

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

OSEP FY 2021 Grant Performance Report

CFDA # 84.323A

PR/Award # H323A200002

Budget Period # 2

Report Type: Annual Performance

PR/Award # H323A200002

Table of Contents

Sl#	Title	Page#
1.	Project Narrative - Completed SF 425 -----	3
2.	Project Narrative - Optional attachment for additional Section A text -----	4
3.	Section_A_Additional_EBPD_Rubric_Eval_Plan.pdf -----	5
4.	Project Narrative - Signed Cover Sheet -----	67
5.	Signed_524b_Cover_Sheet_5_4_22.pdf -----	68
6.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Cover Sheet - Revised 2015 -----	70
7.	Idaho_SPDG_Executive_Summary_2022.pdf -----	72
8.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1 -----	74
9.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2 -----	75
10.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3 -----	76
11.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4 -----	77
12.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C -----	78
13.	Section_B_3_20_22.pdf -----	79
14.	Section_C_3_30_22.pdf -----	81

Project Narrative - Completed SF 425

Title : Completed SF 425

Attachment:

File :
1

Project Narrative - Optional attachment for additional Section A text

Title : Optional attachment for additional Section A text

Attachment:

File :

- 1 [Section_A_Additional_EBPD_Rubric_Eval_Plan.pdf](#)



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 07/31/2021

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 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

I.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%

I.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
After one school year of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of school leadership teams will meet implementation components indicated on the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist (scoring 80% or greater), or increase their score by 10% from the previous year's assessment.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			17/22	80%		999 / 999	100

I.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Annually, 100% of the skill-based trainings provided will have 90% of the adult-learning principles in place, as observed using the high-quality PD checklist.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			7 / 7	100%		3 / 7	43%

I.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the knowledge-based learning targets.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			15/19	79%		17/19	89%

I.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the skill-based learning targets.	PROJ						
			20/26	77%		24/26	92%

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%	

The Project Director self-rated 14 out of 16 of the items a 3 or a 4.

1.b. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure was collected in August 2021 at the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading training during the Fall Institute. The trainer recommended teams complete the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist (Checklist) as a school leadership team but some teams with multiple participating schools decided it made more sense for them to complete as a district. Teams scored each indicator over all 5 elements. To calculate the average overall score for this measure, we found the average score for each element and then calculated the average of all the element scores. The first year of performance data will be collected in August 2022 and reported for the first time in the 2023 APR. Below is a table of the baseline scores for each participating program.

School/District	Average Percent Implemented 2021
Kuna-Hubbard Elementary	43%
Minidoka-Heyburn Elementary	65%
Mullan Elementary	14%
Notus Elementary	45%
Preston-Oakwood Elementary	23%
Project Impact STEM	51%
St Maries-Heyburn Elementary	35%
Sugar Salem-Central Elementary	55%
Wendell Elementary	58%
Filer School District	27%
West Ada-Virtual School House	93%
Twin Falls-Bickel Elementary	40%
Blackfoot-Fort Hall Elementary	49%
Blackfoot-Ridge Crest Elementary	44%
Blackfoot-Wapello Elementary	37%
Boundary School District	38%
Gem Prep Schools	49%
Snake River-Moreland Elementary	26%
Snake River-Riverside Elementary	45%
Snake River-Rockford Elementary	14%
Ririe Elementary	Did not submit data
Lapwai Elementary	44%
Future Public School	74%

There are some data quality considerations for this measure. First, as the Checklist is used as a self-assessment, the scores reflect the school leadership team members' understanding, beliefs, and biases. The measure from year to year likely will not have high reliability, as members' perceptions will likely change as they learn more about the work and members

may leave or new members join the team. The second data quality issue is that not all schools completed the Checklist and/or submitted the data. We anticipate that some programs that decided to complete the Checklist in August 2021 as a district instead of a school may decide to complete the Checklist in August 2022 as a school team. If this happens, it will be more difficult to compare data from year to year for these programs.

1.c. Performance Measure.: The Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development (Version 3) (HQPD Checklist-3) was used to evaluate the quality of 7 trainings from August 2021 through February 2022. In cases where the same trainer delivered multiple similar trainings, only one session was evaluated. For example, a trainer facilitated three separate trainings on the various fidelity of instruction rubrics and only one of the three was observed. Two separate evaluators observed each of the 7 trainings. The two evaluators checklist scores were then calibrated. Where there was disagreement in scores, the individual calibrating the scores looked at the evidence provided and determined if the evidence met or did not meet the component. The overall percentage score was calculated by dividing the number of components on the checklist that were met by the total number of components. 3 out of 7 trainings met the target of having 90% of the components from the checklist in place. The percentage scores for each of the trainings are as follows: Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading, 90%; Reading Instruction training, 95%; Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Rubric training, 81%; Leading by Convening, 62%; Serving on Groups, 65%; Librarian training, 90%; Coaching training, 86%.

After each training, the SPDG Project Director summarized all the evaluation data into a report and met individually with each trainer. She presented the data and suggestions for improvement. She will review the report again with each trainer when planning for the delivery of the trainings in the 2022-23 school year to ensure that the improvements are implemented.

1.d. Performance Measure: 11 trainings were delivered from August 2021-February 2022. Training participants were sent a post-training survey upon completion of the training. A follow up email was sent within 2 weeks of the training to increase the response rates. Participants were asked how much they improved as a result of the training according to each of the knowledge-based learning targets. Question categories were on a 5-point likert scale of “Extremely Improved”, “Much Improved”, “Somewhat Improved”, “Little Improved”, and “Not at all Improved”. The three categories of “Extremely Improved”, “Much Improved”, and “Somewhat Improved” were combined and considered as meeting the measure. Those who responded “Little Improved” and “Not at all Improved” were combined and considered as not meeting the measure. There were 19 total knowledge-based learning targets among the 7 trainings. Over 80% of participants responded that they met the measure on 17 out of 19 of the knowledge-based learning targets. See the table below for details of each of the trainings and learning targets.

Training Name	% of respondents meeting knowledge-based target
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading Training Response rate = 125/160 (78%)	Learning Target #1 – 114/125 = 91%
Teaching the Foundational Skills training Response rate = 29/55 (53%)	Learning Target #1 -- 27/29 = 93%
Data-Based Decision Making for Reading Instruction Response rate = 18/21 (86%)	Learning Target #1 – 18/18 = 100% Learning Target #2 – 18/18 = 100%
Teaching Vocabulary training Response rate = 6/6 (100%)	Learning Target #1 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #2 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #3 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #4 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #5 – 6/6 = 100%
Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Comprehensive Decoding Rubric training Response rate = 6/45 (13%)	Learning Target #1 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #2 – 6/6 = 100% Learning Target #3 – 6/6 = 100%
Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Data-Based Decision-Making Rubric training Response rate = 14/20 (70%)	Learning Target #1 – 14/14 = 100%
Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Reading for Meaning Rubric training Response rate = 0/6 (0%)	No survey responses
Leading by Convening	Learning Target #1 – 11/14 = 79%

Response rate = 14/40 (35%)	Learning Target #2 – 11/14 = 79% Learning Target #3 – 13/14 = 93%
Serving on Groups Response rate = 17/20 (85%)	Learning Target #1 – 16/17 = 94% Learning Target #2 – 14/17 = 82% Learning Target #3 – 14/17 = 82% Learning Target #4 – 17/17 = 100%
Library training Response rate = 59/59 (100%)	Learning Target #1 – 52/59 = 88%
Coaching training	No knowledge-based learning targets

In addition to collecting the post-training survey data to assess improvement in participants' knowledge, the Idaho SPDG team collected data for some of the trainings by asking participants to answer multiple choice or true/false questions before and after their participation. For example, librarians participating in the online asynchronous Librarian training modules answered true/false and multiple-choice questions before taking the modules, and then again after completing the modules. Additionally, in some live virtual trainings, trainers asked participants to answer poll questions before the training and then asked the same questions again at the end of the training.

There are a couple of data quality considerations for this program measure. As the data were obtained through a post-training survey, not every individual was captured. Some surveys had low response rates. We will work with trainers to ensure that in the 2022-23 school year trainings, facilitators ask participants to complete the post-training surveys as an exit ticket. Additionally, these data are based on participants' perceptions and are subjective. For the trainings that will be delivered in the 2022-23 school year, the Project Director and External Evaluator will work with each trainer individually to determine if there are more objective ways to measure pre and post data to assess knowledge that are appropriate to the training format and learning targets.

1.e. Performance Measure: 11 trainings were delivered from August 2021-February 2022. Training participants were sent a post-training survey upon completion of the training. A follow up email was sent within 2 weeks of the training to increase the response rates. Participants were asked how much they improved as a result of the training according to each of the skill-based learning targets. Question categories were on a 5-point likert scale of “Extremely Improved”, “Much Improved”, “Somewhat Improved”, “Little Improved”, and “Not at all Improved”. The three categories of “Extremely Improved”, “Much Improved”, and “Somewhat Improved” were combined and considered as meeting the measure. Those who responded “Little Improved” and “Not at all Improved” were combined and considered as not meeting the measure. There were 26 total skill-based learning targets among the 7 trainings. Over 80% of participants responded that they met the measure on 24 out of 26 of the skill-based learning targets. See the table below for details of each of the trainings and learning targets.

Training Name	% of respondents meeting skill-based target
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading Training Response rate = 125/160 (78%)	Learning Target #1 – 103/125 = 90% Learning Target #2 – 118/125 = 94% Learning Target #3 – 112/124 = 90% Learning Target #4 – 112/124 = 90% Learning Target #5 – 111/124 = 88%
Teaching the Foundational Skills training Response rate = 29/55 (53%)	Learning Target #1 -- 28/29 = 97% Learning Target #2 – 28/29 = 97%
Data-Based Decision Making for Reading Instruction Response rate = 18/21 (86%)	Learning Target #1 – 18/18 = 100%
Teaching Vocabulary training Response rate = 6/6 (100%)	Learning Target #1 – 6/6 = 100%

Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Comprehensive Decoding Rubric training Response rate = 6/45 (13%)	Learning Target #1 – 6/6 = 100%
Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Data-Based Decision-Making Rubric training Response rate = 14/20 (70%)	Learning Target #1 – 13/14 = 93% Learning Target #2 – 14/14 = 100%
Recognizing Effective Special Education Teacher (RESET) Reading for Meaning Rubric training Response rate = 0/6 (0%)	No survey responses
Leading by Convening Response rate = 14/40 (35%)	Learning Target #1 – 12/14 = 86% Learning Target #2 – 12/14 = 86% Learning Target #3 – 11/14 = 79%
Serving on Groups Response rate = 17/20 (85%)	Learning Target #1 – 13/17 = 76% Learning Target #2 – 14/17 = 82% Learning Target #3 – 17/17 = 100% Learning Target #4 – 14/17 = 82% Learning Target #5 – 15/17 = 88%
Library training Response rate = 59/59 (100%)	Learning Target #1 – 57/59 = 97% Learning Target #2 – 58/59 = 98% Learning Target #3 – 55/59 = 93% Learning Target #4 – 51/59 = 86%
Coaching training Response rate = 5/6 (83%)	Learning Target #1 – 5/5 = 100% Learning Target #2 – 5/5 = 100%

There are a couple of data quality considerations for this program measure. As the data were obtained through a post-training survey, not every individual was captured. Some surveys had low response rates. We will work with trainers to ensure that in the 2022-23 school year trainings, facilitators ask participants to complete the post-training surveys as an exit ticket. Additionally, these data are based on participants' perceptions and are, therefore, subjective. For the trainings that will be delivered in the 2022-23 school year, the Project Director and External Evaluator will work with each trainer individually to determine if there are more objective ways to measure pre and post data to assess skills that are appropriate to the training format and learning targets.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 07/31/2021

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

The Idaho SPDG will use a continuous improvement model to inform, monitor, improve, and achieve high fidelity in instructional staff's implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of instructional staff will reach full implementation on an explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10% or more from the previous year's assessment.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			40/50	80%		999/999	100

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach full implementation on the instructional coaching fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10 percentage points or more from the previous year's assessment.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			16/20	100		999 /999	100

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach 80% interrater reliability on the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric with an expert rater, or improve interrater reliability by 10% or more from the previous year's assessment.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			16/20	100		999/999	100

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

2.a. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR.

2.b. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR.

2.c. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 07/31/2021

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

The Idaho SPDG will deliver follow-up activities to sustain instructional staff in their implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The Idaho SPDG will use at least 50% of total funds in year 2, 60% in year 3, and 70% in years 4-5 to provide follow-up activities and ongoing technical assistance to sustain the implementation of project practices.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			255,512/511,025	50		333,544/511,025	65

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Annually, 80% of coaches and teachers participating in onsite coaching and technical assistance visits will report that their skills will improve as a result of the onsite visit, as measured by a post-onsite technical assistance survey.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			20/25	80%		24/25	96%

3.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Annually, all virtual collaboratives will have 90% of the effective facilitation practices for virtual meetings in place, as observed using a virtual facilitation checklist.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3/3	100		3/3	100

3.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
--------------------------	--------------	-------------------	--	--	--	--

By the end of year 4 of project implementation, all LEAs will have 80% of the items scored at 5 or above on a program sustainability assessment tool.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			7/7	100		999/999	100

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

3.a. Program Measure: The Fall Institute trainings were considered “initial trainings” for the purposes of calculating this performance measure. We calculated the cost of the initial training by summing all the contractor costs, LEA drawdowns associated with the initial trainings, and all personnel costs for the month of August, the month that the Fall Institute trainings occurred. The Fall Institute costs ended up being \$177,481. We considered all other costs for the reporting period as funds that supported follow-up activities. We subtracted the Fall Institute costs from the total amount expended during the performance period (\$511,025). We ended up with a value of \$333,544 expended on follow-up activities. We divided \$333,544 by \$511,025 to calculate the percent of funds spent on follow-up activities, which was 65%

3.b. Program Measure: SPDG state coaches provided virtual one-on-one technical assistance and coaching in 15 schools in October 2021 and in-person in 14 schools in February and March 2022 (1 school cancelled due to school closure). State coaches observed teachers’ classroom instruction, provided feedback, modeled instruction, coached, and provided training to school staff. Additionally, school leadership teams met and participated in systems coaching. Participants were sent a post-onsite visit survey via email after each visit. A reminder email was sent within 2 weeks. Participants responded by choosing a likert-scale type response to the following statement, “The support I received in the In-District Visit will help me improve my skills.” Those who responded with “Strongly Agree”, and “Agree” were combined and reported as agreeing with the statement. After the fall 2021 visit, 13/14 respondents (93%) agreed with the statement, and 11/11 (100%) after the spring 2022 visit.

Qualitative data was also collected to learn about how participants thought the supports would impact their skills. Common responses were that getting one-on-one support, receiving immediate feedback, and state coaches modeling practices were all valuable aspects of the support that would help them improve their skills.

There are a couple of data quality considerations for this program measure. As the data were obtained through a survey, not every individual was captured and the response rate was relatively low (fall response rate = 14/49 (29%), spring response rate = 11/49 (22%). For improving the response rate in the future, we will work with state coaches to ask onsite visit participants to complete the survey at the end of the technical assistance session. Additionally, these data are based on participants’ perceptions and are, therefore, subjective. We cannot say that participants did, indeed, improve their skills as a result of the technical assistance visit.

3.c. Program Measure: From September 2021 through February 2022, the SPDG state implementation team facilitated three unique collaboratives. State coaches led the Collaborative Calls for instructional staff and coaches every month or every other month, depending on the year of project participation. The SSIP Coordinator facilitated Special Education Director Calls monthly, and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) facilitated a monthly Parent Collaborative for parents on school leadership teams. An evaluator observed each of these three calls using the Virtual Facilitation Checklist once between February and March 2022. The checklist is comprised of 27 indicators of effective facilitation. For each indicator the evaluator answered as “yes” if the practice was observed, “no” if the practice was not observed, or “N/A” if the practice was not relevant to the meeting. Virtual Facilitation Checklist scores for the three collaboratives were as follows: Collaborative Call for instructional staff and coaches, 18/19 (95%); Special Education Director Call, 20/21 (95%); Parent Collaborative, 23/23 (100%).

