

# **U.S. Department of Education**

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FY 2007 GRANT PERFORMANCE  
REPORT FOR CONTINUATIONS  
CFDA # 84.323A  
PR/Award # H323A050002  
Budget Period # 3  
Report Type: Annual Performance**

OMB No. 1890-0004, Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

# **\*\*Table of Contents\*\***

## **Forms**

1. Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) - Revised 2005	e1
Attachment - 1	e3
2. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1	e5
3. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2	e9
4. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3	e20
5. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4	e25
6. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 6	e30
7. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 5	e34
8. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 7	e37
9. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 8	e40
10. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 10	e43
11. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 9	e45
12. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 11	e50
13. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 13	e53
14. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 12	e57
15. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 14	e61
16. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 16	e64
17. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 15	e67
18. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C	e71
Attachment - 1	e72
Attachment - 2	e73

This report was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this report. Some pages/sections of this report may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Report's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Report PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).



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

*Check only one box per Program Office instructions.*

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

**General Information**

1. PR/Award #: **H323A050002**  
*(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification.)*

2. NCES ID #: 37  
*(See Instructions.)*

3. Project Title: North Carolina Personnel Development Grant  
*(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)*

4. Grantee Name*(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

5. Grantee Address *(See Instructions.):* 301 N. Wilmington Street  
City: Raleigh State: NC Zip:27601 Zip+4:

6. Project Director: First Name	Last Name	Title
Mary	Watson	Exceptional Children Director
Phone #:	Fax #:	Email Address:
(919)807-3969	(919)807-3243	MWATSON@DPI.STATE.NC.US

**Reporting Period Information** *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period:            From: 6/1/2007    To: 4/2/2008    (mm/dd/yyyy)

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

8. Budget Expenditures

	<b>Federal Grant Funds</b>	<b>Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)</b>
a. Previous Budget Period	443,597.00	0.00
b. Current Reporting Period	450,781.00	0.00
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	0.00	0.00

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

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  Yes  
 No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?  Yes  
 No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:  
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2007 To: 6/30/2008 (mm/dd/yyyy)  
 Approving Federal agency:  ED  Other (Please Specify)  
 Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only):  Provisional  Final  Other (Please Specify)
- d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that :
- Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?  
 Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

**Human Subjects** ( See instructions.)

10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval?  Yes  No  
 N/A

**Performance Measures Status and Certification** ( See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status
- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?  Yes  No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? (mm/dd/yyyy)
12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative: June Atkinson	Title: State Superintendent
Signature:	Date:

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

Title :  
 File : G:\Maxtor backup\NCSIP II\3rd Annual Report\Final Drafts\NCSIP\_ED524BExecSummary\_final.doc



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

OMB No. 1890 - 0004  
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #: (Please Enter)

*(See Instructions.)*

North Carolina State Improvement Project II  
Executive Summary for the Third Annual Report

The third year annual report on the status of the North Carolina State Improvement Project II (State Personnel Development Grant) covers a period of time from June 1st, 2007 through April 2nd, 2008. The project continued to focus on improving the quality of instruction for students with disabilities through the use of research supported personnel development and on-site technical assistance for the public schools and university teacher education programs.

This third annual report addresses each of the sixteen NCSIP II project objectives associated with the four project goals. OSEP Long-term Measures 1 and 2 and OSEP Program Performance Measures 1, 2 and 3 are all addressed under Objective 2. OSEP Performance Measure 4 is not addressed in project's goals and objectives approved by OSEP.

The Explanation of Progress section for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the 16 project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT – documentation of the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOALS - documentation of extent to which intermediate or enabling goals are met, and (c) OUTCOMES - documentation of the extent to which the project objectives are being, or have been, achieved.

This report systematically addresses the four project goals, 16 project objectives and 38 performance measures aligned with the project objectives. A summary of the third year outcomes across the four project goals is provided below.

Goal 1. Improve Basic Skills Performance For Students With Disabilities

- The project's network of best practices centers and sites across North Carolina have been expanded to include a total of sixty-six reading and writing instruction centers and sites and, thirty-four mathematics instruction centers and sites.
- Ninety-two percent of the educators participating in the NCSIP II training events received professional development based on scientific and/or evidence-based instructional practices.
- Twelve of the thirteen types of professional development events are aligned with the North Carolina State Performance Plan.

- Approximately 75% of the 385 professional development events provided during the third year of the project reflected scientific- or evidence-based practices.
- Ninety-Seven percent of the training activities provided were followed up with on-site sustainability activities including comprehensive fidelity observations.
- The project's target for increasing the percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level state-wide in reading was not met. However, it should be noted that across the last five years of NCSIP and NCSIP II, the reading progress of students with disabilities in North Carolina has increased at approximately twice the rate of reading progress made for all students in North Carolina.

#### Goal 2. Increase The Percentage Of Qualified Teachers Of Students With Disabilities

- In addition to the project's statewide professional development work involving 4665 in-service teachers, six teacher education technical assistance events were planned and implemented to (a) improve the quality of pre-service teacher education programs, (b) increase the number of approved teacher education programs and, (c) develop a comprehensive student recruitment program to increase the number of new teachers produced
- Eleven special education teacher education programs participated in the Cooperative Planning Consortium meeting designed to assist with teacher education program improvement.

#### Goal 3. Increase Graduation Rates And Decrease Drop-Out Rates Of Students With Disabilities

- Thirty-three percent of the 2,397 schools in North Carolina have established school wide PBS programs and are receiving training and support services.
- Using school exiting data, there was a slight increase from last year in the percentage of students with disabilities who dropped out of school. There was no change from last year in the 49% of students graduating with a diploma.

#### Goal 4. Improve Parent Satisfaction With, And Support Of, School Services.

- Parent organizations involved in briefings and input have increased from six to seven.
- Parents continue to express a high level of satisfaction, as measured by a parent satisfaction rating scale, with the instruction and services their children have received through the NCSIP II project.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**1. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase the percentage of students entering school age with age-level language skills, including age appropriate levels of phonological awareness skills.

1a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of outreach events including personnel development workshops classroom demonstrations, and technical assistance events provided by the regional Early Literacy/NCSIP II Centers. Note: The target is calculated at last year's number of events (135) plus an increase of five.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		140	/		55	/	
The percent of children with disabilities receiving services in the three Early Literacy/NCSIP II regional centers that are making progress toward an age appropriate level of language development including	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 1	100		21 / 21	100

phonological awareness.  
Note: The target has been set at 100% for each year of the project.

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

### Introduction

This is the Third Annual Report describing the strategies, events and outcomes to date for the North Carolina State Improvement Project II (SPDG Grant Program). The report covers a period of time from June 1, 2007 through April 2, 2008. The approved plan for the project addresses four general goals as follows:

1. Improve basic skills performance of students with disabilities
2. Increase the percentage of qualified teachers of students with disabilities
3. Increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates of students with disabilities
4. Improve parent satisfaction with, and support of, school services for students with disabilities

The Third Annual Report is organized to sequentially address each of the sixteen project objectives associated with the four project goals. OSEP Long-term Measures 1 and 2 and OSEP Program Performance Measures 1, 2 and 3 are all addressed under Objective 2. OSEP Performance Measure 4 is not addressed in project's goals and objectives approved by OSEP.

The Explanation of Progress Section for each objective includes up to three evaluation categories for describing the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives have been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOALS - the extent to which intermediate or enabling-goals have been met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objectives are being, or have been, achieved.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance, was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

INPUT: To what extent has the project established (a) an early language foundation training program for teachers in Early Literacy Centers and, (b) transition orientation training for staff of infant and toddler and early childhood program implementation in the partner centers?

### Objective 1

Increase the percentage of students entering school age with age-level language skills, including age appropriate levels of phonological awareness skills.

**INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented?**

Early in the project NCSIP II developed a partnership with the North Carolina's Office of School Readiness, a statewide early literacy program to provide training, demonstration and outreach to public schools in North Carolina interested in establishing early literacy programs for students with disabilities. Three Preschool Demonstration Programs for young children with disabilities were established in school districts in different geographical sections of North Carolina. During the third year of the project twenty-one children with IEPs across the three instructional sites received instruction to improve language development and phonemic awareness in addition to other skills and knowledge.

During the third year of the project the three demonstration programs provided fifty-five outreach and professional development events. These outreach events included (a) thirteen workshops that included research-based instructional techniques and procedures (b) twenty-eight on-site visits to the demonstration sites by staff from school districts in their region interested in establishing similar preschool programs, (c) three technical assistance visits to other school districts in their region, and (d) ten mini-grants providing instructional and developmental materials to help facilitate the development of quality early literacy programs.

To measure the progress of preschool children receiving instruction across the three Preschool Demonstration Programs the Child Outcome Summary Rating Form developed by the Early Child Outcome Center was used. All twenty-one of the children with IEPs receiving services improved their skills. Sixteen of the twenty-one children with IEPs made significant gains in acquisition of skills and knowledge.

**INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Have Early Literacy Teachers Improved Instructional Skills?**

Performance Measure 1.a. The number of events including personnel development workshops, classroom demonstrations, and technical assistance events provided by the regional Early Literacy/NCSIP II Centers.

For the remainder of the project the target for Performance Measure 1.a. has been set at an increase of at least five additional events each year. For the third year of the project the target was set at 140 outreach events across the three program sites. However, there was a drop in the number of outreach events during the third year to fifty-five. Performance Measure 1.a. was not met.

**OUTCOMES: To What Extent Have Children In The Early Literacy/NCSIP II Centers Improved Basic Language And Phonological Awareness Skills?**

Performance Measure 1.b. The percent of children receiving services in the three Early Literacy/NCSIP II regional centers that are making progress toward an age appropriate level of language development including phonological awareness.

The target for Performance Measure 1.b. has been set at 100 percent. All children with disabilities receiving the project's instruction should demonstrate some progress toward functioning at grade level. To measure the progress of preschool children receiving instruction across the three Preschool Demonstration Programs the Child Outcome Summary Rating Form developed by the Early Child Outcome Center was used. All twenty-one of the children with IEPs receiving services improved their skills. Sixteen of the twenty-one children with IEPs made significant gains in progress toward grade level. Performance Measure 1.b. has been met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**2 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Improve in-service teachers' instructional skills in reading, writing and mathematics through the use of intensive and explicit multi-sensory teaching strategies as measured by increased rates of progress of students with disabilities statewide.

Note for Reader: The Third Annual Report is organized to sequentially address each of the sixteen project objectives associated with the four project goals. OSEP Long-term Measures 1 and 2, and OSEP Program Performance Measures 1, 2 and 3 are all addressed in Objective 2. OSEP Performance Measure 4 is not addressed in the project's goals and objectives approved by OSEP.

