



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

PR/Award # (11 characters): \_\_\_\_\_

This is the second annual report for the North Carolina State Improvement Project (NC SIP), a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Program. The report addresses the new SPDG Program Performance Measures as well as the revised NC SIP Project Measures. The NC SIP Project Measures have been revised in order 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 NCSIP 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.e and 2.c.

Because of the new SPDG Measures and revised NC SIP Project Measures, some data are not yet available. Baseline data for these measures will be collected during the 2012-13 project period. Data presented for performance measures related to project activities are for those project activities that occurred between October 1, 2011-February 29, 2012. 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 2010-11 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 EOG slightly decreased from the previous year (reading: from 30.5% in 2009-10 to 30.0% in 2010-11; math: from 40.7% in 2009-10 to 40.2% in 2010-11). The percentage of NC SIP students scoring proficient in 2010-11 remained below the percentage of all students with disabilities scoring proficient in NC and the percentage of all students scoring proficient in NC on both the reading and math EOG tests. A current focus of the project is to improve the accuracy of the achievement data reported by NC SIP teachers by developing a checklist for LEAs to verify their data before submission and having LEAs submit their data to their regional consultant for review prior to submitting it to the evaluation team for analyses. Additionally, the evaluation team has developed a NC SIP LEA Data Form that will provide each NC SIP LEA with a summary of their student achievement, teacher fidelity, and parent data. It is hoped these data will be used to improve the response rates related to these data collections as well as to inform site-based efforts.

### **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 at Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and Eastern Carolina University. These partnerships will be revising their courses to incorporate the evidenced-based practices of NC SIP professional development. As of year 2 of the grant, 4 faculty members had received NC SIP training.

### **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 from 2009-10 to 2010-11 in NC SIP districts considered to be high implementing (i.e., participated in NC SIP for 7 or more years and had 60% or more of schools participating in NC SIP).

### **Goal 4. Improve parent satisfaction and involvement with the NCSIP project.**

NC SIP is working with their reading and mathematics sites and centers across the state to increase the opportunities available for parents to become involved in the program. In partnership with the Exceptional Children Assistance Center (ECAC), NC SIP will offer training to LEA staff to increase LEA knowledge about engaging parents. Other activities will include parent webinars, access to parent materials that support the work of the project, and assistance in involving parents on Advisory Boards. This year the project drafted training modules and revised and distributed resources for parents. With regard to satisfaction, the average rating of parent satisfaction based on the annual survey conducted by NC SIP LEAs decreased from 2.69 to 2.43 (out of 3.00). It is hoped this rating will increase as ECAC starts implementing trainings and 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 continues to expand their network of reading and mathematics centers and sites across NC with the number of traditional LEAs with a reading and/or mathematics center or site having increased from 86 to 91. The ultimate goal is that all of the traditional LEAs (i.e., not including charter schools) in the state will have a reading or math center or site by the end of the grant period. NC SIP is currently working to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the NC SIP model by developing a comprehensive project manual, researching and adopting a coaching model to be used in all sites, improving follow-up training practices, and improving the teacher fidelity observation process.



Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart

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.

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

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
By the end of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of funding the NC SIP Reading Initiative, 50% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8/16	50%		12/16	75%

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
By the end of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of funding the NC SIP Mathematics Initiative, 50% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8/16	50%		12/16	75%

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of teachers 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	%
			999			2,635	

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	%
		999			57		

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.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			86/115	74.8%		91/115	79.1%

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

**Performance Measure 1.a.** By the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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, 12 of 16 (75%) 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; E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation.

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) 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Attachment 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, 12 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; E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation.

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) 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 NCSIP 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 use Eventbrite, an electronic registration process, OR submit summary forms about the type of event and numbers of participants after each training (Note: Some districts must use their own electronic registration process and therefore must submit the summary forms). NC SIP sites did not submit summary forms for all of the trainings that were completed. Therefore, the data for these measures 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 could be counted twice in the total. Targets will be set for these measures next year because this was the first year that the data could be disaggregated for teachers and leaders. It is estimated that about 2,635 teachers and 57 leaders participated in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction during the project period (i.e., March 1, 2011 to February 29, 2012).

