed appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Part D: Magnet School Assistance</td>
<td>Competitive preference is given for proposals with evidence-based activities (Tier I, II, III, or IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Part F: Education Innovation</td>
<td>Includes program-specific evidence requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Title IV, Part F: National Community Support | • Promise Neighborhoods: Some requirements and competitive preference for (Tier I, II, III, or IV).  
• Full-Service Community Schools: Competitive preference for Tiers I to IV |
| Perkins V (Perkins ACT) | • Professional development for CTE must be EBPs  
• Title I Innovation for CTE proposal must include EBPs |
Sources of Evidence-Based Practices

For the potential practice(s) you propose for implementation in CSI/TSI/ATSI schools, you must find a published research study that addresses the same intervention that you are considering and meets the Tier 1, 2 or 3 criteria, from:

- Clearinghouses such as What Works Clearinghouse
- Research studies not reviewed in clearinghouses

The intervention may be a current practice (if a study is found for it that meets Tiers 1-3) or this may be a practice that is new to you.
I’m a Tier 1 intervention, use me!
ESSA Tiers of Evidence
## Evidence Tier Criteria for Evaluating a Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Criterion</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design rigor</strong> (minimum)</td>
<td>Experimental study</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Logic model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random assignment of participants to control and treatment</td>
<td>Control and treatment groups not random (but purposeful)</td>
<td>Well-designed correlational study</td>
<td>Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low attrition or baseline equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Low attrition (baseline equivalence is assumed)</td>
<td>Higher attrition ok but then must have baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Statistical controls for selection bias</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistically significant favorable effect (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Includes evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant unfavorable effect from causal study (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large study sample (&gt;350)</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multisite study sample (&gt;=2 schools)</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample overlap</strong></td>
<td>Students and setting</td>
<td>Students or setting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESSA Decision Tree for WWC Studies

1. Study Design
   - Experimental
   - Quasi-experimental
   - Correlational

2. Reviewed by WWC?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Meets standards without reservations?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Meets standards with reservations?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Statistical controls for selection bias?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Well-specified logic model?
   - Yes
   - No

7. Does not meet criteria for ESSA evidence tiers

8. Statistically significant favorable effect?
   - Yes
   - No

9. Countervailing unfavorable effects from causal studies?
   - Yes
   - No

10. Large, multisite sample?
    - Yes
    - No

11. Tier 1: Strong Evidence
    - Tier 2: Moderate Evidence
    - Tier 3: Promising Evidence
    - Tier 4: Demonstrates a Rationale

Check other clearing-houses and review with caution.
Well-designed, well-implemented study

- Design rigor
- Low attrition (for tier 1)
- Baseline equivalence (for tier 2)
# Evidence Tier Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Criterion</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design rigor (minimum)</strong></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Logic model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random assignment of participants to control and treatment</td>
<td>Control and treatment groups not random (but purposeful)</td>
<td>Well-designed correlational</td>
<td>Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low attrition or baseline equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Low attrition (baseline equivalence is assumed)</td>
<td>Higher attrition ok but then must have baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Statistical controls for selection bias</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistically significant favorable effect (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Includes evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant unfavorable effect from causal study (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large study sample</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multisite study sample</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample overlap</strong></td>
<td>Students and setting</td>
<td>Students or setting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Rigor: Comparison Groups

- Experimental (tier 1) and quasi-experimental (tier 2) studies both have purposeful (you choose) control and treatment groups.

- **Treatment group**
  Receives the intervention, practice, strategy, or program (also known as the intervention group)

- **Control group**
  Does not receive the intervention, practice, strategy, or program
Random assignment of participants denotes an experimental study (Tier 1).

Participants have equal chance of assignment to the control group or the treatment group.
**Design Rigor: Nonrandom Assignment**

Quasi-experimental studies (tier 1) purposefully assign participants to control and treatment groups by statistical methods.