3.d. Program Measure: We will work on adapting a program sustainability checklist in spring 2022 to begin using with school and district leadership in the 2022-23 school year. Baseline data will be collected in the 2022-23 school year.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 07/31/2021

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

The Idaho SPDG project activities will result in improved reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of Idaho SPDG schools will have 100% of students with disabilities reading on grade level or will improve from fall to spring by 10 percentage points each year of the project.	PRGM						
		26/32		80%		999/999	100

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
After 2 school years of project participation, 50% of Idaho SPDG schools' percentage of students with disabilities scoring on grade level in reading will be greater than the state average, with 60% after 3 years, and 70% after 4 years.	PROJ						
		16/32		50%		999/999	100

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

4.a. Performance Measure: Baseline data will be collected in fall 2022 and reported in the 2023 APR using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator by Istation. Students with disabilities scoring in Tier 1 (on grade level in reading) will be included in the numerator and the total number of students with disabilities taking the assessment will make up the denominator. We calculated the percentage of students with disabilities reading on grade level according to the Fall 2021 Idaho Reading Indicator administration for schools participating in the Idaho SPDG in the 2021-22 school year. Some schools' data had to be masked due to the number of students not meeting Idaho's minimum reporting requirements. The percentages are as follows:

School Name	Fall 2021 Percentage Tier 1
ACEQUIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	18%
BICKEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	19%
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39%
FORT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	<5%

FILER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	12%
FUTURE PUBLIC SCHOOL	9%
GEM PREP: MERIDIAN	38%
GEM PREP: NAMPA	18%
GEM PREP: ONLINE	<5%
GEM PREP: POCATELLO SCHOOL	28%
HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - MINIDOKA	16%
HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - ST MARIES	11%
HOLLISTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13%
HUBBARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	17%
LAPWAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	6%
MORELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	18%
MOUNT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	25%
MULLAN SCHOOLS	20%
NAPLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	8%
NOTUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	18%
OAKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	32%
PIONEER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	37%
PROJECT IMPACT STEM ACADEMY	24%
RIDGE CREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	25%
RIRIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	17%
RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	<5%
RUPERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	18%
UPRIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	<5%
VALLEY VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21%
VIRTUAL SCHOOL HOUSE	29%
WAPELLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	<5%
WENDELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	10%

4.b. Performance Measure: Baseline data will be collected in spring 2022 and reported in the 2023 APR.

Initiative Name and Year: Cultivating Readers, March 1, 2021 through February 28, 2022

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.

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
A(1) Selection	<p>Clear expectations are provided for PD participants and for schools, districts, or other entities.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description of expectations for PD participants (e.g., attendance in training, data reporting, pre and post training activities). ● Identification of what schools, districts, or other entities agreed to provide (e.g., necessary resources, supports, facilitative administration for the participants). ● Description of how schools, districts, or other entities were informed of their responsibilities. <p>Provide a brief description of the form(s) used for these agreements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expectations for PD participants: Expectations for PD participants in the Idaho SPDG vary by role and year in the project and include attendance in trainings and follow-up activities, data reporting, and using data-driven decision making. All participants were required to participate in PD training and follow-up activities. PD activities included the Fall Institute and coaching trainings, online training modules, in-district coaching and technical assistance, virtual collaborative meetings, school leadership team meetings, special education director virtual meetings, and instructional coaching sessions. Virtual trainings were recorded and available online if participants were unable to attend trainings live. For in-person trainings, online training modules were developed with facilitator guides and accompanying resources. Project team members who were unable to join the trainings in-person had access to these online modules. If new members joined the school implementation team mid-year, they were able to catch up using these materials. All participants were required to collect data, use it for decision-making, and submit select data to the state leadership team. ● What have schools, districts, or other entities agreed to provide? Upon application for participation, each LEA Superintendent was required to read and sign an agreement during the application window for participation in the 2021-22 school year. Superintendents signed an agreement to provide the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage in a collaborative needs assessment process using SDE recommended tools and develop a comprehensive action plan following the project’s continuous improvement process 2. Identify priority area(s) and select evidence-based practice(s) responsive to needs of student groups 3. Identify district leadership team members that include special education director, principal(s), instructional coach(es), general education teacher(s), special education teacher(s) and parents/family members to support the implementation of evidence-based practices, explicit instruction, instructional coaching, and family engagement. Some small LEAs will have one person participating in multiple team roles. 4. Participate in the project for the four consecutive years 5. Require instructional staff and LEA coaches to complete online training modules (first year of participation only) 6. Prioritize resources to allow ongoing collaboration among LEA coach, instructional staff, and leadership team members including opportunities to attend monthly district leadership team meetings 7. Collect and submit all required project data to the SDE

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

8. Assess all kindergarten through third grade students with disabilities in reading monthly for progress monitoring through Istation
9. Continuously engage in data-based decision making to identify and overcome barriers to implementation
10. Support the participation of the identified district leadership team members in professional development and ongoing activities including:
 - a. Participation in project trainings, ongoing collaboratives and technical assistance
 - b. Meeting regularly with the district leadership team, state leadership team staff and project consultants, as necessary

- **How were schools, districts, or other entities informed of their responsibilities?**

District and school teams were informed of their responsibilities through multiple resources that are all available on the Idaho SPDG website. These materials, resources and meetings included the following:

- A one-hour meeting with special education directors whose districts were already participants of the SSIP project to inform them of the additional requirements under the Idaho SPDG and to answer questions
- A 30-minute informational webinar outlining project activities and requirements
- A detailed implementation guide that includes information on all requirements including project activities and data collection
- Activities checklists that were differentiated for each individual role in the project, specifying activities and data collection required each month during the year.
- Superintendent signed letter of intent with agreement form
- An entry meeting between the principal of each participating school and a state consultant
- A webinar for business managers on fiscal expectations and requirements
- Participants submitted individual agreements in the electronic registration form agreeing to complete project requirements according to their role and year in the project
- LEAs receiving sub-awards agreed to use funds appropriately and track expenditures quarterly to submit to the ISDE for monitoring
- On-on-one in-person and/or virtual calls with LEA administrators and team members

- **Brief description of the agreement forms**

Each LEA Superintendent was required to sign and submit an agreement to the bullets outlined under question 2. During project registration, each project participant signed an electronic agreement to complete all required project activities and data collection according to their role in the project. Additionally, principals and special education directors on the leadership teams agreed to provide facilitative administration of project activities including meeting with leadership teams at least monthly, using a continuous improvement process to identify and overcome barriers, implement and update an action plan for systems improvements, use data for decision making and continuously work towards sustaining and scaling up of evidence-based practices in the building and district.

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

<p>A(2) Selection</p>	<p>Clear expectations are provided for SPDG trainers and SPDG coaches/ mentors.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for trainers’ qualifications and experience and how these qualifications are 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 are ascertained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Description of role and responsibilities for coaches or mentors (the people who provided follow-up to training). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for trainers’ qualifications and experience and how these qualifications are ascertained: <p>All Idaho SPDG trainers except trainers from Idaho’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) had been training Idaho’s SSIP participants for numerous years before receiving support through the SPDG. Their SPDG contracts were a continuation and expansion of their training responsibilities in the SSIP. All trainers were initially chosen through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process or with sole-source authorization if they have unique experience or expertise in the content area(s) for which they deliver training. Additionally, each trainer submitted a resume or curriculum vitae to the Project Director which was provided with the Idaho SPDG application in September 2020. Descriptions of each Idaho SPDG trainer’s qualifications and experience are outlined below.</p> <p>Metis Education Consulting Group trainers were chosen for the SSIP project for which this grant supports through a request for proposal (RFP) process in August 2014 resulting in their being awarded a service contract for providing training and coaching. Metis provided evidence of meeting the qualifications, including a deep understanding of multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), knowledge of adult learning theory in relation to professional development, and an understanding of how data is used to inform training and coaching. Within Metis Education Consulting group’s proposal for the RFP, each trainer’s experience was delineated. Each of the co-owners of Metis has experience as an administrator, specialized training in MTSS, and extensive experience working with states in the area of providing training and coaching for improving reading instruction. The Metis Education Consulting group contract was renewed annually, based on the performance of coaching evaluations and participating LEAs’ feedback. Metis consultants work cross-departmentally with the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) Principals’ Network and Idaho SMART PD, are familiar with Idaho schools and have expertise in multiple reading curricula and interventions.</p> <p>Dr. Evelyn Johnson, Professor in the Department of Early and Special Education at Boise State University, was selected in 2017 to train SSIP teachers and coaches on the use of the RESET observation protocols (RESET Rubrics) she developed through a grant from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The SSIP and Idaho SPDG utilize the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR) to measure fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading (Moylan, L.A., et. al, 2018). The contract with Dr. Johnson was developed with sole-source authorization due to her unique knowledge and experience with the rubrics as their developer. Dr. Johnson was also the CEO of Lee Pesky Learning Center, a non-profit education consultancy firm that partnered with Boise State University to develop the RESET Rubrics. Lee Pesky Learning Center will be conducting the external evaluation of instructional staff using the CDR.</p> <p>Carol Dissen and Dr. Scott Baker with the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL) began providing training for SSIP participants in 2017 and continued under the Idaho SPDG. NCIL consultants have unique knowledge and experience in training district and school staff on using tools they developed, which the SSIP and Idaho SPDG utilize as school infrastructure assessments. NCIL developed the Planning and Evaluation Tool – Reading (PET-R), which was utilized in the SSIP work until fall 2020. NCIL updated, expanded and re-named the tool the “MTSS-R Implementation Checklist” (2020) and the SSIP began using the new tool in fall 2020. Since the NCIL consultants developed the</p>
---------------------------	--	--

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

instrument, they have the unique skills required to deliver the trainings on its use and are contracted with sole-source authorization.

Angela Lindig, the Executive Director (ED) of Idaho Parents Unlimited, Idaho's PTI, trained LEA leadership team administrators (principals and special education directors) in Leading by Convening, and leadership team parents in Serving on Groups. Angela has been the ED of IPUL for 12 years and has extensive experience providing training to parents and professionals on special education topics and has been trained to deliver both Idaho SPDG trainings. As the ED of Idaho's only PTI, Angela has unique experience and expertise. The Idaho SPDG contract with IPUL has sole-source authorization.

- **Description of role and responsibilities for trainers:**

All trainers signed a contract outlining the scope of work and other requirements and responsibilities. Trainers were required to plan, develop and deliver trainings using the Evaluation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development [Version 3] (HQPD Checklist-3) (Gaumer, E., et al, 2020) as a guide to meet indicators of effective adult-learning strategies. Trainers were required to use Universal Design for Learning principles when developing and delivering trainings to maximize accessibility. In addition, they were required to create training materials to be sustainable whenever possible (e.g. video-recording live trainings or developing asynchronous modules). Trainers were responsible for meeting with SPDG state leadership team staff before each training to discuss the training format, materials and learning objectives. They met again with SPDG state leadership team staff within three weeks of completed trainings to review training data and plan for improvements.

- **Expectations for coaches'/mentors' qualifications and experience and how these qualifications are ascertained:**

Metis consultants provided an all-inclusive, comprehensive training, technical assistance, and coaching system for the Idaho SPDG. The Metis group serves as consultants in filling both the roles of SPDG trainers and SPDG state coaches for the target schools. The qualifications and experience of Metis trainers are outlined above.

LEAs identified their own coaches to build capacity within their LEA. The coaches' levels of experience varied according to LEA and their position within the LEA. Upon project registration, LEA coaches rated their expertise in reading instruction and coaching to determine the level of training needed. Coaches were offered training in foundational reading skills, explicit instruction, and instructional coaching. They received intensive technical assistance from the SPDG state coaches and will be assessed for fidelity of implementation of instructional coaching, as well as for interrater reliability on scoring the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric, beginning in year 2 of their participation (2022-23 school year).

- **Description of role and responsibilities for coaches or mentors:**

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

State coaches (Metis) signed a contract in September 2021 which outlined activities, roles, responsibilities, and timelines including; delivery of face-to-face institute trainings, virtual small group meetings, in-district coaching and technical assistance in delivery of effective reading instruction, development of evaluation tools, observations of LEA coaches, and data submission. During the 2021-22 school year, Metis and the SPDG state leadership team met monthly to review the contract, debrief interactions with project participants, review coaching data, and discuss barriers to implementation and improvement strategies. Specific responsibilities of the contracted coaches are detailed below.

- Conduct a virtual ‘entry conversation’ with each participating building principal to develop rapport and gauge team’s strengths and needs.
- Provide one day of training to all instructional staff and LEA coaches at the initial fall training.
- Provide one day of coaching training to LEA coaches
- Meet monthly or bimonthly in collaborative virtual calls with LEA coaches and instructional staff
- Visit schools twice per year (years 2-4 of participation) onsite to provide in-person technical assistance and coaching to LEA staff
- Conduct observations of LEA coaches and debrief post-observation
- Collect and submit coaching fidelity data to SPDG state leadership team
- Train, share resources, and have virtual conversations with LEA coaches and instructional staff on the virtual coaching platform
- Submit consultant coaching logs to SPDG state leadership team after each coaching session

LEA coaches were responsible for providing coaching to identified instructional staff participants, including both general and special education staff. LEA coaches in years 2, 3 and 4 of project implementation were responsible for reviewing video recordings the instructional staff recorded and uploaded to a virtual coaching platform, providing feedback, and meeting with the instructional staff to discuss improvement strategies, review data, model instruction, set and revise goals, etc. LEA coaches were required to complete this process each month per instructional staff. They were also responsible for conducting a formal observation for each teacher in the fall to score the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric and submit to the SPDG state leadership team. They will be required to complete this process again in the spring. Additionally, they were required to record their own coaching session, self-assess using the coaching fidelity of implementation rubric, and submit to the state coaches. They will be required to do this again in the spring. Additionally, LEA coaches were responsible for attending all required trainings, collaborative virtual calls, in-district visits with consultant coaches, and monthly meetings with their school leadership teams.

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
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– include name and position/title. • Description of the lead person(s)' role and responsibilities related to developing and supporting evidence-based professional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead person(s) accountable for training (include name and position/title): The Project Director, Kailey Bunch-Woodson, and SSIP Coordinator, Shannon Dunstan, oversee all scheduling and delivery of trainings. • Lead person(s)' role and responsibilities related to developing and supporting evidence-based professional development: The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator dedicated a substantial amount of time (.8 full-time equivalency, each) to the Idaho SSIP/SPDG professional development activities. The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator met at least weekly to discuss activities that were in progress or upcoming and for planning. The Project Director's role was to manage all project activities. Some of these activities follow. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and manage project systems • Meet with the Principal Investigator and Fiscal Coordinator weekly to discuss contracts and data, review project expenditures, provide updates on project activities, and plan for project improvements based on evaluation data • Meet with the external evaluator biweekly to collaboratively implement the project evaluation, discuss evaluation data and improvements to the evaluation system, and plan actions to be taken based on the data and communication to stakeholders • Meet with partners to develop scopes of work and discuss contracts, review training data and develop action plans for improving or refining trainings and/or coaching activities • Delegate project tasks to other SDE SPDG staff • Conduct fiscal monitoring of LEAs quarterly • Create and disseminate monthly emails to project participants to communicate project activities and data to stakeholders • Create and disseminate performance reports for participating LEAs, share data with school leadership teams, build leadership teams' data literacy, and provide technical assistance related to data • Recruit new schools for participation • Participate in and complete all SPDG Project Directors meetings and SPDG requirements including presenting in webinars and conferences, being the first line of communication with OSEP, submitting the APR, and submitting any program or budget modification requests

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage various stakeholder groups for continuous project improvement <p>The SSIP Coordinator’s role is to work directly with school leadership teams on implementing project evidence-based practices. Some of the activities follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit LEAs for participation Organize LEAs’ participation in project activities including developing timelines, agendas, and training materials Facilitate special education director virtual meetings monthly to provide training and technical assistance on implementation science Attend in-district coaching and technical assistance visits with project consultants to deliver systems-level coaching and assist school leadership teams in building the infrastructure to support evidence-based reading instruction Meet with partners to develop scopes of work and discuss contracts, review training data and develop action plans for improving or refining trainings and/or coaching activities Review project data with Project Director and develop improvement activities Engage various stakeholder groups for continuous project improvement
<p>B(2) Training</p>	<p>Effective research-based adult learning strategies are used.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of adult learning strategies used, including the source of those strategies (e.g., citation). Description of how these adult learning strategies were used. Description of data gathered to assess how well adult learning strategies were used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adult learning strategies used, including the source of those strategies (e.g., citation): <p>At the initial meeting with each consultant trainer in December 2020, consultants were told by the SPDG state leadership team that all trainings were required to be developed and delivered according to the research on effective adult learning strategies. All SPDG trainers were sent a copy of the HQPD Checklist-3 and notified that their trainings would be evaluated using the tool. The HQPD Checklist-3 was developed through a review of the research on effective professional development and through the developers’ own experience of observing more than 500 professional development sessions.</p> <p>Each SPDG consultant’s contract explicitly stated that the HQPD Checklist-3 would be used to evaluate the trainings they delivered and that the trainings should be designed to meet the indicators. Trainers were reminded of this when developing the 2021-22 contracts and the same verbiage was included again, requiring them to design trainings to meet indicators on the HQPD Checklist-3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were these adult learning strategies used? <p>The SPDG professional development adult learning strategies were accomplished through the following:</p> <p>Preparing for learning: trainers provided learning objectives and agendas in advance of the training, followed the agenda, and communicated their expertise during the training to establish credibility</p> <p>Contextualizing the content: trainers contextualized the content by explicitly stating how it fits into the greater SPDG professional development project and within their own settings, summarized the evidence base, and providing model</p>

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>examples of the practices</p> <p>Engaging in learning: trainers built on prior learning, prompted participants to relate the content to their context, and facilitated opportunities for collaboration and practice</p> <p>Reflecting on learning: trainers facilitated opportunities for participants to reflect on how they would implement skills learned in their own practices</p> <p>Transferring learning to practice: trainers introduced rubrics for evaluating fidelity of implementation, facilitating opportunities for action planning and providing ongoing technical assistance and coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data gathered to assess how well adult learning strategies were used: State implementation team members, other Special Education Department staff, and/or the external evaluator assessed each training using the HQPD Checklist-3 during a live or recorded observation of the training. Each training was observed by two individuals separately and then the two scores were calibrated. The checklist was completed for each training during the Fall Institute in 2021 that was delivered by a unique trainer. For example, if the same trainer delivered 3 trainings, the checklist was only completed once. Additionally, the checklist was completed in December 2021 to evaluate the coaching and librarian trainings. These data were collected to evaluate how closely the trainings aligned with the key skill-based adult learning elements. Additionally, a project training evaluation survey measuring participant satisfaction with the training and their perceptions of the effective use of adult learning principles by trainers were disseminated after each of the trainings. The training consultants, Project Director and SSIP Coordinator met to review training evaluation summary data within three weeks of each training and made adjustments to training strategies, training content, and timelines.
<p>B(3) Training</p>	<p>Training is skill-based (e.g., participant behavior rehearsals to criterion with an expert observing).</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 (e.g., 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills that participants were expected to acquire as a result of the training: <p>SPDG participants participated in various trainings throughout the year, based on their role on the district/school team and their year of participation in the project. The following sections detail the skills that participants were expected to acquire at each individual training.</p> <p><u>MTSS-R Training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize the MTSS-R Checklist to evaluate the current MTSS-R implementation in your context • Use data to prioritize the area of focus to support instruction and intervention • Create an action plan to improve MTSS-R implementation <p><u>Reading Instruction Trainings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply intensified instructional strategies to meet the literacy needs of students • Deliver effective instruction focused on the foundational skills of reading • Use the data-based decision-making process to plan for instructional needs of students

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

observation of skills; exit ticket that demonstrates use of skills).

