



SPDG Program Data: Improving Performance Reporting

December 1, 2020

Shauna Harps, Ph.D.
Brad Keller, Ph.D.



Center to Improve Program and Project Performance (CIPP)


Review and report *Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)* data

- 1.1. (*Program Measure 1*) Percentage of SPDG-funded initiatives that meet benchmarks for use of evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.
- 2.1. (*Program Measure 2*) The percentage of Special Education State Personnel Grant-funded initiatives that meet benchmarks for improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.
- 2.2. (*Program Measure 3*) The percentage of Special Education State Personnel Grant-funded initiatives that meet targets for the use of funds to sustain SPDG-supported practices.

Annual GPRRA Reporting

Annual performance report

- SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet
- ED 524B project status chart

	U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart	OMB No. 1894-0003 Exp. 08/31/2020																												
		PR/Award # (11 characters): _____																												
SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)																														
1. Project Objective <input type="checkbox"/> Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.																														
1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Quantitative Data</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">Target</th> <th colspan="4">Actual Performance Data</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th>%</th> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th colspan="2">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quantitative Data							Target			Actual Performance Data				Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%			/			/		
Quantitative Data																														
Target			Actual Performance Data																											
Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%																									
	/			/																										
1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Quantitative Data</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">Target</th> <th colspan="4">Actual Performance Data</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th>%</th> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th colspan="2">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quantitative Data							Target			Actual Performance Data				Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%			/			/		
Quantitative Data																														
Target			Actual Performance Data																											
Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%																									
	/			/																										
Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)																														

Worksheet: Insert Initiative Name & Initiative Year

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 <i>(please note if you are attaching documents)</i>	Project's self-rating
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>		
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). 		
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. 		

CIPP's Process for Reviewing and Reporting *GPRA* Data

- For all measures, two reviewers:
 - Independently reviewed data reported in annual performance reports.
 - Examined and rated the quality and completeness of the data.
 - Aggregated grantee data for annual reporting to OSEP.

Measure 1.1 (*Program Measure 1*)

Percentage of SPDG-funded initiatives that meet benchmarks for use of evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.



Tips for performance reporting

- ☑ Provide thorough descriptions of activities.
- ☑ Provide sufficient information about activities.
- ☑ Limit description to information relevant to the professional development component.
- ☑ Describe completed activities only.

Component Requirements and Sample Description for Measure 1.1 (*Program Measure 1*)

Rating: 1=Inadequate; 2=Barely adequate; 3=Good; 4=Exemplar

Component and Requirements

E(2) 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.

- Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing student and teacher data to recognize barriers to implementation success.
- Describe processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work.

Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success.

• School data are shared with site coaches (e.g., fidelity of implementation, teacher training completion) and sent to regional coaches. Regional coaches monitor school trends in the district and the District Checklist, and send the data to the Site Implementation Team (SIT) for analysis. The SIT shares summaries with the State Leadership Team (SLT), who reviews district and regional trends.

Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes.

Project members conduct Plan-Do-Study-Act Improvement Cycles to self-examine, self-correct, and improve implementation.

- School coaches provide guidance on how to modify policies and procedures. SITs use the Fidelity of Implementation Tool to identify actions for greater implementation and gave coaches guidance.
- The District Support Team (DST) reviews/revises district policies hindering project implementation. Regional coaches guide the DST on policy and procedural changes.
- The SLT meets twice a year to review implementation and survey data. The SLT provides guidance and suggestions to the SPDG director and assistant director for state supports, and suggests policy and process changes at the district and school levels to help increase implementation fidelity and the overall success of the project.

Poll Question 1

What rating would you give this description?

1. Inadequate
2. Barely adequate
3. Good
4. Exemplar

Component Requirements and Sample Description for Measure 1.1 (*Program Measure 1*)

Rating: 1=Inadequate; 2=Barely adequate; 3=Good; 4=Exemplar

Component and Requirements

E(2) 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.

- Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing student and teacher data to recognize barriers to implementation success.
- Describe processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work.

Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success.

• School data are shared with site coaches (e.g., fidelity of implementation, teacher training completion) and sent to regional coaches. Regional coaches monitor school trends in the district and the District Checklist, and send the data to the Site Implementation Team (SIT) for analysis. The SIT shares summaries with the State Leadership Team (SLT), who reviews district and regional trends.

Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes.

Project members conduct Plan-Do-Study-Act Improvement Cycles to self-examine, self-correct, and improve implementation.

- School coaches provide guidance on how to modify policies and procedures. SITs use the Fidelity of Implementation Tool to identify actions for greater implementation and gave coaches guidance.
- The District Support Team (DST) reviews/revises district policies hindering project implementation. Regional coaches guide the DST on policy and procedural changes.
- The SLT meets twice a year to review implementation and survey data. The SLT provides guidance and suggestions to the SPDG director and assistant director for state supports, and suggests policy and process changes at the district and school levels to help increase implementation fidelity and the overall success of the project.