**Time series**
Compare results for similar students before and after interventions

**Nonequivalent groups**
Treatment and control groups created using assignment that is nonrandom

**Matching**
Uses statistical methods to create treatment and comparison groups (rather than random assignment)
Design rigor: Correlational research

- No purposeful control and treatment groups
- Determines *relationship* between intervention and outcome but cannot make *causal* inferences
- Commonly retrospective (for example, use of archived data)

Math score = $\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{historically disadvantaged?} + \beta_2 \text{income} + \beta_3 \text{intervention?} + u$
Attrition

Experimental studies must have low participant drop-out, from research start to data analysis, to qualify for tier 1.

What Causes Attrition?

- Lack of consent
- Inconsistent or missing data
- Transfer from study school
- Student absenteeism
- Refusal to participate
- Dropping out of the study
- Inability to locate
Attrition

Experimental studies must have low overall attrition and low differential attrition to qualify for tier 1.

Overall attrition
Percentage of participants assigned to control or treatment group in total that do not have outcome data

Differential attrition
Subtract the attrition percentage for the intervention group from the attrition percentage for the control group
Baseline Equivalence

Quasi-experimental studies must demonstrate baseline equivalence to qualify for tier 2.

The comparison and treatment groups must be equivalent on key factors such as race, achievement, at-risk status, class size, and so forth, depending on the type of study.
Similar to *baseline equivalence*: Statistical Controls for Bias

Correlational studies (tier 3) use statistical controls to account for factors other than the intervention that could influence the outcome.

Math score = $\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{historically disadvantaged?} + \beta_2 \text{income} + \beta_3 \text{intervention?} + u$

- Controls account for differences between participants that could influence the outcome other than the intervention
Effect on outcome

- Statistically significant, favorable effect
- No significant unfavorable effect from well-designed, well-implemented causal studies
### Evidence Tier Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Criterion</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design rigor (minimum)</strong></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Logic model Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design rigor</td>
<td>Random assignment of participants to control and treatment</td>
<td>Control and treatment groups not random (but purposeful)</td>
<td>Well-designed correlational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low attrition or baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Low attrition (baseline equivalence is assumed)</td>
<td>Higher attrition ok but then must have baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Statistical controls for selection bias</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically significant favorable effect (by outcome)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Includes evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant unfavorable effect from causal study (by outcome)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large study sample</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisite study sample</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample overlap</td>
<td>Students and setting</td>
<td>Students or setting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistically significant, favorable effect

• Required for intervention to qualify for tiers 1, 2, or 3
• The statistical test for significance generates a “p value” as its result
• $p$ value = probability that relationship between intervention and outcome is caused by random factors (i.e., not the intervention)
• $p$ value of .05 or less is universally considered significant, indicating a “95% chance that the intervention-outcome relationship is not random”

| Table. Estimated Coefficients from Regressions Predicting Grade 3 ELA Achievement and Reading |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| With Reading 180                                | 3rd Grade ELA achievement | 3rd Grade Reading diagnostic |
| English learner                                 | .91*                          | .71**                         |
| Poverty status                                  | .78                            | .90***                        |
| Original Curriculum                             |                                |                               |
| English learner                                 | .83*                          | .61**                         |
| Poverty status                                  | .71                            | .82***                        |

*p<.05. **P<.01. ***p<.001.
No Statistically Significant, Unfavorable Effects

• Required for the intervention to qualify for tiers 1, 2, or 3
• No well-designed, well-executed experimental or quasi-experimental studies for the intervention may have statistically significant, unfavorable effects on the outcome of interest (look in WWC)
Reflect on Meeting Tier 3

Using the table of study results from the previous slide, discuss the following questions with a partner:

- Why is qualifying for Tier 3 important? What are the minimum requirements for meeting Tier 3?
- Looking at the table, what is the intervention or treatment? What are the outcome measures? How are the data reflecting effects of the intervention organized?
- For which outcomes are there favorable, statistically significant results? How would you explain the results out loud to your partner for a given outcome?
- What conclusions would you draw regarding what how the intervention could be used for school improvement?
KEY TAKEAWAY
At least one intervention in comprehensive, targeted and additional targeted support schools must have, at minimum:

