



U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary

PR/Award # (11 characters): H323A100004

This is the third annual report for the North Carolina State Improvement Project (NC SIP), a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Program. The report addresses the SPDG Program Performance Measures as well as the NC SIP Project Measures. The NC SIP Project Measures were revised in year two to better: align with the SPDG Program Performance Measures, reflect the intent of NC SIP, and capture the outcomes of NC SIP. The SPDG Program and NC SIP Project Measures address the five NC SIP Goals that were approved in the original application as follows:

1. Improve the basic skills performance of students with disabilities as compared to all non-disabled students in North Carolina: NC SIP Project Performance Measures 4.a – 4.c.
2. Increase the number of qualified special education teachers in North Carolina: NC SIP Project Performance Measures 5.a – 5.d.
3. Increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of students with disabilities: NC SIP Project Performance Measures 4.d and 4.e.
4. Improve parent satisfaction and involvement with the NC SIP project: NC SIP Project Performance Measures 6.a – 6.c.
5. Improve the quality of teachers' instructional competencies to impact students' basic skills performance: Program Performance Measures 1.a, 1.b, 2.a, 2.b, 3.a., and 3.b; NC SIP Project Performance Measures 1.c, 1.d, and 2.c.

As a result of the new SPDG Measures and revised NC SIP Project Measures, some data are not yet available. Data presented for performance measures related to project activities are for activities that occurred between March 1, 2012 and March 1, 2013. Data presented for performance measures related to student and teacher outcomes (e.g., achievement data, dropout data, teacher fidelity ratings, etc.) represent data from the 2011-12 school year.

Goal 1. Improve the basic skills performance of students with disabilities as compared to all non-disabled students in North Carolina.

The percentage of NC SIP students with disabilities who scored at proficient on the End-of-Grade (EOG) slightly increased from the baseline year in reading (from 30.5% in 2009-10 to 32.1% in 2011-12) and decreased in math (from 40.7% in 2009-10 to 22.6% in 2011-12). The percentage of NC SIP students scoring proficient in 2011-12 remained below the percentage of all students with disabilities scoring proficient in NC on both the reading and math EOG tests. A current focus of the project has been on improving the accuracy of the achievement data reported by NC SIP teachers. For the 2012-13 school year, NC SIP will obtain student achievement data directly from the State to eliminate concerns about accuracy. Other efforts to improve NC SIP student performance data include 1) providing each NC SIP LEA with a summary of their student achievement, teacher fidelity, and parent data to improve response rates related to these data collections and inform site-based efforts, 2) modifying the Developmental Review process to better assess implementation at each NC SIP site, and 3) continuing work on piloting and eventually adopting a coaching model to be used by NC SIP sites.

Goal 2. Increase the number of qualified special education teachers in North Carolina.

NC SIP has formed a partnership with three institutes of higher education (IHEs): The University of North Carolina (UNC) at Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, and Eastern Carolina University. As of year three of the grant, seven faculty members have completed Reading or Math Foundations Training. Additionally, two courses at UNC-Charlotte have been revised to incorporate the evidenced-based practices of NC SIP professional development. The remaining IHEs expect to start modifying their courses for special educators next year.

Goal 3. Increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of students with disabilities.

The percentage of students with disabilities graduating and dropping out remained fairly stable but slightly improved from 2009-10 to 2011-12 in NC SIP districts considered to be high implementing (i.e., participated continuously in NC SIP for 7 years or more, had 50% or more of their schools participating in NC SIP OR had an average of 2 or more teachers participating per NC SIP school, had 75% or more of the teachers meeting or exceeding the fidelity threshold, submitted 2011-12 test data, and were considered to be high implementers by their regional consultant).

Goal 4. Improve parent satisfaction and involvement with the NC SIP project.

NC SIP continues to work with their reading and mathematics sites across the state to increase the opportunities available for parents to become involved in the program. Through the partnership with the Exceptional Children Assistance Center (ECAC), several opportunities and resources related to math and literacy were provided to parents. All NC SIP LEAs received one or more of these opportunities/resources and over 1,499 NC SIP parents were served. Additionally, ECAC provided webinars to LEA staff about how to engage parents and create effective advisory boards. With regard to satisfaction, the average rating of parent satisfaction based on the annual survey conducted by NC SIP LEAs decreased from 2.69 in 2009-10 to 2.27 in 2011-12 (out of 3.00). It is hoped this rating will start to increase as ECAC continues to provide trainings and resources and as schools increase and improve their efforts to involve parents.

Goal 5. Improve the quality of teachers' instructional competencies to impact students' basic skills performance.

NC SIP is currently working to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the NC SIP model by developing a comprehensive project manual, piloting a coaching model to be used in all sites, improving follow-up training practices, and improving the teacher fidelity observation process. The data currently available related to this goal show that NC SIP trained more teachers in 2012-13 than 2011-12 and was very close in meeting the 70% (i.e., 69%) SPDG target for including evidence-based professional development components in both the reading and math initiative.



Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): H323A100004

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.

SPDG Program Measure 1: Projects use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.

Table with 7 columns: Performance Measure, Measure Type, Quantitative Data (Target and Actual Performance Data). Row 1: 1.a. Performance Measure, Program, Target (Ratio 11.2/16, % 70%), Actual Performance Data (Ratio 11/16, % 69%).