2a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG (NCSIP II) based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices. Note: The target has been set at last years performance of 95%  This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Long-term Measure 2	PRGM	<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>
			95 / 100	95		4272 / 4665	92
2b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					

<p>The percentage of the types of personnel development/training activities or strategies implemented by the NCSIP II project that are aligned with the improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan. Note: The Target for P.M. 2.b. has been established at 90% or higher.</p> <p>This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure # 1</p>	PRGM	<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>
			12 / 13	92		12 / 13	92

2c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>				
-------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--	--

<p>The percentage of (types of) professional development/training activities (events) provided through NCSIP II that are based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional /behavioral practices.</p> <p>This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure # 2</p>	PRGM	<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>
			71 / 100	71		290 / 385	75

2d. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>				
-------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--	--

<p>The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific-or</p>	PRGM	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw</b>			<b>Raw</b>		

evidence-based instructional /behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.)	<b>Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
		95 / 100	95		208 / 214	97
This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure # 3.						

2e. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percent of NCSIP II Reading/Writing project teachers demonstrating mastery of effective reading instruction skills as measured by a series of formal classroom fidelity observations This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Long-term Measure #1. Note: The Target calculation for 07-08 is 80%, (the 06-07 target/baseline)plus an annual increase of 2%, or 82%	PROJ	<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>
			82 / 100	82		131 / 147	89

2f. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade in reading as	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw</b>			<b>Raw</b>		

measured by the NC End-of-grade reading test.  
 Note: The target is calculated at a 2.5 percentage point increase from last year's 63%, resulting in a new target of 65.5% of all SWD at or above grade level in reading.

Number	Ratio	%	Number	Ratio	%
	65 / 100	65		40845 / 63086	65

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

INTRODUCTION

The Third Annual Report is organized to sequentially address each of the sixteen project objectives associated with the four project goals. OSEP Long-term Measures 1 and 2, and OSEP Program Performance Measures 1, 2 and 3 are all addressed in Objective 2. OSEP Performance Measure 4 is not addressed in the project's goals and objectives approved by OSEP.

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - documentation of the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOALS - the extent to which intermediate or enabling goals are met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objectives are being, or have been, achieved.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 2

Improve in-service teachers' instructional skills in reading, writing and mathematics through the use of intensive and explicit multi-sensory teaching strategies as measured by increased rates of progress of students with disabilities statewide.

INPUT: The Extent to Which the Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned

Expanding the Network Of Research-Based Instruction Centers and Sites. During the third year of the project, NC SIP II continued to fund six Regional Reading/Writing Best Practices Centers and 66 Reading/Writing Sites, including 13 new

sites funded for the 2007-2008 school year. To improve the quality of mathematics instruction, funding continued the four mathematics regional centers and a total of 30 mathematics sites were funded. Services provided for and/or by centers and sites continued to include (a) conducting foundation training workshops in reading, writing and/or mathematics; (b) demonstration of research-based model instruction programs, (c) conducting developmental reviews; and (d) conducting fidelity observation trainings and implementation for NCSIP II research to practice sites in each region.

**Development Of Research-Based Foundation Training Materials.** During the third year of the project, NC SIP II continued to work on the development and implementation of both a research-based writing and mathematics foundation training program. Two teams (one each for writing and mathematics) of professionals including teachers, and basic skills instruction specialists continued to work on the development of the training programs and materials. The mathematics foundation training program is complete and trainings are currently being conducted across the NC SIP II mathematics centers and sites. Plans are currently in place to present the writing foundations training program in July 2008. In addition, a comprehensive review of the Reading Foundation Training was conducted and revisions were made.

**Personnel Development Training Events.** NC SIP II provided thirteen professional development events with 4,665 participants during the second year of operation. Each of these is described briefly below.

**Reading Foundation Training.** During the third year of the project, Reading Foundation training was provided for 1,299 teachers in 88 different venues across North Carolina, an increase of 572 participants from the previous reporting period. The Reading Foundation Training program was developed early in the implementation of the North Carolina SIG (NC SIP) project and revisions have been made in the original training materials. Training materials consist of a comprehensive Power Point presentation, a CD with training content and video examples of research-based instructional skills and methods including assessment procedures. The program includes nine training units beginning with a review of the research literature that justifies the content of the program. A more detailed description of the Reading Foundation program can be found on the NCSIP II website [www.ncsip.org](http://www.ncsip.org) including documentation of the research-base for the personnel development program. NCSIP II has classified the Reading Foundation Training as research-based.

**Reading Model Training.** During the third year of NC SIP II 2,129 teachers and leadership personnel received training in the use of research-based model reading instruction in 100 different venues in all regions of the state, an increase of 1,338 participants from last year. As mentioned above, at the end of the Reading Foundation Training each new project 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. The reading content is derived from the National Reading Panel's recommendations and includes phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. NCSIP II does not have a list of approved model programs. However, the model programs selected must reflect the instructional principles derived from the research on reading instruction. The Reading Foundation Training reviews examples of model programs that meet the research criteria.

These include Language!, Corrective Reading, Wilson Reading System, and the Hill Center programs. Most of the LEA based sites select one of these model programs. The model training is delivered directly to the NCSIP II reading sites by the developers of the model. Additional documentation of the research base for the reading model training strategies can be found on the NCSIP II website. NCSIP II classifies the Reading Model Training as research-based.

**Mathematics Instruction Training.** During the third year of the project there were seven mathematics instruction training events, including two Mathematics Foundation Trainings, held that were attended by 78 participants from across the 34 NC SIP II Mathematics Centers and sites. In addition, over 90 staff members from across the math network attended two Mathematics Instruction Network Meetings.

**Reading/Writing Network Meetings.** In the fall of 2007 a Reading/Writing Network Meeting for New Sites was held in Burlington, North Carolina. A total of 36 participants from across a majority of the 13 newly funded sites attended where they were presented with an overview of the NC SIP II project's goals, implementation strategies and accomplishments to date. In March 2008, a Reading/Writing Network Technical Assistance Meeting was held in Atlantic Beach, North Carolina. There were 121 participants representing 58 of the reading/writing centers and sites. The theme of the meeting was "Staying the Course - Making a Difference." One highlight of the meeting was a presentation by Dr. Joseph Torgesen on the importance of use of research-based instruction for struggling readers. Three NC SIP II reading/writing sites were selected to present on their projects' experiences and status. In addition, there was an update on the NC SIP II project, a report made on the Response to Intervention approach to making a difference, as well as a report on the NC SIP II evaluation activities and findings.

**Mathematics Instruction Network Meetings.** In the fall of 2007 a Mathematics Network Meeting for New Sites was held in Burlington, North Carolina. Participants from across a majority of the 10 newly funded sites attended and were presented with an overview of the NC SIP II project's goals, implementation strategies and accomplishments to date. A second Mathematics Instruction Network Meeting was held in March of 2008 in Atlantic Beach, North Carolina. There were over 50 participants representing 23 of mathematics centers and sites. The agenda of the meeting, entitled "Charting the Course" included the presentation "Math Trajectories: by Doug Clements", as well as updates on the project's evaluation procedures and results and the NC SIP II website. Additional items on the agenda included Long-range Math Instruction Planning, Professional Learning Communities, a presentation entitled "What Have We Learned About Training?", discussions on the use of model instruction programs Number Worlds and Transitional Mathematics, and a presentation by Dr. Chris Cain of Mars Hill College on Forming Partnerships with Institutes of Higher Education.

**Writing Instruction Training Activities.** During the third year of NCSIP II, the training development team for writing continued to work on developing a Foundation Training program in writing using the Reading Foundation training as a model. The Writing Foundation training is a two day workshop in which participants will learn strategies for teaching students the Self-Regulated Strategy Development based on the work of Steven Graham, Karen Harris and Linda Mason. They will learn the information from Writing Next to give them skills to take back in order to instruct students in writing

strategies. Participants will also learn and discuss accommodations and modifications used for students with writing disabilities as well as the technology which can support writing.

**Writing Model Training.** Two Writing Model Training events were held in July of 2007, sponsored by the NC SIP II Reading/Writing Center in Wake County, North Carolina. The Reasoning in Writing instructional model program was presented, including a program overview, a review of a placement test, planning for instruction, teaching effectively, lesson practice, assessments and corrective writing.

**Coaching Training.** In the third year of the project, one reading coaching training event was conducted with a total of 45 participants. The coaching personnel development workshop was developed and conducted by the reading instruction model developers (i.e., Language!, Wilson Reading System, and Corrective Reading). Each of these models reflects the instructional principles derived from multiple research reviews and specifically the principles identified by the National Reading Panel. Each of these models has a fairly extensive database supporting their effectiveness. The Coaching Training uses the same research-base as the NCSIP II Reading Model Training described above. Accordingly, the project has identified the Coaching Training program as research-based.

**TARS Recruitment Planning.** In collaboration with the Personnel Center at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) the UNC TARS component of the project provided a planning workshop designed to develop comprehensive plans for increasing the student enrollment in special education personnel preparation programs. During the third year of the project, three recruitment planning events were conducted with teacher education staff, resulting in the development of three comprehensive recruitment plans. The planning process employs a technical assistance approach to identifying the (a) characteristics of the students to be recruited, (b) a review of the characteristics of students currently enrolled, (c) the communities and region of the state to be targeted for recruitment strategies, and (d) identifying the strategies to be included in the recruitment plan. The TARS Recruitment Planning event is not based on scientifically-based research evidence.

**Fidelity Observation Training.** The purpose of the fidelity observation strategy is to follow-up personnel development training to assure effective implementation of instruction in schools and classrooms. Early in the NCSIP, structured classroom observation rating scales were developed for the each of the reading instruction models selected by school-based centers and sites. Each scale uses a three point rating with explicit criteria for a rating of 1, 2 or 3. Personnel in each NCSIP II center and/or sites were selected and trained to conduct the fidelity observations. Almost exclusively, personnel selected to conduct the fidelity observation are trained teachers that have experience in implementing the specific reading model used at the site. Project teachers received at least three observations during the school year. Coaching and feedback is also included in the fidelity observation process. During the third year of the project, 75 fidelity observation training events involving 150 teacher participants were completed. The fidelity observation procedures employ the use of classroom observation rating scales that are derived from the fidelity observations forms and procedures used by the model developers (e.g., Corrective Reading). These forms can be found on the NCSIP II website ([www.ncip.org](http://www.ncip.org)). The NCSIP II project

classifies the fidelity observation process used by the project as evidence-based.