- Deliver effective instruction focused on the development of vocabulary

Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Rubric Trainings

- Improve teacher-coach agreement using the Comprehensive Decoding Rubric
- Use the Vocabulary Rubric as a way to differentiate coaching
- Use the Comprehensive Decoding Rubric to accurately rate instruction
- Deliver effective feedback using the rubrics

Leading by Convening

- Collaboratively determine which data are relevant
- Collaboratively make decisions about which aspects of an issue to focus on
- Collaboratively translating group intentions into purposeful action

Serving on Groups

- Teach family members how to get started if they are interested in joining a decision-making group
- Teach family members about the processes groups commonly use
- Identify common reasons why groups might be unproductive
- Identify strategies groups can use to increase participation from diverse communities
- Interpret data

Coaching Training

- Tag a video within the Insight Advance platform
- Plan a full coaching session based on a teacher-submitted video and RESET Rubric scores

Librarian Training

- Build an inclusive collection with a wide range of resources
- Help students find “just the right book”
- Create an inclusive library environment
- Organize special events supporting literacy that includes appropriate activities for struggling readers and students with disabilities

- **Activities conducted to build skills:**

The following activities were conducted in each of the training to build participants’ skills:

MTSS-R Training: School Leadership Teams participated in training on each of the elements of the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist. After the training on each element, teams rated their system by going through each indicator on the checklist as a team. Upon completion of the Checklist, teams were given instruction on how to

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

prioritize an area to focus their improvement efforts on and how to create an effective action plan. Teams prioritized together and developed an action plan to be used during the school year.

Reading Instruction Trainings: Instructional staff and LEA coaches participated in reading instruction trainings according to their year of participation in the project. All trainings were facilitated by Metis Education Consulting trainers and were all similarly structured. Trainers taught content and modeled routines. Participants had opportunities to reflect, ask questions, and participate in breakout rooms to collaborate with other participants from around the state and in their district. Additionally, they developed goals and planned instructional approaches that would help them reach their goals.

RESET Rubric Trainings: Participants watched videos of teachers delivering classroom reading instruction, then rated the RESET Rubric. The correct scores and reasoning behind the scores were presented. Additionally, each participant was asked to choose an indicator from the rubric and practice providing feedback based on the practice video observation.

Leading by Convening: Trainers went through the content of each Leading by Convening chapter. They introduced the content, asked participants questions in the large group, sent participants to breakout rooms to have small-group discussions and complete activities from the Leading by Convening activity book, and introduced the Depth of Interaction rubric for improving authentic engagement with stakeholders.

Serving on Groups: Similar to the Leading by Convening training, trainers discussed training content for each Serving on Groups chapter. Participants had opportunities to practice through organized activities in each chapter. Participants worked individually and in groups at their tables. They were asked to answer questions during large-group discussions and share out about table discussions. They ended by completing SMART goals for participation on their schools' leadership teams.

Coaching Training: Trainers taught participants how to use the virtual coaching platform by demonstrating each step of the process. Participants were given time on their own to practice the steps and then reconvened to discuss, ask questions, and talk about challenges. Participants finished by planning a coaching session based on a video of a teacher delivering reading instruction. Participants shared with each other about their plans.

Librarian Training: Participants worked through online training modules where they received information and then practiced the skills by completing activities built into the modules. They ended the training by developing an action plan to implement strategies from the training. Participants then attended a live virtual debrief session where they asked questions, participated in large and small group discussions, and talked about their future plans for implementation of strategies.

- **How was participants' use of new skills measured?**

After each training, participants were surveyed using retrospective pre/post self-report questions on the skills that were

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>to be attained. Additionally, some of the trainings utilized evaluation methods during the trainings to assess participants' improvement in skills. For example, during the RESET Rubric trainings, participants rated the RESET Rubric based on an instructional video. The evaluator used these ratings to measure participants' skills in scoring the rubrics accurately. The State Leadership Team will work closely with trainers in summer 2022 to plan for more in-training measurements of participants' new skills.</p>
--	--	---

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
B(4) Training	<p>Trainers (the people who trained PD participants) are trained, coached, and observed.</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. This instrument should measure the extent to which the training is implemented as intended, including the content that is covered and how the training is delivered. • Description of procedures to obtain training evaluation data (e.g., participant reaction, self-efficacy, demonstration of skill and knowledge development). • Description of how observation, training fidelity data, and training evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training provided to trainers: All Idaho SPDG trainers except trainers from Idaho’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) have been training Idaho’s SSIP participants for numerous years. Their SPDG contracts are a continuation and expansion of their training responsibilities in the SSIP. All trainers were initially chosen through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process or with sole-source authorization if they have unique experience or expertise in the content area(s) for which they deliver training. Due to trainers having extensive and unique knowledge and skills, training and coaching them was not necessary. For a detailed description of the unique knowledge and skills each trainer possesses see section A(2). • Coaching provided to trainers: N/A • Procedures for observing trainers. Observers evaluated each unique training session for use of effective adult learning strategies using the HQPD Checklist-3, described in B(2). Two individual observers rated the session separately. After the session, they submitted their completed rubric to the Project Director. The Project Director reviewed each indicator on the two rubrics. If the two raters agreed on the rating for an indicator, that rating was assigned. If there was disagreement on a rating, the Project Director reviewed the evidence provided for the indicator. If there was sufficient evidence from one of the raters that the indicator was implemented, the indicator was assigned a rating of “implemented”. If there was not sufficient evidence provided that the indicator was implemented, the indicator was assigned a rating of “not implemented”. • Training fidelity instrument used: Because trainers are content experts in their fields, no fidelity instrument was used to collect data on the content. • Description of procedures to obtain training evaluation data (e.g., participant reaction, self-efficacy, demonstration of skill and knowledge development). Post-training surveys were used to evaluate each unique training. These surveys assessed participants’ improvements in knowledge and skills according to the learning targets, perceptions of the usefulness of the content, perceptions of

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

	<p>data (reaction, self-efficacy, demonstration of skill/knowledge development) were used (e.g., to ensure that trainers are qualified; to identify further training and coaching needed for trainers; to inform revisions to training content/materials).</p>	<p>the quality of the training and satisfaction. Each post-training survey allowed participants to provide qualitative data on what they liked about the training and what could be improved. For virtual training evaluation, digital survey links were provided at the end of the training and sent out in a follow up email. A reminder email was sent two weeks post training. For in-person trainings, a QR code and shortened URL were provided at the end of the training. Participants were asked to submit the survey before leaving the training. A link was sent in a follow up email and a reminder was sent two weeks later.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>How were observation, training fidelity data, and training evaluation data used?</p> <p>For trainings that were repeated multiple times, post-training survey data was immediately reviewed and adjustments were made for the next session. For example, the MTSS-R training took place in three regional locations. After the first training, the Project Director pulled the survey data and reviewed both the quantitative and qualitative data with the SSIP Coordinator and the MTSS-R trainers to make changes for the next day.</p> <p>After all trainings were complete, SPDG staff compiled the training observation and post-training survey data for each training session into a report. The SPDG Project Director and SSIP Coordinator met with each trainer individually and went over the training report. The report highlighted strengths of the training and areas for improvement. The group discussed ways the training could be improved for the future. When planning for next year's trainings, the training reports will be sent to trainers again so the data can be used when updating and modifying the trainings.</p>
--	--	---

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
B(5) Training	<p>Administrators are trained and coached on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation, including how to develop and support implementation teams and how to support coaches.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of expectations for the role of building, district, and regional administrators in project implementation, including how coaches will be supported. • Description of how administrators are trained and coached to support implementers and coaches. • Description of supports for creating implementation teams at the building and district or local program levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for the role of building, district, and regional administrators in project implementation, including how coaches will be supported: Building principals and LEA special education directors signed an assurance upon registration for participation where they agreed to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate the completion of all project activities and data collection by staff • Hold district or building leadership team meetings at least once per month to review data, discuss barriers to implementation, action plan and work on continuously improving implementation of Cultivating Readers evidence-based practices • Make decisions based on data • Attend/complete all project activities required of the role • Submit timely and accurate data to the SDE required of the role • Continuously work towards sustaining and scaling up Cultivating Readers evidence-based practices in their building and/or LEA <p>Expectations in project implementation are outlined in an implementation guide that is available on the Idaho SPDG website. The implementation guide includes information on all of the elements of project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are administrators trained and coached to support implementers and coaches? The implementation guide was sent to all administrators prior to the start of the 2021-22 school year. In spring 2022 the state leadership team will create “orientation” videos and materials that will be provided to new schools that applied to participate starting in the 2022-23 school year. These materials will be sent to principals and special education directors to review prior to an onsite meeting between administrators and the SPDG Project Director and SSIP Coordinator. In this onsite visit in May 2022, administrators will be informed of their roles in supporting the leadership and implementation teams, including LEA identified coaches. <p>During the fall training, administrators participated in training facilitated by NCIL on the components and implementation of MTSS-R. District and building leadership teams met during this training to assess their systems and develop an action plan for improvement. The MTSS-R Implementation Checklist includes indicators related to the MTSS-R School Leadership Team and professional development and coaching. Administrators used the MTSS-R to assess their systems for supporting professional development and coaching. Administrators were trained and provided information and resources to improve leadership team efficiency and effectiveness, and on the policies,</p>

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

practices, and procedures that should be in place to effectively support instructional staff and coaches. Next school year, leadership teams will participate in two additional follow-up sessions to the MTSS-R training. In these follow up sessions, principals and their building leadership teams will share about their MTSS-R work so far and collaborate with other schools to share problems of practice and successes.

Additionally, administrators were trained in Leading by Convening for authentically engaging stakeholders. Special education directors participated in training and ongoing technical assistance in implementation science by the SSIP Coordinator. Special education directors met with the SSIP Coordinator monthly to discuss barriers to implementation and brainstorm ways to overcome barriers. These calls will be extended to principals starting in the 2022-23 school year.

Monthly reminder emails were sent to building principals and special education directors that included information on the activities their instructional staff and coaches should be completing each month. They were encouraged in these emails to support their staff in completing the activities.

- **Supports for creating implementation teams at the building and district or local program levels:**

Upon application to the project, district and school administrators identify district and building leadership teams, as well as staff who will not be part of the leadership team but will be part of the implementation team. In spring 2021, teams were provided supports through introductory project webinars to go over required activities and data collection and to answer questions. District/building leadership teams met initially at the fall training where they participated in MTSS-R training for developing and sustaining a high-quality reading program. Contracted trainers and SPDG leadership supported the teams in completing the checklist and developing an action plan for implementing MTSS-R. Building leadership teams met monthly to review project implementation, data, and to modify the MTSS-R action plan. The building leadership teams will meet again in June with trainers and SPDG state leadership staff to review their school reading data and plan for the upcoming school year. In 2022-23, school leadership teams will be supported twice more during the year on MTSS-R.

The Idaho SPDG also provides financial support to LEAs for implementing the project activities and practices. In May 2021, special education directors filled out a financial needs' assessment. LEAs were awarded funds to support their instructional staff and LEA coaches to participate in trainings, complete project activities off-contract or pay for substitute teachers, and participate in coaching. LEAs were also awarded a budget line item to support other teachers who were not part of the SPDG to participate in trainings that would further achievement of the SPDG's goals and objectives.

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

<p>B(6) Training</p>	<p>Training outcome data are collected and analyzed to assess participant knowledge and skills.</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 other method(s) for assessing knowledge and skills gained from training. • Description of how training outcome data were used to make appropriate changes to the training and to provide further supports through coaching (e.g., to determine if changes should be made to the content or structure of trainings, such as schedule or processes). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training outcome measure(s): Post-training surveys were used to evaluate all trainings. All post-training surveys asked participants questions about their perception of the quality of the training. Each post-training survey was tailored to ask questions about participants' improvement in knowledge and skills acquired according to the learning objectives specific to the training. • Procedures to collect pre- and post-training data or other method(s) for assessing knowledge and skills gained from training: Pre- and post-training data for assessing knowledge and skills gained were collected in various ways. For outcomes that can be measured through demonstrating knowledge or skills in a written format, assessments were given to participants before and after trainings. These were in the form of multiple choice-type questions. Additionally, every post-training survey asked participants to either rate their abilities according to the learning targets before and after the training, or asked them how much they improved on each learning target as a result of the training. • How were training outcome data used to make appropriate changes to the training and to provide further supports through coaching: Pre-post data were reviewed after the training with the State Leadership Team. Items on the assessments that were particularly challenging for training participants were identified. The SPDG Project Director summarized the various data collected for each training on a post-training feedback form, met with each trainer individually to present the data and try to better understand the issues, and discussed suggestions for training modifications. When planning for the 2022-23 school year trainings, the SPDG Project Director will again meet with every trainer to review the data again, discuss the changes that should be made and how those changes will be implemented in the modified trainings.
<p>C(1) Coaching</p>	<p>Accountability for the development and monitoring of the quality and timeliness of SPDG coaching services.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the lead person(s) accountable for coaching services. Please include name and position/title. • Description of the lead person(s) role and responsibilities for promoting high quality and timely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead person(s) accountable for coaching services. Please include name and position/title: Kailey Bunch-Woodson, Project Director and Shannon Dunstan, SSIP Coordinator are responsible for monitoring coaching services. Lexie Domaradzki, Owner/Consultant, Metis/REACH Education Consulting and Shelby Skaanes, Education Consultant, Metis/REACH Education Consulting are the lead state coaches in the Idaho SPDG. • Lead person(s) role and responsibilities for promoting high quality and timely coaching services: The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator met with the contracted coaches on a monthly basis for planning, reviewing data, discussing barriers, and making improvements to coaching services. Ms. Domaradzki and Ms. Skaanes, contracted consultants, provided coaching services to both instructional coaches and instructional staff as part of the Idaho SPDG ongoing support. The consultants met with LEA instructional coaches and instructional staff monthly in year 1 of project participation to deliver coaching and technical assistance on the skills learned through the Essential Components of Reading Instruction modules. The

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

	coaching services.	<p>consultants met with instructional coaches and instructional staff in years 2 and 3 of project participation bi-monthly to provide coaching and technical assistance to improve implementation of coaching and use of explicit instruction. Ms. Domaradzki and Ms. Skaanes also visited each school in years 2 and 3 of participation twice during the 2021-22 school year, virtually in the fall and in-person in the spring. During the onsite visits they worked in small groups to observe teachers delivering reading instruction, model instruction and/or coaching practices, answer questions and provide targeted training based on the individuals' needs.</p> <p>The consultants will also assess LEA coaches' fidelity of coaching practices through video recordings using the coaching fidelity of implementation rubric. Once fidelity rubrics have been completed, the consultants will contact the LEA coaches and provide them with one-on-one coaching around the areas identified for targeted supports.</p> <p>Consultants will be required to complete coaching logs for each contact they have with an LEA coach or instructional staff. The coaching logs will detail the participants who are present, amount of time spent and strategies used.</p>
--	--------------------	--

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
C(2) Coaching	<p>Coaches use effective coaching practices to increase innovation fidelity.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of coaching process, including coaching strategies, frequency, how feedback is provided, use of data within the coaching process, and how coaching effectiveness is measured. <i>Note: This description may take the form of a coaching service delivery plan.</i> Description of how coaching process is captured and connected to impact on fidelity of the innovation. <i>Note: These data may be collected in a coaching log.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coaching process, including coaching strategies, frequency, how feedback is provided, use of data within the coaching process, and how coaching effectiveness is measured: Instructional staff were required to video tape their instruction at least once per month. They uploaded the videos to a virtual coaching platform where they self-assessed their instruction delivery using the fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction rubric as a guide. The LEA coach then observed the video-recorded instruction and provided time-stamped feedback in the coaching platform. The coach and instructional staff pair met and used the video to direct coaching and review feedback. Coaches and teachers used the fidelity of explicit instruction rubric and student outcomes and progress monitoring data to guide coaching, set goals and action plan. Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, LEA coaches will complete a coaching service delivery plan with the assistance of the contracted state coaches to plan for the elements that are not already built into the SPDG requirements, such as whether the coach/teacher pair will meet in-person or virtually, or if the teacher needs coaching more frequently than once a month. To measure coaching effectiveness, coaches will videotape their coaching twice per year beginning in their second year of project participation and self-assess their practices using the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT), developed by the Idaho SPDG external evaluator and consultants. Part A of the C-LIFT is a qualitative assessment on unobservable practices. Each LEA coach will complete Part A by providing evidence that they have met each defined indicator. They will submit the rubric to the SPDG state implementation team. The LEA coach will upload their video to the virtual coaching platform, self-assess their coaching delivery using Part B of the C-LIFT (observable practices), and submit to the SPDG state coaches. The SPDG state coaches will review Parts A and B of the LEA coach’s C-LIFT, provide a rating for Part A and score Part B. The state coach will then meet with the LEA coach to provide feedback and coaching and to develop an improvement plan. The state coaches will revisit the improvement plans during monthly collaborative calls with LEA coaches and each year during the one-on-one meeting to review the C-LIFT scores. Additionally, LEA coaches will practice rating the CDR through a tool in the virtual coaching platform. The coach will watch videos of teachers delivering reading instruction, rate the CDR, and then receive feedback on their ratings, comparing them to an expert’s ratings. The evaluator will use these data to assess interrater reliability between the LEA coach and an expert rater on the CDR. How is your coaching process captured and connected to impact on fidelity of the innovation?