Table with 7 columns: Performance Measure, Measure Type, Quantitative Data (Target and Actual Performance Data). Row 1: 1.b. Performance Measure, Program, Target (Ratio 11.2/16, % 70%), Actual Performance Data (Ratio 11/16, % 69%).

Table with 7 columns: Performance Measure, Measure Type, Quantitative Data (Target and Actual Performance Data). Row 1: 1.c. Performance Measure, Project, Target (Ratio 2,635), Actual Performance Data (Ratio 3,905).

I.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of leadership personnel participating in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		57			44		

I.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of local education agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina that have a NC SIP reading or mathematics center or site. (NO LONGER A PERFORMANCE MEASURE)	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

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

Performance Measure 1.a. By the end of the 2nd year of funding the NC SIP Reading Initiative, 50% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.

The attached worksheet (See Appendix A for Reading Initiative Worksheet and supporting documents) presents detailed information about the evidence-based practices used for the NC SIP reading initiative. NC SIP's evidence-based professional development components began in 2000 as part of NC SIP I and in the last two years has been preparing for scale-up across the state. The project is currently revising some of the forms and processes for the reading initiative to help ensure a smooth scale-up transition.

As shown in Table 1.a, 11 of 16 (69%) reading initiative professional development components were rated in place. The components in place include: A(1) Clear expectations are provided for all NC SIP participants. Schools and LEAs agree to provide the necessary resources, supports and facilitative administration for the participants; A(2) Clear expectations are provided for Reading Foundations trainers and for NC SIP Coordinators who provide follow-up to training; B(1) Accountability for delivery and quality monitoring of training are in place, with responsibility assigned primarily to NC SIP Reading Consultants and district NC SIP Coordinators; B(2) Adult learning principles are used in all professional development and strategies to address them are included; B(3) Training is skill-based and provides opportunities for participants to practice what they've learned with feedback provided by the trainers. Pre- and post-testing are used to assess participant learning and identifying those needing additional coaching; B(4) Outcome and evaluation data are collected, analyzed, and used for improving the professional development and follow-up support; B(5) Trainers are trained, coached, and observed to ensure fidelity and quality. Participant feedback is used to improve training and trainer skills; D(1) Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear and fidelity observation forms are provided; D(2) Data are used to make decisions at multiple levels in the state; D(3) Implementation and student outcome data are shared regularly w/stakeholders at multiple levels; D(5) All participants receive instructions on providing data to NC SIP.

The components NC SIP will focus on developing and/or implementing in the coming year include: C(1) Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear and this includes using data to give feedback to coaches; C(2) Coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling; D(4) Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and plans are in place to share and celebrate successes; E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation; E(2) Leadership analyzes feedback from staff and makes changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation, including revising policies and procedures to support new way of work.

Performance Measure 1.b. By the end of the 2nd year of funding the NC SIP Mathematics Initiative, 50% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.

The attached worksheet (See Appendix B for Math Initiative Worksheet and supporting documents) presents detailed information about the evidence-based practices used for the NC SIP math initiative. This is the second year that NC SIP has engaged in the initiative. NC SIP's evidence-based professional development components began in 2000 as part of NC SIP I and in the last two years has been preparing for scale-up across the state. The project is currently revising some of the forms and processes for the math initiative to help ensure a smooth scale-up transition.

As shown in Table 1.b, 11 of 16 (75%) math initiative professional development components were rated in place. The components in place include: A(1) Clear expectations are provided for all NC SIP participants. Schools and LEAs agree to provide the necessary resources, supports and facilitative administration for the participants; A(2) Clear expectations are provided for Math Foundations trainers and for NC SIP Coordinators who provide follow-up to training; B(1) Accountability for delivery and quality monitoring of training are in place, with responsibility assigned primarily to NC SIP Math Consultants and district NC SIP Coordinators; B(2) Adult learning principles are used in all professional development and strategies to address them are included; B(3) Training is skill-based and provides opportunities for participants to practice what they've learned with feedback provided by the trainers. Pre- and post-testing are used to assess participant learning and identifying those needing additional coaching; B(4) Outcome and evaluation data are collected, analyzed, and used for improving the professional development and follow-up support; B(5) Trainers are trained, coached, and observed to ensure fidelity and quality. Participant feedback is used to improve training and trainer skills; D(1) Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear and fidelity observation forms are provided; D(2) Data are used to make decisions at multiple levels in the state; D(3) Implementation and student outcome data are shared regularly w/stakeholders at multiple levels; D(5) All participants receive instructions on providing data to NC SIP.

The components NC SIP will focus on developing and/or implementing in the coming year include: C(1) Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear and this includes using data to give feedback to coaches; C(2) Coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling; D(4) Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and plans are in place to share and celebrate successes; E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation; E(2) Leadership analyzes feedback from staff and makes changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation, including revising policies and procedures to support new way of work.

Performance Measure 1.c. The number of teachers participating in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction.

Performance Measure 1.d. The number of leadership personnel participating in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction.

For measures 1.c and 1.d, only those professional development events that involved training that directly impacted teacher practice in reading or mathematics were considered. To collect these data, NC SIP sites were to submit summary forms about the type of event and numbers of participants for each training that occurred from March 1, 2012 to March 1, 2013. NC SIP sites did not submit summary forms for all of the trainings conducted. Therefore, the data for measures 1.c and 1.d under estimate the total number of teachers and leaders trained. Additionally, numbers are duplicated in that teachers and leaders could have participated in more than one type of training (see Table A) and therefore would be counted twice in the total. The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the previous year (2011-12). For measure 1.c, the target was met as the number of teachers trained increased from 2,635 teachers to 3,905 teachers. For measure 1.d, the target was not met as the number of leaders trained decreased from 57 to 44.