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

<b>Professional Development Event</b>	<b>Total # Trainings</b>	<b>Total # of Teachers</b>	<b>Total # of Leaders</b>
<b>Reading Foundations Training:</b> 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	1,721	22
<b>Reading Model Instruction Training:</b> As a result of the Reading Foundations Training, each new NCSIP 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	340	16
<b>Literacy Training:</b> In addition to providing Reading Foundations Trainings and Reading Model Trainings, NCSIP 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	101	0
<b>Mathematics Foundations Training:</b> 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	434	19
<b>Mathematics Model Instruction Training:</b> Each new NCSIP 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	39	0
<b>DIBELS Training:</b> The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. The results of the DIBELS assessment can be used to measure the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. NCSIP recommends the use of DIBELS to assist school in measuring the progress of K-2 students reading skills. The DIBELS training involves training on administering, scoring, and managing data as well as on instruction. The DIBELS assessment and its use are based on research and the training helps ensure that K-2 teachers use the DIBELS as intended.	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>2,635</b>	<b>57</b>

**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.

Based on NCSIP project documents, 91 out of 115 traditional LEAs (79.1%) in North Carolina currently have a reading and/or mathematics center or site. Specifically, 43 LEAs have a reading AND math center or site, 6 LEAs have a mathematics center or site only, and 42 LEAs have a reading center or site only. The goal is for all 115 traditional LEAs in North Carolina (i.e., not including charter schools) to have a reading and/or a mathematics center or site by the end of the grant period. As shown in Table 1.e., the number of traditional LEAs with a reading and/or mathematics center or site has increased from 86 to 91 indicating that progress has been made toward achieving this goal.



**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					
100% 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.** 100% of a sample of continuing NC SIP teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their reading or mathematics fidelity observation.

The NC SIP project is currently improving the process for assessing the fidelity of teachers who have completed foundations training and are implementing one of the reading or math instructional models in an NC SIP school. Originally, teachers (both new and continuing) were considered to have high fidelity of implementation if they scored an average of 2.5 or greater on three classroom observations that were rated using a fidelity observation form for the reading and/or math instruction model they are implementing (e.g., Foundations, Letterland). The fidelity observation forms (which will remain the same) 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), and 3 (appropriate) on their use of instructional skills associated with high implementation fidelity of the instructional model. The teacher was to report their average fidelity score when he/she submitted student test data in June.

The weaknesses with the current process are 1) no explicit criteria for who is qualified to conduct the fidelity observations, 2) no system for tracking who has or has not been observed, 3) no information is collected on when fidelity observations were conducted to ensure they are spaced appropriately, 4) the amount of missing or invalid data (e.g., values above 3.0), and 5) that the process itself is not sustainable as LEAs scale up. To improve the process, NC SIP is:

- developing criteria specifying who (e.g., coordinator, principal, etc.) can observe a teacher and what qualifications (e.g., training) those persons need to have.

- developing a database to identify all new and continuing teachers at NC SIP schools who have completed foundations and model instruction training. The database will enable NC SIP to identify the teachers who need to be observed and to track observations.

- having observers complete their fidelity observation forms online as they complete observations in order to track when observations occur and provide NC SIP direct access to the raw data enabling the project to calculate fidelity scores.

- developing different fidelity procedures for new and continuing teachers. For NEW teachers (i.e., teachers who complete their training between October 1, 2011 and September 30, 2012), three observations will be conducted during the school year following completion of their training. The score for the third or final observation will be used for reporting. For CONTINUING teachers (i.e., teachers who completed their training prior to October 1, 2011), the project will select a sample of 50% to receive one fidelity observation during the school year. Continuing and new teachers who were observed the previous year will not be observed the next year (i.e., teachers will not be observed two years in a row). 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.