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>Coaching was monitored through data collected from the virtual coaching platform. The platform collects data on the frequency of video uploads, instructional staff self-assessing and LEA coaches providing written feedback on videos, completion of coaching cycles and fidelity of explicit instruction and coaching rubric ratings.</p> <p>The Mid-Year-Survey and End-of-Year Survey collect data on how frequently the coach/teacher pair met for coaching during the year, how many goals were met on average, what the goals were, and how satisfied the coach and instructional staff were with their experience together. The Mid-Year-Survey was sent out in January 2022 and the End-of-Year Survey will be sent out in May 2022. Information on goal setting will also be collected through the coaching videos LEA coaches will submit to state coaches.</p> <p>To connect coaching with impact on instructional staffs' fidelity of explicit instruction, the SPDG evaluation team will analyze data collected in the coaching platform (number of videos uploaded, interaction between coach/teacher, completion of coaching cycles) with LEA coaches' C-LIFT scores and instructional staffs' fidelity of explicit instruction rubric ratings over time, as well as school level student reading outcomes, measured on the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) by Istation.</p>
<p>C(3) Coaching</p>	<p>Coaching outcome data are collected and analyzed to assess participant knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description of how coaching is monitored for fidelity to content and quality. ● Description of how coaching fidelity data are used to identify potential training and coaching for coaches ● Description of procedures to assess the knowledge and skills gained by those who are coached. ● Description of how coaching outcome data are analyzed by the SPDG team. ● Description of how coaching outcome data are used as part of feedback loops among trainers, coaches, and coaching recipients. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How is coaching monitored for fidelity to content and quality? <p>In January 2022, coaching quality was solicited through the Mid-Year-Survey and will be asked again through End-of-Year Survey. These surveys ask participants about their perceptions of the quality of the coaching they participated in or delivered.</p> <p>Beginning in spring 2022, coaching will be monitored for fidelity to content and quality through two additional data collections. First, the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT) is the fidelity rubric the Idaho SPDG will utilize with individual LEA coaches. The C-LIFT was developed through a review of research of effective general coaching practices, including the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) Practice Profile for Coaching, and content and practices specifically related to coaching teachers to improve delivery of reading instruction. Part A of the C-LIFT is a descriptive scoring of coaching practices and contains components related to literacy knowledge, coaching process, and performance assessment and improvement process. Each LEA coach will complete the descriptions for each indicator by describing if/how they meet each indicator. They will provide evidence, self-rate each component and submit the document to the SPDG state coaches. Part B of the rubric is for evaluating implementation of observable practices such as the LEA coach observing the teacher, modeling, providing performance feedback, and using alliance-building strategies. The LEA coach will upload their coaching video to the virtual coaching platform, self-reflect using Part B and submit to the state coaches. The state coaches will rate Part B. They will review the LEA coaches' description of Part A and provide a rating for each component.</p> <p>Second, LEA coaches will practice rating the CDR through a tool in the virtual coaching platform at least twice per year. The coach will watch videos of teachers delivering reading instruction, rate the CDR, and then receive feedback on their ratings, comparing them to an expert's ratings. The evaluator will use these data to assess interrater reliability between the LEA coach and an expert rater on the CDR.</p>

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

Third,

- **How is coaching fidelity data used to identify potential training and coaching for coaches?**

C-LIFT scores and survey data will be used to identify potential training and coaching for LEA coaches. C-LIFT data will be used when state coaches provide coaching to LEA coaches. Once an LEA coach has met the fidelity threshold on the C-LIFT, they will no longer participate in coaching with the state coaches. C-LIFT and survey data will also be used in the aggregate to identify trends in coaches' performance on the components of coaching to identify areas where LEA coaches have challenges and may need additional training. State coaches will address issues during the monthly/bimonthly collaborative calls with LEA coaches, during onsite visits, in feedback sessions after coaching observations and when developing the annual coaching training.

- **Procedures to assess the knowledge and skills gained by those who are coached:**

Instructional staffs' knowledge and skills will be assessed through two data collections. First, instructional staffs' skills will be assessed through the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR). This is an evaluation tool that assesses teachers' implementation of explicit instruction delivery during reading lessons. Teachers are formally assessed in the spring of their first year of project implementation to set baseline and then each subsequent spring and fall to monitor improvement in implementation fidelity. At least 20% of instructional staffs' videos will be rated by an external observer. Second, instructional staffs' completion of goals will be collected through two surveys per year. Instructional staff and their coaches will set instructional goals based on classroom video observations and RESET rubric scores. Instructional staff will submit information on what their goals were during the year and how many they completed. They will also self-report their perceptions on knowledge and skills gained as a result of the coaching they received.

- **How are coaching outcome data analyzed by the SPDG team?**

Coaching outcome data will be analyzed at the individual level by comparing fall and spring (pre-post) data from the CDR of the instructional staff that each LEA coach supports. At the project level, the SPDG team will conduct regression analyses to determine the relationship between LEA coaches' scores on the C-LIFT and their instructional staffs' scores on the CDR. This data will inform the team on how teachers improve their delivery of reading instruction as their coach becomes more proficient in coaching.

Coaching outcome data from surveys will also be used at the project level to understand the perceptions of instructional staff on their own improvement in knowledge and skills as a result of being coached. Both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected and analyzed to understand trends in successes and challenges with coaching.

- **How are coaching outcome data used as part of feedback loops among trainers, coaches, and coaching recipients?**

Coaching recipients will have the opportunity to provide feedback on their perceptions and experience with their LEA coaches in the mid-year and end-of-year surveys. These data, as well as explicit instruction and

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>coaching fidelity data will be provided to trainers to identify trends in training needs. Future training content will be developed around these data. Individual- and cohort-level coaching data will be provided to consultant coaches so they can differentiate the technical assistance provided in one-on-one coaching and collaborative calls with LEA coaches and in-district technical assistance visits. Challenges between instructional staff and their coaches will be addressed on a case-by-case basis by consultant coaches or the SSIP Coordinator. LEA coaches will use explicit instruction fidelity data to determine coaching and training needs of the instructional staff they support.</p>
--	--	--

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
D(1) Data Systems that Support Decision Making	<p>Accountability for the system of measuring and reporting of innovation fidelity and student outcomes.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the lead person(s) accountable for measuring and reporting fidelity to the innovation and related student outcomes – include name and position/title. • Description of the data expertise, role and responsibilities of the identified lead person(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead person(s) accountable for measuring and reporting fidelity to the innovation and related student outcomes – include name and position/title: The SPDG Project Director, Kailey Bunch-Woodson, in collaboration with the external evaluator, Cari Murphy, will lead in overseeing the fidelity measurement and data system across the project, including related student outcomes. LEA coaches will measure and submit fidelity of explicit instruction data for each of the instructional staff they coach. Lee Pesky Learning Center consultants will observe 20% of the instructional staff using the CDR and assess interrater reliability with the LEA coaches. Metis Education Consulting consultants will observe LEA coaches and rate the C-LIFT. • Data expertise, role and responsibilities of the identified lead person(s): The SPDG Project Director is the internal evaluator of the Idaho SDE’s State Systemic Improvement Plan initiative and a Pyramid Model professional development pilot project. She developed the data systems of these two professional development projects, manages the repositories where the data are housed, analyzes data, and disseminates and reports data in different formats to a wide range of stakeholders. Additionally, she leads an annual training to improve data literacy for special education directors and their teams, creates data reports for LEA teams using data visualization techniques, and provides technical assistance to LEA staff on data analysis and use. The external evaluator has extensive education and experience in program evaluation. She was the external evaluator for Idaho’s SPDG from 2011 to 2018. The SPDG Project Director and external evaluator work collaboratively manage the following responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and update the evaluation process manual • Develop data collection instruments • Build data collection systems • Collect quantitative and qualitative data • Manage the repository where project data are housed • Manage and monitor the data collection calendar, following up with district and school leadership team staff when data is missing • Communicate results regularly to stakeholders

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create performance reports to provide district and school leadership teams, including fidelity and student outcomes data • Provide technical assistance to district and school leadership team staff around data literacy • Meet with project consultants and state leadership team members on an ongoing basis to review data and action plan • Report progress toward program measures in the SPDG APR
<p>D(2) Data Systems that Support Decision Making</p>	<p>Coherent data systems are in place at all education levels (SEA, regional, LEA, school).</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of key data sources are analyzed to connect training and coaching to fidelity of the innovation and then child outcomes: • Description of how targets/benchmarks are set for the various types of data. • Description of how data collection guidance (e.g., procedures, timelines) is provided to professional development sites and participants. • Description of how teams are trained and coached to use training/coaching, fidelity of the innovation, and child outcomes data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key data sources analyzed to connect training and coaching to fidelity of the innovation and then child outcomes: Starting in spring 2022, LEA coaches will observe instructional staff using the fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction rubric to assess baseline. Each subsequent spring and fall, instructional staff will be formally evaluated using the rubric to monitor to what degree they are improving fidelity of implementation. Data from coaching fidelity of implementation rubrics, interrater reliability scores, and from activity logs in the virtual coaching platform will be analyzed to assess the quality and frequency of coaching that instructional staff receive. Students’ reading assessment scores will be progress monitored monthly and disaggregated to the school and grade level. Reading assessment scores from the official fall and spring administrations will be analyzed to measure students with disabilities’ reading proficiency percentages and growth. The evaluation team will analyze the associations between scores on the explicit instruction fidelity rubric and quality and frequency of coaching they receive and students’ reading outcomes. Starting in spring 2022, LEA coaches will video record themselves delivering coaching twice per year (fall and spring). They will self-assess their performance using the coaching fidelity rubric. The state coaches will assess LEA coaches’ fidelity of coaching. Furthermore, their quality and frequency of coaching will be assessed monthly through data collected in the virtual coaching platform. The evaluation team will analyze the associations between LEA coaches’ scores on the coaching fidelity rubric and quality and frequency of coaching from the monthly coaching data and their teachers’ scores on the explicit instruction fidelity rubric. • How are targets/benchmarks set for the various types of data? Targets for performance measures related to high-quality professional development are set at 90%, as the expectation is that trainings are of very high quality from the beginning. The trainers are experts in their fields and contracted for their skills in the content areas and ability to deliver high-quality training. All other targets are set using growth metrics. For fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction and instructional coaching, and MTSS-R systems implementation, the target is to reach full implementation (score of 80% or greater) or improve by a certain percentage from the previous year. Since no previous research on average year-to-year growth in scores on these instruments exists, the evaluation team will reassess these benchmarks after participants begin

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

implementation and data has been collected.

There are two performance measures around students' reading outcomes. Measure 4.a. (see Performance Measures) was set using 2018-2019 fall to spring state-level data for Idaho students with disabilities. Statewide, students with disabilities improved reading proficiency by 10 percentage points from fall to spring that year. Measure 4.b. uses the same data source for students' reading proficiency but compares project schools with the state average, increasing the target percentage of schools scoring above the state average from year to year, as project schools increase implementation of evidence-based practices. Measure 4.c. measures parents' perceptions of their children's reading growth. The target is set at 80%, as we have high expectations around parents' perceptions.

• **How is data collection guidance provided to professional development sites and participants?**

Data collection guidance was provided to professional development sites and participants various times throughout the year and in multiple formats. The training and guidance included the following:

- The project implementation guide outlines all project data collection requirements and information on due dates and submission processes.
- Participants received training during the virtual coaching platform orientation on its use, the data it collects, and what data the project will use for evaluation. The training was recorded and available to participants.
- The coaching platform offers 24/7 technical assistance that project participants can access if they have questions or to troubleshoot.
- Monthly reminder emails were sent with information, resources, and survey links to participants for completing post-training, mid-year and end-of-year surveys and for using the virtual coaching platform.
- State coaches provided training and technical assistance on use of the virtual coaching platform to collect fidelity data during onsite visits and monthly collaborative calls with instructional staff and LEA coaches.
- Instructions for completing the instructional staff and coaching observation processes using the virtual coaching platform were developed and attached to a calendar "observation window" which was sent to every instructional staff and coach via email
- The SSIP Coordinator provided information and technical assistance to special education directors during monthly virtual calls.
- The SPDG Project Director and SSIP Coordinator communicated to participants that they were always available via email or phone to provide technical assistance.

• **How are teams trained and coached to use training/coaching, fidelity of the innovation, and child outcomes data?**

Instructional staff and coaches were trained on use of the explicit instruction fidelity of explicit instruction rubrics at the fall training in August 2022. During they training they practiced scoring the rubrics and their scores were compared with the expert raters' scores. The training also covered how to use the rubric scores to identify areas for

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>improvement and develop and implement action plans to improve scores. In addition, the rubrics are integrated into the asynchronous science of reading training modules that instructional staff and coaches in their first year of project participation completed in the 2021-22 school year.</p> <p>The Idaho SDE Special Education Department provides regional annual trainings for special education directors and their teams to develop data literacy, promote a culture of data use, and identify root causes and develop action plans using data. The SDE has been delivering the trainings for the past 4 years with very high attendance and satisfaction of participants. Idaho Reading Indicator fall administration data and monthly progress monitoring data was provided for the 2020 and 2021 data trainings and will be provided each year moving forward. Idaho SPDG districts and schools had the opportunity to attend the fall 2021 training to evaluate students with disabilities' reading proficiency from the previous year and develop an action plan. Furthermore, during the onsite visits, coaching consultants and district and school leadership team members reviewed students' reading outcomes and progress monitoring data to differentiate the coaching and technical assistance provided. School and district leadership teams reviewed student reading outcome data monthly at leadership team meetings.</p> <p>The spring data training is scheduled for June 2022 and will take place every year. SPDG teams will bring implementation and student outcome data and IRI school-level data reports will be provided. Trainers will facilitate data literacy activities and train participants on intensification strategies aligned to what they see in their student outcome data.</p> <p>In summer 2021, Idaho SSIP funds supported a partnership between the SSIP/SPDG and Istation, the Idaho Reading Indicator assessment administrator. Istation developed training and technical assistance materials specifically for special educators on creating special education classrooms in the platform and downloading reports disaggregated by disability status. The Idaho SPDG will support district and school leadership teams through technical assistance related to generating reports in Istation and using reports for data-based decision making.</p>
--	--	--

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
D(3) Data Systems that Support Decision Making	<p>Fidelity and student outcome data are used to inform the continuous improvement of the project in collaboration with stakeholders at multiple levels (SEA, regional, schools, community, other agencies).</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of how data are compiled and communicated in usable format(s) with various audiences/stakeholders (e.g., communication protocol). • Description of how feedback loops function to inform improvement across multiple levels (State, regional, local, community, and other agencies). • Description of how fidelity and child outcome data inform modifications to project plans and processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are data compiled and communicated in usable format(s) with various audiences/stakeholders? <p>Data were compiled and communicated in multiple usable formats and to various audiences throughout the year. To communicate data with project participants, monthly emails were sent to all according to their role on the school implementation team. Data were shared in these emails and successes of individuals and teams were published and celebrated. Student reading outcomes data were compiled into reports and given to school leadership teams to inform the fall and spring onsite technical assistance visits. Activity completion monitoring data was emailed to special education directors so they could see, of their instructional staff and coaches, who was progressing through the training and coaching requirements. Project-level student outcomes data were shared and celebrated at the December coaching training. Finally, the State Implementation Team began exploring and using Shorthand to communicate data and information to project participants. Data will be shared again at the June spring data training.</p> <p>The SPDG Project Director and SSIP Coordinator shared data with external audiences throughout the year in presentations at various conferences, statewide special education directors’ webinars, Directors Advisory Council (DAC) meetings, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) meetings, and the Idaho Principals’ Network annual meeting.</p> <p>An annual report will be completed to tell the SPDG story of the 2021-22 school year. In the annual report for stakeholders, data will be presented graphically with written descriptions summarizing the project activities and outcomes. Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, the State Implementation Team plans to disseminate newsletters at least quarterly, summarizing data collected during the previous three months. Twice-annual progress reports will be shared with district and school leadership teams participating in the project. The reports will summarize fidelity of implementation and student outcome data from the previous semester. Reports will be shared with various stakeholder groups including Idaho SPDG project participants, the Directors Advisory Council (DAC) and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), as well as uploaded to the Idaho SPDG website for public access. Data and reports will be shared at various conference presentations by the Idaho SPDG state team throughout the year. District and school leadership team progress reports will be shared only to the teams and debriefed at district leadership team meetings with Idaho SPDG state team staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do feedback loops function to inform improvement across multiple levels? <p>As Idaho has a relatively small student population, education personnel, and resources, the Idaho SPDG has fewer</p>

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

layers in its system than larger states. These levels include state, district, and school. Because many of our SPDG participating LEAs only have one elementary school, this effectively eliminates the district level for those small LEAs.