Other NC SIP events that were conducted in addition to those listed in Table A. include reading and math training of trainers, orientation for new NC SIP sites, and the 2012 Spring Network Meeting. Overall, 643 teachers and 6 leaders participated in these events.

Table A. Summary of Professional Development Events that Directly Impact Teacher Practice

Professional Development Event	Total # Trainings		Total # of Teachers		Total # of Leaders	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Reading Foundations Training: Provides teachers with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills needed to deliver effective instruction for students, who, after several years of instruction and learning experiences in reading, still have difficulties reading fluently and are significantly behind their age peers. The training consists of nine units and provides a solid foundation on which to build an effective reading instruction program. The content and teaching techniques presented in the program are derived directly from the extensive research-based literature available on teaching students with severe reading difficulties.	71	52	1,721	1,065	22	13
Reading Model Instruction Training: As a result of the Reading Foundations Training, each new NC SIP reading site selects a reading model training program to implement in their school and school system. Models selected must reflect the instructional principles derived from the review of instruction research addressing effective reading instruction for students with serious reading difficulties and disabilities. These principles include explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory instruction and progress assessment. Training on the model is provided directly to the sites by trainers approved by the developers of the reading model.	28	105	340	1,576	16	17
Literacy Training: In addition to providing Reading Foundations Trainings and Reading Model Trainings, NC SIP provides workshops that focus on specific areas of reading instruction, presenting the most recent research-based and proven techniques in these areas. These workshops include “Investigating the Science of Reading,” Reading Fundamentals,” “Success with Direct Instructions,” and “Production of Sounds for Reading and Spelling.”	6	16	101	408	0	1
Mathematics Foundations Training: Provides teachers with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills needed to deliver effective instruction for students, who, after several years of instruction and learning experiences in math, still have difficulties. The content and teaching techniques presented in the program are derived directly from the extensive research-based literature available on teaching students with severe math difficulties.	27	34	434	681	19	9
Mathematics Model Instruction Training: Each new NC SIP math site selects a math model training program to implement in their school and school system. Models selected must reflect the instructional principles derived from the review of instruction research addressing effective math instruction for students struggling in math. Training on the model is provided directly to the sites by trainers approved by the developers of the math model.	4	18	39	175	0	4
TOTAL	136	225	2,635	3,905	57	44

Performance Measure 1.e. The percentage of local education agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina that have a NC SIP reading or mathematics center or site.
 This is no longer a project performance measure as the focus of NC SIP has changed from expanding across districts to building capacity within districts.



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

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.

SPDG Program Measure 2: Participants in SPDG professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG-supported practices over time.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
One year after completing Reading Foundations Training and Reading Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		85%		/

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
One year after completing Mathematics Foundations Training and Mathematics Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		85%		/

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
85% of a sample of continuing NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their reading or mathematics fidelity observation.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		100%		/

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

Performance Measure 2.a. One year after completing Reading Foundations Training and Reading Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.

Performance Measure 2.b. One year after completing Mathematics Foundations Training and Mathematics Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.

Performance Measure 2.c. 85% of a sample of continuing NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their reading or mathematics fidelity observation.

As part of participation NC SIP, LEAs are required to observe teachers who 1) have completed Reading/Math Foundations training, 2) have completed Reading/Math Model training, AND 3) are implementing or will be implementing a reading/math model program. In order to improve the process, meet federal reporting requirements, and help ensure sustainability of the process, changes were made that went into effect during the 2012-13 school year. Results generated from the new process, which are responsive to performance measures 2.a. – 2.c, will be reported on the 2014 APR. Below is a description of the new fidelity process.

All new NC SIP teachers and 50% of continuing NC SIP teachers are to be observed each school year. The NC SIP evaluation team provides each LEA with a list of new and continuing teachers to be observed at the beginning of the school year. **New NC SIP teachers** are defined as those teachers who completed the series of trainings (i.e., Reading/Math Foundations and Reading/Math Model training) between October 1st of the last school year and September 30th of the current school year. **Continuing NC SIP teachers** are defined as teachers who completed the series of trainings before October 1st of the last school year. For both new and continuing teachers, observers conduct observations using the fidelity observation form that corresponds to the reading/math model being implemented by the teacher who is to be observed. Fidelity observation forms are structured classroom observation rating scales developed for each of the reading and math instruction models selected by NC SIP sites by the vendor (please see the NC SIP website for copies of the fidelity observation forms). Teachers are rated on a scale of NO (not observed), 1 (Not Appropriate), 2 (Somewhat Appropriate), 3 (appropriate), or NA (not applicable) on their use of instructional skills associated with high implementation fidelity of the instructional model.

Observations are conducted during the school year. Observers are to have completed a full training course in the reading or math model being implemented by the teacher who is to be observed. All persons in an LEA who conduct fidelity observations complete an inter-rater reliability process to ensure they are using similar criteria to assign ratings on the fidelity observation form. New teachers are observed THREE times and continuing teachers are observed ONE time during the school year. The rationale for the difference in processes is that for new teachers the three observations during the first year of implementation help ensure that the teacher understands and is implementing the instructional model with fidelity. For continuing teachers, who have already been through this process, the fidelity observation serves as a check-up to ensure that teachers are still implementing their instructional model with fidelity.