**Training of Teacher Education Faculty.** In North Carolina all approved teacher education licensure programs must develop and implement an exit evaluation system to be used to demonstrate that each new teacher produced has meets the State Board of Education standards for a specific teaching license. To meet this requirement the NCSIP II project and the Cooperative Planning Consortium (CPC) for Special Education in the UNC General Administration worked together to develop and recommend a New Teacher Evaluation System for the Special Education: General Curriculum (SE:GC) licensure program.

The development of the recommended New Teacher Evaluation System for the Special Education: General Curriculum certification program was initiated in the spring of 2007 and a preliminary draft of the System was presented to the CPC membership in April, 2007. With feedback from the CPC work on the development of the evaluation system continued. The final version of the New Teacher Evaluation System was developed as a resource to be used by special education teacher preparation programs. The exit evaluation system is to be used to evaluate the quality of students applying for the Special Education: General Curriculum teaching license. The New Teacher Evaluation Items Bank provides a description of student projects that are recommended for use as course projects in the various required courses for the Special Education: General Curriculum License. The system is used to evaluate the extent to which candidates meet the North Carolina Quality Teacher Standards for the Special Education General Curriculum Teaching License. Each item has been reviewed by experienced special educators and special education teacher educators for inclusion in the item bank and approved by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The evaluation items are listed and organized by the eleven North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards and Standard Indicators measured by the item.

**Technical Assistance and Training for Teacher Education Faculty.** In the fall of 2007, the New Teacher Evaluation System was presented to the members of the Cooperative Planning Consortium. Seventeen teacher education faculty members from eleven different teacher education programs participated in the two-hour presentation and discussion of the use of new teacher evaluation procedures.

**Training of Trainers (TOT).** To sustain quality of reading instruction and at the same time to meet the demands of providing Reading Foundation Training for all teachers of students with disabilities NCSIP continued to provide Training of Trainers professional development events. During the third year of the project a Training of Trainers (TOT) event was provided, involving 41 participants. It should also be noted that a second TOT was held in April, 2008 that included approximately 25 participants, however it was held just after the end of the reporting period for this report. As reported last year, the TOT training includes several sequential steps or phases that each trainee is required to complete. These steps include (1) satisfactorily completes Level 2 Reading Foundation Training, (2) submission of a letter of intent to become a NCSIP II Foundation Trainer, (3) participation in a day long training of trainers workshop, (4) complete an apprenticeship under the supervision of a SIP II Foundation Trainer, (5) submit a plan for Reading Foundations training within the trainee's school system and the trainee conducts the training, (6) receive structured observation and feedback by experienced trainers, and

(7) quality of TOT trainee's task feedback is reviewed by an experienced trainer. This event is classified as research based in that the content of the training is the same as the content for the Reading Foundation Training.

Developmental Reviews. The Developmental Review is an on-site review and planning procedure that has been developed to support the sustainability of research-based instruction. The purpose of the developmental review event is to review the planning, organization, and management of the reading sites located in the LEAs. The review form addresses five dimensions of the sites that include; (a) Clarity and Integrity of Model, (b) Clarity and Appropriateness of the Model's Service Delivery Procedures, (c) Administration and Management, and (d) Staff Readiness to Teach and Train. The developmental review process is conducted with all the first year projects as well as with projects that are identified as having a need to address sustainability of the use of research-based instruction. During the third year of NC SIP II, 89 developmental reviews were conducted with 356 center and site leadership and teacher staff participating.

DIBELS Training. DIBELS training was again provided during the third year of the project. 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. The DIBELS assessment program was developed and distributed by the University of Oregon's Center on Teaching and Learning. The NCSIP II project recommends the use of the DIBELS assessment program to assist schools in the measuring the progress in the development of early reading skills of young children kindergarten through 2nd grade. In the third year of the NC SIP II project, the DIBELS training consisted of a two- day workshop that included the administration and scoring across the five sub-test areas, data collection and management, and instruction. The training includes a time for hands-on activities after each of the workshops main topics. The DIBELS assessment has a growing research-base and the workshop is considered to be an evidence-based personnel development event. Twelve DIBELS training events were conducted involving 240 participants.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Have Teacher Skills in Teaching Reading Improved?

Performance Measure 2.a. The percent of personnel receiving professional development through SPDG (NCSIP II) based on scientific or evidence-based instructional practices. This performance measure also addresses OSEP Long-term Measure 2.

In the second year of the project, 89% of personnel receiving staff development received research-based staff development. In the third year of the project the percentage of personnel receiving research-based training increased to 92%. Although the ambitious target for the third year of 95% was not met, the project provided structured personnel development based on scientific or evidence-based instructional practices for 4272 out of 4665 participants. The number of participants receiving research-based professional development increased dramatically from the second year (2534) to the third year (4272) of the project.

Performance Measure 2.b. The percentage of the types of personnel development/training activities or strategies

implemented by the NCSIP II project that are aligned with the improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan. This performance measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.

The target for Performance Measure 2.b. was established at 90% or higher during the first year of the project. As can be seen in the performance measure chart 2.b. above, twelve of the thirteen NCSIP II personnel development events (See list of events in Table 2.a. in the supplemental materials) are aligned with the North Carolina State Performance Plan Indicators. The Improving Teacher Training event is the only NCSIP II personnel development event that is not aligned with one or more of the North Carolina Performance Plan indicators. With this alignment of 92% during the third year of the project, the project has continued to meet the target for the Performance Measure 2.b.

Performance Measure 2.c. The percentage of (types of) professional development/training activities (events) provided through NCSIP II that are based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional /behavioral practices. This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.

The baseline for Performance Measure 2.c. was established in the first year of the project with 80% of personnel development training events reflecting a research-based foundation for the content of the events. In the second year of the project, 69% of the events reflected research-based contents. An annual target of two percentage point's growth was established for each of the next three years. During the third year of the project 290 of 385, or 75%, professional development events were built on a research-based foundation. This represents a six percentage point increase from last year, which surpasses the targeted yearly increase of two percentage points, however the project remains below the baseline established in the first year. Performance Measure 2.c. has been met by the project. Table 2.c. in the supplemental materials submitted to OSEP provides a more detailed look at the data used to respond to Performance Measure 2.c.

Performance Measure 2.d. The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional /behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.) This Performance Measure addresses OSEP Program Performance Measure 3.

In the third year of NCSIP II, Fidelity Observations, Developmental Reviews and Coaching Training comprised the three personnel development events designed to provide sustainability and follow-through of training events. In the first year of the project a baseline was established at 68% of professional development events to be followed up with onsite sustainability events. In setting an annual target for this performance measure an increase of five percentage points in each of the remaining years was projected for the target for Performance Measure 2.d. However, that target has been adjusted to a target of 95% or higher percentage of sustainability in each of the remaining years of the project. In the third year of the project 214 professional development events were conducted that were research-based with 208 or 97%, that were followed up with at least one sustainability event (Fidelity Observation, Developmental Review and/or Coaching Training). The target for Performance Measure 2.d. was met in the third year of the project.

## OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Basic Skills Performance Of Students With Disabilities Improved?

Performance Measure 2.e. The Percent of NCSIP II Reading/Writing Project Teachers Demonstrating Effective Instructional Skills as measured by a series of formal classroom fidelity observations.

Data on the percentage of NCSIP II teachers demonstrating effective instructional skills as measured by fidelity observations ratings are collected each year by the NCSIP II reading/writing centers and sites. The fidelity observation ratings range from 0 to 3. Each teacher is observed at least three times during the year and the ratings are averaged. A rating total score of 2.5 and above has been designated as the criteria for demonstrating effective reading instruction skills. An evaluation coordinator designated by each center and site collects the data. A target reflecting last year's performance (80%), plus an annual growth of two percentage points, or 82%, was established for Performance Measure 2.e. As can be seen in Performance Measure chart above, in the third year of the project 131 out of 147, or 89%, of the teachers included demonstrated a high fidelity of instruction as defined above. The target for Performance Measure 2.e. was met in the third year of the project.

Performance Measure 2.f. The percentage of students with disabilities in North Carolina performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade reading assessment.

For the third year of the project the Target for Performance Measure 2.f. was calculated at a 2.5 percentage point increase from last year's target of 63%, resulting in a new target of 65.5% of all students with disabilities statewide will perform at or above grade level in reading. The target was missed by half of a percentage point.

It should be noted that across the last five years of the NCSIP and NCSIP II projects the reading progress of students with disabilities in North Carolina has increased at approximately twice the rate of progress made for all students in North Carolina. From 2001-2002 through 2006-2007 the percentage of all students reading at or above grade level increased from 79.5 percent to 87.4 percent; a gain of 7.9 percentage points. During the same time period the percentage of students with disabilities statewide that were reading at or above grade level increased from 49.9 percent to 64.7, a gain of 14.8 percentage points.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**3 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase the percentage of students with disabilities enrolled in the standard curriculum that are performing at or above grade level in the basic skills areas of reading, writing and mathematics on the statewide end-of-grade ABC testing to a level of at least 80% by the end of the NCSIP II (SPDG) project.

3a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade reading test. Note: The target is calculated at a 2.5 percentage point increase from last year's 63%, resulting in a new target of 65.5% of all SWD at or above grade level in reading.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			65 / 100	65		40845 / 63086	65

3b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in Mathematics as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			42 / 100	42		34389 / 84394	41

mathematics assessment.  
 Note: The target is calculated using a six percentage point increase from last year's performance of 36 % of all SWD at or above grade level in mathematics.

3c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of all SWD in North Carolina who participate in the 4th grade writing test that are performing at or above grade level in writing as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade Assessment. Note: The target is calculated using a 12 percentage point increase from last year's performance of 17% of all SWD at or above grade level in writing skills.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			29 / 100	29		3180 / 13251	24

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met.

The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

### Objective 3

Increase the percentage of students with disabilities enrolled in the standard curriculum who are performing at or above grade level in the basic skills areas of reading, writing and mathematics on the statewide end-of-grade ABC testing to a level of at least 80% by the end of the NCSIP II (SPDG) project.

INPUT: The Extent to Which the Project Strategies and Activities for Improving the Basic Skill Areas of Reading, Writing and Mathematics Have been Implemented as Planned.

The Input strategies and activities conducted to meet this Objective 3 have been described in Objective 2 and will not be repeated here. Please see the following strategies and activities under the Input section of Objective 2.

- Expansion of the Network of Research-Based Instruction Centers and Sites,
- Development of Research-Based Foundation Training Materials,
- Reading Foundation Training,
- Reading Model Instruction Training,
- Mathematics Instruction Training,
- Reading/Writing Network Meetings,
- Mathematics Network Meetings,
- Writing Instruction Training,
- Coaching Training,
- Fidelity Observation Training, and
- Training of Trainers

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Basic Skills Performance Improved?