State level feedback loops

Project data and feedback were collected from LEA and school participants multiple times and through various methods throughout the year. During the onsite visits, consultant coaches and the SSIP Coordinator shared school-level student reading outcomes data to inform the coaching and technical assistance consultants provided and for action planning. School Leadership Team and School Implementation Team members had the opportunity to provide in-person feedback with the state coaches and SSIP Coordinator at the onsite visits and during monthly virtual collaborative calls that the state coaches facilitated with instructional staff and LEA coaches. Additionally, the SSIP Coordinator facilitated monthly virtual calls with the special education directors where they discussed problems of practice and brainstormed ideas for overcoming barriers. The state coaches and SSIP Coordinator submitted consultant coaching logs after each technical assistance contact where they logged the time spent on the activity as well as any issues that came up that could inform project improvements.

After each data collection and/or feedback opportunity, the State Implementation Team analyzed and communicated the information with multiple stakeholders to inform improvements. The State Leadership Team met on a weekly basis to discuss implementation of project activities, current contractors and their completion of activities, expenditures, and fiscal monitoring of LEAs. The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator met weekly and the State Implementation Team met monthly to discuss project data collected and make timely adjustments to project activities. The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator also met monthly with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent training and information center, staff to debrief the monthly virtual call they facilitate with parents who are on the school leadership teams, discuss challenges, and plan improvement activities.

Additionally, project data were disseminated at Directors Advisory Council (DAC, comprised of special education directors statewide) and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP, comprised of staff from other agencies providing services to students with disabilities and parents of students with disabilities) meetings during the year. These stakeholder advisory groups provided their input on overcoming barriers and improving project data.

School and district feedback loops

At the fall MTSS-R training, School Leadership Teams were trained on the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist elements, which include collection and use of implementation and student outcome data. They were also provided a resource for planning MTSS-R Team meetings and an agenda to follow. These resources have a built-in feedback loop where team members review the action items that were identified at the previous month's team meeting, they discuss any data that was collected to understand if they achieved their goals, to review student data and plan for the following month. The LEA coach sits on the School Leadership Team and acts as a conduit between the classroom and school. The LEA coach collects teacher fidelity and student outcome data and brings it to School Leadership Team meetings.

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

Additionally, schools provided Idaho Reading Indicator data reports to parents after the fall administration and will provide the reports again in the spring.

- **How do fidelity and child outcome data inform modifications to project plans and processes?**

The State Leadership Team used child outcome data in the 2021-22 school year to inform training and technical assistance provided to school teams. For example, the State Leadership Team identified that many schools were having challenges with their students scoring proficient in the text fluency subskill area of the IRI. Therefore, trainers will focus additional time specifically in addressing intensification strategies for improving students' text fluency during the spring training. As stated in previous questions.

In addition to fidelity and child outcome data informing training, coaching and technical assistance in the ways stated in previous questions, the State Leadership Team will use the data to inform modification to project plans and processes. If instructional staff are not improving fidelity of their delivery of explicit instruction over time and/or students are not improving reading proficiency, the State Leadership Team will conduct a root-cause analysis to understand what is causing the lack of improvement, using the National Implementation Research Network's (NIRN) research on Implementation Drivers as a guide. The team will change project plans and processes to address these gaps. In addition, school-level fidelity and child outcome data will be monitored throughout the entirety of each school's participation in the SPDG project. Towards the end of the 4 -year PD, the data will be used to determine whether and what project supports should be extended into an additional year.

District and School Leadership Team members will monitor fidelity and student outcome data to adjust their goals for improving evidence-based practices and for modifying instructional strategies with students. Instructional staff and coaches will collaborate to collect baseline data on the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric. They will use the rubric scores and student-level reading outcome data to write instructional goals, updating and adding to those goals as necessary. Coaches will use coaching fidelity of implementation rubric scores to collaborate with consultant coaches and their special education directors and principals in setting goals aligned with rubric scores to improve their quality of coaching. Coaches will update or add to those goals as necessary in a continuous improvement cycle. District and School Leadership Teams will analyze student-level reading outcome data and project implementation data during monthly leadership team meetings to identify proficiency gaps, assess barriers to effective implementation and staff needs, and action plan to address those needs. At the spring data dive and training, district leadership teams review student outcome data and plan for the following school year.

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

<p>E(1) Systemic Leadership Supports</p>	<p>Accountability for the technical and adaptive leadership of the project at the state level.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identification of the lead persons responsible for (1) technical leadership and (2) adaptive leadership – include names and position/title. ● Description of how the lead(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Engages in regular communication with the leads for training, coaching and data systems, ● Promotes the effective use of evidence based professional development components, ● Problem solves challenges to innovation implementation, ● Recognizes effort and successes, and ● Develops and/or refines state policies or procedures to support the sustainability of evidenced based professional development components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lead persons responsible for (1) technical leadership and (2) adaptive leadership – include names and position/title: <p>Kailey Bunch-Woodson, SPDG Project Director and Shannon Dunstan, SSIP Coordinator are the leads responsible for technical and adaptive leadership.</p> <p>How does this person ensure there is regular communication with the leads for training, coaching and data systems?</p> <p>Both the project leads met with the consultants responsible for delivering the bulk of the training, coaching and technical assistance on a monthly basis. Consultants leading monthly and bimonthly collaborative calls with LEA coaches and instructional staff updated the leads on the barriers, and questions or concerns that come up in the collaborative calls and onsite visits. The SPDG Project Director met with the external evaluator biweekly to ensure regular communication related to data systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How does this person promote the effective use of evidence-based professional development components? <p>The Project Director used the SPDG EBPD Rubric as a guide when planning project activities and systems with trainers, coaches, and the external evaluator. The leads promoted the effective use of evidence-based professional development by project consultants and trainers in multiple ways including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trainers’ contracts specified that they use the components in the HQPD Checklist-3 when developing trainings. After the observation of each training using the HQPD Checklist-3, the SPDG Project Director provided a report of the data collected on the training, met with each trainer individually, and outlined the strengths and areas for improvement for the next training. Before the fall 2022 trainings, the Project Director will again review the training data with the trainers to remind them of the changes that should be made. ● The SSIP Coordinator and state coaches provided technical assistance to individuals and school teams during onsite visits in the fall and spring ● The project leads manage the virtual coaching platform to improve fidelity of implementation ● The SSIP Coordinator met with special education directors monthly to provide training and technical assistance on aspects of evidence-based professional development relevant to their context, including in implementation science, data-based decision making, coaching and leadership. ● The Project Director sent out monthly reminder emails to all SPDG participants, reminding them of the activities that are to be completed during the month ● The project leads followed a Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle for improving PD components ● The Project Director celebrated individual and school team successes in monthly emails and will develop a
--	--	---

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

celebration video to be shared at the end-of-year training

- **How does this person problem solve challenges to innovation implementation?**

The leads examine both quantitative and qualitative data to problem solve challenges to implementation. They determine whether the challenges are technical or adaptive and respond with the appropriate strategies. For technical challenges, the response is more straightforward, with the leads generating the solution, assigning tasks, and managing and monitoring the tasks. For adaptive challenges, the leads create a safe environment and develop a culture of trust to create conditions that help participants take greater responsibility for the work of change. The leads use a plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycle to come up with a plan, implement the plan, collect data and evaluate the changes made, and then act based on the data.

The leads often bring the challenges to stakeholder groups, including the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and special education director virtual collaboration calls with participating special education directors. The leads present the challenges (or ask participants to discuss their challenges), ask stakeholder group participants to ask questions about the challenges, and then offer their suggested solutions. They finish by summarizing the suggested solutions and discuss how they could implement strategies in their work. Starting in the 2022-23 school year, the leads will use a consultancy protocol, when appropriate, to formalize this process.

- **How does this person recognize effort and successes?**

The leads recognized effort and successes in multiple ways. They highlighted individuals and school teams who completed project activities each month in the monthly emails sent to all project participants. Also, at the onsite visits, the SSIP Coordinator and state coaches highlighted specific areas where the school teams were making growth in their student reading outcomes. Next, the SPDG Project Director developed a Shorthand “story” where they recorded a video of a lottery drawing for participants who had completed project activities. These participants had the opportunity to win a cash prize, a certificate and the public recognition. They published the story and disseminated it in the monthly emails. Additionally, at the spring data training the leads will create a video of celebrations submitted to them by principals and special education directors recognizing their staffs’ hard work and successes they have seen over the year.

- **How does this person lead the work of developing and/or refining state policies or procedures to support the sustainability of evidenced based professional development components?**

The leads work interdepartmentally within the SDE and with external stakeholders to refine state policies and procedures to support the Idaho SPDG’s sustainability. Currently, the leads collaborate at least monthly with the English Language Arts (ELA) Coordinator in the Content and Curriculum Department to align professional development resources and activities. The ELA Coordinator is responsible for another SDE early reading initiative

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

		<p>called Idaho SMART. The team works to align supports and leverage each other's resources. Furthermore, the SPDG Project Director is a member of the Idaho SDE's State Technical Assistance Team (STAT), which leads the state's school improvement efforts. The Project Director is currently working with the School Improvement Coordinator to better align the supports offered through the SPDG and school improvement PD and leverage resources. The Project Director's ultimate goal is to build one coherent PD system at the Idaho SDE. The leads also work closely with the Assessment and Accountability Department to create sustainable resources around assessment administration and data use. Additionally, the leads focus on building internal capacity to sustain the work whenever possible. For example, the Project Director works closely with the external evaluator when building the data and evaluation systems and continues to be the internal evaluator of the SSIP project. The fiscal work is distributed between three individuals on the State Leadership Team and administrative and communication support is provided by the Program Specialist.</p> <p>The leads also maintain a project website that houses project trainings and materials. Many project trainings have been developed into sustainable online trainings complete with handbooks and facilitator guides. School personnel can access these materials to train new teachers coming into the project after year 1, paraprofessionals, and to scale-up the project's evidence-based practices to additional staff not actively participating in the project.</p>
--	--	--

Worksheet: 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 (please provide after each bullet)
<p>E(2) Systemic Leadership Supports</p>	<p>Leadership systems are in place to build state-level capacity and promote project sustainability.</p> <p>Required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of how project leadership analyzes feedback regarding barriers and successes to identify and make necessary changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation. • Description of processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work (e.g., communication protocol that supports decision making). • Description of collaborative efforts with other state offices, departments, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does project leadership analyze feedback regarding barriers and successes to identify and make necessary changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation? As the internal evaluator of the SSIP, the Project Director has direct access to project evaluation data and monitors data monthly. She develops summary reports for project data and discusses them in weekly meetings with the SSIP Coordinator and the State Leadership Team. Together, they review the quantitative and qualitative data, come up with a plan and use a PDSA cycle to guide their continuous improvement process. They disaggregate data in meaningful ways in an attempt to identify root causes of the barriers, research the literature, consult experts, and seek more data when necessary to make necessary changes. • What are the processes for revising policies and procedures to support a new way of work? Due to the relatively small population of students with disabilities in Idaho compared to other states, Idaho has a small number of Special Education Department staff. Although having a small staff comes with its challenges, revising policies and procedures can be relatively simple and fast-paced. The Project Director and SSIP Coordinator have ongoing direct communication with the primary project consultants that deliver training and coaching and with the district and school participants. The Project Director has weekly meetings with the SSIP Coordinator, Principal Investigator and Fiscal Coordinator where she brings up needs related to revising policies and procedures. For minor procedural changes, the Project Director and SSIP Coordinator make timely decisions during their weekly meetings. For more substantial policy or procedural revisions, the Principal Investigator provides recommendations and gives the ultimate authorization. • What collaborative efforts have occurred with other state offices, departments, and outside agencies to promote the work of the project, align initiatives, and support improved outcomes for children with disabilities? The SPDG State Leadership Team is currently working and will continue to improve efforts to partner and align with other state offices, agencies, and initiatives to support improved reading outcomes for children with disabilities. Through the SPDG, Idaho has begun a partnership with the Idaho Commission for Libraries, a state agency that provides professional development to school and public library staff. The project also partners with two public Idaho universities, Boise State University and University of Idaho. As stated in a previous question, the

Worksheet: SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components

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

	<p>outside agencies to promote the work of the project, align initiatives, and support improved outcomes for children with disabilities.</p>	<p>SPDG State Leadership Team is currently working with other Idaho SDE professional development projects to align and leverage resources. Furthermore, the SPDG project aligns with other SDE initiatives whenever possible. For example, LEAs identified in “Needs Intervention” for LEA Determinations have the opportunity to participate in the Idaho SPDG work if they find through a needs assessment that their needs align to the SPDG objectives. Additionally, schools identified as Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) under Idaho’s Consolidated State Plan as having a proficiency gap for students with disabilities in English/Language Arts will be given priority to participate in the Idaho SPDG.</p>
--	--	---

References:

1. Moylan, L. A., Johnson, E. S., Crawford, A.R., and Zheng, Y.Z. (2018). Comprehensive Decoding Rubric. Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET), Boise State University: Boise, ID
2. National Center on Improving Literacy (2022). *Multi-tiered System of Support Implementation Checklist*. National Center on Improving Literacy, Wheelock College of Education, Boston University.
3. Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Noonan, P.M., Ault, M., Monroe, K., & Brussow, J. (2020). *Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development* [Version 3]. Center for Research on Learning, University of Kansas. <http://www.researchcollaboration.org/page/high-quality-professional-development-checklist>
4. (2021). *Coaching Literacy Implementation Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT)* <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/1047>

Idaho SPDG FY2021-FY2025: Evaluation Plan

Goal 1: Improve reading proficiency for students with disabilities through the sustained implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Objective 1: 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.					
Performance Measure 1.a.: 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. (GPRA/Program Measure)					
Performance Measure 1.b.: After one school year of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of school leadership teams will meet implementation components indicated on the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist (scoring 80% or greater), or increase their score by 10% from the previous year's assessment. (Project Measure)					
Performance Measure 1.c.: Annually, 100% of the skill-based trainings provided will have 90% of the adult-learning principles in place, as observed using the high-quality PD checklist. (Project Measure)					
Performance Measure 1.d.: Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the knowledge-based learning targets. (Project Measure)					
Performance Measure 1.e.: Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the skills-based learning targets. (Project Measure)					
Process and Outcome Measures					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis & Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are Idaho SPDG PD practices implemented? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the end of year 2, 50% (8 out of 16) 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. (1.a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPDG Evidence-based PD Components Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually each spring, project director and evaluator will score separately and then calibrate Data will be reported in spring APR submission to OSEP each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data shared with stakeholders at spring quarterly meeting, in quarterly and annual reports
N/A. Will score for the first time in 2023 APR					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are schools developing infrastructure to support an effective schoolwide reading program? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Measure 1.b.: After one school year of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of school leadership teams will meet implementation components indicated on the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist (scoring 80% or greater), or increase their score by 10% from the previous year's assessment. (1.b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District leadership teams complete the MTSS-R checklist (Excel) annually in the fall and submit electronically along with a copy of their action plan. Scale-up year teams complete at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project director will analyze LEA/school data longitudinally for progress toward full implementation Data will be reported in spring APR submission to OSEP each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data shared with stakeholders at fall/winter quarterly meeting, in quarterly and annual reports

			beginning and end of year		
--	--	--	---------------------------	--	--

• Baseline data was collected in August 2021 and are as follows:

School/District	Average Percent Implemented 2021
Kuna-Hubbard Elementary	43%
Minidoka-Heyburn Elementary	65%
Mullan Elementary	14%
Notus Elementary	45%
Preston-Oakwood Elementary	23%
Project Impact STEM	51%
St Maries-Heyburn Elementary	35%
Sugar Salem-Central Elementary	55%
Wendell Elementary	58%
Filer School District	27%
West Ada-Virtual School House	93%
Twin Falls-Bickel Elementary	40%
Blackfoot-Fort Hall Elementary	49%
Blackfoot-Ridge Crest Elementary	44%
Blackfoot-Wapello Elementary	37%
Boundary School District	38%
Gem Prep Schools	49%
Snake River-Moreland Elementary	26%
Snake River-Riverside Elementary	45%
Snake River-Rockford Elementary	14%
Ririe Elementary	Did not submit data
Lapwai Elementary	44%
Future Public School	74%

Process	• To what extent are face-to-face and virtual trainings	• 100% of the skill-based trainings provided will have 90% of the adult-learning principles in place (1.c)	• In person and virtual observation of trainings using the	• Descriptive analysis of frequencies and qualitative analysis of	• Summary shared within 10 days post training with trainer(s)
---------	---	--	--	---	---

	designed and delivered in accordance with adult learning principles?		high-quality professional development checklist, including descriptors of evidence	descriptors resulting in a summary including the calculation of % of items in place along with strengths and areas of improvement	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skill-based trainings 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. MTSS-R = 19/21 90% b. Reading Content sessions = 20/21 95% c. RESET sessions = 17/21 81% d. Leading by Convening = 13/21 62% e. Serving on Groups = 13/20 65% f. Library training 18/20 90% g. Coaching Training 18/21 86% 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are training participants learning about the target content? (Online & F2F) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the knowledge-based learning targets. (1.d.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey questionnaire given pre and post training, measuring knowledge gain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys • Reported to OSEP in APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 10 days post training • Data shared in quarterly and annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge-based learning targets 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MTSS-R (LT1 114/125 91%) ○ Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 27/29 93%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 18/18 100%, LT2 18/18 100%) Vocabulary (LT1 6/6 100%, LT2 6/6 100%, LT3 6/6 100%, LT5 6/6 100%) ○ RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 6/6 100%, LT2, 6/6 100%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1: 14/14 100%), Vocabulary (no responses) ○ Leading by Convening (LT1 11/14 79%, LT2 11/14 79%, LT3 13/14 93%) ○ Serving on Groups (LT1 16/17 94%, LT2 14/17 82%, LT3 14/17 82%, LT4 17/17 100%) ○ Library training (LT1 52/59 88%) ○ Coaching training – no knowledge-based learning targets 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are participants able to perform the learning targets of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the skill-based learning targets. (1.e.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-training evaluation survey measuring participants self-report ability to perform the stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys • Reported to OSEP in APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 10 days post training

	trainings? (Online & F2F)		learning targets (Likert-type scale)		• Data shared in quarterly and annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skill-based learning targets 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MTSS-R (LT1 103/125 90%, LT2 118/125 94%, LT3 112/124 90%, LT4 112/124 90%, LT5 111/124 88%) ○ Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 28/29 97%, LT2 28/29 97%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 18/18 100%), Vocabulary (LT1 6/6 100%) ○ RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 6/6 100%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 13/14 93%, LT2 14/14 100%), Vocabulary (no responses) ○ Leading by Convening (LT1 12/14 86%, LT2 12/14 86%, LT3 11/14 79%) ○ Serving on Groups (LT1 13/17 76%, LT2 14/17 82%, LT3 17/17 100%, LT4 14/17 82%, LT5 15/17 88%) ○ Library training (LT1 57/59 97%, LT2 58/59 98%, LT3 55/59 93%, LT4 51/59 86%) ○ Coaching training (LT1 5/5 100%, LT2 5/5 100%) 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the attendance rate of participants in the trainings provided? (Online & F2F) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of grant-identified instructional staff and 100% of LEA coaches will complete 100% of the online module trainings • 90% of grant-identified instructional staff, LEA coaches, principals, and special ed directors will attend F2F/virtual trainings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fall Institute ○ Coaching Training • 75% of family members will attend F2F/virtual trainings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fall Institute 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student account records and learning management system (LMS) tracking of progress • Attendance sheets from online registrations forms with signatures for attended, including name, email, LEA, school, and role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student records, including gradebook showing progress, housed in LMS with aggregate monthly and year-end reports generated • Attendance sheets housed in project's online data repository; attendance rate % to be included in training evaluation summary report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMS aggregate reports shared with project director during monthly data meetings • Attendance reports included in training evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 10 days post training (see below)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online modules participation: will be reported in 2023 APR • Trainings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MTSS-R: 160/180 = 89% ○ Reading trainings: 102/118 = 86% ○ RESET Trainings: 88/118 = 75% ○ Leading by Convening: 45/54 = 83% ○ Family members-Serving on Groups: 12/18 = 66% ○ Coaching training: 8/11 = 73% 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are participants with the training received? (Online & F2F) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of recipients will report satisfaction with training received 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-training evaluation surveys (Likert-type scale and open-ended questions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training evaluation summary report shared with project staff and

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reported to OSEP in APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> trainer(s) within 10 days post training Data shared in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trainings 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTSS-R: 104/125 82% Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (28/29 97%), Data Based Decision Making (18/18 100%), Vocabulary (6/6 100%) RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (5/6 83%), Data Based Decision Making (13/14 93%), Vocabulary (no responses) Leading by Convening: (Q26: 12/14 86%) Serving on Groups (Q32: 17/17 100%) Library modules (59/60 98%) Coaching training (5/5 100%) 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each year of the grant, is the project able to select and maintain the target number of LEAs, LEA coaches and instructional staff? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning in SPDG year 2, each new cohort has on average 10 LEAs with 10 LEA coaches and 40 instructional staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spreadsheet roster of names including LEA, school, role that is updated annually in September and May 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spreadsheet roster housed in project's online data repository 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spreadsheet roster available to project staff on an ongoing basis through project's online data repository Numbers reported in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 1: 12 LEAs, 17 coaches, 53 instructional staff 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the on-time submission rate of project data by LEA personnel? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA personnel will submit their project data on-time 80% of the time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RESET Rubrics C-LIFT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online data repository tracking data submissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-time submission rate calculated based on comparing date stamp to stated deadline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of on-time submissions shared with SSIP coordinator within 5 days post submission deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be reported in 2023 APR 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many school and public library staff view the training modules on engaging struggling readers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 library staff view the developed training modules annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytics from accessing of training modules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICfL will report to project director on the number of views quarterly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data shared with team members quarterly Reported in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 participants completed online training as of 4/18/22 					

<p>Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the perceptions of parents and family members who attend reading events at their children’s schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of parents and family members who attend SPDG events at their children’s schools will report satisfaction with the event. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents and family members who attend reading events organized by district leadership team family members will be sent an electronic survey within one week of the event (Likert-type scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis including number of attendees, satisfaction and open-ended questions about improvements • Survey data will be downloaded quarterly and disaggregated by cohort, LEA, and school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data will be shared in team and stakeholder meetings twice/year • An annual infographic report will be created to summarize all SPDG reading activities for parents and families • Data will be included in the annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A-to be collected in 2022-23 school year 					
<p>Outcome</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are parents and family members learning about at-home reading strategies at school events? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of parents and family members who attend SPDG events at their children’s schools will report an increase of knowledge of at-home reading strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents and family members who attend reading events organized by district leadership team family members will be sent an electronic survey within one week of the event. They will answer about the amount of knowledge gain (Likert-type scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data analysis including • Survey data will be downloaded quarterly and disaggregated by cohort, LEA, and school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data will be shared in team and stakeholder meetings twice/year • An annual infographic report will be created to summarize all SPDG reading activities for parents and families • Data will be included in the annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A-to be collected in 2022-23 school year 					

Objective 2: The Idaho SPDG will use a continuous improvement model to inform, monitor, improve, and achieve high fidelity in instructional staff’s implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Performance Measure 2.a.: After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of instructional staff will reach full implementation on an explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10% or more from fall to spring each year of the project. (GPRA/Program Measure)

Performance Measure 2.b.: after 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach full implementation on a coaching fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10% or more from fall to spring each year of the project. (Project Measure)

Performance Measure 2.c.: After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach 80% interrater reliability on the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric with an expert rater, or improve interrater reliability by 10% or more from the previous year's assessment. (Project Measure)					
Process and Outcome Measures					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis & Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are instructional staff improving their fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of instructional staff will reach full implementation on an explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10% or more from fall to spring each year of the project (2.a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (fidelity of implementation) 2X per year (Oct/March) beginning in Implementation year, completed by LEA coach and submitted digitally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative analysis of % of items implemented Qualitative analysis of challenging areas that may need more training Longitudinal fidelity of implementation data logged by project director Data submitted to OSEP in annual APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data shared with SPDG State Team and consultants within 3 weeks of the close of spring FIR submission date Data shared with stakeholders in spring meeting Data shared in quarterly and annual report Data shared with district leadership teams in performance reports 2X/year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline to be collected in spring 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are LEA coaches providing instructional coaching with fidelity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of LEA coaches will reach full implementation on a coaching fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 20% or more from fall to spring each year of the project. (2.b.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional coaching fidelity implementation rubric (FIR) completed annually in the spring by a project consultant via observation. All LEA coaches in Implementation, Sustainability and Scale-Up observed twice per year (Oct, March). Qualitative portion of rubric submitted by LEA coach in spring and rated by state coach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative analysis of % of items partially/fully implemented resulting in project-level report Qualitative analysis of challenging areas that may need more training Longitudinal fidelity of implementation data logged by project director Data submitted to OSEP in annual APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data shared with SPDG State Team and consultants within 3 weeks of the close of spring FIR submission date Shared with stakeholders in spring meeting Data shared in quarterly and annual report Data shared with district leadership teams in performance reports 2X/year

			Scores from spring are used in APR.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline to be collected in spring 2022 					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do LEA coaches use the fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction rubric consistently with expert raters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach 80% interrater reliability on the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric with an expert rater, or improve interrater reliability by 10% or more from the previous year’s assessment. (2.c.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric completed by LEA coach in rubric calibration platform. LEA coach watches a video of a teacher and completes the rubric. The LEA coach submits the rubric in the platform and receives accuracy scores. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of % agreement for each area of the rubric. • Qualitative analysis of challenging areas for LEA coaches to rate and where more training may be needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data shared with SPDG State Team and consultants within 3 weeks of the close of spring FIR submission date • Shared with stakeholders in spring meeting • Data shared in quarterly and annual report • Data shared with district leadership teams in performance reports 2X/year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline collected in spring 2022 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is a continuous improvement model used to provide coaching supports to instructional staff? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of instructional staff will receive two observations and feedback sessions by LEA coaches on implementing explicit instruction when teaching reading 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit instruction observational feedback online form with notes including the step-by-step feedback provided • submitted by LEA coach twice annually (October & March) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive analysis of frequencies and qualitative analysis of feedback resulting in an aggregate summary including calculation of % of observations completed and themes of instructional staff’s strengths and areas of improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate summary report shared with project director, consultants, and coaches within 3 weeks of completion of observations (October & March); report used to adjust/align ensuing training and TA supports to instructional staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data will be reported in 2023 APR 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At what frequency and duration, and to what percent of instructional staff is ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of instructional staff will receive in-classroom coaching on a monthly basis (at least 6 months per school year) (as outlined in management plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online coaches log entries (date, location, recipient, time spent, mode of support, focus of coaching) entered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online coaches log system provides real-time (on demand) reports available to logged in users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly status updates from online coaches log reports shared at monthly project meetings with project director and consultants

	coaching provided by LEA coaches?		monthly by LEA coaches		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be reported in 2023 APR 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is a continuous improvement model used to provide coaching supports to LEA coaches? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of LEA coaches will receive two observations (fall/spring) each year in Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up years until they reach full implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional coaching observational feedback online form submitted by consultant with notes including the step-by-step feedback provided in fall. Consultant meets with LEA coach to debrief. Completed coaching FIR submitted and provided to coach in spring. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive analysis of frequencies and qualitative analysis of feedback resulting in an aggregate summary including calculation of % of observations completed and themes of coaches' strengths and areas of improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregate summary report shared with project director and consultants within 3 weeks of completion of observations (February & April); report used to adjust/align ensuing training and TA supports to coaches
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be reported in 2023 APR 					

Objective 3. The Idaho SPDG will deliver follow-up activities to sustain instructional staff in their implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Performance Measure 3.a.: The Idaho SPDG will use at least 50% of total funds in year 2, 60% in year 3, and 70% in years 4-5 to provide follow-up activities to sustain the implementation of explicit instruction by instructional staff when teaching reading to students with disabilities. (GPRA/Program Measure)

Performance Measure 3.b.: Annually, 80% of coaches and teachers participating in onsite coaching and technical assistance visits will report that their practices improved as a result of the onsite visit, as measured by a post-onsite technical assistance survey. (Project Measure)

Performance Measure 3.c.: Annually, all virtual collaboratives will have 90% of the effective facilitation practices for virtual meetings in place, as observed using a virtual facilitation checklist. (Project Measure)

Performance Measure 3.d. By the end of year 4 of project implementation, all LEAs will have 80% of the items scored at 5 or above on a program sustainability assessment tool. (Project Measure)

Process and Outcome Measures					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis & Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the % of SPDG funds used to sustain the implementation of explicit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Idaho SPDG will use at least 50% of total funds in year 2, 60% in year 3, and 70% in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project director along with the fiduciary coordinator will track 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program measure will be calculated by dividing the total cost for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be shared in first stakeholder meetings after calculation

	instruction by instructional staff when teaching reading to students with disabilities?	years 4-5 to provide follow-up activities to sustain the implementation of explicit instruction by instructional staff when teaching reading to students with disabilities. (3.a.)	funds throughout the year and meet monthly to review	follow-up activities by the sum total cost of all initial training activities plus all follow-up activities • Reported to OSEP in SPDG APR annually	• Data will be included in quarterly and annual reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fall Institute trainings were considered “initial trainings” for the purposes of calculating this performance measure. We calculated the cost of the initial training by summing all the contractor costs, LEA drawdowns associated with the initial trainings, and all personnel costs for the month of August, the month that the Fall Institute trainings occurred. The Fall Institute costs ended up being \$177,481. We considered all other costs for the reporting period as funds that supported follow-up activities. We subtracted the Fall Institute costs from the total amount expended during the performance period (\$511,025). We ended up with a value of \$333,544 expended on follow-up activities. We divided \$333,544 by \$511,025 to calculate the percent of funds spent on follow-up activities, which was 65% 					
	• To what extent are LEA coaches and teachers improving their practices as a result of the onsite visits?	• Annually, 80% of coaches and teachers participating in onsite coaching and technical assistance visits will report that their skills will improve as a result of the onsite visit, as measured by a post-onsite technical assistance survey. (3.b.)	• In an End-of-Year survey, a question lists all of the project supports and asks respondents a likert-scale type question about how much each of the supports helped in them improving their practices	• Measure will be calculated by dividing the number of teachers and coaches that responded that their practices improved as a result of the onsite visit by the total number of teachers and coaches that responded to the survey.	• Data will be reported in the APR and shared with stakeholders including the consultants that provide the TA for continuous improvement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2021 in-district visit: 13/14 93% • Spring 2022 in-district visit: 11/11 100% 					
Process	• To what extent are virtual collaboratives designed and delivered in accordance with best practices in virtual facilitation?	• 100% of the virtual collaboratives will have 90% of the effective facilitation practices for virtual meetings in place (3.c.)	• Virtual facilitation checklist with descriptors of evidence • Either observe one of each unique collaborative OR ask participants questions in a mid-year or end-of-year survey.	• Descriptive analysis of frequencies and qualitative analysis of descriptors resulting in a summary including the calculation of % of items in place along with strengths and areas of improvement • Reported to OSEP in APR annually	• Summary shared within 10 days post training with facilitator(s) and project staff

