Colorado Structured Literacy Project Evaluation Plan (9/2024)



EvaluationQuestion	Target/Performance Indicator	Responsibility	Data Collection Method/Frequency	Data Collection Tools
 Long-Term Outcomes How much did students in kindergarten through grade 3 improve reading skills? How does the 4th and 5th grade cohorts (that went through SL) reading skills compare to non-SSIP sites? How much did students in grades 4 and 5 improve reading skills? 	1. Reading Assessment scores 2. CMAS reading scores SSIP sites versus non-SSIP sites SiMR: Students in kindergarten, first, and second grades who are identified at the beginning of the school yearas WellBelow Benchmark according to the DIBELS Next Assessment, will significantly improve their reading proficiency as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students who are identified at the end of the school year as Well Below Benchmark.	SSIPSites: Administer the Read Actuniversal screening k – 3 assessment Reportdatato CDE CDE: Analyze Read Act universal screening assessment reading results for growth, gap between students with disabilities ExamineIndicator 3a, 3b, 3d	Annually Weekly progress monitoring Benchmark testing threetimes peryear	Read Act assessment (K – 5) CMAS (3 – 5) Decrease in students scoring well below benchmark Overall percentage to statewide percentage
 IntermediateOutcomes 1. Do teachers have an increased understanding of data to guide instruction? 2. How does leadership use data? 	Increasedunderstanding of data literacy Increased use of data to guide instruction	SSIP (CDE) coaches: • Discuss data sources within structured literacy lessons duringPD	Ongoing:summer PDmonthly coaching sessions with teachers	End of year survey with included data literacy questions

Colorado Structured Literacy Project Evaluation Plan (9/2024)



EvaluationQuestion	Target/Performance Indicator	Responsibility	Data Collection Method/Frequency	Data Collection Tools
	Identification of various data sources to guide instruction, provide support through PD/coaching	 Review data during coaching loops SSIPSites: Increased use of data by leadership Participation in regular data digs/root cause analysis meetings led by leadership with support from CDE coaches 	regular check- ins with leadership	
Intermediate Outcomes Do teachers implement structured literacy with fidelity?	Fidelity scores as measured by comparing scores from beginning of year to end of year.	CDE Coaches Coaches will observe teachers twice per year (beginning semester andend semester) Compare total scores on a 0 – 2 scale	Twice per year Between Sept and Nov Between March and May	Fidelity walk-through form
Short Term Outcomes Do professional learning opportunities lead to increased knowledge of structured literacy	Teachers satisfied or very satisfied with professional learning	CDECoaches: • Provide professional learning	Survey	At end of professional learning in summer End of year survey

Colorado Structured Literacy Project Evaluation Plan (9/2024)



EvaluationQuestion	Target/Performance Indicator	Responsibility	Data Collection Method/Frequency	Data Collection Tools
components and instructional strategies?		 Administer professional learning survey SSIPSites: Attend professional learning Complete survey 		
Short Term Outcomes Are structured literacy lessons taught with increased fidelity and meeting student needs as a result of coaching?	Completed coaching loops; fidelity to structured literacy components; student growth in reading skills	CDECoaches:	 Y1:2coaching loops/week in fall and 1 coaching loop/week in spring Y2:2coaching loops first 6 weeks; 1 loop/week Y3:2coaching loops/month Y4:1coaching loop/month 	Coaching logs