Component Requirements and Sample Description for Measure 1.1 (*Program Measure 1*)

Rating: 1=Inadequate; 2=Barely adequate; 3=Good; 4=Exemplar

Component and Requirements

E(2) 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.

- Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing student and teacher data to recognize barriers to implementation success.
- Describe processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work.

Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success.

Districts receive a data dashboard report that includes a summary of the evaluation data collected through the SPDG. During the annual Building Leadership Team Meeting, building teams review the data, identify barriers, revisit their action plan, and implement strategies to remove the barrier. When assistance is needed, the district team communicates any needs or concerns to the SPDG Co-Directors and/or Coaching Coordinator.

Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes.

District teams and the coach are the first level to address barriers. If unable to find a resolution, the next step would be to bring the barrier to the Co-Directors and/or SPDG Advisory Group. They would make recommendations to the district level or state leadership level depending on the complexity of the issue.

Poll Question 2

What rating would you give this description?

1. Inadequate
2. Barely adequate
3. Good
4. Exemplar

Component Requirements and Sample Description for Measure 1.1 (*Program Measure 1*)

Rating: 1=Inadequate; 2=Barely adequate; 3=Good; 4=Exemplar

Component and Requirements

E(2) 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.

- Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing student and teacher data to recognize barriers to implementation success.

Incomplete

- Describe processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work.

Incomplete

Describe processes for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing input and data from various levels of the education system to recognize barriers to implementation success.

Districts receive a data dashboard report that includes a summary of the evaluation data collected through the SPDG. During the annual Building Leadership Team Meeting, building teams review the data, identify barriers, revisit their action plan, and implement strategies to remove the barrier. When assistance is needed, the district team communicates any needs or concerns to the SPDG Co-Directors and/or Coaching Coordinator.

Describe processes for revising policies and procedures and making other necessary changes.

District teams and the coach are the first level to address barriers. If unable to find a resolution, the next step would be to bring the barrier to the Co-Directors and/or SPDG Advisory Group. They would make recommendations to the district level or state leadership level depending on the complexity of the issue.

Measure 2.1 (*Program Measure 2*)

The percentage of Special Education State Personnel Grant-funded initiatives that meet benchmarks for improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.

Tips for performance reporting

- ☑ Work with your program officer to confirm that targets are appropriate and achievable.
- ☑ Use the correct equation.

Number of professional
development participants
meeting the benchmark



Total number of professional
development participants

- ☑ Report complete data.
- ☑ Enter data in the correct location of the project status chart (e.g., target vs. actual).
- ☑ Sum benchmarks with multiple components into a single numerator and denominator.

Sample Data for Measure 2.1 (*Program Measure 2*)

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Target			Actual		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
In Year 3 of MTSS implementation, 80% of schools that received 2 years or more of SPDG support will score 85% or more on the MTSS fidelity rubric.	Program		24/30	80		26/30	87



Performance Measure	Measure Type	Target			Actual		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
In Year 3 of MTSS implementation, 90% of schools that received 2 years or more of SPDG support will score 85% or more on the MTSS fidelity rubric.	Program			87			90



Measure 2.2 (*Program Measure 3*)

The percentage of Special Education State Personnel Grant-funded initiatives that meet targets for the use of funds to sustain SPDG-supported practices.

Tips for performance reporting

- ☑ Use the correct equation.

Cost of technical assistance



Cost of all professional
development activities

- ☑ Report complete data.
- ☑ Enter data in correct location of the project status chart (e.g., target vs actual).
- ☑ Sum multiple costs for an initiative into a single numerator and denominator.

Sample Data for Measure 2.2 (Program Measure 3)

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Target			Actual		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
✓ Percent of the project's professional development funds supporting the project that is used for follow-up activities designed to sustain the use.	Program		540,000 / 900,000	60		630,000 / 900,000	70

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Target			Actual		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
X Percent of the project's sustainability funds used for follow-up activities designed to support the initiative.	Program		180,000 / 300,000	60		210,000 / 300,000	70

Recommendations for Reporting Across Measures

- Categorize **project** and **program (GPRA)** measure data clearly.
- Report the numerator, denominator, and resulting percentage for each measure and initiative.
- If multiple instruments are used to report on one measure, report aggregated data on unduplicated counts of participants.
- Provide relevant information in the Explanation of Progress (EOP).
- Ensure that information in the table and EOP are consistent.



1.a. Performance Measure		Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
			Target			Actual Performance Data		
			Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				/			/	

1.b. Performance Measure		Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
			Target			Actual Performance Data		
			Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				/			/	

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

Key Takeaways

- Set realistic targets
- Review report guidance carefully
- Report complete data
- Check data for accuracy and completeness
- Consult with your program officer if necessary

Resources and Support

- Visit OSEP's IDEAs That Work website (<https://osepideasthatwork.org/>) for useful tools and resources.

CIPP Team

- CIPP@westat.com
- (888) 843-4101



Questions and Discussion