All observations are submitted online using the online versions of the fidelity observation forms. Once submitted electronically, the fidelity score is calculated and sent via email to the observer along with an electronic version of the completed observation. The fidelity score is calculated by dividing the total number of points by the total number of items applicable to the lesson. Valid fidelity observation scores range from 0 to 3. Teachers are considered to be implementing with fidelity if the fidelity observation score is at or above 2.5. For new teachers, the third or last fidelity observation score is used to determine whether the teacher is teaching with fidelity. If a new teacher (last observation only) or a continuing teacher scores less than a 2.5, the teacher is to be referred to the LEA's designated NC SIP coach to receive technical assistance aimed at improving his/her implementation of the reading/math model. These teachers are to be included on the list of teachers to be observed during the next school year in order to check that growth has been made.

Because the new fidelity process started during the 2012-13 school year, data responsive to the revised measures will be reported on the 2014 APR. However, 2010-11 and 2011-12 data collected following the previous methodology are available and shared in Table B. As shown, valid fidelity scores (i.e., not missing and between 0-3) were obtained for 839 teachers in 2011 and 746 teachers in 2012. Of those teachers, 88.1% in 2011 and 84.0% in 2012 scored at or above 2.5, which indicates those teachers are implementing their instructional model with high fidelity.

Table B. Number and Percent of Teachers with Fidelity Scores At or Above 2.5 for 2010-11 and 2011-12						
Subject	Number of Teachers with Valid Fidelity Scores		Number of Teachers with Fidelity Scores of 2.5 or Greater		Percentage of Teachers with Fidelity Scores of 2.5 or Greater	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
3-8 Reading	561	515	491	431	87.5%	83.7%
3-8 Mathematics	184	122	166	104	90.2%	85.2%
K-2 Literacy	94	109	82	92	87.2%	84.4%
TOTAL	839	746	739	627	88.1%	84.0%



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

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.

SPDG Program Measure 3: Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
TBD% of NC SIP Reading Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the reading model instructional practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		999		/

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
TBD% of NC SIP Mathematics Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the mathematics model instructional practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		999		/

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

Performance Measure 3.a. TBD% of NC SIP Reading Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the reading model instructional practices.

Performance Measure 3.b. TBD% of NC SIP Mathematics Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the mathematics model instructional practices.

Nearly all NC SIP funds are awarded to LEAs to implement NC SIP reading and/or math initiatives. LEAs had not previously been required to track their spending of NC SIP funds. LEAs started tracking their expenditures using a form developed by NC SIP during the 2012-13 school year. Therefore, data for measures 3.a and 3.b will be reported on the 2014 APR.



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

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.

NC SIP Project Measure 4: Increase the percentage of students with disabilities in NC SIP districts demonstrating positive reading and mathematics achievement outcomes and remaining in school.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students in grades K-2 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who remained at or demonstrated progress toward an age appropriate level of reading or mathematics skills.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				34.5%		/	23.4%

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in reading.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				30.5%		/	32.1%

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in mathematics.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				40.7%		/	22.6%

4.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities that dropped out of schools in high implementing NC SIP districts.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				6.1%		384/6,744	5.7%

4.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a diploma in high implementing NC SIP districts.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				64.4%		954/1,475	64.7%

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

Performance Measure 4.a. The percentage of students in grades K-2 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who demonstrate progress toward an age appropriate level of reading or mathematics skills.

Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and model instruction training course. A total of 89 teachers (n=106 total) representing 24 LEAs and one charter school submitted complete Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) 6th Edition data. Additionally, 6 teachers representing 2 LEAs submitted DIBELS Next data; however, these data were not included as part of the analyses for Performance Measure 4.a. because of differences in the tests and scoring procedures between the two versions.

DIBELS 6th Edition contains five tests that assess different early literacy skills including Initial Sound Fluency (ISF), Letter Naming Fluency (LNF), Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF), Nonsense Word Fluency (NSF), and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). DIBELS identifies which tests and when the tests should be administered to students based on when students should start developing the early literacy skill assessed by a specific test. For example, at the beginning of Kindergarten students should be administered the ISF and LNF. Table C below shows which DIBELS tests were to be administered to students and when they were to be administered.

Grade	Fall 2011	Winter 2012	Spring 2012
K	ISF LNF	ISF LNF PSF NWF	LNF PSF NWF
1	LNF PSF NWF	PSF NWF ORF	PSF NWF ORF
2	ORF	ORF	ORF

