

# The SSIP Template Guide: A Companion Tool to Indicator 17 Reporting

As part of the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) results-based accountability system, every state is required to develop a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): a comprehensive, ambitious yet achievable, multi-year plan aimed at improving outcomes in targeted areas. Each state submits annual updates on its SSIP in Indicator 17 of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Indicator 17 is a results indicator for which the state provides baseline data and targets for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).

## How to Use This Resource

This companion resource is designed to be used alongside the Part B SPP/APR Template to assist state education agency (SEA) staff in preparing, writing, and submitting a well-written and comprehensive SSIP. The resource is organized to include template prompts, along with associated tips for reporting.

We recommend reviewing this entire resource before writing the Indicator 17 responses, especially if this is your first time reporting on the SSIP. Alternatively, you may find it useful to refer to this resource when you have a question about a particular prompt, or you may want to use the tool as a quality check after completing all the responses. You may also find it helpful to refer to your previous year's SSIP submission and any OSEP comments or required actions as you review this resource to ensure you make needed corrections on the new draft. Whatever your approach, remember that you can reach out to your [IDC State Liaison](#) for assistance with your SSIP at any point in the process.



## Section A: Data Analysis

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <b>What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include a plain language statement of your SiMR here. It should clearly align with the baseline, target, and annual performance data you will enter in the tables.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)</b>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Answer yes if the SiMR you listed is new since your last report. If you are still reporting on the SiMR from last year but plan to make a change, you will write about those planned changes in another prompt and you should answer no here.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Provide a description of the systems analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If you answered yes to <b><i>Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission</i></b>, describe how your state analyzed your systems and data to come to the conclusion to change the SiMR. A systems analysis requires examination of all levels of the SSIP, including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, selection of improvement strategies, and evaluation. The systems analysis must be conducted in partnership with state staff and stakeholders. This prompt asks about the review; the next prompt asks for the data sources.</li></ul> |
| <b>List the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.</b>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• List all data sources directly related to the SiMR change, including implementation and/or fidelity data, child outcomes, or other data.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe your state’s analysis of the data sources you listed and how that analysis led to your state’s decision to change the SiMR.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Describe the role of the stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.</b>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Be clear about how stakeholders contributed to decisionmaking and the level and type of their engagement. Consider describing your decisionmaking norms (e.g., majority vote, modified consensus, unanimous agreement).</li><li>• Stakeholders should be consulted at all stages of SSIP work, including making changes to the SiMR.</li></ul>  |



### Section A: Data Analysis (cont.)

| Prompt   | Reporting tips  |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The population is the entire group of students included in your SiMR (e.g., all 4th-grade students with disabilities in the SEA). Subsets could be identified by a variety of variables, such as local education agency (LEA) or school characteristics, student demographics including area of disability, and student outcomes.</li><li>• If your state is only implementing SSIP activities in some districts or schools, then answer yes because your SSIP activities are not reaching the whole population of students in your SiMR.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.</b>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If you answered yes to <b><i>Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator</i></b>, you should respond to this item by clearly stating the selection criteria your state used to identify the subset. If your state identified the subset by enrollment in participating schools or LEAs, give a brief explanation of how your state selected those participating sites.</li><li>• If there are changes in the subset from year to year, explain what those changes were, why they occurred, and how they affected the data, if at all. For example, if schools or LEAs were dropped from or added to the SSIP cohort, provide explanations.</li></ul> |
| <b>Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Answer yes if your state made ANY changes to its theory of action since the last report submission.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.</b>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe why your state made changes/updates to the theory of action, what changes the state made, and how stakeholder involvement influenced those changes and updates.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Provide a link to the current theory of action.</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enter the full address for the link. Ensure the link is active and includes the most up-to-date theory of action before submission.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Progress toward the SiMR: Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If your state has one target each year, select no.</li><li>• If your state has two targets each year, select yes.</li><li>• Your answer here determines the options you will have in the next few prompts.</li></ul>  |