Performance Measure 3.a. The percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade reading assessment.

In the first year of NCSIP II, 57.4 % of the students statewide with disabilities participating in AYP progress assessment demonstrated at or above grade level reading skills and abilities. Accordingly, a baseline of 57% was established and an annual target of 2.5 percentage point's increase in each year of the project was set by the project. The second year's AYP reading assessment indicated that the percentage of students with disabilities statewide at or above grade level increased to

63%, an increase of five percentage points which met the target of an annual increase of 2.5 percentage points. In the third year of the project 65 % of students with disabilities performed at or above grade level in reading. The project missed the third year target by one half of a percentage point.

It should be noted that across the last five years of the NCSIP and NCSIP II projects the reading progress of students with disabilities in North Carolina has increased at approximately twice the rate of progress made for all students in North Carolina. From 2001-2002 through 2006-2007 the percentage of students reading at or above grade level increased from 79.5 percent to 87.4 percent; a gain of 7.9 percentage points. During the same time period the percentage of students receiving reading instruction in the NC SIP II project that were reading at or above grade level increased from 49.9 percent to 64.7, a gain of 14.8 percentage points.

Performance Measure 3.b. The percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in mathematics.

In the second year of the NCSIP II, project grade level standards and cut scores were reset for mathematics performance by the North Carolina State Board of Education. Using the new cut scores 36.4 % of students with disabilities performed at or above grade level in Mathematics. The target for year three was established based on the second year performance plus an increase of six percentage points. Accordingly, the target for the third year of the project for this performance measure was established at 42% of students with disabilities statewide performing at or above grade level in the mathematics assessments. In the third year of the project 41% of students with disabilities statewide performed at or above grade level. As can be seen the target for the percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in mathematics was missed by one percentage point.

Performance Measure 3.c. Gains in the percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in writing.

In the second year of the NCSIP II project, the data indicates that 10166 students with disabilities in North Carolina participated in the assessment and 1775, or 17%, demonstrated grade level or above proficiency in writing. As can be seen in the data chart for Performance Measure 3.c. above, in the third year of the project 13251 students with disabilities participated in the statewide writing assessment and 3180, or 24%, demonstrated proficiency at or above grade level. Based on the goal of a 12% yearly increase, the project missed the target of 29% by five percentage points. It should be noted that a baseline of 20% was established in the first year of the project, which has been surpassed by four percentage points in the third year. As indicated in last year's report it has been difficult for the project to meet the annual target set for writing progress because the yearly target established by the project was set unrealistically high. During the third year of the project a comprehensive foundations training staff development program has been developed and the project will begin extensive and comprehensive personnel development in the summer of 2008 to improve the writing instruction for students with disabilities in North Carolina. It is clear that over the next two years the NCSIP II project must provide extensive statewide

professional developments if writing abilities of students with disabilities are to improve to satisfactory levels.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**4. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase the knowledge of school leaders in the use of effective, research-proven instructional programs and practices as measured by a 10% yearly increase in the percentage of students with disabilities meeting AYP and the percentage of schools meeting AYP for students with disabilities.

4a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of leadership personnel receiving professional development through NC SIP II based on research-based instructional practices. Note: The target is calculated at a yearly increase of 20 leadership personnel receiving professional development.	PROJ	<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>
		141	/		205	/	
4b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade reading test. Note: The target is calculated at a 2.5 percentage point	PROJ	<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>
			65 / 100	65		40845 / 63086	65

increase from last year's 63%, resulting in a new target of 65.5% of all SWD at or above grade level in reading. (Same as Performance Measure 3.a.)

4c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina that are performing at or above grade level in Mathematics as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade mathematics assessment. Note: Target is calculated using a six percentage points increase from last year's performance of 36 % of all SWD at or above grade level in mathematics. (Same as Performance Measure 3.b.)	PROJ	<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>
			42 / 100	42		34389 / 84394	41

4d. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of all SWD in North Carolina who participate in the 4th grade writing test that are performing at or above grade level in writing as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade Assessment. Note: Target of 29% is	PROJ	<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>
			29 / 100	29		3180 / 13251	24

calculated using a 12 percentage point increase from last year's performance of 17% of all SWD at or above grade level in writing skills. (Same as Performance Measure 3.c.)		

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 4

Increase the knowledge of school leaders in the use of effective, research-proven instructional programs and practices as measured by the documentation of leadership training events and training content and an increase in the of the percentage of schools meeting AYP for students with disabilities.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned.

Training Events Attended by Leadership Personnel. During the 3rd year of the project research-based professional development events attended by leadership personnel included Reading Foundation Training, Reading Model Training, Reading/Writing Network Meetings, Mathematics Network Meetings, Training of Trainers Meetings, and Developmental Reviews.

Annual Exceptional Children Administrators Conference/Director's Institute. In the 3rd year of the project the Exceptional Children Division of the Department of Public Instruction held a conference for all special education program administrators

in the state, March 11-12, 2008. Approximately 450 special education program administrators and other leadership personnel attended the spring session. The first day of the meeting focused heavily on Forms Training, while day two featured continued forms training, focusing on CECAS forms, as well as Q & A session for NC DPI and a grant update. The objectives and content of the Exception Children Administrators Conference overlaps extensively with the NCSIP II content and objectives.

#### INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Improved Leadership Personnel Knowledge of Effective Instruction For Students With Disabilities

Performance Measure 4.a. Percent of NCSIP II project's leadership personnel receiving professional development through NCSIP II based on research-based instructional practices. During the first year of the project a baseline of sixty-seven leadership personnel received personnel development that was based on research. An annual target for improving leadership personnel knowledge of research-based instruction was established at a gain of twenty additional leadership personnel per year. As reported last year in the Second Annual report, 121 leadership personnel received professional development through NCSIP II. As can be seen in the Performance Measure 4.a. chart above, in the third year 205 leadership personnel received research-based training for improving the quality of instruction for students with disabilities during this past project year. This is a gain of eighty-four leadership personnel. The target for the third year of the project for this performance measures has been met.

#### OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Basic Skills Performance Of Students With Disabilities Statewide Improved?

Performance Measure 4.b. The percentage of students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade Reading Assessment. This performance measure links the increase in leadership personnel receiving research-based instruction training from NCSIP II with the improvement of reading performance of students with disabilities statewide. Although the NCSIP II professional development is only one independent variable among a number of independent variables, linking gains in SWD performance with the increase of leadership personnel involved in professional development events contributes support to the conclusion that the project has contributed to increases in performance.

The project has set an annual target of a 2.5 percentage point increase in each year of the project. In the second year of the project, the AYP reading assessment indicated that the percentage of students with disabilities at or above grade level increased to 63%. In the third year of the project, 65% of SWD performed at or above grade level in reading. The project missed the third year target by approximately one half of a percentage point.

Performance Measure 4.c. The Percentage Of All Students With Disabilities In North Carolina That Are Performing At Or Above Grade Level In Mathematics.

In the second year of the NCSIP II, project grade level standards and cut scores were reset for mathematics performance by the North Carolina State Board of Education. Using the new cut scores 36.4 % of students with disabilities performed at or above grade level in Mathematics. The target for year three was established based on the second year performance plus an increase of six percentage points. Accordingly, the target for the third year of the project for this performance measure was established at 42% of students with disabilities statewide performing at or above grade level in the mathematics assessments. In the third year of the project 41% of students with disabilities statewide performed at or above grade level. As can be seen the target for the percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in mathematics was missed by one percentage point.

#### Performance Measure 4.d. Gains In The Percentage Of All Students With Disabilities In North Carolina That Are Performing At Or Above Grade Level In Writing.

As can be seen in the data chart for Performance Measure 4.d. above, in the third year of the project the data for the 2006-2007 school year indicates 13251 students with disabilities participated in the statewide writing assessment and 3180, or 24%, demonstrated proficiency at or above grade level. Based on the goal of a 12% yearly increase, the project missed the target of 29% by five percentage points. As indicated in last year's report it has been difficult for the project to meet the annual target set for writing progress because the yearly target established by the project was set unrealistically high. During the third year of the project a comprehensive foundations training staff development program has been developed and the project will begin extensive and comprehensive personnel development in the summer of 2008 to improve the writing instruction for students with disabilities in North Carolina. It is clear that over the next two years the NCSIP II project must provide extensive statewide professional development if the writing abilities of students with disabilities are to improve to satisfactory levels.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

**SECTION A - Project 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.  
 Revise IHE teacher preparation programs to align with new special education teaching standards, the North Carolina ABC Accountability System for student progress, and the NCLB Act, as measured by increased percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level.

6a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Special Education: General Curriculum licensure programs that have been fully approved by the NCDPI and aligned with the revised teaching competency standards including competencies in instructional procedures and methods that are research-based and reflect explicit, systematic and multisensory instruction. Note: The target is calculated at a yearly average of three new approved programs for a total of fifteen by the end of the grant.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		9	/		9	/	
6b. Performance Measure	Measure	Quantitative Data					

<p>The percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in reading as measured by the NC End-Of-Grade reading test.          Note: The target is calculated at a 2.5 percentage point increase from last year's 63%, resulting in a new target of 65.5% of all SWD at or above grade level in reading.</p>	<p><b>Type</b></p> <p>PROJ</p>	<p><b>Target</b></p>			<p><b>Actual Performance Data</b></p>		
		<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>	<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>
			<p>65 / 100</p>	<p>65</p>		<p>40845 / 63086</p>	<p>65</p>

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 6

Revise IHE teacher preparation programs to align with new special education teaching standards, the North Carolina ABC Accountability System for student progress, and the NCLB Act, as measured by increased percentage of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Aligned With This Objective Have Been Implemented As Planned.

During the third year of NC SIP II, the project continued to provide assistance to Fayetteville State University and Elizabeth City State University. In addition the project conducted a fall Cooperative Planning Consortium meeting that was attended

by representatives of ten of the special education teacher education programs in North Carolina. At the consortium meeting NCSIP II presented a final report providing recommendations for Student Exit Evaluation Portfolios to be used by the various teacher education programs. In addition, staff from the University of North Carolina General Administration discussed the universities initiatives for improving the quality of teacher education programs across North Carolina. Finally representatives of the teacher education programs who were provided recruitment planning technical assistance from the NCSIP II project presented their recruitment program plans.