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional staff and coaches Collaborative: 18/19 95% • SPED Director Collaborative: 20/21 95% • Parent Collaborative: 23/23 100% 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are schools able to plan and provide infrastructure, resources, and enabling contexts for sustaining DEI and instructional coaching? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of year 4 of project implementation, all LEAs will have 80% of the items scored at 5 or above on a program sustainability assessment tool. (3.d) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program sustainability checklist completed electronically (spreadsheet with 4 tabs for 4 years) and submitted as an exit ticket at spring (May) F2F training or within 10 days of spring training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive analysis of frequencies and qualitative analysis of descriptors resulting in a summary including the calculation of % of items in place along with noted areas of improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary report shared with SSIP coordinator by June 30 annually • Shared with stakeholders at fall quarterly meeting • Included in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the attendance rate of special education directors in virtual technical assistance calls? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of special ed directors will attend 75% of virtual TA calls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSIP coordinator will track participation on each technical assistance call via spreadsheet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance logs housed in project's online data repository; attendance rate % to be included in technical assistance evaluation summary report results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance rates will be reported in stakeholder meetings • Reported longitudinally in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data quality issues will not allow us to report this year. We will improve processes in the 2022-23 school year and report in the 2023 APR 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the attendance rate of participants in the virtual collaboratives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of instructional staff, LEA coaches attend 75% of virtual collaboratives • 80% of family members attend at least 75% of the virtual collaboratives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance tracked by consultants and sent to project director after each virtual meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance logs housed in project's online data repository; attendance rate % to be included in collaborative evaluation summary report results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance rates will be reported in stakeholder meetings • Reported longitudinally in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data quality issues will not allow us to report this year. We will improve processes in the 2022-23 school year and report in the 2023 APR 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are attendees with the virtual collaboratives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of recipients will report satisfaction with virtual collaboratives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-collaborative evaluation surveys (Likert-type scale and open-ended questions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic based collaborative evaluation report per collaborative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 10 days post collaborative • Year-end summary report shared with project staff,

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year-end summary report covering all collaboratives across the year, broken into target audiences of instructional staff and LEA coaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> posted online, and shared with stakeholders Included in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be collected in spring 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are participants reciprocating knowledge during virtual collaboratives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of attendees will respond that they learned something from another participant that will benefit their SPDG-sponsored work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End-of collaborative survey measuring participants self-report learning from another (Likert-type scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative and quantitative analysis of surveys resulting in one data infographic based collaborative evaluation report per collaborative Year-end summary report covering all collaboratives across the year, broken into target audiences of instructional staff and LEA coaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 10 days post collaborative Year-end summary report shared with project staff, posted online, and shared with stakeholders Included in annual report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be collected in spring 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are family members applying at-home reading strategies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of family members who attended a reading event at their school (and who complete the 3-month post survey) will report application of reading strategies at home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-month post training follow-up survey on applying strategies at home (Likert-type scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative and quantitative analysis of compiled annual parent training attendance, end-of training survey data, and 3-month post training survey data resulting in one data year-end summary infographic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family member training evaluation summary report shared with project staff and trainer(s) within 20 days of last school event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be collected in 2022-23 school year 					
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are visitors to the Cultivating Readers topic page viewing and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given baseline in year 1, website analytics will increase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website analytics including unique visitors, page views, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data infographic based summary report created twice a year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary report shared with project staff twice a year

	downloading reading/literacy resources?	50% in year 2, 80% in year 3 and maintain in years 4 and 5	downloads, pulled bi-annually by ITC		• Reported in annual report
<p>Unique pageviews on idahotc.com/readers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2021 – 275 • September 2021 – 164 • October 2021 – 140 • November 2021 – 83 • December 2021 – 77 • January 2022 – 136 • February 2022 – 174 • March 2022 - 137 					
Process	• To what extent are instructional staff and LEA coaches progressing on their Individual Growth Plans (IGP)?	• 80% of instructional staff and coaches will report completion of all annual goals	• Coaches and instructional staff complete IGP in year 1 and update annually in fall. Each spring, they answer a survey on completion of IGP goals	• % of completed or in progress goals calculated via export of online survey data, resulting in a summary report showing status across all instructional staff	• Summary report shared with project director and consultants at the monthly project meeting immediately following the end of the school year • Data reported in annual report • Data reported in LEA performance reports
• Will be collected in spring 2022 and reported in 2023 APR					
Process	• At what frequency and duration, and what percent of LEA coaches and instructional staff receive ongoing coaching provided by consultants?	• 90% of LEA coaches and instructional staff will receive 1:1/small group onsite or virtual coaching/technical assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEA coaches-3x per year (2x in-district visits, 1 coaching session) ○ Instructional staff- 2 in-district visits 	• Online coaches log entries (date, location, recipient, time spent, mode of support, focus of coaching) entered monthly by consultants	• Online coaches log system provides real-time (on demand) reports available to logged in users	• Monthly status updates from online coaches log reports shared at monthly project meetings with project director and consultants, and crosschecked and verified for alignment with consultant invoices
• Collected at end of year and reported in 2023 APR					

Objective 4. The Idaho SPDG project activities will result in improved reading outcomes for students with disabilities.					
Performance Measure 4.a. With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of Idaho SPDG schools will have 100% of students with disabilities reading on grade level or will improve from fall to spring by 10% each year of the project. (Program Measure)					
Performance Measure 4.b. After 2 school years of project participation, 50% of Idaho SPDG schools’ percentage of students with disabilities scoring on grade level in reading will be greater than the state average, with 60% after 3 years, and 70% after 4 years. (Project Measure)					
Performance Measure 4.c. After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of families of students with disabilities in Idaho SPDG schools will report that their children have made adequate progress in reading. (Project Measure)					
Process and Outcome Measures					
Type of Measure	Evaluation Questions	Performance Targets/Indicators	Timeline and Data Collection Methods	Analysis & Reporting Process	Sharing of Results Process
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the % of SPDG schools that improve the percentage of students with disabilities scoring on grade level in reading by 5% each year of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of Idaho SPDG schools will have 100% of students with disabilities reading on grade level or will improve from fall to spring by 10% each year of the project. (4.a.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each fall and spring the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) is administered to students kindergarten through third grade. Data will be requested by project director from assessment department at ISDE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In spring of year 1, baseline will be set. Each subsequent spring, percentage of students with disabilities at each school scoring on grade level will be calculated. The percentage of schools that increased by 5% will be calculated Data will be disaggregated by cohort, LEA, school, teacher, grade level, and reading sub scores Data will be reported to OSEP in the SPDG APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be shared in fall stakeholder meetings Through quarterly and annual report To district leadership teams in end of year performance report – schools not meeting benchmarks will develop improvement activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline collected fall 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the % of SPDG schools that improve the percentage of students with disabilities meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After 2 school years of project participation, 50% of Idaho SPDG schools’ percentage of students with disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each spring, SPDG instructional staff will be surveyed and asked on average the percentage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In spring of year 1, baseline will be set. Each subsequent spring, percentage of students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be shared in fall stakeholder meetings Through quarterly and annual report

	evidence-based curriculum benchmarks in reading by 5%?	scoring on grade level in reading will be greater than the state average, with 60% after 3 years, and 70% after 4 years. (4.b.)	of students with disabilities meeting benchmarks	with disabilities meeting curriculum benchmarks in reading will be calculated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage that increased by 5% from previous year will be calculated. Data will be reported to OSEP in APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To district leadership teams in end of year performance report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline collected fall 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the % of family members who attended school reading events that report their students have substantially improved reading? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of families of students with disabilities in Idaho SPDG schools will report that their children have made adequate progress in reading. (4.c.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names and email addresses of family members will be collected at school reading events. A survey will be sent at the end of each school year identifying family members of students with disabilities and asking a Likert-type scale question about child's reading ability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of family members who respond that their child made significant progress in reading in the past year will be calculated. Data will be reported to OSEP in APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be shared in fall stakeholder meetings Through quarterly and annual report To district leadership teams in end of year performance report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline collected fall 2022 					
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the average % growth each month for students with disabilities reading on grade level for SPDG schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPDG schools increase percentage of students with disabilities reading on grade level by 1.2% on average each month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPDG instructional staff will administer the IRI monthly to all students with disabilities. Project director will request data from assessment department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools will be monitored monthly Data will be disaggregated by cohort, LEA, school, teacher, grade level, and reading sub scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data will be shared with district leadership teams twice per year Schools that are consistently not meeting benchmarks will be contacted and an improvement plan developed
<p>Project-level IRI data 2021-22, Tier 1 percentages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall IRI – 19% 					

- December – 25%
- January – 26%
- February – 28%
- March – 29%

Project Narrative - Signed Cover Sheet

Title : Signed Cover Sheet

Attachment:

File :

- 1 [Signed_524b_Cover_Sheet_5_4_22.pdf](#)



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 07/31/2021

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.
 Annual Performance Report Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/Award #: H323A200002
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 characters.)
2. Grantee NCES ID#: 16
(See instructions. Up to 12 characters.)
3. Project Title: Cultivating Readers through Evidence-Based Practices in Instruction and Coaching
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification)*: Idaho State Department of Education
5. Grantee Address *(See instructions.)*
6. Project Director *(See instructions.)* Name: Kailey Bunch-Woodson Title: Program Evaluation Coordinator
 Ph #: (208) 332-6925 Ext: () Fax #: (208) 334-2228
 Email Address: kbunch-woodson@sde.idaho.gov

Reporting Period Information *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period: From: 3/1/2021 To: 02/28/2022 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)*

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds <i>(Match/Cost Share)</i>
a. Previous Budget Period	45,684.83	0
b. Current Budget Period	511,025.67	0
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	NA	NA

Indirect Cost Information *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)*

9. Indirect Costs
- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? Yes No
 If yes, please indicate which of the following applies to your grant?
- b. YES The grantee has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government:
 The period covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement is from: 07 / 01/2021 to: 06 / 30 / 2022 (mm/dd/yyyy)
 The approving Federal agency is: ED Other *(Please specify)*: _____
 The Indirect Cost Rate is 11.7 %
 The Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only)* is: Provisional Final Other *(Please specify)*:
- c. The grantee is not a State, local government, or Indian tribe, and is using the de minimus rate of 10% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) in compliance with 2 CFR 200.414(f).
- d. The grantee is funded under a Restricted Rate Program and is you using a restricted indirect cost rate that either:
 Is included in its approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement; or
 Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2).
- e. The grantee is funded under a Training Rate Program and:
 Is recovering indirect cost using 8 percent of MTDC in compliance with 34 CFR 75.562(c)(2); or
 Is recovering indirect costs using its actual negotiated indirect cost rate reflected in 9(b).

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) *(See instructions.)*

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? Yes No N/A

Data Privacy and Security Measures Certification *(See instructions.)*

11. Is a statement affirming that you are aware of federal and state data security and student privacy regulations included, with supporting documentation attached? Yes No N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

12. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? ___ Yes x No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? 12/29/2025 (mm/dd/yyyy)

13. By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate and the expenditures, disbursements, and cash receipts are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the terms and conditions of the Federal award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1001 and Title 31, Sections 3729-3730 and 3801-33812).

Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true, complete, and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of data reported.

Dr. Charlie Silva
Name of Authorized Representative:

Title: Special Education Director

CS
Signature:

Date: 5/4/2022

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

**Check only one box per
Program Office instructions.**

**Annual
Performance
Report** **Final
Performance
Report**

General Information

1. PR/Award #: H323A200002
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 Characters.)
2. Grantee NCES ID#: 16
(See instructions. Up to 12 Characters.)
3. Project Title: Cultivating Readers through Evidence-Based Practices in Instruction and Coaching
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
4. Grantee Name: EDUCATION, IDAHO STATE BOARD OF
(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.)
5. Grantee Address:
(See instructions.)
Street: 650 W STATE ST STE 307
City: BOISE
State: ID Zip: 83720 Zip+4: 5936
6. Project Director:
(See instructions.)
First Name:Kailey Last Name:Bunch-Woodson Title:Program Evaluation Coordinator
Phone #: 2083326925 Fax #: 2083342228 Email Address: kbunch-woodson@sde.idaho.gov

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 03/01/2021 To: 02/28/2022
(mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)

8. Budget Expenditures:

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	45,648	0
b. Current Budget Period	511,025	0
c. Entire Project Period (For Final Performance Reports only)		

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?
If yes, please indicate which of the following applies to your grant? Yes No
- b. The grantee has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government: Yes No
The period covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement is : From: 07/01/2021 To:06/30/2022
(mm/dd/yyyy)
The approving Federal agency is : ED Other (Please specify):
- The Indirect Cost Rate is : 11.7 %
- Type of Rate Provisional (Please specify):
(For Final Performance Reports Only): Final Other
- c. The grantee is not a State, local government, or Indian tribe, and is using the de minimus rate of 10% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) in compliance with 2 CFR 200.414(f) Yes No
- d. The grantee is funded under a Restricted Rate Program and is you using a restricted indirect cost rate that either :
 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?
- e. The grantee is funded under a Training Rate Program and:
 Is recovering indirect cost using 8 percent of MTDC in compliance with 34 CFR 75.562(c)(2)
 Is recovering indirect costs using its actual negotiated indirect cost rate reflected in 9(b)

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? Yes No N/A

Data Privacy and Security Measures Certification (See instructions.)

11. Is a statement affirming that you are aware of federal and state data security and student privacy regulations included, with supporting documentation attached? Yes No N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

12. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? 12/29/2025 (mm/dd/yyyy)

13. By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate and the expenditures, disbursements, and cash receipts are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the terms and conditions of the Federal award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1001 and Title 31, Sections 3729-3730 and 3801-33812). Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true, complete, and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of data reported.

Name of Authorized Representative: Charlotte Silva

Title: Special Education Director

Signature:

Date:

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:

Title : Idaho SPDG Executive Summary 2022

File : [Idaho SPDG Executive Summary 2022.pdf](#)



IDAHO SPDG EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2022

The 2020-2025 Idaho State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), Cultivating Readers, provides local education agency (LEA) and school staff with training, coaching, and ongoing technical assistance to help teachers improve their delivery of reading instruction in Idaho's schools and improve reading proficiency for students with disabilities in kindergarten through third grade. The Cultivating Readers project supports LEAs, not only by helping to improve teachers' practices in the classroom, but by helping them strengthen their systems to support high-quality reading instruction.

Cultivating Readers launched implementation with LEAs in August 2021. From August 2021 through February 2022, Cultivating Readers achieved a number of accomplishments and progress toward its objectives and goal. The goal of Cultivating Readers is to "Improve reading proficiency for students with disabilities through the sustained implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities". The project aims to achieve its goal by focusing on four objectives. Below is a description of each objective and how Cultivating Readers has made progress toward the objective over the past year.

Objective 1: 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.

Cultivating Readers trainers, coaches, and support staff designed and delivered a comprehensive system of professional development (PD) to LEA and school personnel. State leadership and implementation team members used the SPDG Evidence-based PD Components Rubric to design the PD system, ensuring that Cultivating Readers was working towards full implementation of the components of effective PD. In August 2021, school leadership teams participated in training to assess their Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R) and develop an action plan for improving their MTSS-R over the school year. Additionally, special education directors and principals participated in training on leadership and authentic stakeholder engagement, instructional staff and LEA coaches in training related to delivery of high-quality reading instruction, and parents in training to improve their knowledge and skills for serving on decision-making groups. Furthermore, school librarians participated in training on strategies to help students to develop a love of reading. Trainings were followed up throughout the year with ongoing support and technical assistance, coaching, and data collection, analysis, and use.

The Cultivating Readers system of PD was evaluated through data collection activities and improved by utilizing a continuous improvement process. Cultivating Readers achieved various training outcomes and will continue working to improve those that were not achieved in the first year of implementation. Some outcomes that were achieved were as follows:

- Over 80% of training attendees reported improvement on over 75% of the knowledge-based and skills-based learning targets

Objective 2: Use a continuous improvement model to inform, monitor, improve and achieve high fidelity in instructional staff's implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Although fidelity of implementation data will not be collected formally until spring 2022, Cultivating Readers state implementation team staff and LEA participants built the foundation to support instructional staff in achieving high fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities. In August 2021, the state implementation team launched project utilization of a virtual coaching platform. Throughout the year, instructional staff video-recorded their reading instruction, uploaded their videos to the platform, reviewed their videos and self-reflected, then submitted the videos to their LEA coach. The LEA coach reviewed the videos, provided feedback in the platform, and the pair met for collaborative coaching. State implementation team staff monitored the coaching platform activity of each instructional staff and LEA coach. This allowed them to understand which individuals were more engaged in the coaching process and which might have needed more support. State implementation team staff contacted administrators whose staff were less engaged in coaching to try and increase their activity in the platform.

In spring 2022, LEA coaches will rate a fidelity of explicit instruction rubric to collect baseline fidelity of explicit instruction data. Additionally, LEA coaches will record a coaching session and state coaches will evaluate fidelity of coaching. This process will be completed each subsequent fall and spring to inform, monitor, improve and achieve fidelity of implementation.