**Section A: Data Analysis (cont.)**

| Prompt                       | Reporting tips  |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Historical Data</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option 1 is for one target. You will see prompts for Baseline Year and baseline data if you indicated that you have one target. The baseline year and data should be prepopulated. Check the prepopulated fields for accuracy.</li><li>• Option 2 is for SSIPs with two targets. You will see prompts for A and B Baseline Years and A and B baseline data if you indicated that you have two targets. The baseline years and data should be prepopulated. Check the prepopulated fields for accuracy.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Targets</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Select the set of targets that are labeled “greater than” if your goal is to be above the targets. Select the set of targets that are labeled “less than” if your goal is to be below the targets.</li><li>• Check that you have the correct number of targets per year. If you reported that your state uses one target each year, then you should see one target per year. If you reported that your state uses two targets each year, then you should see A and B targets for each year.</li><li>• Check the accuracy of the prepopulated fields and ensure that any manually entered data also match.</li><li>• All Indicator 17 baselines and targets are reported as a percentage; this may affect how you write your SiMR.</li></ul> |
| <b>FFY 202x SPP/APR Data</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Select the set of SPP/APR targets that are labeled “greater than” if your goal is to be above the targets. Select the set of targets that are labeled “less than” if your goal is to be below the targets.</li><li>• Add a description of your numerator (the top number in a fraction that represents part of the whole). If using two targets, add descriptions for both Part A and Part B numerators. Your numerator description should indicate what the whole number in the box represents (e.g., the number of students with disabilities ages 14–21 who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma).</li></ul>  |



**Section A: Data Analysis (cont.)**

| Prompt   | Reporting tips  |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Add a description of your denominator (the bottom number in a fraction that represents the whole). If using two targets, add descriptions for both Part A and Part B denominators. Your denominator description should indicate what the whole number in the box represents (e.g., the total number of students with disabilities ages 14–21 who exited special education).</li><li>• The current FFY data is the percentage conversion of the numerator divided by the denominator. If using two targets, the current FFY Part A and Part B data are the percentage conversions of the numerator divided by the denominator for each part.</li><li>• Status refers to whether the SEA met the target; the choices are Met or Not Met.</li><li>• Slippage has occurred when there is 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:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point.</li><li>– For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point.</li></ul></li><li>• If slippage has been identified for a target, provide reasons for the slippage; the more data-informed your rationale is, the better. Describe only why you think the slippage happened in this response. You can describe actions you are taking to prevent or reverse slippage in later sections, such as in the summary of next steps or in sections on infrastructure improvement strategies, evidence-based practices, and/or additional implementation activities.</li></ul> |
| <p><b>Provide the data source for the FFY 202X data.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Name the data source(s) used for the SiMR. It may be a results indicator, a standardized assessment, or another source that is specific to your SSIP. Include the names of files and databases as appropriate.</li></ul>  |



### Section A: Data Analysis (cont.)

| Prompt  | Reporting tips   |
|---|--|
| <b>Describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Describe how data are collected, by whom and in what system, and how the data are analyzed. If you have an evaluation team or third-party evaluator, they may be in a good position to assist with responding to this prompt.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI [continuous quality improvement], survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Choose yes if you want to report any additional SiMR-related data. Additional data may come from short-term and intermediate goals and objectives outlined in your SSIP evaluation plan. Do not report fidelity of implementation data here; you will report on those data in a later prompt.</li></ul>                              |
| <b>Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>If you answered yes to <b><i>Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR</i></b>, describe the additional data sources and how they are related to the SiMR. You only need to describe the data sources, not the collection or analysis methodology.</li></ul> |
| <b>Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Answer only yes or no here. Data issues are common. Potential issues include data that are not timely, accurate, complete, usable, accessible, or secure.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.</b>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>If your state identified any data quality issues, you should describe them here and explain what your state did to alleviate them.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)</b>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Answer only yes or no here.</li></ul>  |



## Section A: Data Analysis (cont.)

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To ensure you address each item in this prompt appropriately, you may want to number sections of your response (1, 2, and 3).</li></ul> |

## Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

| Prompt   | Reporting tips   |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enter the full address for the link. Check the link to make sure it is active with the most up-to-date evaluation plan before submission.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)</b></p>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respond no only when there were no changes to the evaluation plan between the last SPP/APR report and this report.</li> <li>• Review your evaluation plan when you attach it to make sure the contents are accurate, relevant, and aligned with all other SSIP components.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.</b></p>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List the changes and provide only a brief description of them. You will need to include details in the next prompt.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.</b></p>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the reasons the state made changes (e.g., new SiMR, new SSIP baseline/targets, changes to infrastructure or evidence-based practices, new external evaluator), including data-driven decisionmaking and stakeholder input.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefly describe all the state’s efforts to improve its capacity to support LEAs with SSIP-aligned activities. Infrastructure strategies are <i>how</i> and <i>with what resources</i> states support local progress toward meeting SiMR targets. Infrastructure strategies do not include evidence-based practices or foundational knowledge—you will list and describe those later in response to prompts specifically related to evidence-based practices.</li> <li>• Relevant SSIP infrastructure elements may include             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– organizational standards, values, commitments, or priorities;</li> <li>– funding;</li> <li>– communication and collaboration protocols;</li> <li>– legislation;</li> <li>– policies and procedures;</li> <li>– monitoring, quality assurance, or accountability capacity;</li> <li>– capacity to provide technical assistance, professional learning, or coaching;</li> <li>– technology and equipment; and</li> <li>– personnel/teaming structures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation (cont.)**

| Prompt   | Reporting tips   |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be brief in this response. You will describe each strategy in detail in the next response.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for:</b></p> <p><b>(a) achievement of the SiMR;</b><br/> <b>(b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or</b><br/> <b>(c) scale-up.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this response, you will provide additional details about each strategy you described in the previous response. This prompt includes multiple parts, so be sure to address them all for each strategy. You could consider a structure like the one below for each strategy.</li> <li>• Infrastructure Improvement Strategy 1             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Outcomes achieved</li> <li>– Related systems framework area (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development/technical assistance)</li> <li>– Measures/metrics for achievement</li> <li>– How and to whom achievement was communicated</li> <li>– How this strategy supports system change and is needed for achievement of the SiMR, sustainability of improvement efforts, or scale-up</li> </ul> <p><i>(Repeat the items above for each of the infrastructure improvement strategies you identified in the previous response.)</i></p> </li> <li>• If you are having difficulty describing the strategy with these details, it may not be an infrastructure activity.</li> <li>• Be mindful of the 8000-character limit on this response.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Did the State implement any <i>new</i> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respond yes for new strategies only—ones that the state has not previously reported.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Describe each <i>new</i> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide details about each new strategy and connect them to results. If the strategy does not yet have any results, describe the progress to date and the expected outcomes.</li> </ul>   |

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation (cont.)**

| Prompt  | Reporting tips   |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this response, discuss your state’s plans for all existing and new infrastructure improvement strategies described in previous responses. For each strategy, indicate outcomes you expect to achieve by the next SPP/APR submission.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period.</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence-based practices (EBPs) implemented as part of the SSIP should have direct impact on the SiMR. The state should have selected these EBPs because they are known to be effective for growth for students with disabilities in the area of the SiMR focus. The selected EBPs should be readily teachable, learnable, and doable at the system, school, classroom, and/or student level. Provide a list; do not describe the EBPs here. You will summarize them in the next response.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use this space to describe each EBP listed in response to the previous prompt. Provide only a summary of the practice here; you will describe the expected effects of each practice in response to the next prompt.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice, and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices; teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors); parent/caregiver outcomes; and/or child outcomes.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is another multipart prompt; be sure to respond to each part. Describe how the SEA is supporting each EBP and how each EBP will have a positive impact on SEA and/or LEA policies, procedures, or practices; teacher or provider practices; and outcomes for students with disabilities and their families aligned with the SiMR.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe fidelity data that measures actual implementation as intended by the evidence-based practice. Other types of fidelity measures such as self-assessments, training attendance, pre- and post-training knowledge checks are should be reported in the item below.</li> <li>Describe the fidelity measures for each identified EBP, how the state collects the fidelity measure, and how it analyzes the fidelity data to track improvement of both practices and outcomes.</li> </ul>          |