In the fall of 2007, two technical assistance and planning meetings were held to assist Fayetteville State University with the planning for the development of a Southeastern Regional Special Education Teacher Education System to include partnerships with community colleges and public schools in the Southeastern Region of North Carolina. As a result FSU developed a plan to include the following strategies in the implementation of a regional teacher education system

1. Development of a concentration of SE courses that would be available to students enrolled in the Elementary Education to qualify them for a license in GE:SE
2. Development of a joint training programs with community colleges
3. Providing an emphasis on the inclusion of specific research-based instruction knowledge, skills in methods courses
4. Improving the exit evaluation system with alignment with the North Carolina Special Education: General Curriculum licensure standards and standards indicators

**INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Are The Special Education Teacher Education Programs Aligned With The New Research-Based Instruction Standards?**

Performance Measure 6.a. The number of Special Education: General Curriculum licensure programs that have been fully approved by the NCDPI and aligned with the revised teaching competency standards including competencies in instructional procedures and methods that are research based and reflect explicit, systematic and multisensory instruction.

In the first year of the project only three of the 23 higher education institutions in North Carolina with special education teacher preparation programs were fully approved to offer the Special Education: General Curriculum license. Accordingly, a target of an average of three new fully approved teacher education programs a year was established for Performance Measure 6.a. During the second year, five additional programs were reviewed and were fully approved for a total of eight fully approved programs. In the third year of the project the number of fully approved teacher education programs increased to nine. Across the first three years of the project nine teacher education programs have been fully approved and aligned with the new Special Education: General Curriculum standards. Performance Measure 6.a. has met the target to produce an average of three new fully approved teacher education programs per year.

**OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Basic Skills Performance Of Students With Disabilities Improved Statewide?**

Performance Measure 6.b. The percentage of all students with disabilities in North Carolina who are performing at or above grade level in reading.

In the first year of NCSIP II, 57.4 % of the students with disabilities statewide participating in AYP progress assessment demonstrated at or above grade level reading skills and abilities. Accordingly, a base line of 57.4% was established and an annual target of 2.5 percentage point increase in each year of the project was set by the project. The second year's AYP reading assessment indicated that the percentage of students with disabilities statewide at or above grade level increased to 63.2 %, an increase of 5.8 percentage points which met the target of an annual increase of 2.5 percentage points. In the third year of the project 65 % of SWD performed at or above grade level in reading. The project missed the third year target by one half of one percentage point.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

**SECTION A - Project 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.  
Provide a comprehensive system of student progress evaluation reports to assist SEAs, LEAs, and IHEs in assessing the impact of the instruction improvement on the progress of students with disabilities statewide.

5a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The development and dissemination of two comprehensive evaluation reports during the 2007- 2008 school year and the 2009-2010 school year. Note. One evaluation report has been completed. The second comprehensive evaluation report will be completed during the final year of the NCSIP II project. This performance measures is on schedule for being met.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1	/		1	/	

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

**INTRODUCTION**

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities

are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 5

Provide a comprehensive system of student progress evaluation reports to assist SEAs, LEAs, and IHEs in assessing the impact of instruction improvement on the progress of students with disabilities statewide.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned.

Procedures Used In The Development Comprehensive System Of Student Progress Evaluation Reports. The purpose of this objective is to assure that SEAs, LEAs, IHEs, parents and the general public have an understanding of the school progress status of students with disabilities and the impact that improved research-based instruction has had on school progress.

During 2006-2007, a comprehensive report entitled, "Five Years of Progress: Improving The Quality of Instruction for Students with Disabilities in North Carolina" was developed and disseminated. The 25 page document provides a comprehensive evaluation report of the first North Carolina State Improvement Project. Two thousand copies of the report were printed and disseminated to state, local and national educators and parent organizations. To address Performance Measure 5.a., a second comprehensive evaluation report will be developed and disseminated during the last year of the NCSIP II project (2009-2010). With the development and dissemination of the first evaluation report in 2007-2008 covering multiple years (00-01 through 05-06) of NCSIP and NCSIP II, Performance Measure 5.a. is on schedule for being met.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable For Objective 5

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Have The Comprehensive Evaluation Reports Been Developed And Disseminated?

Performance Measure 5.a. The development and dissemination of two comprehensive evaluation reports during the 2007-2008 school year and the 2009-2010 school year.

A target for Performance Measure 5.a was established during the first year of NCSIP II and was set at two reports across the five years of the NCSIP II project. As indicated above a comprehensive evaluation report on the five years of progress made

during the NCSIP I project was completed and disseminated during second year of the project. Work on this Performance Measure is ahead of schedule in that the first report under this performance measure was not due until the end of the 07-08 school year. To date the project has made substantial progress toward meeting Performance Measure 5.a. The second comprehensive evaluation report will be completed by the project during the final year of the NCSIP II project. This performance measures is on schedule for being met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**7 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Decrease to 5% the percentage of special education teachers teaching without appropriate certification.

7a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
		Target			Actual Performance Data			
Percent of special education teachers teaching without an appropriate certification.  Note: The target calculated at a two percentage point decrease from last year's 13%, resulting in a new target of 11% of special education teachers teaching without appropriate certification.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
			11 / 100	11		403 / 10264	4	

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

**INTRODUCTION**

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is

used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 7

Decrease to 5% the percentage of special education teachers teaching without appropriate certification.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned

Documentation of Project Strategies and Activities To Increase the Number of Fully Certified Special Education Teachers.

The UNC TARS (University of North Carolina Technical Assistance and Resource System) component of the NCSIP II project is designed to impact on this objective. Please see the Input sections of Objective 6 for a complete description of the UNC TARS component.

During the third year of the project, in addition to the ongoing activities of the UNC TARS (Technical Assistance and Resources System) described in the Input section of Objective 6, NCSIP II also provided technical assistance to Fayetteville State University (FSU) in the development of a regional special education teacher education system. The NCSIP II project assisted the Special Education Program at FSU in the initial planning and establishment of a regional teacher education consortium and partnership to improve the quality, and increase the quantity of special education teachers. The proposed Southeastern SETE system includes the State Improvement Project (NCSIP II) in the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's Exceptional Children Division, selected NCSIP II LEA projects, and selected Community Colleges.

The purpose and mission of the Southeastern SETE Center is to plan, develop, implement and evaluate a restructured teacher preparation system to improve the quality of special education teachers and increase the number of new teachers trained and hired in North Carolina. The design of the Center includes student enrollment in a partner community college for two years and enrollment in an IHE teacher preparation program for two years, with the final year devoted to participation in an intensive internship in an NCSIP-LEA Best Practices program. The internship would include training provided by FSU and NCSIP to develop knowledge and skills in evidence-based (a) remedial reading and writing instruction, (b) remedial mathematics instruction, (c) cognitive learning strategies instruction and (d) implementation and maintenance of school-wide positive behavior support programs.

The Cooperative Planning Consortium (CPC). (Also a strategy for accomplishing Objective 7). As indicated in previous annual reports, the CPC planning consortium was established approximately 25 years ago to facilitate joint planning across the UNC system of constituent teacher education programs. The CPC consists of representatives of the special education personnel preparation programs across the state. The purpose of the consortium is to develop planning recommendations

that are submitted to the President of the University of North Carolina. NCSIP II has established a partnership with the CPC to work together to improve the quality of the special education personnel preparation programs and to increase enrollments to meet the critical need for qualified special education teachers. During the third year of the NCSIP II project the fall meeting of the Cooperative Planning Consortium included presentations of the newly developed recruitment plans to the CPC membership. The recruitment plans were developed by Mars Hill College, Greensboro College and East Carolina University with assistance from NCSIP II.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable for Objective 7.

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Number of Newly Qualified Teachers In Special Education in North Carolina Increased?

Performance Measure 7.a. Percent of special education teachers teaching without an appropriate certification.

The annual target for this performance measure was established using the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's Division for Exceptional Children report to Westat's IDEA data reporting system. Last year 13% of special education teachers were teaching without appropriate certified and were not highly qualified. The target for this performance measure was established at 13% plus a decrease of 2 % for a target of eleven percent of special education teachers teaching without being highly qualified.

As reported in the 7.a. Performance Measure chart above, in the third year of the project 403 out of 10264, or four percent, of special education teachers were not highly qualified. Performance Measure 7.a. was met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**8 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Increase the number of new teachers entering the field of Special Education in North Carolina through initial entry and/or lateral entry.

8a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increase the number of new licensed Special Education teachers produced each year through lateral entry and/or traditional teacher education programs. Note: The target for new teachers produced was calculated using the previous year's total number of new special education teachers produced (793) plus a growth of 10% for a target of 872 new licensed special education teachers. (See Table 8a in supplemental materials.)	PROJ	<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>
		872	/		697	/	
(This area is currently blank in the provided image.)							

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

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - Documentation of the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal, is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase or decrease in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 8

Increase the number of new teachers entering the field of Special Education in North Carolina through initial entry and/or lateral entry.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned

Documentation of Project Strategies and Activities To Increase the Number of Fully Certified Special Education Teachers.

Please refer to Objective 7 of this report for input strategies.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable for Objective 8.

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Number of Newly Qualified Teachers In Special Education in North Carolina Increased?

Performance Measure 8.a. Increase the number of new teachers entering the field of special education in North Carolina through initial entry and/or lateral entry.

As indicated in the Performance Measure 8.a. chart above, 697 newly licensed teachers were produced in North Carolina during 2006-2007. Data available at the time of submission of our second annual report indicated that 657 newly licensed teachers were produced during 2005-2006 school year, however that data was corrected and the actual number produced that year was 793, which is the figure we used to determine our target for this year. This production of 697 new special education teachers missed the target of 872 new teachers. It should be noted that the strategies initiated by the project to increase the production of new special education teachers are long term in nature. The NCSIP II project strategies for improving the recruitment of more students into special education teacher preparation programs are long term and results may not be seen

until newly recruited students complete their training.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**10 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Decrease the dropout rate of students with disabilities from the current rate of approximately 40% of students with disabilities exiting schools to a rate no greater than 25%.

10a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of students with disabilities exiting school that dropped out of school statewide.  Note: The target is calculated using last year's dropout rate of 38% minus three percentage points for a total dropout rate of 35%.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			35 / 100	35		4050 / 10495	39

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

**INTRODUCTION**

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained achieved.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is

used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 10

Decrease the dropout rate of students with disabilities from the current rate of approximately 40% of students with disabilities exiting schools to a rate no greater than 25%.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned.

