# Measuring Student Outcomes for MTSS: How Do We Show the Impact of Our Project?

# Student outcomes need to be …

- Aligned with the focus of the SPDG Project
- Sensitive to incremental change
- Appropriate given the amount of time one can reasonably expect for changes in teacher practices to occur and have their intended impact on student outcomes.

For these reasons, state-mandated achievement tests may not be well suited for measuring the impact of a professional learning program on student outcomes.

# Curriculum-Based Measures (CBM)

- Focus on the specific skills addressed by the professional learning
- Measure incremental gains in student achievement in response to instruction and intervention
- Provide formative assessment data to inform instructional and project improvement planning

**CBM for MTSS**

Acadience
aimsWeb
DIBELS 8th Edition
EasyCBM
FastBridge

# CBM Metrics

## School-Level Data

- % of students at or above benchmark:
  BOY, MOY, EOY
- Movement between Tiers indicating reduction in risk.
  *Example:* % of students Tier 2 →Tier 1

## Student-Level Data

- Rate of Improvement
  *Example*: Gain in ORF/number of weeks of intervention

# Individualized Student Outcomes

| Instead of … | | Consider … |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IEP Goals | ⇨ | Goal Attainment Scaling |
| Student Grades | ⇨ | Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) |

# Virginia – District & Teacher SMART Goals

- In our current project, districts select an HLP of focus, then identify teachers/staff through transformation zones to receive supports.
- Each district can select a different HLP.
- To show project impact, each district is setting a SMART goal for students with disabilities. We are tracking progress toward their SMART goal.
- Additionally, each teacher receiving supports sets a SMART goal and reports progress.

# Virginia – Example

**HLP of Focus:** HLP 18: Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement

**Division SMART Goal:** By the end of the 2027–28 school year, expanded implementation of High-Leverage Practice 18 (use of strategies to promote active student engagement) in English classrooms will result in improved reading performance for students with disabilities, reducing the gap between their average reading proficiency scores and the state proficiency level to within 5 percentage points.

*Note: Our districts are in the process of writing their SMART goals.*

# Linking Implementation to Student Outcomes

| |
|---|
| 1. Skills are taught systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence. Teacher makes explicit connections between sounds and articulatory gestures. |
| 2. The teacher provides a focused review of word reading skills. The teacher uses grapheme cards to follow the deliberate order of graphemes being reviewed. Teacher reviews grapheme-phoneme correspondences by students writing the letters(s) to the given sounds. Teacher uses word chains using previously taught graphemes and phonemes, doing all of the manipulation of the letters and allowing students to practice decoding. |
| 3. The teacher uses effective step by-step procedures or routines with appropriate pacing. |
| 4. The teacher makes explicit connections between sounds and letters or letter groups. |
| 5. The teacher clearly and accurately models articulation. |
| 6. The teacher engages all students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds with a sufficient emphasis on accurate articulation. |
| 7. Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are used clearly and consistently throughout the lesson |
| 8. When a word is segmented, the teacher consistently ensures the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate. |
| 9. The teacher provides students with adequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill. |
| 10. The teacher guides students to compare and contrast learned patterns |
| 11. The teacher explicitly reinforces precise letter-sound correspondence through encoding exercises aligned to the target skill(s). • Writing (letters, words or sentences) AND/OR • Using manipulatives to build words (tiles, cards |
| 12. The teacher effectively integrates word meaning into the lesson |
| 13. The teacher scaffolds the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading as needed for students to experience success. |
| 14. The teacher provides sufficient opportunities for all students to engage in reading decodable text. |
| 15. The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading. |
| 16. The teacher effectively scaffolds meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text. |
| 17. Throughout the lesson the teacher provides affirmative and corrective feedback consistently focused on reinforcing the application of word reading skills and strategies.<br>18. When errors are detected, the teacher consistently elicits the correct response from the student throughout the lesson. OR No errors are made by the student(s) throughout the lesson. |

**If a teacher is applying what they have learned through the program what changes would we expect them to see in the students they are working with?**

- At this time, to what extent have you **observed off-task behaviors in your students** during literacy time?

**Over the last week:**

- How many **students remember** the sound-spelling patterns taught last week?
- How many **students can apply** last week's sound-spelling patterns to segment and blend a new list of words?
- How many **students can use the letter-sound patterns taug** last week to spell words accurately?
- How many **students remember the word meaning** for words taught last week?
- How many **students can apply the sound-spelling patterns** taught last week to read a decodable text?