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation (cont.)**

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include any other data the state collected related to the EBPs that your answers in earlier prompts have not captured. Additional data might include satisfaction surveys, stakeholder meeting notes, personnel/retention data, training completion rates, cost/return on investment analyses, and other data identified in the SSIP evaluation plan but not already discussed.</li> <li>• If your state has other fidelity measures besides implementation fidelity, such as self-assessments, training attendance, pre- and post-training knowledge checks report those here. Implementation fidelity should be reported in the item above.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.</b></p>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each EBP mentioned in previous responses, discuss plans for the EBP and expected outcomes to be achieved by the next SPP/APR submission.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answer yes if your state will not make changes to any aspect of the SSIP in the upcoming year (i.e., the SiMR, theory of action, target population, evidence-based practices, infrastructure, scale-up, evaluation activities).</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a multipart item—be sure to respond to all aspects:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– what will change from your previous SSIP implementation;</li> <li>– when or in what order the changes will occur; and</li> <li>– why the changes are needed or what could happen if the changes are not made.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If relevant, describe how data (including implementation fidelity data), infrastructure changes, shifts in SEA priorities, or any other factors outside the SSIP itself informed the decision to change the SSIP.</li> </ul>   |



## Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation (cont.)

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe, in clear language, the direct connection between the data gathered from the evaluation and how those data support making no changes to the SSIP (e.g., because it is meeting short- and long-term desired outcomes). If your state’s plan includes a logic model, you could reference it to make your case here.</li><li>• It is always helpful to review your state’s theory of action each year to ensure that all activities continue to be aligned.</li></ul> |

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Description of Stakeholder Input</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use this response to describe the mechanisms, meeting cycles, teaming structures, staff, accommodations, and technology employed to gather input from stakeholders specific to the SSIP. Describe what stakeholders contributed to your improvement efforts and how their input shaped implementation and outcomes. Describe stakeholder participation numbers and demographics. It is helpful to have a method to document and track stakeholder involvement efforts, including how the SEA continues to facilitate opportunities for diverse stakeholder engagement, to increase the capacity of diverse groups to support the SSIP work by being true thought-partners in every aspect of data analysis, planning, implementation, and evaluation, and to communicate with the groups.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the state facilitated stakeholder contributions to key improvement efforts. You have already described infrastructure strategies and EBP items in earlier responses, so do not describe those here. Instead, select key efforts from those and describe the ways you partnered with stakeholders to make changes, allocate resources, align initiatives, measure progress, celebrate success, or disseminate findings. Describe the strategies and activities that have been implemented since the previous report and demonstrate how they support <i>continued</i> engagement with stakeholders.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)</b></p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most states should anticipate one or more concerns to arise while working with stakeholders.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.</b></p>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you answered yes to <b><i>Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities</i></b>, report each concern stakeholders expressed and how the state addressed each concern, including how the SEA responded to the concerned stakeholders and any actions taken to remedy the concern.</li> </ul>  |

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement (cont.)**

| Prompt  | Reporting tips  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Additional Implementation Activities: List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only include new activities that your previous responses have not captured. This may be a place to document plans to address slippage in SiMR data, if slippage occurred.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.</b></p>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respond to each portion of this prompt (timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes) for the new activities you listed under <b>Additional Implementation Activities</b>.</li> </ul>                     |
| <p><b>Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include only new barriers that you have observed within the past year. Describe how the state addressed these barriers or how the state plans to address them in the future.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only provide information that your previous responses in this report have not captured. This is a place to report on any successes, celebrations, bright spots, feel-good stories, achievements, epiphanies, and accolades.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Response to actions required in FFY 202X SPP/APR</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe steps that the state took in response to OSEP comments on last year’s submission, if any.</li> </ul>  |

The IDEA Data Center (IDC) created this publication under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs grant number H373Y240002. Amy Bae and Alexis Lessans serve as the project officers.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred. This product is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted.