

Worksheet
SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

Worksheet Instructions

Use the SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components worksheet to provide descriptions of evidence-based professional development practices implemented during the reporting year to support the attainment of identified competencies.

Complete one worksheet for each initiative and provide a description relevant to each of the 16 professional development components (A1 through E2).

Provide a rating of the degree to which each description contains all necessary information (e.g., contains the elements listed in the “PD components” column) related to professional development practices being implemented: 1=inadequate description or a description of planned activities, 2=barely adequate description, 3=good description, and 4=exemplar description. Please note that if you are describing a plan to implement an activity, it will not be considered as part of the evidence for the component. Only those activities already implemented will be considered in scoring the component description.

The “PD components” column includes several broad criteria for elements that grantees should include in the description to receive the highest possible rating. Refer to the SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components rubric (Rubric A) for sample descriptions corresponding with each of the ratings.

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
A(1) Selection	<p>Clear expectations are provided for PD participants and for schools, districts, or other agencies.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of expectations for PD participants (e.g., attendance in training, data reporting).¹ • Identification of what schools, districts, or other agencies agreed to provide (e.g., necessary resources, supports, facilitative administration for the participants).^{2,3} • Description of how schools, districts, or other agencies were informed of their responsibilities.^{2,3} <p>Provide a brief description of the form(s) used for these agreements.</p>	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
A(2) Selection	<p>Clear expectations are provided for SPDG trainers and SPDG coaches/ mentors.¹</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for trainers' qualifications and experience and how these qualifications will be ascertained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Description of role and responsibilities for trainers (the people who trained PD participants). • Expectations for coaches'/mentors' qualifications and experience and how these qualifications will be ascertained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Description of role or responsibilities for coaches or mentors (the people who provided follow-up to training). 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
B(1) Training	<p>Accountability for the delivery and quality of training.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the lead person(s) accountable for training. • Description of the role and responsibilities of the lead person(s) accountable for training. 	
B(2) Training	<p>Effective research-based adult learning strategies are used.^{4,5,6}</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of adult learning strategies used, including the source (e.g., citation). • Description of how adult learning strategies were used. • Description of how data are gathered to assess how well adult learning strategies were implemented. 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
B(3) Training	<p>Training is skill-based (e.g., participant behavior rehearsals to criterion with an expert observing).^{3,5}</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of skills that participants were expected to acquire as a result of the training. • Description of activities conducted to build skills. • Description of how participants' use of new skills was measured. 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
B(4) Training	<p>Training outcome data are collected and analyzed to assess participant knowledge and skills.⁵</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of training outcome measure(s). • Description of procedures to collect pre- and post-training data or another kind of assessment of knowledge and skills gained from training. • Description of how training outcome data were reported. • Description of how training outcome data were used to make appropriate changes to the training and to provide further supports through coaching. 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
B(5) Training	<p>Trainers (the people who trained PD participants) are trained, coached, and observed.^{5,7}</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of training provided to trainers. • Description of coaching provided to trainers. • Description of procedures for observing trainers. • Identification of training fidelity instrument used (measures the extent to which the training is implemented as intended). • Description of procedures to obtain participant feedback. • Description of how observation and training fidelity data were used (e.g., to determine if changes should be made to the content or structure of trainings, such as schedule, processes; to ensure that trainers are qualified). 	<p><u>Description of training provided to trainers:</u> The state trainer for regional trainers/coaches received intensive training from the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) in implementing the GraduateFIRST process. In addition, the state trainer received advanced training in specific content areas based on the identified needs for regional coaches. Also, the state trainer received certification from the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network as a Dropout Prevention Specialist. The state trainer received additional training by participating in the Cross-state Collaborative and by attending state and national conferences focused on improving graduation rates and preventing dropout. Initially, the regional trainers received training from the NDPC-SD and NTACTION. The regional trainers observed the national trainers as they provided training to school teams. Then the regional trainers participated up to five days of training from national trainers. The national trainers provided modules, scripts, and reflective questions for training.</p> <p><u>Description of coaching provided to trainers:</u> Initially, the regional coaches co-taught the modules with national trainers, and then the national trainers observed the regional trainers teaching and provided feedback. Course evaluations were reviewed by the national trainers and state trainer. Support was provided to improve content delivery and/or facilitation skills. Coaching was available from the national trainers until the regional trainers were able to train using the modules independently. These regional coaches have continued to provide training for districts. Training aids, web-based seminars, and downloadable resources were provided to improve training outcomes. In Year 6, the number of area coaches was reduced to two based on the increased capacity of the regional coaches. These two dedicated area coaches provided ongoing support to the regional coaches. New regional coaches participated in initial training sessions which included face-to-face meetings and conferences, virtual meetings, and individual conferencing and coaching sessions. Trainers with less than 3 years of experience were paired with experienced trainers who provided support and feedback on performance.</p> <p><u>Description of procedures for observing trainers:</u> New SPDG trainers providing statewide training were observed annually and evaluated using the Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development Training (HQPD) and feedback was provided to the state trainer to strengthen the training. Regional trainers were observed at least annually using the Coach Observation Rubric. All standards were observed, but there was a focus on Standard 4, Guiding the Process, which addressed the training. Standard 4 indicates that the regional trainer/coach employed practices that develop participants' expertise and self-efficacy with the GraduateFIRST/Student Success process. Identification of training fidelity instrument used (measures the extent to which the training is implemented as intended): Initially, regional trainers were observed using a fidelity checklist for each module related to the GraduateFIRST process. After multiple satisfactory observations, regional trainers participated in debrief sessions and shared their perceptions about training content and facilitation. Annually, regional trainers were observed using the Coach Observation Rubric. Pre-observation conferences with the regional coaches were held to provide context, and post-observation (cont) were held to provide feedback to the coaches. Description of procedures to obtain participant feedback: The GA SPDG Professional Development Evaluation Form was used to evaluate all training. This measure assessed the participants' knowledge aligned with the learning targets and participants' perception of the training in the areas of preparation, engagement, structure/delivery, evaluation, quality, relevance, and usefulness. Participants completed the evaluation form at the conclusion of each training session. The forms were submitted either by paper or electronically to the SPDG</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
C(1) Coaching	<p>Accountability for the development and monitoring of the quality and timeliness of SPDG coaching services.⁸</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the lead person(s) responsible for coaching services. • Description of the role and responsibilities of the lead person(s) accountable for coaching services. • Description of how data were used to provide feedback to coaches and improve coaching strategies. 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
C(2) Coaching	<p>SPDG coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should describe the coaching strategy used and the appropriateness for use with adults (i.e., evidence provided for coaching strategies).⁶ • Describe how SPDG coaches monitored implementation progress. • Describe how the data from the monitoring is used to provide feedback to implementers. 	<p>Coaching strategy used: The Project CTG Coaches use Jim Knight’s model of Instructional Coaching. Project CTG Coaches have received four days of training from Ann Hoffman, consultant for Jim Knight’s Instructional Coaching approach to coaching (e.g., Knight, 2007; Knight, 2008). The trainers and Project CTG Coordinator observe the coaches’ adherence to the Instructional Coaching model for working with teachers through observing co-planning sessions. During coaching sessions, the Project CTG Coaches uses the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing a partnership with the teachers; Guiding the teachers to set his/her own goals for the coaching and instruction; Explaining how the strategies are implemented; Providing specific feedback on the teacher’s classroom/students/subject; Modeling the strategies so teachers know how the strategies look when they are implemented with fidelity; Observing teachers implementing the co-teaching/co-planning/CHAMPS strategies; Working with the teachers to reflect on what strategies worked well and why; and Refining implementation of strategies for those teachers who have met the fidelity target but would like to improve their co-teaching, co-planning, or CHAMPS implementation. <p>Monitoring implementation progress: The amount of coaching depends on the needs of the teachers, however the Project CTG Coaches conduct on-site visits at least three times per month with each teacher, with ranges from every other day to three times a month. During the on-site or online coaching sessions, the teachers are asked about the barriers to implementation, the ability to implement the co-teaching or behavior practices, and student outcomes. The teachers plan for the lesson, and the Coach provides guidance using lesson planning tools, including the attached Lesson Plan Sheet. These tools assist the teachers with developing the instructional roles for each teacher as well as using a variety of instructional strategies to meet the standards addressed in the lesson. In addition, coaches meet with the site’s Implementation Team, which meets monthly. Each site develops plans for implementation, and the coaches work with the teams to define activities, protocols, and data collection strategies to ascertain the progress.</p> <p>How the data is used to provide feedback: The Project CTG Coaches provide feedback from the prior lesson observed (either remotely through online coaching or face-to-face). Using the principles of Instructional Coaching, the Coach does not direct the goals or areas of improvement, but allow the teachers to direct the areas they want to improve. Since the practices have been established for a year, the Project CTG Coaches reflected with the teachers following a class, or worked on refining the skills, often through modeling. Annually, the Project CTG Evaluator conducts a Coaching Evaluation. Individuals who received coaching were asked to complete the evaluation, which addresses each of the Instructional Coaching components. These data are shared with the Project CTG Coordinator, Director, and coaches to determine how to improve the coaching. The results from the 2016 Coaching Evaluation showed the lowest implementation scores were for modeling and individualizing strategies. As a result, the CoTeaching/Co-Planning consultants began meeting with the coaches on a monthly basis to talk about coaching strategies, including how to model the co-teaching and co-planning strategies and how to provide teacher-specific strategies to address areas of concern. In addition, at the Coaches’ Meetings, coaching strategies are discussed.</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