• Favorable statistical significance for the outcome of interest
• No statistically significant, unfavorable effects from related well-designed experimental or quasi-experimental studies (causal studies)
• Statistical controls that account for differences in participants (i.e., by race, socioeconomic, etc.)
Population characteristics

- Sample size and sites
- Sample overlap
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Criterion</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design rigor (minimum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quasi-experimental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Correlational</strong></td>
<td><strong>Logic model</strong> Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random assignment of participants to control and treatment</td>
<td>Control and treatment groups not random (but purposeful)</td>
<td>Well-designed correlational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low attrition or baseline equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Low attrition (baseline equivalence is assumed)</td>
<td>Higher attrition ok but then must have baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Statistical controls for selection bias</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistically significant favorable effect (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Includes evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant unfavorable effect from causal study (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large study sample</strong></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multisite study sample</strong></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample overlap</strong></td>
<td>Students and setting</td>
<td>Students or setting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large study sample:

Required to qualify for tiers 1 or 2

- Must have sample size ($N$) of **350 or more**
- Sample may be aggregated across studies for the same outcome
Multisite sample:

Required to qualify for tiers 1 or 2

• The favorable impact must have been replicated in 2 or more schools
• Must have control and treatment groups in two or more schools
• May be aggregated across studies for the same outcomes
Study sample overlap with target population

• For tier 1, students and setting
• For tier 2, students or setting

Population

Setting

• If the study includes a narrow population, findings should not be generalized to broad target population
• If the study includes a broad population, findings can be applied to a more narrow target population (look subgroup results)
A Quick Note About ESSA Tiers 1 and 2

• Deciding whether a study is “well designed and well implemented” for tiers 1 and 2 should include a review against WWC standards wherever possible.

• Contact REL-Southwest for single study reviews
Tier 4: Demonstrates a Rationale

- A well-specified logic model that explains how intervention is likely to improve outcomes
- Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation results
- An effort to study the effects is currently or will be underway

For more logic model development guidance, see [here](#).
Take a break

See you in 5 minutes
Navigating What Works Clearinghouse
Find What Works

Searchable database
Visit the WWC Website

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/
Select a topic area—consider results of needs assessment.

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/
Select multiple filters to narrow your search.

Evidence of effectiveness icon—sorts interventions by highest level of:

- Statistically significant favorable effect
- No significant unfavorable effect from experimental/quasi

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FFW/Results?filters=,Literacy
Evidence of effectiveness:

- Your first clue regarding *statistical significance* and *countervailing effect*

Three possible determinations:

- Positive or potentially positive effects
- Mixed or no discernable evidence
- No evidence

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FFW/Results?filters=,Literacy
### “Leveled Literacy Intervention”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ 180®</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Partners</td>
<td>K-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological Awareness Training plus Letter</td>
<td>PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpellRead</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic Reading</td>
<td>PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success for All®</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaisyQuest</td>
<td>PK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earobics®</td>
<td>K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveled Literacy Intervention</td>
<td>K-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepping Stones to Literacy</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review the effectiveness rating by outcome to determine if:

- **Statistically significant, favorable effect**
- **No significant unfavorable effect from experimental or quasi-experimental (causal study)**

See effectiveness rating at outcome level to determine:

- Statistically significant, favorable effect
- No significant unfavorable effect from experimental or quasi-experimental study (causal study)

Six possible effectiveness ratings:

| - - | - | 0 | + - | + | ++ |

Negative
Potentially negative
No discernable
Mixed

Not eligible for ESSA Tiers 1–3
See effectiveness rating at outcome level to determine:

- Statistically significant, favorable effect
- No significant unfavorable effect from experimental or quasi-experimental study (causal study)

Six possible effectiveness ratings:

- - - - 0 + - + +

Potentially positive
Positive

Eligible for ESSA Tiers 1–3
Review:

- Aggregate *sample size* across studies, by outcome

To meet the large sample criteria, a study (or group of studies) must have at least 350 students.

