## *Data-Based Decision Making Practice Profile*

Implementation with fidelity requires clearly described implementation criteria. The Practice Profile framework has recently been developed by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) as a way of outlining implementation criteria using a rubric structure with clearly defined practice-level characteristics (NIRN, 2011). According to NIRN, the Practice Profile emerged from the conceptualization of the change process outline in the work of Hall and Hord’s (2006) Innovation Configuration Mapping (NIRN, 2011).

The Practice Profile template includes four pieces and is anchored by the essential functions. First, as a header is the foundation of implementation that philosophically grounds implementation. Then moving from left to right across the template are the essential functions of the practice, implementation performance levels, and lastly, evidence which provides data or documentation for determining implementation levels.

How to Use the Practice Profile

The essential functions align with the teaching/learning objectives for each learning package. Four levels of implementation are described for each teaching/learning objective: exemplary, proficient, close to proficient, and far from proficient. The professional development provider should review the practice profile with the educator-learners, referring to the data and artifacts listed as suggested evidence. It is an important tool for self-monitoring their own implementation, because it serves as a reminder of the implementation criteria and is also aligned with the fidelity checklists and the electronic practice profile self-assessment tool. These sources provide data regarding further training or coaching.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data-based Decision Making (DBDM) Practice Profile** | | | | | |
| **Essential Function** | | **Exemplary Implementation** | **Proficient** | **Close to Proficient**  **(Skill is emerging, but not yet to proficiency. Coaching is recommended.)** | **Far from Proficient**  **(Follow-up professional development and coaching are critical.)** |
| 1 | Educators collect, chart, and disaggregate student learning data. | * ≥90% of teachers administer common formative assessment and use common scoring method to evaluate student proficiency. * ≥90% of teachers share charted class data with the data team prior to meeting. * Results are disaggregated into 4 proficiency groups according to specific school needs (e.g., specific subgroups). * Results are available electronically to all team members and administration at all times. | * ≥80% of teachers administer common formative assessment and use common method to evaluate student proficiency. * ≥80% of teachers share charted class data with the data team prior to meeting. * Results are disaggregated into 4 proficiency groups according to specific school needs (e.g., specific subgroups). * Results are available to all team members at all times. | * ≥70% of teachers administer common formative assessment and use common scoring method to evaluate student proficiency. * ≥70% of teachers share charted class data with the data team prior to meeting. * Results are disaggregated into fewer than 3 proficiency groups. * Results are available only to team members present for the meeting. | * <70% of teachers administer common formative assessment and use common scoring method to evaluate student proficiency. * <70% of teachers share charted class data with the data team prior to meeting. * Results are not disaggregated. * Results are available only to team data recorder. |
| 2 | Educators analyze results to identify priority learning needs. | * Team lists strengths, misconceptions, and inferences for 4 proficiency groups. * Strengths and misconceptions are directly related to the common formative assessment and all essential standards. * Learning needs are prioritized. * Prioritized needs are categorized according to a hierarchy of prerequisite skills. | * Team lists strengths, misconceptions, and inferences for 4 proficiency groups. * Strengths and misconceptions are directly related to the common formative assessment and a targeted standard. * Learning needs are prioritized. * Prioritized needs are categorized. | * Team lists strengths, misconceptions, and inferences for 3 proficiency groups. * Strengths and misconceptions are directly related to the common formative assessment and targeted standard(s). * Learning needs are prioritized. * Prioritized needs are not categorized. | * Team lists strengths, misconceptions, and inferences but does not list by proficiency groups. * Any strengths and misconceptions listed are not directly related to the common formative assessment and targeted standard(s). * Learning needs are not prioritized. * Prioritized needs are not categorized. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | Educators establish SMART  goals based on data- identified student learning needs. | Team meets the 5 criteria of SMART goals and 7/8 additional goal criteria. | Team meets the 5 criteria of SMART goals and 4/8 additional goal criteria. | Team meets the 5 criteria of SMART goals and fewer than 4 of the additional goal criteria. | Team meets fewer than 5 criteria of SMART goals. |