D(1) Performance Assessment (Data-based Decision Making)	<p>Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear (e.g., lead person designated).¹⁰</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a description of the role/responsibilities of the lead person and who this person is. 	
D(2) Performance Assessment	<p>Coherent data systems are used to make decisions at all education levels (SEA, regional, LEA, school).</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe data systems that are in place for various education levels. • Describe how alignment or coherence is achieved between various data systems or sources of data. • Describe how multiple sources of information are used to guide improvement and demonstrate impact.¹⁰ 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
D(3) Performance Assessment	<p>Implementation fidelity and student outcome data are shared regularly with stakeholders at multiple levels (SEA, regional, local, individual, community, other agencies).¹⁰</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the feedback loop for each level of the system the SPDG works with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe how these data are used for decision-making to ensure improvements are made in the targeted outcome areas. • Describe how fidelity data inform modifications to implementation drivers (e.g., how can Selection, Training, and Coaching better support high fidelity).¹⁰ 	<p><u>Description of the feedback loop for each level of the system the SPDG works with:</u> The State Implementation Team developed clearly defined processes, protocols, and feedback loops to eliminate gaps in communication between various levels of the state’s system (e.g. GaDOE, regional technical assistance agencies, districts, and schools). The cascading team structure provided the conduit for communication and well-defined feedback loops supported the sharing of information from one level of the system to another. Information about barriers to implementation in schools and districts was shared with regional teams that assisted them in addressing these barriers. Systemic issues that could not be addressed at the regional levels were then referred to the next highest level, the State Implementation Team. This team problem-solved issues for systemic barriers and shared school teams. When changes in procedures or processes were required to address barriers to implementation, these changes were then communicated back down the cascading team structures to local schools. The State Implementation Team provided sample agenda templates for school, district, regional, and state meetings to promote structured times for team members to address implementation barriers and successes and to identify resources and supports needed. The State Implementation Team used information gathered through the feedback loops to adjust processes and timelines. Information about barriers experienced in districts was also used to inform the development and distribution of resources to support districts in implementing the process.</p> <p><u>School and District Level:</u> Participating districts and schools collected student outcome data and implementation data. These data were shared with students and their families during conferences and at IEP meetings. Most of the participating districts and schools had access to a web-based management system. These schools entered the data into the web-based management system, which was reviewed by district administrators. At the school and district levels, student outcome and implementation data were used to assess outcomes, to identify successes, and to identify barriers to implementation. Successes were celebrated, and challenges were addressed in team meetings. Regional coaches shared this information about implementation barriers and successes with the area coaches. This information was then used to make changes in supports statewide. These changes were then communicated back down to the schools by the regional coach.</p> <p><u>Regional Level:</u> Implementation data collected at the districts and schools were shared with regional technical assistance providers as well as the regional coaches. Regional School Improvement Specialists, GLRS Directors, District Liaisons and regional coaches met to discuss district, school, and, student outcome data from participating districts and schools within the region. This data sharing provided opportunities to discuss challenges and to identify those strategies which were being implemented in participating schools in the region. (continued)</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
D(4) Performance Assessment	<p>Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and successes are shared and celebrated.¹⁰</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how benchmarks are created and shared. • Describe positive recognition processes for achievements. • Describe how data are used to “market” the initiative. 	<p><u>Description of how benchmarks are created and shared:</u> Goals for GraduateFIRST were established in the SPDG application process and were reflected within each of the performance measures of the APR. Prior to the beginning of each school year, the State Implementation Team in coordination with regional coaches established benchmarks for implementation fidelity and student outcome data. These benchmarks were based on previous year data on the goals and benchmarks. For Student Success, long-term, mid-term, and short-term goals were established by the State Leadership Team and were reflected on the project’s logic model. These goals were shared through state meetings and conferences. Goals and benchmarks were shared with the area and regional coaches who then worked with district and school teams to implement activities designed to lead to achievement of the goals and objectives. The State Implementation Team monitored progress on the benchmarks at monthly team meetings.</p> <p><u>Description of positive recognition processes for achievements:</u> Positive recognition processes for achievements were implemented at multiple levels. At state level meetings, state personnel modeled the sharing of success. Regional, district and school teams also shared successes at every meeting. Everyone was encouraged to celebrate progress toward goals. All regional coaches modeled this celebration by asking district and school team members to share successes when they attended state, regional, district, and school meetings. This process of celebrating successes was also used during the monthly regional coach and technical assistance meetings. As the SSIP was developed, the state recognized the excellent work achieved through GraduateFIRST and utilized the GraduateFIRST framework as the basis for the school implementation of Student Success. School teams demonstrating successful implementation were asked to showcase their implementation practices at regional meetings and in February 2018 at the Best Practices Forum. Student Success districts highlighted their implementation efforts during sessions of the quarterly Leadership Launch webinars and at state meetings and conferences. One district team was selected to present at the National Dropout Prevention Conference in 2017.</p> <p><u>Description of how data are used to “market” the initiative:</u> Since its inception, GraduateFIRST successfully supported participating districts and schools in improving graduation rates for students with disabilities. Schools shared improvements with GraduateFIRST ABCs (attendance, behavior, and course performance data). Sharing data at the regional level with GLRS and RESAs resulted in deeper collaboration with School Improvement Specialists. Sharing data at the state level with GaDOE staff members resulted in partnership with the Division for School and District Effectiveness in supporting districts with Focus and Priority schools. Throughout Years 1-5, data were shared at some district board of education meetings and meetings with district administrators as well as with community members and local media. Members of the State Implementation Team and participating district and schools have shared data and information about GraduateFIRST, CCaR, and Student Success at national conferences and</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
D(5) Performance Assessment	<p>Participants are instructed in how to provide data to the SPDG Project.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures described for data submission. • Guidance provided to schools/districts. 	<p><u>Procedures described for data submission:</u> Procedures for submitting data were clearly described for all participating district and schools. Data were collected for targeted students and implementation data were collected from each GraduateFIRST school team. For students on the targeted list, data were collected for attendance, behavior, and academic performance. Student data for days absent, in-school and out of school suspensions, and course performance were reported for each grading interval and collected through the Student Information System (SIS). Implementation data were collected and reported in the fall and spring of each year. These data were electronically submitted to the SPDG evaluator. Regional coaches shared information about implementation from their informal pulse checks during the regional coach meetings with the members of the State Implementation Team which includes the state trainer, the area coaches, and the Implementation Fidelity Specialists. Throughout Years 1-5, in the fall and in the spring, school teams assessed their implementation of GraduateFIRST using the GraduateFIRST Implementation Scales. These schools provided evidence and artifacts to support their assessment. They also used the scales to reflect on the next steps needed to reach the Sustaining level on the scale. The assessment data were submitted electronically to the SPDG evaluator. Also, in Years 1-5 for the spring assessment, there was a 20% verification process of the self-assessments and evidence was provided. Data from these assessments were shared with the regional coaches and the State Implementation Team. During Year 6, the GraduateFIRST Implementation Scales were completed once by school teams.</p> <p><u>Guidance provided to schools/districts:</u> Procedures for submitting data were detailed in the GraduateFIRST and Student Success Implementation Manuals. A monthly timeline and guide were provided for district and school teams and leaders to assist participating educators in understanding what data were required and how to submit data. Regional coaches provided training for school administrators and team leaders on the procedures for the submission of data each year. The district coaches and school team leader were responsible for the data collection and the submission of data. The regional coach was available for follow-up and support for the timely data submissions. Regional coaches sent emails and prompts for data submission and the SPDG evaluator sent prompts to regional coaches to ensure that data were submitted timely. GaDOE provided training and support for data submission for districts in Student Success. Webinars, individual meetings with district teams, and assistance from the regional teams were provided to assist districts in the completing data submission. A timeline and guidance were developed for district teams to understand what data were required and how to submit these data. The district and school teams were responsible for the data collection and the submission of data. Regional coaches also worked individually with the district teams to ensure successful data submission. Regional coaches submitted data through their Coaching Logs which detailed activities and contacts with district and school teams, district and school administrators, and district coaches and school team leaders. Regional coaches also submitted implementation data from the districts and schools to the SPDG evaluator.</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components (with required elements the description should contain)	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
E(1) Facilitative Administrative Support/ Systems Intervention	<p>Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role/job description of administrators relative to program implementation provided. • Describe how the SPDG trains and supports administrators so that they may in turn support implementers. 	

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

Professional development (PD) domains	PD components <i>(with required elements the description should contain)</i>	Project description of related activities (please note if you are attaching documents)
E(2) Facilitative Administrative Support/ Systems Intervention	<p>Leadership at various education levels (SEA, regional, LEA, school, as appropriate) analyzes feedback regarding barriers and successes and makes the necessary decisions and changes, including revising policies and procedures to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success (e.g., Describe how communication travels to other levels of the education system when assistance is needed to remove barriers). • Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes. 	<p>Description of processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success (e.g., Describe how communication travels to other levels of the education system when assistance is needed to remove barriers): Promoting a coherent and aligned state system to support implementation was a critical component of Student Success. In order to create hospitable environments for implementation of Student Success improvement strategies and associated activities, it was essential that feedback loops be established between each level of the state system. A state infrastructure of linked teams, feedback loops, and communication protocols was created to ensure that practice informs policy and policy informs practice. Communication roles, schedules, and meeting formats were identified for the State Teams (State Leadership Team, the State Implementation Team, and State Implementation Team), regional teams, district teams, and school teams. These linked teams created feedback loops to help with the flow of information from the schools, districts, regions, the State and back again. Each team incorporated the use of a communication protocol which helped to guide the discussions. Included in this protocol were opportunities to discuss successes, barriers to implementation, and feedback needed up and down the linked team structures. This information was shared across all levels of the State infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes:</u> Information and data obtained through the linked team structure and feedback loops moved up the feedback loops to a level where action could be taken. Action steps for addressing issues such as state policies and procedures were addressed at the State Leadership Team. Information moved back down the feedback loops to the implementers. These feedback loops and the connections across the GaDOE Divisions have led to changes in processes and procedures. Over the past two years significant improvements were made to state and regional infrastructures to better support districts in implementing and scaling-up evidence-based practices that will improve graduation rates for all students including students with disabilities. The infrastructure components of Governance and Finance focused on the alignment of plans and initiatives at all levels of the state system (e.g. GaDOE, regions, districts, and schools) to reduce duplication, leverage resources, and maximize results for all students. This alignment of plans was essential to ensuring a common focus (e.g. vision, mission, and goals) on improving graduation rates for all students including students with disabilities. The alignment of the SSIP with the ESSA Plan has resulted in collaborative planning, delivery, and monitoring of technical assistance for districts that are supported through the School and District Effectiveness Division and the Division for Special Education Services and Supports through Student Success. This collaborative partnership is more cost effective than providing duplicated supports, and it is expected that it will have a positive impact on districts implementing their improvement activities and achieving their desired outcomes. The State Leadership Collaborative, which was developed by the Superintendent of Schools in FFY 2015 to seamlessly align the implementation efforts of individual GaDOE offices and divisions continued to support the alignment of key GaDOE plans and initiatives. The development of the Leadership Collaborative has placed a strong emphasis on effective implementation of improvement strategies and has led to common strategic planning, blending of resources, and development of strong partnerships that can be leveraged to improve graduation rates and sustain the focus on improving graduation rates over time. Staff from thirteen Federal programs at the GaDOE developed a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) that removes the requirement for districts to complete multiple assessments to meet the statutory requirements for each individual program. Completing multiple assessments leading to the development of siloed plans has led to frustration for districts, duplicative</p>

SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

The description of the component is: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Exemplary

¹ <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf> (pp. 36-39).

² <http://learningforward.org/standards/resources#.U1Es3rHD888> .

³ Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development* (pp. 79-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

⁴ Dunst, C.J., & Trivette, C.M. (2012). Moderators of the effectiveness of adult learning method practices. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8, 143-148.

⁵ <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf> (pp. 39-43).

⁶ <http://learningforward.org/standards/learning-designs#.U1GVhbHD888> .

⁷ <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf> (pp. 47-55).

⁸ <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf> (pp. 44-47).

⁹ http://learningforward.org/standards/data#.U2FGp_IdWYk .

¹⁰ <http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/sites/implementation.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-ImplementationDriversAssessingBestPractices.pdf> (pp. 15-16).