The DIBELS 6th Edition Administration and Scoring Guide provides instructions on how teachers should administer and score each test. Based on these scores, the DIBELS 6th Edition Administration and Scoring Guide provides descriptive levels of performance that correspond to a range of scores for each test and administration period (i.e., fall, winter, spring). For example, for kindergarten students who completed the ISF in the fall, those who scored less than a 4 would be considered “at-risk=1” for not achieving subsequent early literacy outcomes, those who scored between 4 and 7 would be considered “some risk=2” for not achieving subsequent early literacy outcomes, and those who scored at or above 8 would be considered “low risk=3” for not achieving subsequent early literacy outcomes. These descriptive levels were the same for all tests except for PSF in which students were considered “deficit=1,” “emerging=2,” or “established=3.” All of the scores provided by NC SIP teachers were converted to the appropriate performance level following the instructions provided in the DIBELS Administration and Scoring Guide. Once all scores were converted to performance levels, the pattern of DIBELS performance across tests was examined for each student for the fall and spring. Based on the pattern of performance across tests, each student was assigned one score for the fall and one score for the spring based on the instructional recommendations for individual patterns of performance provided in the DIBELS Administration and Scoring Guide. For example, students at the end of kindergarten who scored at risk on the LNF, deficit on the PSF, and at risk on the NWF were assigned a 1 which corresponds to the instructional support recommendation “Intensive – Needs Substantial Intervention.” Students were assigned a 2 if their pattern of performance indicated they needed “Strategic support – Additional Intervention” and a 3 if their pattern of performance indicated they needed no additional support or “Benchmark – At Grade Level.” Once an Instructional Support Recommendation was assigned to each student for the fall and spring based on DIBELS recommendations, the fall score was subtracted from the spring score to determine if the student had shown progress from the fall to the spring.

A total of 106 teachers submitted DIBELS 6th Edition data on 751 students. Of these teachers, 89 submitted valid scores for 547 students (72.8% of the total students with data) on all of the requested DIBELS tests for the fall and the spring (see Table C above). On average, teachers reported complete data for 6 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 29). As the data show in the Table 4.a above, of the 547 students with disabilities for whom complete DIBELS data were reported for 2011-12, 128 or 23.4% showed progress from fall to spring (i.e., instructional support recommendation based on the performance pattern was better in the spring than in the fall) OR scored at grade level in the fall and in the spring. A total of 290 or 53.0% showed no change from fall to spring (does not include students who scored at grade level in the fall and spring), and 129 or 23.6% showed a negative change from fall to spring. The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the baseline year (2009-10); however, because the first grade results were calculated differently in 2009-10, 2010-11 data will be used as baseline. The target was not met as the percentage of students remaining at or demonstrating progress toward an age appropriate level of reading decreased from 34.5% to 23.4%. Table D below shows the results across years for each grade level and overall.

Table D. DIBELS 6th Edition Results by Grade Level and Overall for 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12

Grade Level	% Students Showed Progress			% Students Remained at Grade Level (3)			% Students Showed No Change (1,2)			% Students Showed Negative Change		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Kindergarten (2010 n=78; 2011 n=123; 2012 n=119)	34.6% (27)	28.5% (35)	37.0% (44)	11.5% (9)	26.0% (32)	15.1% (18)	32.1% (25)	31.7% (39)	29.4% (35)	21.8% (17)	13.8% (17)	18.5% (22)
First Grade (2010 n=152*; 2011 n=161; 2012 n=152)	36.2% (55)	11.8% (19)	6.0% (9)	40.8% (62)	28.0% (45)	16.4% (25)	13.8% (21)	31.7% (51)	40.1% (61)	9.2% (14)	28.6% (46)	37.5% (57)
Second Grade (2010 n=231; 2011 n=282; 2012 n=276)	12.6% (29)	7.1% (20)	6.2% (17)	16.5% (38)	15.6% (44)	5.4% (15)	54.1% (125)	57.8% (163)	70.3% (194)	16.9% (39)	19.5% (55)	18.1% (50)
TOTAL K-2 (2010 n=461; 2011 n=566; 2012 n=547)	24.1% (111)	13.1% (74)	12.8% (70)	23.6% (109)	21.4% (121)	10.6% (58)	37.1% (171)	44.7% (253)	53.0% (290)	15.2% (70)	20.8% (118)	23.6% (129)

*Caution should be used when interpreting first grade results for 2009-10 as the recommended instructional recommendation scores were not determined using DIBELS because the entire test battery for first grade was not administered.

Performance Measure 4.b. The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in reading. Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and an instructional model training course. It should be noted that there are concerns about the accuracy of these data. The two major issues were scale scores not

matching the proficiency levels reported and scale scores not matching the type of test reported. NC SIP strategies for improving the accuracy of these data in 2011-12 included 1) developing a checklist for LEAs to verify their data before submission and 2) having LEAs submit their data to their regional consultant for review prior to submitting it to the evaluation team for analysis. For the 2012-13 school year, NC SIP will obtain the data directly from the State to eliminate concerns about accuracy.

Overall, a total of 515 grade 3-8 teachers representing 63 LEAs and 2 charter schools (90 LEAs and 3 charter schools have NC SIP reading sites) submitted useable 2012 EOG reading data. On average, teachers submitted data for 10 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 75). As shown in Table 4.b above, of the 5,328 students with disabilities on whom valid data were reported for 2011-12, 1,710 or 32.1% performed at or above grade level in reading (i.e., at level III or IV). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the baseline year (2009-10). The target was met as the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level slightly increased from 30.5% to 32.1%. Table E provides comparison data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina.

Group	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	30.5% (total n=4,374)	30.0% (total n=5,611)	32.1% (total n=5,328)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	40.6% (total n=86,850)	40.8% (total n=88,284)	40.7% (total n=90,551)
NC State: All students	70.1% (total n=681,460)	70.7% (total n=688,428)	71.2% (total n=694,016)

Performance Measure 4.c. The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in mathematics.

Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and an instructional model training course. It should be noted that there are concerns about the accuracy of these data. The two major issues were scale scores not matching the proficiency levels reported and scale scores not matching the type of test reported. NC SIP strategies for improving the accuracy of these data in 2011-12 included 1) developing a checklist for LEAs to verify their data before submission and 2) having LEAs submit their data to their regional consultant for review prior to submitting it to the evaluation team for analysis. For the 2012-13 school year, NC SIP will obtain the data directly from the State to eliminate concerns about accuracy.

Overall, a total of 122 grade 3-8 teachers representing 22 LEAs (53 LEAs have NC SIP math sites) submitted useable 2012 EOG math data. On average, teachers submitted data for 6 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 23). As shown in Table 4.c. above, of the 1,034 students with disabilities on whom valid data were reported for 2010-11, 233 or 22.6% performed at or above grade level in reading (i.e., at level III or IV). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the baseline year (2009-10). The target was not met as the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level decreased from 40.7% to 22.6%. Table F provides comparison data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina. Efforts being taken by NC SIP to improve student performance data include 1) providing each NC SIP LEA with a summary of their student achievement, teacher fidelity, and parent data to improve response rates related to these data collections and inform site-based efforts, 2) modifying the Developmental Review process to better assess implementation at each NC SIP site, and 3) continuing work on piloting and eventually adopting a coaching model to be used by NC SIP site.

Group	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	40.7% (total n=907)	40.2% (total n=1,313)	22.6% (total n=1,034)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	57.0% (total n=86,830)	57.6% (total n=88,274)	57.3% (total n=90,539)
NC State: All students	81.8% (total n=681,509)	82.4% (total n=688,443)	82.8% (total n=694,032)

Performance Measure 4.d. The percentage of students with disabilities that dropped out of schools in high implementing NC SIP districts.

Performance Measure 4.e. The percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a diploma in high implementing NC SIP districts.

For Performance Measures 4.d and 4.e NC SIP districts (i.e., traditional LEAs only; not charter schools) were classified as high implementing if they: 1) participated continuously in NC SIP for 7 years or more, 2) had 50% or more of their schools participating in NC SIP OR had an average of 2 or more teachers participating per NC SIP school, 3) had 75% or more of the teachers with fidelity scores meeting or exceeding the fidelity threshold score of 2.5, 4) submitted 2011-12 test data, and 5) were considered to be high implementers by their regional consultant. Because there are more elementary and middle schools than high schools participating in NC SIP, we focused on districts involved in NC SIP for at least seven years as they would have had some elementary (i.e., grade 5) and middle school students who participated in the program complete high school. It is expected that the definition for high implementing will continue to evolve as more complete and accurate data become available on the quality of implementation via the new developmental review and fidelity checks process. Due to the evolving definition and the fact that more schools will meet the seven-year requirement as the grant progresses, the NC SIP schools considered to be high-implementing are expected to change each reporting period.

The dropout percentage represents the number of students with disabilities who dropped out in a given year divided by the total number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 for that year (i.e., December EC count). These data were obtained directly from NC DPI. The graduation percentage represents the number of students with disabilities who graduated with a diploma in their fourth or fifth year of high school divided by the total number of students with disabilities who were in grade 9 in 2005-06 for 2009-10 graduates, or 2006-07 for 2010-11 graduates, or 2007-08 for 2011-12 graduates. These data were obtained for each LEA from the NC DPI website at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgraduate>.

As shown in Table 4.d above, the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out from schools in high implementing NC SIP districts slightly decreased from 2009-10 to 2011-12. This also was the trend for the other NC SIP districts (i.e., those not identified as high implementing), non-NC SIP districts, and the state overall (see Table G). The target for this measure was to meet or decrease the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out the baseline year (2009-10). Based on these data, the target was met as the percentage of students with disabilities who dropped out decreased from 6.1% in 2009-10 to 5.7% in 2011-12.

As shown in Table 4.e above, the percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a diploma in four or five years from schools in high implementing NC SIP districts slightly increased from 2009-10 to 2011-12. This also was true for the other NC SIP districts (i.e., those not identified as high implementing), non-NC SIP districts, and the state overall (see Table G). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the percentage of students with disabilities graduating the baseline year (2009-10). Based on these data, the target was met as the percentage of students with disabilities graduating increased from 64.4% in 2009-10 to 64.7% in 2011-12.

Table G. Dropout and Graduation Results for 2009-10 and 2010-11

Group	% Students w/Disabilities Dropping Out (Number dropouts/EC December 9-12 Count)			% Students w/Disabilities Graduating (5 Year Cohort)		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
	High Implementing NC SIP Districts (n=17)	6.1% (417/6,799)	6.4% (437/6,792)	5.7% (384/6,744)	64.4% (957/1,487)	66.0% (1,031/1,562)
All Other NC SIP Districts (n=77)	6.7% (2,347/35,214)	5.7% (1,988/35,145)	5.0% (1,787/35,971)	63.0% (4,864/7,724)	64.3% (5,124/7,975)	63.3% (5,092/8,047)
Non NC SIP Districts (n=21)	5.7% (280/4,926)	6.0% (302/5,063)	4.4% (227/5,176)	67.5% (653/967)	70.1% (730/1,042)	68.2% (769/1,128)
NC State (n=115)	6.5% (3,044/46,939)	5.8% (2,727/47,000)	5.0% (2,398/47,891)	63.6% (6,474/10,178)	65.1% (6,885/10,579)	64.0% (6,815/10,650)



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

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

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

NC SIP Project Measure 5: Increase the number and skills of pre-service teachers in the field of special education.