The expected start date for the new fidelity process is the start of the 2012-13 school year, which means data will be reported for the first time on the 2014 APR. However, data collected following the previous methodology (i.e., all teachers reporting their average fidelity score when submitting student data) are available and shared in Table B. As shown, valid fidelity scores (i.e., not missing and between 0-3) were obtained for 849 teachers (89.0% of teachers who submitted student data had valid fidelity scores). Of those teachers, 748 or 88.1% scored at or above 2.5, which indicates those teachers are implementing their instructional model with high fidelity.

<b>Table B. Number and Percent of Teachers with Fidelity Scores of 2.5 or Greater for 2010-11</b>				
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Total # of Teachers</b>			<b>Percent with Fidelity of 2.5 or Greater</b>
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>With Valid Fidelity Scores</b>	<b>With Fidelity Scores of 2.5 or Greater</b>	
3-8 Reading	606	561	491	87.5%
3-8 Mathematics	227	184	166	90.2%
K-2 Literacy	110	94	82	87.2%
English I	11	10	9	90.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>954</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>88.1%</b>



**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.

All most all of the NC SIP funds are awarded to LEAs to implement their reading and/or math sites. LEAs have not been required to track their spending of NC SIP funds. Therefore, starting in the 2012-13 school year LEAs will be required to track their spending of NC SIP funds and guidance will be provided to LEAs as to what specifically constitutes a follow-up activity. Because these data have not been tracked, there is no information on which to base the percentage of funds being used to sustain the use of reading and math instructional practices.



**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	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
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.	<b>Project</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			195/566	34.5%

4.b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</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.	<b>Project</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
				30.5%		1,682/5,611	30.0%

4.c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in mathematics.	<b>Project</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
				40.7%		528/1,313	40.2%

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	%
			191/3,255	5.9%		187/3,222	5.8%

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	%
			474/690	68.7%		505/739	68.3%

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 NCSIP schools (i.e., schools located within NCSIP sites) who have completed a foundations and model instruction training course. Overall, a total of 90 teachers (n=109 total) representing 22 LEAs and two charter schools submitted complete 2011 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) data. On average, teachers submitted data for 6 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 23).

DIBELS 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. The tests shown in parentheses are those that are recommended for administration by DIBELS but were not requested of NCSIP K-2 teachers.

Grade	Fall 2010	Winter 2011	Spring 2011
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 Administration and Scoring Guide provides instructions on how teachers should administer and score each test. Based on these scores, the DIBELS 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. Of the 825 students on whom data were submitted, 566 (68.6%) had valid scores on all of the requested DIBELS tests for the fall and the spring (see Table C above). As the data show in the Table 4.a above, of the 566 students with disabilities for whom valid DIBELS data were reported for 2010-11, 195 or 34.5% 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 253 or 44.7% showed no change from fall to spring (does not include students who scored at grade level in the fall and spring), and 118 or 20.8% showed a negative change from fall to spring. Table D below shows the results for each grade level. Targets will be set next year when a second year of complete DIBELS will be available (i.e., data from all subtests across grade levels). As evident in Table D., there was a substantial difference in the first grade results from 2009-10 to 2010-11 due to the difference in subtests.

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	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
Kindergarten (2010 n=78; 2011 n=123)	34.6% (27)	28.5% (35)	11.5% (9)	26.0% (32)	32.1% (25)	31.7% (39)	21.8% (17)	13.8% (17)
First Grade (2010 n=152*; 2011 n=161)	36.2% (55)	11.8% (19)	40.8% (62)	28.0% (45)	13.8% (21)	31.7% (51)	9.2% (14)	28.6% (46)
Second Grade (2010 n=231; 2011 n=282)	12.6% (29)	7.1% (20)	16.5% (38)	15.6% (44)	54.1% (125)	57.8% (163)	16.9% (39)	19.5% (55)
<b>TOTAL (2010 n=461; 2011 n=566)</b>	<b>24.1% (111)</b>	<b>13.1% (74)</b>	<b>23.6% (109)</b>	<b>21.4% (121)</b>	<b>37.1% (171)</b>	<b>44.7% (253)</b>	<b>15.2% (70)</b>	<b>20.8% (118)</b>

\*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 instructional model training courses. 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 is working to improve the accuracy of these data by 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.