Select a specific study to determine:

- **Design rigor**
- **Attrition or baseline equivalence**

---

### Evidence Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Effectiveness rating</th>
<th>Studies meeting standards</th>
<th>Grades examined</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Improvement index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabettics</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>1 study meets standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading achievement</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>2 studies meet standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading fluency</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>1 study meets standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Meets WWC Standards Without Reservations” means:

- **Design rigor:** well-designed, well-implemented experimental study (tier 1)
- **Attrition** is low

“Meets WWC Standards With Reservations” means:

- **Design rigor:**
  - Well-designed, well-implemented quasi-experimental study (Tier 2) or
  - Well-designed, well-implemented experimental study (high attrition; Tier 2)
- **Baseline equivalence** is met

View Findings for **statistical significance** at the outcome level.

### Alphabettics outcomes—Statistically significant positive effects found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention mean</th>
<th>Comparator mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS): Nonsense Words Fluency subtest</td>
<td>Leveled Literacy Intervention vs. 0 Days Business as usual</td>
<td>Full sample (aggregated, grades K-2); 422 students</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading achievement outcomes—Statistically significant positive effects found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention mean</th>
<th>Comparator mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System</td>
<td>Leveled Literacy Intervention vs. 0 Days Business as usual</td>
<td>Full sample (aggregated, grades K-2); 427 students</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

View Supplemental Findings (under “More Outcomes”) for statistical significance by subgroup to inform population overlap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention mean</th>
<th>Comparison mean</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>Improvement index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System</td>
<td>Leveled Literacy Intervention vs. Business as usual</td>
<td>0 Days</td>
<td>Full sample (aggregated, grades K-2); 427 students</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System</td>
<td>Leveled Literacy Intervention vs. Business as usual</td>
<td>0 Days</td>
<td>Grade: K; Hispanic or Latino; 50 students</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

View “Sample characteristics” for sample overlap:

- Tier 1: student population and setting
- Tier 2: student population or setting

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712
**Multisite study:**

- Required for tier 1 and tier 2
- At least two schools

Source: [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712)
Multisite study:

- See Study Details for more explicit information

Setting

The study took place in five rural elementary schools in Tifton, Georgia and four suburban elementary schools in Middletown, New York.

Study sample

The study participants, who were in grades K–2, were predominantly economically disadvantaged, with 84% being eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The study included predominantly minority students; 37% were Hispanic, 33% were African American, and 29% were White. Approximately 13% of students were classified as English learners.

Source: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712
Small-Group Activity: Using Data to Select Evidence-Based Practices
## Intervention Report

### Reviewed Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Effectiveness rating</th>
<th>Studies meeting standards</th>
<th>Grades examined</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Improvement index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabets</td>
<td>- - 0 - + +</td>
<td>1 study meets standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading achievement</td>
<td>- - 0 + + +</td>
<td>2 studies meet standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading fluency</td>
<td>- - 0 + + +</td>
<td>1 study meets standards</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Study/78712)
Intervention reports have contextual information

- Program information, including implementation and cost
- All studies reviewed and summary of their findings
- Sample characteristics

Source:
Searching for Building Assets-Reducing Risk
Evidence Clearinghouses

- What Works Clearinghouse
- Evidence for ESSA
- Top Tier Evidence-Social Programs that Work (Tier 3)
- Blueprints Programs
- Campbell Corporation
- Crime Solutions
- ArtsEdSearch
- RAND Social/Emotional Evidence Review
- ERIC (research, but not a clearinghouse)
Alignment Between Clearinghouses and Evidence Tiers

• Currently, none of the clearinghouses align perfectly with the ESSA tiers.

• Just because a practice is reviewed on a clearinghouse does not mean the practice meets CSI/TSI requirements.

• Some analysis is required when you use the clearinghouse to determine if tiers are met.