| SMART Goal Criteria:   1. Are specific to targeted subject area, grade level, and student population 2. Are measurable and how measurement will occur is specified 3. Are attainable demonstration of percentage gains or increases in terms of expected change 4. Are results oriented, and must be something learners can do and that is relevant 5. Are time-bound with a set timeframe established   Additional Goal Criteria:   * are based on correctly calculated data percentages * reflect > 80% of students in the categories of proficient, close, and far from proficient are proficient by post-assessment * are identified separately for student growth in the intervention category, on a case-by-case basis * are derived from specific team inferences * include baseline (pre-assessment) mid-assessment and outcome (post-assessment) for all essential standards * indicate closure of achievement gaps for targeted student groups * are few and prioritized * include scheduled time set for formal analysis of results | | | |
| 4 | Educators use data to select a common  instructional practice/ strategy to implement with fidelity. | * Selected instructional practices are DESE approved. * Selected instructional practices/ strategies:   + target prioritized needs and are evidence-based   + have an effect size >.60 impact on student growth   + are linked to prioritized needs for each proficiency group   + include learning environment, time, frequency, and duration to be used | * Selected instructional practices are DESE approved. * Selected instructional practices/ strategies:   + target prioritized needs and are evidence-based   + have an effect size of >.40 impact on student growth   + are linked to prioritized needs for each proficiency group | Selected instructional practices/ strategies:   * target prioritized needs. * are described in detail to allow for replication. * are linked to prioritized needs for each proficiency group. | Selected instructional practices/ strategies target prioritized needs. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Educators explain results indicators for process (cause) and product (effect). | * *Weekly or more frequently*, team discusses expected cause data (teacher behavior) related to expected student results (effect data) for each proficiency group, with detail for replication. * *Weekly or more frequently*, discrepancies in student results are examined in relation to difference in implementation data. * *Monthly*, based on data, improved implementation processes are recommended or alternative instructional practice and/or strategy is chosen. | * *At least every two weeks*, team discusses expected cause data (teacher behavior) related to expected student results (effect data) for each proficiency group, with detail for replication. * *At least every two weeks*, discrepancies in student results are examined in relation to difference in implementation data. * *Quarterly*, based on data, improved implementation processes are recommended or alternative instructional practice and/or strategy is chosen. | * *At least quarterly*, team discusses expected cause data (teacher behavior) related to expected student results (effect data) for each proficiency group, with detail for replication. * *At least quarterly*, discrepancies in student results are examined in relation to difference in implementation data. * *Semi-annually*, based on data, improved implementation processes are recommended or alternative instructional practice and/or strategy is chosen. | Team discussion about expected cause data (teacher behavior) and student results (effect data) occurs but does not include a cause/effect discussion, or uses incomplete data. |
| 6 | Educators design and practice ongoing monitoring of results (monitor, reflect, adjust, repeat). | * *Weekly or more frequently*, teams use data to self-reflect and self-assess for implementation fidelity and record discussion. * After 2 assessments (pre-, mid, post-) for the timeframe have been completed, visual representation of growth is displayed. * Visual representation of results is kept electronically. * Times are scheduled for formal analysis of results. * Effect size(s) is/are calculated and recorded. | * *Every two weeks*, teams use data to self-reflect and self-assess for implementation fidelity and record discussion. * After 2 assessments (pre-, mid, post-) for the timeframe have been completed, visual representation of growth is displayed. * Visual representation of results is kept electronically. * Times are scheduled for formal analysis of results. | * *Quarterly*, teams use data to self-reflect and self-assess for   implementation fidelity and record discussion.   * After 2 assessments (pre-, mid, post-) for the timeframe have been completed, visual representation of growth is displayed. * Visual representation of results is kept electronically. * Times are scheduled for formal analysis of results. | * *Two times per year*, teams use data to self-reflect and self-assess for implementation fidelity but discussion is not recorded. * After 2 assessments (pre-, mid, post-) for the timeframe have been completed, visual representation of growth is displayed. |