Overall, a total of 601 grade 3-8 teachers representing 53 LEAs and 3 charter schools (85 LEAs and 4 charter schools have NC SIP reading sites) submitted useable 2011 EOG reading data. On average, teachers submitted data for 9 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 119). As shown in Table 4.b. above, of the 5,611 students with disabilities on whom valid data were reported for 2010-11, 1,682 or 30.0% 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 previous year. The target was not met as the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level slightly decreased. Table E provides comparison data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina.

<b>Group</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	30.5% (total n=4,374)	30.0% (total n=5,611)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	40.6% (total n=86,850)	40.8% (total n=88,284)
NC State: All students	70.1% (total n=681,460)	70.7% (total n=688,428)

**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 instructional model training courses. 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 is working to improve the accuracy of these data by 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.

Overall, a total of 225 grade 3-8 teachers representing 29 LEAs (49 LEAs have NC SIP math sites) submitted useable 2011 EOG math data. On average, teachers submitted data for 6 students with disabilities (ranged from 1 to 31). As shown in Table 4.c. above, of the 1,313 students with disabilities on whom valid data were reported for 2010-11, 528 or 40.2% 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 previous year. The target was not met as the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level slightly decreased. Table F provides comparison data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina.

<b>Group</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	40.7% (total n=907)	40.2% (total n=1,313)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	57.0% (total n=86,830)	57.6% (total n=88,274)
NC State: All students	81.8% (total n=681,509)	82.4% (total n=688,443)

**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 had participated continuously in NC SIP for 7 years or more and had 60% or more of their schools participating in NC SIP. 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 evolve as more complete data become available on the quality of implementation via developmental reviews and fidelity checks.

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). These data were obtained for each LEA from the NC DPI website at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgradrate>.

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 2010-11. This also was the trend for the other NC SIP districts (i.e., those not identified as high implementing) but not for non-NC SIP districts (see Table G). The target for this measure is to meet or decrease the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out the previous year. Based on these data, the target was met.

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 decreased from 2009-10 to 2010-11. This was not true of the other groups in which the percentage increased (see Table G). The target for this measure is to meet or exceed the percentage of students with disabilities graduating the previous year. Based on these data, the target was not met.

**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	2009-10	2010-11
	High Implementing NC SIP Districts (n=15)	5.9% (191/3,255)	5.8% (187/3,222)	68.7% (474/690)
All Other NC SIP Districts (n=76)	6.6% (2,551/38,381)	5.8% (2,215/38,337)	62.7% (5,286/8,426)	64.1% (5,591/8,716)
Non NC SIP Districts (n=24)	5.7% (302/5,303)	6.0% (325/5,441)	67.2% (714/1,062)	70.2% (789/1,124)
NC State (n=115)	6.5% (3,044/46,939)	5.8% (2,727/47,000)	63.6% (6,474/10,178)	65.1% (6,885/10,579)



**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	%
		999	/		4	/	

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	%
		999	/			/	

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	%
		999	/		272	/	

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	%
		999	/		80	/	

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). As of this report, four faculty members had received Foundations training. Specifically, two faculty members at UNC-Charlotte completed training (one completed Math Foundations and one completed Reading Foundations) and two faculty members at UNC-Chapel Hill completed training (both completed Reading Foundations). No faculty members received NC SIP training during the project period for ECU.