The NCSIP II strategies and activities during the third year that contribute to decreasing the percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school remained the same as the first two years of the project. As indicated last year, it is the project's belief that a comprehensive array of improvement strategies and activities will contribute to a reduction in the number and percentage of students that drop out of school. Each year these strategies have included; (a) the expansion of the network of schools implementing positive behavior support systems; (b) scaling up, or expanding, the number and percentage of in-service teachers using research-based instruction to improve basic skills; (c) improving the quality of the instruction provided by new teachers being produced by the IHEs, and (d) expanding the knowledge and skills of leadership personnel in supporting quality instruction for students with disabilities. The project believes that with adequate improvement in basic skills and positive behaviors these strategies will eventually lead to successful school experiences and will reduce the drop out rate of students with disabilities. Most of these strategies are discussed in more detail in Objective 2 of this report.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Drop Out Rate For Students With Disabilities Decreased.

Performance Measures 10.a. The percent of students with disabilities exiting school that dropped out of school statewide. School exiting data is presented in Table 10a in the supplemental materials submitted to OSEP. These data are collected yearly by the staff of the Exceptional Children Division in the Department of Public Instruction and reported to OSEP. Out of a total of 10395 students with disabilities who exited school during the 2006-2007 school year 4,050, or 39%, dropped out of school. The drop out rate for students with disabilities increased by approximately one percentage point from the previous year. The target was reduced to 35% by the project and was missed by four percentage points. The target for Performance Measure 10.a. was not met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**9 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase school leadership staff and teacher skills in the use of positive behavioral supports, as measured by decreases in school suspensions, expulsions and office discipline referrals.

9a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of schools state wide with teachers and leadership personnel who have received professional development in the implementation of school wide positive behavior supports. Note: The target is set at ten percentage point increase from last year's performance data of 22% for a target of 32%.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			32 / 100	32		792 / 2397	33

9b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The decrease in the percentage of short-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide.  Note: The target is calculated at last year's performance of	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			28 / 100	28		67524 / 171692	39

38 percent with a decrease of 10 percentage points for a target of 28.

Note: This performance measure is the same as Performance Measure 12.a.)

9c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
<p>The decrease in the percentage of school long-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide.</p> <p>Note: The long-term suspension data available in the third year of the project indicated a suspension rate under 1%. Because of this low long-term suspension rate the target for the remaining years of the project is set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities.</p> <p>(This performance measure is the same as Performance Measure 12.b.)</p>	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 100	1		652 / 171692	0

9d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
<p>The decrease in the percentage of school expulsions of students with disabilities</p>	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw			Raw		

statewide.  
 Note: The latest expulsion data available in the third year of the project indicated an expulsion percentage rate under 1%. Because of this low expulsion rate the target for the remaining years of the project will be set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of expulsion for students with disabilities.  
 (Same as Performance Measure 12.c. for Objective 12)

Number	Ratio	%	Number	Ratio	%
	1 / 100	1		8 / 171692	0

9e. Performance Measure

Measure Type

Quantitative Data

The percentage of SWD that were involved in school crime and/or violence.  
 Note 1: This performance measure has been modified to address student crime and violence  
 Note 2: The target for P.M. 9.e. is set at last year's ratio of two percent.

PROJ

Target			Actual Performance Data		
Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
	2 / 100	2		2653 / 171692	2

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities

are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 9

Increase school leadership staff and teacher skills in the use of positive behavioral supports, as measured by decreases in school suspensions, expulsions and office discipline referrals.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned.

The North Carolina Positive Behavior Support Initiative (NCPBS) has continued expanding each year. During the third year of the NCSIP II project the Positive Behavior Support Regional Consultants continued to coordinate and provide new school team trainings. School System staff were identified as coach/trainers and participated in module training with school teams. After these individuals complete the three modules of training and trained all three modules with experienced trainers, they are considered PBS trainers for school teams in their own and other local education agencies.

During the 2007-08 school year approximately 260 schools were added to the NCPBS system. Staff in these schools received training and technical assistance in establishing a positive behavior supports system. The Positive Behavior Support Training Modules were provided during the year. After a training module was provided the school teams returned to their respective schools to share the PBS training with their school staff. The PBS Training Module One covers an introduction to Positive Behavior Support and how to apply the PBS strategies to the entire school environment. Module Two provides information about classroom implementation, social skills instruction and interventions for groups of students who may be at risk for behavioral difficulties. Module Three focuses on interventions for individual students.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Have Teachers and Leadership Personnel Received Professional Development?

Performance Measure 9.a. The percent of schools state wide with teachers and leadership personnel who have received professional development in the implementation of school wide Positive Behavior Supports. Due to an update in data, the data for last year (2006-2007) differs slightly from what was reported. In the second year of the NCSIP II project 532 schools, or approximately 22% of all schools, were identified as PBS schools. An annual target for demonstrating progress was established at a ten percentage point increase for each of the remaining years of the project. In the 2007-2008 school year 792 schools out of 2397 schools statewide or 33% of schools were implementing school-wide PBS programs. This

represents an increase of approximately eleven percentage points. Performance Measure 9.a. has been met.

**OUTCOMES:** The Extent to Which School Personnel Developed Skills in the Implementation of Positive Behavioral Supports.

Performance Measure 9.b. The decrease in the percentage of short-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide. ( This is also Performance Measure 12.a.) The Safe Schools section of the Department of Public Instruction collects disaggregated short-term suspensions, long-term suspensions and expulsions data each year. In the third year of the project 39% of students with disabilities statewide received a short-term suspension including multiple referrals of the same student. The target for the third year of the project was calculated by using the previous year's performance at 39 percent with a decrease of 10 percentage points for a target of 29%. The target for decreasing the percentage of short-term suspensions was not met. Next year's goal is to meet the target for reducing short-term suspensions by continuing to scale up on the statewide PBS implementation and establishing a more realistic target.

Performance Measure 9.c. (Same as Performance Measure 12.b.). The decrease in the percentage of school long-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide. The long-term suspension data available in the third year of the project indicated a rate and baseline under 1%. Because of this low long-term suspension rate the target for the remaining years of the project is set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities. In the third year the long-term suspension rate is again under 1%. Therefore, the annual target has been met.

Performance Measure 9.d. (Same as Performance Measure 12.c.). The decrease in the percentage of school expulsions of students with disabilities. The school expulsion data available in the third year of the project indicate an expulsion rate of less than 1%. The school expulsion rate for students with disabilities has continued to be at a rate lower than 1%. The target for Performance Measure 12.c. was met.

Performance Measure 9.e. The percentage of SWD who were involved in school crime and/or violence. This performance measure was added in the 2nd year of project to address student crime and violence. This change has been made to align Performance Measure 9.e. with a new state law enacted by the North Carolina General Assembly designed to track student acts of violence, school crime and disruptive behavior. Accordingly, a new baseline and target have been developed along with data collection procedures designed to monitor the extent of school crime, violence and disruptive behavior. The latest data available on school crime and/or violence are presented in the Performance Measure 9.e. chart above. In the 2004-2005 school year 2341 school crime and/or violence events committed by students with disabilities, a rate of 1.4%. The target for the remaining years of the project has been set at maintaining a rate of school crime and/or violence at 2% or lower for each year of the project. In the 2005-2006 school year 2750 school crime and/or violence events were committed by students with disabilities statewide, a rate of 1.6%. This is a marginal rate increase of .02 percentage points which meets the PM 9.e. yearly target.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**11 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities from the current rate of approximately 48% of students with disabilities exiting schools to a graduation rate of at least 75% of students exiting schools.

11a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of students with disabilities exiting school that graduated with a diploma.  Note. The target is calculated using last year's graduation rate of 50% plus an increase of five percentage points each year.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			55 / 100	55		5179 / 10395	50

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

**INTRODUCTION**

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is

used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

## Objective 11

Increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities from the current rate of approximately 48% of students with disabilities exiting schools to a graduation rate of at least 75% of students exiting schools.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

INPUT: The Extent To Which The Project Activities Have Been Implemented As Planned.

In the third year of the project the NCSIP II continued to apply the same strategies and activities used in the first two years of the project to increase the percentage of students with disabilities exiting school with a diploma. As in the first two years of the project the strategies employed to impact on this performance measures during the third year of the project included (a) the expansion of the network of schools implementing positive behavior support systems, (b) expansion of the number of the research-based instruction sites to scale up, or expanding, the number and percentage of in-service teachers using research-based instruction to improve basic skills, (c) improving the quality of the instruction provided by new teachers being produced by the IHEs, and (d) expanding the knowledge and skills of leadership personnel to effectively support quality instruction for students with disabilities. A more in-depth description of these various strategies and activities can be found in several of the other sections of this report, specifically Objective 2, and will not be repeated here. The project believes that improvement in basic skills and positive behaviors will eventually lead to successful school experiences and will increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Has The Graduation Rate For Students With Disabilities Increased?

Performance Measures 11.a. The Percent Of Students With Disabilities Exiting School Who Graduated With A Diploma. School exiting data is presented in Table 10.a. in the supplemental materials submitted to OSEP. These data are collected yearly by the staff of the Exceptional Children Division in the Department of Public Instruction and reported to OSEP. Out of a total of 10395 students with disabilities exiting school during the 2006-2007 school year 5,179, or 50%, graduated with a diploma. The target for Performance Measure 11.a. was set at 55% of students with disabilities statewide exiting school

with a diploma. It is clear that before the various strategies used by the project have a positive and significant impact on graduation rates a much larger number of students with disabilities statewide need to be receiving the type of services provided by the NCSIP II project. The annual target for Performance Measure 11.a. was not met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**13 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Develop a reliable, valid, system to collect data on school office discipline referrals, and to track post secondary school outcomes, as measured by documentation of the development and use of the data collection procedures.

13a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The development of a data collection system to collect data on school office discipline referrals. Note: The target has been re-set for year three of the project to 2 (a system for collection of data has been implemented.)	PROJ	<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>
		2	/		2	/	
13b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The development of a data collection system to collect data on post secondary school outcomes. Note: The target has been set at 3 (a system for storing, analyzing and reporting the status of post secondary school outcomes has been established and is in use.)	PROJ	<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>
		3	/		3	/	

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

### INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

### Objective 13

Develop a reliable, valid, system to collect data on school office discipline referrals, and to track post secondary school outcomes, as measured by documentation of the development and use of the data collection procedures.

INPUT: To What Extent Has the Project Worked on the Development Of A System For Collecting Office Referrals And Post Secondary School Outcomes Data?

The purpose of Objective 13 is to address the project's needs to collect valid and reliable data to use to evaluate the effectiveness of the positive behavior supports component and data to address post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities. A review of the progress toward meeting the two parts of this objective follows below.