Objective 3: Deliver follow-up activities to sustain instructional staff in their implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Cultivating Readers state implementation team staff followed up throughout the school year with additional training and ongoing support and technical assistance for participants. Instructional staff, LEA coaches, parents, and special education directors participated in monthly or bimonthly collaborative calls to receive additional training, discuss implementation, share problems of practice, and action plan. State coaches met one-on-one, virtually, with school staff in the fall and in person in the spring to observe teachers' instruction and provide feedback, model instructional practices, meet with leadership teams to provide systems coaching, and provide any other individualized support that was needed. Furthermore, Cultivating Readers maintained a project website where they continuously added and updated training materials, resources, and information to support project participants. Some outcomes that were achieved were as follows:

- 96% of coaches and teachers participating in onsite coaching and technical assistance visits reported their practices will improve as a result of the visit.
- All virtual collaboratives had at least 90% of the effective facilitation practices for virtual meetings in place.

Objective 4: Improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

Student reading outcomes data will not be reported this year. In spite of this, the Cultivating Readers state implementation team monitored student reading outcomes data on a monthly basis, provided school-level reports to participating schools in the fall and spring, and used student reading outcomes data to provide targeted technical assistance during the onsite visits and to develop the spring training. As improving student reading outcomes is the Cultivating Readers project's long-term goal, collecting, analyzing and using student outcomes data was a priority throughout the year.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: H323A200002

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

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

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.a 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.	PROGRAM		8 / 16	50		14 / 16	88
1.b After one school year of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of school leadership teams will meet implementation components indicated on the MTSS-R Implementation Checklist (scoring 80% or greater), or increase their score by 10% from the previous year's assessment.	PROJECT		18 / 22	82		999 / 999	100
1.c Annually, 100% of the skill-based trainings provided will have 90% of the adult-learning principles in place, as observed using the high-quality PD checklist.	PROJECT		7 / 7	100		3 / 7	43
1.d Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the knowledge-based learning targets.	PROJECT		15 / 19	79		17 / 19	89
1.e Annually, 80% of training attendees will improve on 75% of the skill-based learning targets.	PROJECT		20 / 26	77		24 / 26	92

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

Please see Additional Section A text attachment for explanation of progress information, completed SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components rubric, and Idaho SPDG Evaluation Plan

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: H323A200002

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

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

The Idaho SPDG will use a continuous improvement model to inform, monitor, improve, and achieve high fidelity in instructional staff's implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.a After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of instructional staff will reach full implementation on an explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10% or more from the previous year's assessment.	PROGRAM		40 / 50	80		999 / 999	100
2.b After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach full implementation on the instructional coaching fidelity of implementation rubric, or improve implementation by 10 percentage points or more from the previous year's assessment.	PROJECT		16 / 20	80		999 / 999	100
2.c After 2 school years of project participation and annually thereafter, 80% of LEA coaches will reach 80% interrater reliability on the explicit instruction fidelity of implementation rubric with an expert rater, or improve interrater reliability by 10% or more from the previous year's assessment.	PROJECT		16 / 20	80		999 / 999	100

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

2.a. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR. 2.b. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR. 2.c. Performance Measure: Baseline data for this measure is being collected in spring 2022 and will be reported in the 2023 APR.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: H323A200002

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

The Idaho SPDG will deliver follow-up activities to sustain instructional staff in their implementation of explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.a The Idaho SPDG will use at least 50% of total funds in year 2, 60% in year 3, and 70% in years 4-5 to provide follow-up activities and ongoing technical assistance to sustain the implementation of project practices.	PROGRAM		255512 / 511025	50		333544 / 511025	65
3.b Annually, 80% of coaches and teachers participating in onsite coaching and technical assistance visits will report that their skills will improve as a result of the onsite visit, as measured by a post-onsite technical assistance survey.	PROJECT		20 / 25	80		24 / 25	96
3.c Annually, all virtual collaboratives will have 90% of the effective facilitation practices for virtual meetings in place, as observed using a virtual facilitation checklist.	PROJECT		3 / 3	100		3 / 3	100
3.d By the end of year 4 of project implementation, all LEAs will have 80% of the items scored at 5 or above on a program sustainability assessment tool.	PROJECT		7 / 7	100		999 / 999	100

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

Please see Additional Section A attachment for explanation of progress information and Idaho SPDG Evaluation Plan.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: H323A200002

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

The Idaho SPDG project activities will result in improved reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
4.a With fall of year 2 of project participation as baseline, 80% of Idaho SPDG schools will have 100% of students with disabilities reading on grade level or will improve from fall to spring by 10 percentage points each year of the project.	PROGRAM		26 / 32	81		999 / 999	100
4.b After 2 school years of project participation, 50% of Idaho SPDG schools' percentage of students with disabilities scoring on grade level in reading will be greater than the state average, with 60% after 3 years, and 70% after 4 years.	PROJECT		16 / 32	50		999 / 999	100

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

4.a. Performance Measure: Baseline data will be collected in fall 2022 and reported in the 2023 APR using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator by Istation. Students with disabilities scoring in Tier 1 (on grade level in reading) will be included in the numerator and the total number of students with disabilities taking the assessment will make up the denominator. We calculated the percentage of students with disabilities reading on grade level according to the Fall 2021 Idaho Reading Indicator administration for schools participating in the Idaho SPDG in the 2021-22 school year. The percentages are as follows: School Name Fall 2021 Percentage Tier 1 ACEQUIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 18% BICKEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 19% CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 39% FORT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL <5% FILER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 12% FUTURE PUBLIC SCHOOL 9% GEM PREP: MERIDIAN 38% GEM PREP: NAMPA 18% GEM PREP: ONLINE <5% GEM PREP: POCATELLO SCHOOL 28% HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - MINIDOKA 16% HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - ST MARIES 11% HOLLISTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 13% HUBBARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 17% LAPWAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 6% MORELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 18% MOUNT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 25% MULLAN SCHOOLS 20% NAPLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 8% NOTUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 18% OAKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 32% PIONEER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 37% PROJECT IMPACT STEM ACADEMY 24% RIDGE CREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 25% RIRIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 17% RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL <5% RUPERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 18% UPRIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL <5% VALLEY VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 21% VIRTUAL SCHOOL HOUSE 29% WAPELLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL <5% WENDELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 10% 4.b. Performance Measure: Baseline data will be collected in spring 2022 and reported in the 2023 APR.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: **H323A200002**

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Idaho SPDG Section B 5-3-22

File : [Section_B_3_20_22.pdf](#)

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Idaho SPDG Section C 5-3-22

File : [Section_C_3_30_22.pdf](#)



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003

PR/Award # (11 characters): H323A200002

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

- Report budget expenditure data in items 8a. – 8c. of the ED 524B Cover Sheet, as applicable. Please follow the instructions for completing items 8a. – 8c. included in this instruction sheet.

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	45,684.83	
b. Current Budget Period	511,025.67	
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	NA	NA

- For budget expenditures made with Federal grant funds, you must provide an explanation if funds have not been drawn down from the G5 System to pay for the budget expenditure amounts reported in items 8a. – 8c of the ED 524B Cover Sheet.
N/A
- Provide an explanation if you **did not** expend funds at the expected rate during the reporting period.
The areas for which we did not expend funds at the expected rate during the reporting period was on salaries, fringe benefits and contracts. In terms of salaries and fringe benefits, the Fiduciary Coordinator and Principal Investigator spent less time on the grant than what was budgeted. Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted our ability to recruit the number of schools we originally budgeted to support. Therefore, our LEA allocation expenditures were less than what was expected.

- Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modification of project activities.
N/A
- Describe any changes to your budget that affected your ability to achieve your approved project activities and/or project objectives.
N/A
- Do you expect to have any unexpended funds at the end of the current budget period? If you do, explain why, provide an estimate, and indicate how you plan to use the unexpended funds (carryover) in the next budget period.
Yes, we expect to have unexpended funds at the end of the current budget period. We budgeted funds for LEA allocations based on an estimate of the number of LEAs, schools, and personnel that would be participating in the grant activities. We are under our target for new LEAs starting in 2022-23. Our budget supports 10 new LEAs each year, with an average of 2 schools per LEA. Although 7 new LEAs applied to participate starting in 2022-23, they are all either single school charters or districts with only one elementary school. Additionally, we expect to have unexpended funds in our salaries line-item due to the Fiduciary Coordinator and Principal Investigator not spending as much time on grant activities as budgeted. The estimated unexpended funds are as follows:
 - Salaries \$50,000
 - Fringe benefits \$20,000
 - Contracts \$65,000

These funds will be reallocated into various contracts. First, we will increase the off-contract time/substitutes line item in LEA budgets that allows them to pay their staff for additional hours worked to complete project activities, and develop new contracts. In 2021-22, we awarded funds based on the substitute teacher rate of \$75 per day. Most LEAs were not able to find substitute teachers and needed to pay their staff for additional time worked. Since teachers and coaches' salaries and benefits are more than \$75 per day, the funds often times did not cover the costs. In 2022-23, we will estimate the number of additional hours that staff may need to complete project activities per month and award funds based on the average teacher hourly rate plus benefits. In addition, we plan to develop a contract with the University of Idaho to increase evaluation capacity and add to the National Center on Improving Literacy contract to increase the training and ongoing support offered to school leadership teams on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading.
- Describe any anticipated changes in your budget for the next budget period that requires prior approval from the Department (see 2 CFR 200.308, as applicable).
N/A

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

- If applicable, please provide a list of current partners on your grant and indicate if any partners changed during the reporting period. Please indicate if you anticipate any change in partners during the next budget period. If any of your partners changed during the reporting period, please describe whether this impacted your ability to achieve your approved project objectives and/or project activities.
Our current partners include Metis Education Consulting, Boise State University, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Idaho Commission for Libraries, Insight Advance, Lee Pesky Learning Center, and the National Center on Improving Literacy. We would like to establish a contract through the SPDG with the University of Idaho during the next budget period. Currently, the external evaluator’s contract through the University of Idaho is supported through IDEA funds. We would like to increase evaluation capacity by supporting the evaluation with SPDG funding as well.
- Provide information about how school, district, regional (as appropriate) and State implementation teams are used for your initiative(s).
The state implementation team (SIT) builds competency and capacity and allocates resources to the district and building implementation teams. The state implementation team is comprised of the Project Director, SSIP Coordinator, and state coaches, and external evaluator, and is supported by the Principal Investigator, Fiscal Coordinator, Financial Specialist, and Program Specialist. The SIT’s responsibilities include the following:
 - Selecting effective innovations and implementation sites
 - Developing state-level professional development infrastructure
 - Providing training and ongoing technical assistance to support participants’ use of evidence-based practices with fidelity
 - Collecting implementation and outcome data to use within a continuous improvement cycle
 - Supporting participants’ knowledge and skills to use data for decision making
 - Managing bi-directional communications between state, district and building implementation teams
 - Supporting implementation sites in sustaining and scaling up practices

The SIT meets on a monthly basis to discuss implementation of project activities, review data, use a continuous improvement process to identify and overcome barriers, and update an action plan for improving implementation. On at least a quarterly basis, the Project Director and SSIP Coordinator review project data or solicit feedback from two of the department’s stakeholder groups; the Directors Advisory Council (DAC, comprised of special education directors statewide) and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP, comprised of staff from other agencies providing services to students with disabilities and parents of students with disabilities). These groups help inform improvements in project activities, systems coherence, and evaluation.

The SIT is currently working and will continue to improve efforts to partner and align with other state offices, agencies, and initiatives to support improved reading outcomes for children with disabilities. Through the SPDG, Idaho has begun a partnership with the Idaho Commission for Libraries, a state agency that provides professional development to school and public library staff. The project also partners with two public Idaho universities, Boise State University and University of Idaho. The SIT is currently working with the Content and Curriculum Department and the Accountability Department to align professional development projects and resources. Furthermore, the SPDG project aligns with other SDE initiatives whenever possible. For example, LEAs identified in “Needs Intervention” for LEA Determinations have the opportunity to participate in the Idaho SPDG work if they find through a needs assessment that their needs align to the SPDG activities and outcomes. Additionally, the SPDG Project Director is on the State Technical Assistance Team (STAT), the leadership team for the school improvement work under the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. The STAT team will continue working to build a coherent system of professional development. Currently, schools identified as Targeted Support and Improvement

(TSI) under Idaho's Consolidated State Plan as having a proficiency gap for students with disabilities in English/Language Arts are prioritized for participation in the Idaho SPDG.

Participating LEAs form district and building implementation teams comprised of special education directors, principals of participating schools, general education and special education teachers, district or school coaches and parents of students with disabilities. The special education director is the lead of the district implementation team and the building principal is the lead of the building implementation team. The special education director provides facilitative administration of project activities including meeting with district implementation teams at least monthly, using a continuous improvement process to identify and overcome barriers, implement and update an action plan for systems improvements, use data for decision making and continuously work towards sustaining and scaling up of evidence-based practices in the building and district. District implementation team members work towards planning for and implementing sustainability strategies and for scaling up the evidence-based practices within the district. District leadership teams share materials and information from their SPDG participation with their local school boards and other stakeholder groups.

The personnel on the district implementation team from each participating school form their own school implementation team. The principal of each school is the lead of the school implementation team, providing facilitative administration. School teams participate in all Idaho SPDG project activities, including training on the project's evidence-based practices, ongoing technical assistance, coaching and data collection. School implementation teams meet at least monthly, using a continuous improvement process to identify and overcome barriers, implement and update an action plan for implementing a Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for reading instruction (MTSS-R), use data for decision making and continuously work towards sustaining and scaling up of evidence-based practices in the building. Parents play an important role on the school leadership and implementation teams, as they are active members in decision making, planning, and implementing reading initiatives for parents and families at the school.

- Provide a description of how you work with local entities (e.g., schools, districts) to plan for sustainability.
The Idaho SPDG SIT works with district and school implementation teams to plan for sustainability throughout the duration of their participation. Each school implementation team completes an MTSS-R Implementation Checklist during the fall training of the first year of their participation, and updates it each subsequent year. This instrument will act as a guide for school teams to improve implementation and increase sustainability. The SIT provides training and technical assistance on both implementation science and use of the checklist. The Idaho SPDG project emphasizes certain items on the checklist that are important to sustaining the evidence-based practices, including forming effective school leadership teams, classroom reading instruction and intervention teams, special education eligibility teams, and effective individual school leaders. The SIT works with district and school-level leaders (i.e. special education directors and principals), to improve sustainability at each of their levels. Special education directors meet with the SSIP Coordinator bimonthly to participate in training on implementation science and discuss barriers to implementation and strategies for overcoming barriers. These meetings will be extended to principals starting in 2022-23. Additionally, The SSIP Coordinator will facilitate the completion of a sustainability checklist in years 3 and 4 of the project with special education director and principals and guide action planning for increasing sustainability and scaling up of the system infrastructure and evidence-based practices within the district.
- Briefly describe the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on your project's management, budget, and activities.
The Idaho SPDG project was planned during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the Idaho SPDG state leadership team was able to plan for barriers that might come up due to the pandemic. The pandemic did negatively impact our project in a number of ways. One activity that was affected was the fall in-district coaching and technical assistance visit by state coaches. The visits were scheduled to be in person, but had to be delivered virtually due to high COVID case counts during that timeframe. The spring in-district visits were able to be delivered in-person. Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic did affect the number of new districts applying to participate in the project for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years. The Project Director

and SSIP Coordinator made great efforts to recruit participants by marketing the project through presentations and approaching individual district and school leaders, presenting them with their student reading outcome data and asking them to participate. Many leaders cited the impacts of COVID-19, such as teacher burn out and not being able to find substitute teachers as reasons for not wanting to participate next school year.

- Describe any changes that you wish to make in the grant’s activities for the next budget period that are consistent with the scope and objectives of your approved application.
 The Idaho SPDG would like to make a couple of changes for the next budget period. First, we would like to establish a contract through the SPDG with the University of Idaho to increase evaluation capacity. Currently, the evaluation work is funded through IDEA dollars. We have a need for more evaluation support in the coming years than what is funded through the current contract. In addition, we would like to expand the scope of work of the National Center for Improving Literacy (NCIL). Last year, NCIL delivered the MTSS-R training. We would like to offer more ongoing support for school leadership teams on MTSS-R. Therefore, we would like to expand the NCIL contract to add two more days of support during the school year. Finally, we would like to modify the way we award the “choice in professional development” funds. This past year, we awarded each LEA a set amount of funds. Some LEAs used the full amount and it did not cover their expenses. Other LEAs did not use any of the funds. Next year, we would like to award the funds based on a proposal process where LEAs would write a proposal, ensure that the professional development meets all requirements, and request funds within a specified range.
- If you are requesting changes to the approved Project Director listed in Block 3 of your GAN and/or to other approved key personnel listed in Block 4 with a proposed effective date during the remainder of the current budget period or the next budget period, please indicate the name, title and percentage of time of the requested key personnel. Please indicate whether the proposed Project Director or other key personnel change would be effective during the current or next budget period. Additionally, please attach a resume or curriculum vitae for the proposed key personnel when you submit your performance report.
 N/A
- Provide any other appropriate information about the status of your project including any unanticipated outcomes or benefits from your project.
 N/A