**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. The partnership IHEs have just started this work and have not begun revising courses. It is expected that some of this work will occur next school year.

**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 program and licensure only programs, UNC-Charlotte offers a bachelors degree program and MAT program, and ECU offers a bachelors degree program and licensure only programs. 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 available online at <https://ir.uncc.edu/fact-book>. 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 available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/research/FactBook.cfm>. The licensure data was requested directly from the partner IHE's. Licensure data for ECU were not available prior to the report deadline. Table H below provides data for enrollment and graduation/completion in special education programs at each IHE. The 2010-11 data will serve as baseline data.

<b>Table H: IHE Partner Enrollment and Graduation/Completion Data for Special Education Teachers for 2009-10 and 2010-11</b>								
<b>Type of Program</b>	<b>UNC-Chapel Hill</b>		<b>UNC-Charlotte</b>		<b>ECU</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	
	<b>2008-10 Cohort</b>	<b>2010-12 Cohort</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
<b>ENROLLMENT</b>								
Degree	18	10	107	129	87	130	212	269
Licensure	7	3	NA	NA			7	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>272</b>
<b>GRADUATION/COMPLETION</b>								
Degree	18	10	44	47	47	20	109	77
Licensure	7	3	NA	NA			7	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>80</b>



**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	%
		999	/		NA	/	

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	%
		999	/			/	

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	/		2.43	/	

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

**Performance Measure 6.a.** The number of parent involvement opportunities provided by NCSIP.

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's focus was on developing trainings as well as developing and revising resources for parents. Specifically, ECAC:

- Conducted presentations and developed a webinar (Making the Connection: Engaging Families to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities) to train NC SIP LEA staff on how to involve parents.
- Drafted a webinar and a guide for creating effective advisory committees for NC SIP sites.
- Drafted a training module and guide on participating on NC SIP advisory committees for NC SIP parents.
- Provided NC SIP sites access to the Literacy Packet information. Revised and distributed The Questions Parents Can Ask About Reading Improvement tool and The Questions Parents Can Ask About Spelling, Writing, and Assessment/Testing tool. Drafted The Questions Parents Can Ask About Math tool.
- Provided NC SIP sites access to the ECAC summer 2011 and spring 2012 Newsletter.
- Modified the ECAC website to include NC SIP Information and the Literacy Questions tools.

The third year of the grant will focus on implementing these trainings and tracking the number of NC SIP parent involvement opportunities that occur in their NC SIP LEAs as well as the total number of parents who participated in these opportunities. Baseline data will be reported in 2013 and results in 2014.

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

As part of their developmental review in the spring of 2012, LEAs will be 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. Therefore, baseline data will be reported in 2013 and results in 2014.

**Performance Measure 6.c. The total average rating of parent satisfaction with the NCSIP 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 2010-11 was a 2.43 out of 3.00 (n=1,187). This does not meet the annual target, which was to meet or exceed the previous year's performance of 2.69. The performance on this measure is expected to improve as NC SIP expands their parent involvement efforts.



**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.)

---

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

## APPENDIX C

### Tables for Section A of APR

<b>Table A. Summary of Professional Development Events that Directly Impact Teacher Practice</b>			
<b>Professional Development Event</b>	<b>Total # Trainings</b>	<b>Total # of Teachers</b>	<b>Total # of Leaders</b>
<b>Reading Foundations Training:</b> 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	1,721	22
<b>Reading Model Instruction Training:</b> As a result of the Reading Foundations Training, each new NCSIP 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	340	16
<b>Literacy Training:</b> In addition to providing Reading Foundations Trainings and Reading Model Trainings, NCSIP 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	101	0
<b>Mathematics Foundations Training:</b> 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	434	19
<b>Mathematics Model Instruction Training:</b> Each new NCSIP 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	39	0
<b>DIBELS Training:</b> The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. The results of the DIBELS assessment can be used to measure the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. NCSIP recommends the use of DIBELS to assist school in measuring the progress of K-2 students reading skills. The DIBELS training involves training on administering, scoring, and managing data as well as on instruction. The DIBELS assessment and its use are based on research and the training helps ensure that K-2 teachers use the DIBELS as intended.	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>2,635</b>	<b>57</b>