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of faculty members at NC SIP partnership IHEs that receive NC SIP training.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		7	/	

5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of courses at NC SIP partnership IHEs for teachers pursuing initial teacher licensure in special education that have been revised to reflect NC SIP instructional practices.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		0	/		2	/	

5.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of students enrolled in teacher education and lateral entry programs for initial teacher licensure in special education in NC SIP partnership IHEs.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		237	/		350	/	

5.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of new special education teachers produced by teacher education and lateral entry programs in NC SIP partnership IHEs.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		146	/		126	/	

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

Performance Measure 5.a. The number of faculty members at NC SIP partnership IHEs that receive NC SIP training.

The NC SIP partnership IHEs are the University of North Carolina (UNC) at Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, and Eastern Carolina University (ECU). Since the start of the grant, seven faculty members have received Foundations training. Specifically, two faculty members at UNC-Charlotte (one completed Math Foundations and one completed Reading Foundations); two faculty members at UNC-Chapel Hill (both completed Reading Foundations), and three faculty members at ECU (all completed Reading Foundations) have completed Foundations training. The target for this measure was to show an increase in the number of faculty members trained until all relevant faculty members are trained. This target was met as the number of trained faculty members has increased from four to seven.

Performance Measure 5.b. The number of courses for pre-service teachers at NC SIP partnership IHEs that have been revised to reflect NC SIP instructional practices.

The NC SIP partnership IHEs are UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, and ECU. Since the start of the grant, two special education courses (4275 and 5275) offered at UNC-Charlotte have been modified to reflect NC SIP instructional practices. Both UNC-Chapel Hill and ECU plan to start modifying courses next year. The target for this measure was to show an increase in the number of courses modified to reflect NC SIP instructional practices. This target was met as the number of courses modified has increased from zero to two.

Performance Measure 5.c. The number of students enrolled in teacher education and lateral entry programs for initial teacher licensure in special education in NC SIP partnership IHEs.

Performance Measure 5.d. The number of new special education teachers produced by teacher education and lateral entry programs in NC SIP partnership IHEs.

The NC SIP partnership IHEs are UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, and ECU. Each IHE has different routes for persons to pursue initial teacher licensure in special education. UNC-Chapel Hill offers a master’s degree and licensure only program; UNC-Charlotte offers a bachelor’s degree and MAT program; and ECU offers a bachelor’s degree, licensure only, and lateral entry program.

The enrollment and graduation data for the UNC-Charlotte degree programs were obtained from their Fact Book published by the UNC-Charlotte Office on Institutional Research and available online at <https://ir.uncc.edu/fact-book> (Table III-2, Table III-3, Table VII-2a, and Table VII-2b). The enrollment and graduation data for the ECU degree programs also were obtained from their Fact Book published by the ECU Office of Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research and available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/research/FactBook.cfm> (from the tables Unduplicated Undergraduate Fall Enrollment History by Unit and Major and Undergraduate Degrees Conferred by Unit and Major). The ECU enrollment data represent undergraduate students who “intend” to major in as well as students officially admitted to teacher education programs in special education. The licensure only and lateral entry program data (i.e., enrollment and completion) were requested directly from the partner IHE’s.

As shown in Table 5.c, there has been an increase in the numbers of students enrolled in initial teacher licensure programs in special education. The target for this measure was to show an increase from the baseline year in the number of students enrolled. This target has been met as the number of students enrolled increased from 237 in 2009-10 to 350 in 2011-12.

With regard to completion and graduation, data in Table 5.d indicate a decline in the number of students graduating/completing teacher education programs in special education. The target for this measure was to show an increase from the baseline year in the number of students completing/graduating from teacher education programs in special education. This target was not met as the number of students graduating/completing programs decreased from 146 in 2009-10 to 126 in 2011-12.

Table H provides enrollment and graduation/completion data in special education programs for each IHE.

Table H: IHE Partner Enrollment and Graduation/Completion Data for Special Education Teachers for 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12											
Type of Program	UNC-Chapel Hill		UNC-Charlotte			ECU			TOTAL		
	2008-10 Cohort	2010-12*	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
ENROLLMENT											
Degree	18	10	107	129	125	87	130	196	212	269	331
Lateral Entry	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	7	11	10	7	11
Licensure Only	7	3	NA	NA	NA	8	4	5	15	7	8
TOTAL	25	13	107	129	125	87	130	196	237	283	350
GRADUATION/COMPLETION											
Degree	18	10	44	47	44	47	20	50	109	77	104
Lateral Entry	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27	32	15	27	32	15
Licensure Only	7	3	NA	NA	NA	3	3	4	10	6	7
TOTAL	25	13	44	47	44	77	55	69	146	115	126

*2010-12 Student cohort counted in the totals for 2010-11 and 2011-12.



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

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

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

NC SIP Project Measure 6: Increase parent involvement in and satisfaction with the NC SIP project.

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of parent involvement opportunities provided by NC SIP.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		0	/		5	/	

6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of parents involved in and/or attending NC SIP program events.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

6.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The total average rating of parent satisfaction with the NC SIP project.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2.69	/		2.27	/	

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

Performance Measure 6.a. The number of parent involvement opportunities provided by NC SIP.

