## Effective Teaching/Learning Practice: Progress Monitoring 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, the header contains 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. For each teaching/learning objective are levels of implementation. For some essential functions, proficient and exemplary implementation criteria are the same and in others, criteria differ. Close to proficient levels of implementation suggest the skill or practice is emerging and coaching is recommended for moving toward more proficient implementation. When implementation is reported at the unacceptable variation level, follow-up professional development in addition to coaching is recommended. The professional development provider should walk through 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 as to the implementation criteria and is also aligned with the fidelity checklists.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Missouri Special Education Learning Package Practice Profile** Foundations present in the implementation of each essential function: *Commitment to the success of all students and to improving the quality of instruction.* | | | | |
| Progress Monitoring Practice Profile | | | | |
| **Essential Function** | | **Proficient**  **Ideal Implementation** | **Close to Proficient**  *(Skill is emerging, but not yet to ideal proficiency. Coaching is recommended.)* | **Far from Proficient** *(Follow-up professional development and coaching is critical.)* |
| **Progress Monitoring focused on IEP goals** | | | | |
| 1 | Educators determine data collection tools and schedules for progress monitoring to support individual student learning on an IEP goal. | All of the following criteria are met:   * Educators (members of the IEP team) conduct analysis of student data (i.e., educator team observations, assessments, student work samples) to identify specific learning needs to write IEP goals. * Educator team members select a specific progress monitoring tool to monitor the identified IEP goal. * Progress monitoring schedule should include who, how, and where. * The progress monitoring tool includes specific components about how the IEP goal will be monitored: where, when, how and who is involved. | 3 of the criteria are met. | 2 of the criteria are met. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Educators implement the planned progress monitoring tool and schedule for the IEP goal. | All of the following criteria are met.   * The progress monitoring tool is implemented in the context of instruction with the IEP goal. * Progress monitoring is consistently implemented in all settings as identified in the IEP goals/objectives, (general classroom, other school classrooms, home). * All educator team members document the implementation of the learning target (within the IEP goal) and data to be collected through expected formats (chart, table, anecdote,). * If data collection/progress monitoring is unable to be implemented as prescribed by the IEP team members, (tools and/or schedule), documentation is provided as to the reason for the lack of data collection. | 2 of the criteria are met | 1 of the criteria is met. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Educators assess the effectiveness of the data collection, progress monitoring tools and schedule. | All of the following criteria are met.   * The progress monitoring tool has clearly defined success criteria (i.e., rubric) used to assess its effectiveness. * Team members analyze student data (student work; teacher documentation of the learning target) to determine how the intervention has impacted the IEP goal (student learning). * Based on analysis of the implementation, team members determine whether to continue use, modify, or discontinue the intervention. * The progress monitoring tool was determined to be effective in providing data to determine how to plan instruction, (i.e., continue the intervention, provide additional instruction). * IEP team members work as a collaborative team throughout the process of selection, implementation and evaluation of the progress monitoring tool, schedule and analysis. | 3 of the criteria are met. | 2 of the criteria is met |

Evidence: IEP documentation, progress monitoring Fidelity Checklist, lesson plans