Subject	Total # of Teachers			Percent with Fidelity of 2.5 or Greater
	Overall	With Valid Fidelity Scores	With Fidelity Scores of 2.5 or Greater	
3-8 Reading	606	561	491	87.5%
3-8 Mathematics	227	184	166	90.2%
K-2 Literacy	110	94	82	87.2%
English I	11	10	9	90.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>954</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>88.1%</b>

Grade	Fall 2010	Winter 2011	Spring 2011
K	ISF LNF	ISF LNF PSF NWF	LNF PSF NWF
1	LNF PSF NWF	PSF NWF ORF	PSF NWF ORF
2	ORF	ORF	ORF

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	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
Kindergarten (2010 n=78; 2011 n=123)	34.6% (27)	28.5% (35)	11.5% (9)	26.0% (32)	32.1% (25)	31.7% (39)	21.8% (17)	13.8% (17)
First Grade (2010 n=152*; 2011 n=161)	36.2% (55)	11.8% (19)	40.8% (62)	28.0% (45)	13.8% (21)	31.7% (51)	9.2% (14)	28.6% (46)
Second Grade (2010 n=231; 2011 n=282)	12.6% (29)	7.1% (20)	16.5% (38)	15.6% (44)	54.1% (125)	57.8% (163)	16.9% (39)	19.5% (55)
<b>TOTAL (2010 n=461; 2011 n=566)</b>	<b>24.1% (111)</b>	<b>13.1% (74)</b>	<b>23.6% (109)</b>	<b>21.4% (121)</b>	<b>37.1% (171)</b>	<b>44.7% (253)</b>	<b>15.2% (70)</b>	<b>20.8% (118)</b>

\*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.

<b>Group</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	30.5% (total n=4,374)	30.0% (total n=5,611)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	40.6% (total n=86,850)	40.8% (total n=88,284)
NC State: All students	70.1% (total n=681,460)	70.7% (total n=688,428)

<b>Group</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	40.7% (total n=907)	40.2% (total n=1,313)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	57.0% (total n=86,830)	57.6% (total n=88,274)
NC State: All students	81.8% (total n=681,509)	82.4% (total n=688,443)

<b>Group</b>	<b>% Students w/Disabilities Dropping Out</b> (Number dropouts/EC December 9-12 Count)		<b>% Students w/Disabilities Graduating</b> (5 Year Cohort)	
	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
High Implementing NC SIP Districts (n=15)	5.9% (191/3,255)	5.8% (187/3,222)	68.7% (474/690)	68.3% (505/739)
All Other NC SIP Districts (n=76)	6.6% (2,551/38,381)	5.8% (2,215/38,337)	62.7% (5,286/8,426)	64.1% (5,591/8,716)
Non NC SIP Districts (n=24)	5.7% (302/5,303)	6.0% (325/5,441)	67.2% (714/1,062)	70.2% (789/1,124)
NC State (n=115)	6.5% (3,044/46,939)	5.8% (2,727/47,000)	63.6% (6,474/10,178)	65.1% (6,885/10,579)

<b>Type of Program</b>	<b>UNC-Chapel Hill</b>		<b>UNC-Charlotte</b>		<b>ECU</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	
	<b>2008-10 Cohort</b>	<b>2010-12 Cohort</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
<b>ENROLLMENT</b>								
Degree	18	10	107	129	87	130	212	269
Licensure	7	3	NA	NA			7	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>272</b>
<b>GRADUATION/COMPLETION</b>								
Degree	18	10	44	47	47	20	109	77
Licensure	7	3	NA	NA			7	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>80</b>