NC SIP has partnered with the Exceptional Children’s Assistance Center (ECAC), a private non-profit organization operated and staffed primarily by parents of children with disabilities, to strengthen and expand upon the parent component of the project. This year ECAC provided five different opportunities/resources through which parents could receive information related to supporting the education of their children with special needs. The target for this measure was to show an increase from the previous year in the number of parent involvement opportunities provided. This target was met as the number increased from 0 in 2010-11 to 5 in 2011-12. Table I provides an overview of the different opportunities and resources provided as well as the number of NC SIP LEAs and parents served.

In addition to the opportunities and resources for parents, ECAC conducted webinars for NC SIP LEAs on how to involve parents (Making the Connection: Engaging Families to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities; 2 webinars; 3 NC SIP LEAs) and create effective advisory boards (2 webinars; 10 NC SIP LEAs). In 2013, ECAC plans to complete development on Workshop in a Box for Literacy and Math, several new math resources, and video clips that model reading and math activities parents can do at home.

Table I: Summary of Opportunities and Resources Provided to Parents through NC SIP

Opportunity/Resource	Number of NC SIP LEAs Served	Number of NC SIP Parents Served
<p>Literacy Packet Information Contains information for families and care givers to help them gain a better understanding of the process their child is likely to go through in learning how to read and how they can help their child become a better reader. Handouts include information on how children learn to read, tips for working with their child’s teachers, activities families can do at home and additional resources that support literacy. These activities are meant to be fun and to encourage the love of reading.</p>	46	143
<p>Reading Improvement Tool for Parents Created to help parents not only start the conversation but feel more confident when talking with their child’s teacher about their child’s progress. The format is parent friendly providing space for parents to write the responses and allowing parents to identify specific questions that address the areas of concern that relate to their child. The reading tool helps parents gather specific information about their child’s progress in reading and how to help their child be successful.</p>	90	934
<p>Math Improvement Tool for Parents Created to help parents not only start the conversation but feel more confident when talking with their child’s teacher about their child’s progress. The format is parent friendly providing space for parents to write the responses and allowing parents to identify specific questions that address the areas of concern that relate to their child. The math tool helps parents obtain specific information to encourage and support their child in developing and building math skills.</p>	35	410
<p>Literacy is for All Workshop Outlines the skills that children need to become better readers, and how families can support their child’s reading progress. Families will understand the basic structure (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary) and how it relates to important reading skills. Participants will also learn the basic vocabulary of reading, learn what questions to ask in order to understand how their child is progressing, and identify key strategies to support their child’s reading at home and in the community. Each participant receives a literacy packet. The workshop and literacy packet is available in Spanish.</p>	1	12
<p>Newsletter</p>	94	19,420

A semi-annual newsletter, NewsLine, which features information related to the education of infants, toddlers, children, youth, and young adults with disabilities. The newsletter has included information about NC SIP and reading and math resources for parents.

(for all LEAs--
unknown for NC
SIP districts)

Performance Measure 6.b. The number of parents involved in and/or attending NC SIP program events.

As part of their developmental review in the spring of 2012, LEAs were asked to report on the NC SIP parent involvement opportunities that occurred in their NC SIP schools as well as on the total number of parents who participated in these opportunities. However, most LEAs had not tracked these data. Therefore, LEAs will start tracking these data in 2012-2013 and results will be reported in 2014.

Performance Measure 6.c. The total average rating of parent satisfaction with the NC SIP project.

As part of their parent-teacher conference, NC SIP reading and math sites are asked to conduct the NC SIP Parent Satisfaction Questionnaire focused on reading or mathematics with parents. Sites are to provide parents with a copy of the NC SIP questionnaire and discuss the purpose of the survey as well as how the information will be used. The questionnaire contains seven questions:

1. How helpful has the reading/mathematics instruction that your child has received been in improving his/her ability to read/in mathematics?
2. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in explaining the reading/mathematics instruction procedures your child is receiving and how the instruction addresses your child's needs?
3. How helpful has the information provided by the reading/mathematics program been in understanding your child's reading difficulties/difficulties in math and the school's plans for improving your child's reading abilities/abilities in math?
4. How helpful has the information provided by the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in providing you with activities to help your child's reading improvement/improvement in math at home and over the summer?
5. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in improving your child's motivation and positive attitude toward school?
6. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in improving communication between you and the school staff?
7. Has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been helpful in improving your child's performance across other areas besides reading/math?

There are four possible response options to each question: Not Helpful (0), Somewhat Helpful (1), Helpful (2) and Very Helpful (3). Each question is reviewed with the parent(s) and parent(s) record their responses on the questionnaire. The average of the seven responses is calculated and used to determine the parents' total rating.

As shown in Table 6.c, the total average rating by parents in 2011-12 was a 2.27 out of 3.00 (n=2,886). This does not meet the annual target, which was to meet or exceed the baseline year's performance of 2.69. The performance on this measure is expected to improve as NC SIP continues to expand parent involvement efforts. Table J provides the average parent satisfaction rating across years.

Table J: NC SIP Parent Satisfaction Ratings		
2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
2.69 (n=1,055)	2.43 (n=1,187)	2.27 (n=2,886)



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

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

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

Included in the \$876,986.66 on line 8a for the Previous Budget Period is \$121,269.67 obligations (encumbrances) not expended and drawn down as of 02/29/12.

Included in the \$1,589,570.33 on line 8b for the Current Budget Period is \$52,850.00 obligations (encumbrances) not expended and drawn down as of 02/28/13.

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