• See this crosswalk document to step through the process for a few clearinghouses.
# Research Tier Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Criterion</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design rigor (minimum)</strong></td>
<td>Experimental&lt;br&gt;Random assignment of participants to control and treatment</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental&lt;br&gt;Control and treatment groups not random (but purposeful)</td>
<td>Correlational&lt;br&gt;Well-designed correlational</td>
<td>Logic model&lt;br&gt;Based on high-quality research or positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low attrition or baseline equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Low attrition (baseline equivalence is assumed)</td>
<td>Higher attrition ok but then must have baseline equivalence</td>
<td>Statistical controls for selection bias</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistically significant favorable effect (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Includes evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant unfavorable effect from causal study (by outcome)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large study sample</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multisite study sample</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample overlap</strong></td>
<td>Students and setting</td>
<td>Students or setting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contacts

David English  denglish@air.org

Aaron Butler  abutler@air.org
External Provider Selection Process
Educational Service Provider Selection Process

- Guide to working with External Providers from American Institutes for Research (AIR)
- The guide provides research and field experience related to how schools and districts can work most effectively with a host of external providers
- Includes a framework for the selection process, vetting, and guidance on the selection process
- Toolkit that provides documents that can be filled in or serve as topics for discussion
Critical Characteristics of High-Quality Provider Services

- **Aligned** with established SMART goals
- **Long term** strategies for school improvement
- **Customized** approach as defined by the comprehensive needs assessment, SMART goals and action plan
- **Evidence based** services that meet Tier 1,2, or 3 criteria
- **Capacity Building** with leaders, teachers, and school personnel to carry out and continue the scope of work in the future
- **Professional development** must match and support SMART goals and action steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Services (Meets site needs, cost, timeline, delivery methods)</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that meets the identified needs of the school, including cost, timeline of services, and delivery methods.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that has some, but not all, of the delivery of services components.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that has none of the delivery of services components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is fully aligned to the SMART goals set by the school as identified by their Comprehensive Needs Assessment.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is partially aligned to the SMART goals set by the school as identified by their Comprehensive Needs Assessment.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is NOT aligned to any of the SMART goals set by the school as identified by their Comprehensive Needs Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that provides a plan for long term sustainability of improvement.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that provides a plan for a 2-3 year term of sustainability.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that does not include a plan for long term sustainability of improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customized</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is customized to the SMART goals set by the school as identified by their Comprehensive Needs Assessment and has a viable plan to get buy-in from key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is not fully customized nor has a viable plan for buy-in from key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that is NOT customized to the SMART goals set by the school as identified by their Comprehensive Needs Assessment and does not have a viable plan to get buy-in from key stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Based</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal with services that are Evidence Based and meets either Tier 1 (strong) or Tier 2 (moderate)</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal with services that are Evidenced Based and meets Tier 3 (promising) criteria.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal with services that are NOT Evidence Based and do NOT meet either Tier 1 (strong), Tier 2 (moderate), or Tier 3 (promising) criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that will build the leadership, teacher, and school's capacity to carry out similar work in the future and the potential provider has the capacity to successfully deliver on the scope of work.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that has limited potential to build the school's capacity to carry out similar work in the future.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that does not address building the school's capacity to carry out similar work in the future nor does the potential provider have the capacity to successfully deliver on the scope of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that outlines how the PD provided will enhance teachers' skills in the classroom and will increase student achievement.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that outlines EITHER how the PD provided will enhance teachers' skills in the classroom OR will increase student achievement.</td>
<td>Provider submits a proposal that does not outline how the PD provided will enhance teachers' skills in the classroom and is not correlated to an increase in student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Monitoring Tool</td>
<td>Provider has a comprehensive, ongoing system to measure and monitor their performance of services being provided and provides documentation to the school.</td>
<td>Provider has a system to measure their performance of services being provided.</td>
<td>Provider has no system in place to evaluate their performance of services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!


Follow us on Twitter! @ RELSouthwest
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