What is this measure's objective? *Projects use evidence-based professional development (PD) practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.*

Simply put, a SPDG project develops a strong PD system that includes engaging and skill-based training along with data-based coaching. This effective PD leads educators to use new and improved skills that improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Who reviews Program Measure 1?

Your Project Officer will review your draft Program Measure 1 in April. They will then review all Program Measure 1 data in your APR submission.

In addition, an OSEP contractor reviews SPDG APRs that have initiatives in implementation year 2 and beyond. They use only what is in the APR to review the program measures. The contractor aggregates data across SPDG projects and provides a Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) report that is shared with Congress.

The contractor rates each component with scores between 1 and 4. Your team's self-assessment of the components is **not** factored into their ratings. Your self-assessment helps you consider your strengths and the areas that could use more or different focus.

What are the requirements for responding to this measure?

Use the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development (EB-PD) Worksheet to describe components of each initiative's PD system.

Pointers:

- Respond to each bullet with details of how this work is currently being conducted. *Note that the contractors reviewing your program measures cannot give credit for future activities.*
- Descriptions should respond only to what is required. Information that does not respond to the requirements will make it challenging for the contractor to score that component.
- Have a "novice" review your draft worksheet. Ask, "What's not clear?" "Are there any requirements we haven't responded to?"
- Have your SPDG team members rate your EB-PD components using the 4-point scale in EB-PD Rubric.

What are the targets for this measure?

This is the only Program Measure that has targets set for you:

- **1st year** of the initiative's implementation is the baseline year, with no target.
- **2nd year target:** 50% of PD components will score a 3 or 4.
- **3rd year target**: 70% of PD components will score a 3 or 4.
- **4th & 5th year target**: 80% of PD components will score a 3 or 4.

What do grantees report in the ED 524B Project Status Chart? (See sample below.)

Note: Each initiative will have its own unique data for Program Measure 1, 2, 3, & 4.

1. Performance Measure: Enter the target goal/benchmark for the reporting year.

2. Measure Type: Enter "Program" to distinguish this GPRA measure from "Project" measure.

3. Target, Ratio: Enter the target number of components that will score a 3 or 4 as the numerator; enter "16" (total number of PD components) as the denominator.

4. Target, %: Divide the numerator by the denominator; enter the resulting percentage.

5. Actual Performance Data, Ratio: Enter the number of components your team scored a 3 or 4 as the numerator; enter "16" (total number of PD components) as the denominator.

6. Actual Performance Data, %: Divide the numerator by the denominator; enter the resulting percentage.

7. Explanation of Progress: Provide information that will explain the quantitative data entered in the chart. It is helpful to list those components you will focus on for improvement and your strategies for improving them.

Sample from APR

Use this link to reach the exemplar APR this section is taken from.

1. Project Objective   [ ] **Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.**

The Idaho SPDG will use evidence-based practices to design and deliver professional development to support instructional staff in using explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
By the end of year 2, 50% (8 out of 16) of the Idaho SPDG professional development (PD) practices on the SPDG Evidence-based PD Components Rubric will score a 3 or 4 (on a scale of 1 to 4), with 70% in year 3 and 80% in years 4 and 5.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8 / 16	50		14 /16	88%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1.a. Performance Measure: The SPDG Project Director completed the SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components worksheet and self-rated each component. For each self-rating that was did not receive full points, the Project Director wrote notes for suggestions for improvement. The self-ratings are as follows:

Domain	Self-rating	Suggestions for improvement
A(1) Selection	4	
A (2) Selection	4	
B (1) Training	4	
B (2) Training	4	
B (3) Training	3	Improve how we measure participants' use of new skills in each training
B (4) Training	3	Plan to review data reports again with each trainer when planning for next year's trainings and make adjustments.
B (5) Training	3	Plan to create orientation videos, provide more support on MTSS-R in the coming school year
B (6) Training	3	Should collect more objective pre-post data. Plans to meet with trainers to make changes for 2022-23 school year
C (1) Coaching	3	Did not assess LEA coaches' fidelity of coaching this year but plans to next year
C (2) Coaching	1	Did not measure fidelity of instruction or coaching yet. Plans to in spring 2022 and moving forward
C (3) Coaching	1	Did not measure fidelity of coaching. Plans to in spring 2022
D (1) Data Systems	4	
D (2) Data Systems	3	Did not measure fidelity. Plans to in spring 2022. Good description of other items.
D (3) Data Systems	3	Did not measure fidelity. Plans to in spring 2022. Good description of other items.
E (1) Systemic Leadership Supports	4	
E (2) Systemic Leadership Supports	3	More work to be done to align initiatives
Total	50/64= 78%	