School Office Discipline Referrals. As reported in last year's annual report a planning meeting was held in March of 2006 to explore the possibility of including data collection on the number of office discipline referrals in each school in the state on a yearly basis. The project requested the assistance of the Accountability Division in adding the collection of office discipline referrals to the official statewide accountability data collection procedures. The Behavioral Support Services Section of the Exceptional Children Division has continued to work on the development of a data collection system to facilitate the work of the statewide Positive Behavior Supports system. During the 2007-2008 school year the North Carolina Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiative has created a data manual that provides information to all the schools participating in PBS about the data and evaluation tools for PBS implementation. As part of this effort, an Office Discipline Referral data collection form has been developed to collect office discipline referral data (see Form "NC PBS ODR Reporting Spreadsheet" in supplemental materials.) The data reporting form will be made available to all schools

participating in PBS. Participation by the PBS schools is voluntary. The Office Discipline Referral form can be found in the supplemental materials submitted by the NCSIP II in support of the third annual report. As can be seen in the reporting form data can be collected on the total number of referrals, percentage of enrolment, ethnicity, grade level, location of the behavior problem and type of incident. During this third year of the project the data collection system outlined above is being used on a voluntary basis and will be available be used across the entire PBS system in the coming year.

Post Secondary School Outcomes. The Exceptional Children Division of the Department of Public Instruction has developed a Performance Measure and a comprehensive plan to address data collection on post secondary outcomes. Performance Indicator 14 of the North Carolina State Performance Plan addresses the post secondary outcomes data collection stated as follows: "Percent of youth who had individualized education programs (IEPs), are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school." North Carolina initiated the development of a post-school outcome data collection system in 2005-06.

The Department of Public Instruction contracted with the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNC-Charlotte) to develop a data collection and reporting system to collect post-school outcome data from students with disabilities. The data collection process developed includes collecting and reporting a set of exit data from students with disabilities who leave high school (graduate, age out or drop out) each year. These data include information on the manner in which students exit school, specific course of study, and contact information for use in gathering follow-up data. These data are gathered through an exit survey completed by personnel in each Local Education Agency (LEA) and sent directly to UNC-Charlotte. The information from the survey is entered into a database to be used to gather follow-up data. Exit data will be collected annually in April/May. Follow-up data will provide the information needed to complete the baseline for the State Performance Plan (SPP) required by IDEA. Students that have exited are contacted between April and September of the year following their graduation from high school, dropping out, or aging out of the program. UNC-Charlotte will also analyze and prepare a transition data report. This report will be shared with the public through the Department of Public Instruction's Web site, conference presentations, and written reports that will be mailed to stakeholders. Each LEA will be provided the information to facilitate the development of the Continuous Improvement Performance Plan (CIPP).

Baseline data collected in 2006 indicate that seventy-five percent of youth who had IEPs, and are no longer in secondary school have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. A total of 2103 students were included in the 2007 (2005-2006 leavers) follow-up survey. Since leaving high school, 478 (45%) reported they had continued their education and 404 (38%) were successfully enrolled in spring 2007. Most leavers who were successfully enrolled in spring 2007, respondent attended one school or program (n=401, 37%).

To illustrate the type of data to be collected and reported an example Table 13b (Disaggregated Results by Disability Type, Gender, Race, ELL Status, and Type of Exit) table is included in the supplemental materials submitted to OSEP.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: The Extent To Which The Objective Has Been Met.

Performance Measure 13.a. The Development Of A Data Collection System To Collect Data On School Office Discipline Referrals. This performance measure to determine the extent to which a data collection system has been developed is unique and does not follow the pattern established for the evaluation of the other project objectives in this annual report. To determine the extent that this objective has been attained the project has developed a developmental scale to be used for this purpose. The scale being used is as follows: 1 = a system for collection of data on school office discipline referrals has been developed; 2 = the data collection system has been implemented and; 3 = a system for storing, analyzing and reporting the status of school office referrals has been established and is in use. In the NCSIP II Second Annual Report submitted last year, a target of 3 for the third year of the project was established. Due to the amount of time needed to establish and implement this data collection system, that target became unrealistic. Therefore, the third year target for Performance Measure 13.a. is set at a rating of 2 (a system for collection of data on school office discipline referrals has been developed,) and the target for year four will be set at a rating of 3, (a system for storing, analyzing and reporting the status of school office referrals has been established and is in use.)

Performance Measure 13.b. The Development Of A Data Collection System To Collect Data On Post Secondary School Outcomes. As in Performance Measure 13.a. above, a performance measure to determine the extent to which a data collection system has been developed and implemented and does not follow the pattern established for the evaluation of the other project objectives in this annual report. To determine the extent to which this objective has been attained the project will use a developmental scale for this purpose. The rating scale will be used as follows: 1 = A system for collection of data on post secondary school outcomes has been developed; 2 = A data collection system has been implemented and; 3 = A system for storing, analyzing and reporting the status of post secondary school outcomes has been established and is in use. The baseline for Performance Measure 13.b. was set at a rating of 1 (A system for collection of data on post school outcomes has been developed.) and the target for year three was established at a rating of 2, (The data collection system has been implemented.) However, the post secondary school outcomes system is now fully functioning with a component for collection of data and components for analyzing, storing and reporting the status of the post secondary school outcomes. Accordingly, Performance Measure 13.b. has been rated as a 3 and has been met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**12 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Decrease the yearly rates of suspension, expulsion, and absence by 5% per year in years two through five of the project.

12a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The decrease in the percentage of short-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide.  Note: The target is calculated at last year's performance of 38 percent with a decrease of 10 percentage points for a target of 28.  (Same as Performance Measure 9.b.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			28 / 100	28		67524 / 171692	39

12b . Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The decrease in the percentage of school long-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide.  Note: The long-term	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 100	1		652 / 171692	0

suspension data available in the third year of the project indicated a suspension percentage rate under 1%. Because of this low long-term suspension rate the target for the remaining years of the project is set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities.  
(Same as Performance Measure 9.c.)

12c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
<p>The decrease in the percentage of school expulsions of students with disabilities statewide.</p> <p>Note: The latest expulsion data available in the third year of the project indicated an expulsion percentage rate under 1%. Because of this low expulsion rate the target for the remaining years of the project will be set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of expulsion for students with disabilities. (Same as Performance Measure 9.d.for Objective 9)</p>	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 100	1		13 / 171692	0

12d. Performance Measure	Measure	Quantitative Data
--------------------------	---------	-------------------

The percent of school attendance for students with disabilities state wide.  (The objective for this performance measure has been modified to measure an increase in attendance rather than a decrease in absences to align with the type of data collected by the State)	Type	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			94 / 100	94		162117 / 171692	94

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained achieved.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 12

Decrease the yearly rates of suspension, expulsion, and absence by 5% per year in years two through five of the project.

INPUT: To What Extent Has the Project Implemented Activities Designed To Decrease the Yearly Rates of Suspension, Expulsions And School Absences?

Objective 12 (Project Objective 3.4) is aligned with the strategies and activities reported earlier in this report including (a) expanding the network of schools implementing positive behavior support systems, (b) expanding the use of research-based instruction to improve basic skills, (c) improving the quality and number of in-service and pre-service teachers, and (d)

expanding training for leadership personnel. (See Input, Objective 2.) These strategies and activities will not be repeated here. The project believes that all of these strategies and activities together will have a positive impact on reducing suspensions and expulsions as well as improving school attendance of students with disabilities.

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Have Suspension And Expulsion Rates Decrease And The Attendance Rate Increased?

Performance Measure 12.a. (Same as Performance Measure 9.b.) The decrease in the percentage of short-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide. The Safe Schools section of the Department of Public Instruction collects disaggregated short-term suspensions, long-term suspensions and expulsions data each year. The target in the third year of the project for Performance Measure 12.a. was calculated using the previous year's performance of 38%, with a decrease of 10 percentage points for a target of 28%. The short-term suspension data available at the end of the third year of the project indicate a suspension rate of 39%. Therefore, the annual target was not met.

Performance Measure 12.b. (Same as Performance Measure 9.c.) The decrease in the percentage of school long-term suspensions of students with disabilities statewide. The long-term suspension data available in the third year of the project indicated a suspension percentage rate under 1%. Because of this low long-term suspension rate the target for the remaining years of the project is set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities. Therefore, the annual target was met.

Performance Measure 12.c. (Same as Performance Measure 9.d.) The decrease in the percentage of school expulsions of students with disabilities. The latest expulsion data available in the third year of the project indicated an expulsion percentage rate under 1%. Because of this low expulsion rate the target for the remaining years of the project will be set at maintaining a 1% or under rate of expulsion for students with disabilities. The target for Performance Measure 12.c. was met.

Performance Measure 12.d. The percent of school attendance for students with disabilities state wide. Statewide disaggregated attendance data is collected annually by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's Accountability Division. The data available at the end of the third year of the project indicate an attendance rate for students with disabilities at 94%. An annual target for this performance measure was set at a gain of 0.2 percentage points per year. In the third year of the project the attendance rate for students with disabilities did not change. The attendance rate for students with disabilities is high and is consistent with attendance rates of other student groups. However, there was no gain in attendance rate for students with disabilities and therefore this performance measure was not met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**14 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase parent involvement in, and support of, research-based instructional programs for their children as measured by documentation data and statewide parent satisfaction surveys.

14a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The increase in the number of parents participating in the NCSIP II Parent Satisfaction Survey.  Performance Measure 14.a. is the same as Performance Measure 16.a.  Note: The target of 230 is calculated based on a gain of 20 surveys from last year's total of 210 collected.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		230	/		1281	/	
14b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The total average rating of parent satisfaction with the NCCIP II project.  Performance Measure 14.b. is	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

the same as Performance Measure 16.b. for Objective 16.  
 Note: The target of 2.58 is calculated based on .04 percentage point gain from last year's 2.54 average rating.

3	/	2	/

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL ? the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 14

Increase parent involvement in, and support of, research-based instructional programs for their children as measured by documentation data and statewide parent satisfaction surveys.

INPUT: To What Extent Has The Project Implemented Activities To Increase Parent Involvement In The Project?

In the third year of the project the Reading/Writing Centers and Sites continued to hold teacher-parent conferences and asked parents of the students to complete the NCSIP II Parent Satisfaction Survey (See Objective 16). The Mathematics Centers and Sites will begin submitting surveys next year. The project's structured Parent Satisfaction survey was used to provide parent feedback to the project. In the second year of NCSIP II 210 surveys were completed by parents. In the third year of the project 1281 parents provided feedback. (Table 14a in supplemental materials.) Please see additional description of activities in the Objective 16 section of this report.

**INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Is Parent Participation In The Project Evaluation Increasing?**

Performance Measure 14.a. The Increase In The Number Of Parents Participating In The NCSIP II Parent Satisfaction Survey.

In the second year of the project 210 parents participated in the end of year parent satisfaction survey. The target for the third year was set at 210 plus a calculated gain of twenty parents participating for a total target of 230 parents. In the third year of the project a total of 1281 parents participated in the parent satisfaction survey. The target for Performance Measure 14.a. was met.

**OUTCOMES: To What Extent Are Parents Satisfied With The NCSIP II Services, Instruction And Parent Involvement?**

Performance Measure 14.b. The Total Average Rating Of Parent Satisfaction With The NCCIP II Project. (See Objective 16 for a description of the Parent Satisfaction Survey.) Parent satisfaction data collected by NCSIP II at the end of the second year of the project were used to establish the third year target for Performance Measure 14.b. The target was established at 2.54 plus a gain of .04 percentage points, or 2.58. In the third year of NCSIP II, the total average satisfaction rating was 2.40, which represents a .14 decrease from the second year of the project. The target for Performance Measure 14.b. was not met. However, it should be noted that the average rating of 2.40 across 1281 parents indicates that this large group of parents responding rate the NCSIP II project to be more than helpful in improving their child's education program.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**16 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Collect reliable and valid parent participation and satisfaction data to evaluate effectiveness of NC SIP II parent program, as measured by review of measurement instruments.

16a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The increase in the number of parents participating in the NCSIP II Parent Satisfaction Survey.  Performance Measure 16.a. is the same as Performance Measure 14.a. for Objective 14. Note: The target is calculated at 230 based on a gain of 20 surveys from last year's total of 210 collected.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		230	/		1281	/	
16b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The total average rating of parent satisfaction with the NCCIP II project.  Performance Measure 16.b. is	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

the same as Performance Measure 14.b. for Objective 14.  
 Note: Target is calculated based on .04 percentage point gain from last year's 2.54 average rating.

3	/	2	/

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

INTRODUCTION

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

Objective 16

Collect reliable and valid parent participation and satisfaction data to evaluate effectiveness of NCSIP II parent program, as measured by review of measurement instruments.

INPUT: To What Extent Has The Parent Satisfaction Evaluation Been Implemented As Planned?

Documentation Of The Procedures Used In The NCSIP II Evaluation Plan. In the spring of each of year the NCSIP II project the Reading/Writing Centers and Sites use a structured Parent Satisfaction Survey to gather satisfaction data. The survey was developed for use in NCSIP I and with minor changes is being used in the NCSIP II Reading/Writing Centers and Sites. It is requested that the Reading/Writing Centers and Sites complete the survey as a part of an end-of-year parent conference with the parent(s) of each student receiving research-based instruction in the NCSIP II project. The survey has seven questions that assess parental satisfaction with the project's services, instruction and communications with parents.

Using the Parent Satisfaction Survey. After a brief discussion of the purpose of the survey and how the information is to be

used a copy of the survey is given to the parent(s). Each question is reviewed with the parent(s) and the parent(s) record their response. The survey has four possible responses as follows: Not Helpful = 0, Somewhat Helpful = 1, Helpful = 2, and Very Helpful = 3. The average of the seven items is calculated to be used in determining the parents' total rating. Parents who are unable to attend an individual parent conference are sent a Parent Satisfaction Rating Scale and asked to fill it out at home and return to school.

**INTERMEDIATE GOAL: To What Extent Is Parent Participation In The Project Evaluation Increasing?**

**Performance Measure 16.a. The Increase In The Number Of Parents Participating I The NCSIP II Parent Satisfaction Survey.**

In the second year of the project 210 parents participated in the end of year parent satisfaction survey. The target for the third year was set at 210 plus a calculated gain of twenty parents participating for a total target of 230 parents. In the third year of the project a total of 1281 parents participated in the parent satisfaction survey. The target for Performance Measure 14.a. was met.

**OUTCOMES: To What Extent Are Parents Satisfied With The NCSIP II Services, Instruction And Parent Involvement?**

**Performance Measure 16.b. The Total Average Rating of Parent Satisfaction With The NCSIP II Project.** Parent satisfaction data collected by NCSIP II at the end of the second year of the project were used to establish the baseline and target for Performance Measure 16.b. The Target was established at 2.54 plus a gain of .04 percentage points, or 2.58. In the third year of NCSIP II, the total average satisfaction rating was 2.40. The target for Performance Measure 16.b. was not met. However, it should be noted that the average rating of 2.40 across 1281 parents indicates that this large group of parents responding rate the NCSIP II project to be more than helpful in improving their child's education program.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

**15 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase parent inclusion in NCSIP II program planning, implementation, and evaluation as measured by the increase in parent involvement in program events.

15a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of statewide, regional and local parent organizations participating in NCSIP II information, discussion and input planning sessions. Note: The target for was set at three additional parent organizations participating in regional and/or local parent (involvement) sessions each year of the project.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		9	/		8	/	

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

**INTRODUCTION**

The Explanation of Progress for each objective includes up to three categories of evaluation activities to measure the extent to which each of the sixteen project objectives has been met. These are (a) INPUT - the extent to which the project activities are being implemented according to plan, (b) INTERMEDIATE GOAL - the extent to which an intermediate goal, or an outcome-enabling goal is met, and (c) OUTCOMES - the extent to which the project objective has been attained.

Performance Measure Targets. In the Target column a number (Raw Number Column) or a percentage (Ratio Column) is used to indicate the Target established by the project to determine the extent to which the performance measure was met. The previous year's performance expressed in terms of a number or a percentage plus an estimated increase, decrease or no change in performance was used by the project to set the final expected target for the year.

#### Objective 15

Increase parent inclusion in NCSIP II program planning, implementation, and evaluation as measured by the increase in parent involvement in program events.

INPUT: How Have Statewide Parent Advocacy Organizations Been Included In Project Leadership Functions?

During the 2007-2008 project year three strategies were used to address Performance Measure 15.a. and are briefly described below.

(a) Joint Planning Efforts and Topical Institute. In February, ECAC, the NC Department of Public Instruction, Exceptional Children Division, the ARC of NC, and the NC Autism Society collaborated to conduct a "What Works Institute" on the topic of literacy for students with significant disabilities. This was a hands-on institute that allowed participants to actually make some assistive devices for use with their children or students. There were 124 participants and 60% of those were parents. The evaluation of the institute rated a 3.74 out of a possible 4.00 and 90% said they would use the tools demonstrated. During third year of the project ECAC has also worked with NCDPI to update and reprint the brochure on Positive Behavior Support. The updated brochures have been widely distributed both in hard copy and electronically.

(b) Statewide Parent Communication and Involvement Activities. As a part of ECAC work with the NCSIP II project the Literacy for All workshop has been adapted for use on the ECAC website. Families can now access the workshop on-line at their convenience.

During the contract period, ECAC conducted eight project workshops including five on PBS and two on Literacy. These were cosponsored with local parent organizations and spread geographically throughout the state.

ECAC provided information on the partnership with NC SIP II and the evidence-based practices being used in North Carolina in thirty-three displays at conferences, institutes and meetings throughout the state. Over eleven thousand conference participants had access to information on literacy, positive behavior support, and the state improvement activities.

(c) Newsletter Communication. The ECAC NEWS Line is currently mailed to 26,000 parents and professionals in North

Carolina. The Summer 2007 edition contained four pages related to NC SIP II including an article on reading instruction in middle and high school, the NCDPI literacy consultants and story based lessons.

(d) Information packets. Since last years report, ECAC has distributed 263 free Literacy For ALL and 587 Positive Behavior Support information packets to North Carolina families of students with disabilities. These 850 packets were distributed by mail and at workshops to families.

(e) Development and Use of Information DVDs. As a compliment to the Elementary School-wide PBS DVD created during NCSIP I project, ECAC has worked on developing new DVDs featuring middle and high schools. Taping was completed in January. In addition, ECAC taped the parts of the What Works Institute and will use that information as a basis for a DVD on Literacy for Students with Significant Disabilities.

#### Participation In NCSIP II Parent Organization Briefing and Input

In March of 2008 NCSIP II invited all parent organization that are members of the North Carolina Special Needs Federation to attend a briefing and feedback session on the progress of the NCSIP II project. The following eight parent and/or advocate organizations attended the meeting. The Exceptional Children Assistance Center, the Learning Disabilities Association of North Carolina, the ARC of North Carolina, the North Carolina Autism Society, the Mental Health Association of North Carolina, Disability Rights of North Carolina association, the Mental Health Association of North Carolina, and the North Carolina Department of Public Health.

#### Parent Satisfaction Survey

A parent satisfaction survey was conducted in the spring, 2008, to gather information on the parent's satisfaction with the effectiveness and quality of the NCSIP instruction. These data are reported under Performance Measure 16.a. and provide parents with a process to provide the project with feedback and their satisfaction with the project. Over 1,000 parent surveys were conducted. It should be noted that the highest positive average rating was reported in response to the question, "How helpful has your child's reading (or math) instruction been in improving his/her ability to read (or math abilities)."

INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Not Applicable

OUTCOMES: To What Extent Have Statewide Parent Advocacy Organizations Been Included In Project Leadership Functions?

Performance Measure 15.a. The Number Of Statewide, Regional And Local Parent Organizations Participating In NCSIP II Information, Discussion and Input Sessions. As indicated in the 15.a. Performance Measure chart above the annual target for 15.a. was set at the participation of three additional parent organizations each year (not including the first organizational year.) Therefore, in the third year of the project the target for Performance Measure 15.a. was set at an involvement of six organizations from last year plus three additional parent organizations for a total involvement of nine parent organizations.

Eight state level parent organizations participated in the briefing and input meeting and the target was missed by one organization. Performance Measure 15 a. was not met.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050002**

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

Title :

File : H:\NCSIP II\3rd Annual Report\Final Drafts\budget524B\_ncsip\_4.21.08.doc

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

Title :

File : G:\Maxtor backup\NCSIP II\3rd Annual Report\Final Drafts\NCSIP II 524BSectionC\_final.doc



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

OMB No. 1890 - 0004  
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:

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

For fiscal year 2007-2008, as of April 2, 2008, \$450,781.26 has been spent on State Improvement Personnel Development (SPDG) obligations. An additional \$839,218.74 has been allocated to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for SPDG activities, for a total of \$1,290,000. As of April 2, 2008, the allocated \$839,218.74 has not been spent by the LEAs.

As of April 2, 2008, \$20,000. was available to carryover to 2008-2009. This is the total available (\$859,218.74) minus the amount allocated to LEAs (\$830,218.74).

Because of potential significant budget reductions from the US Department of Education, carryover funds will be used in 2008-2009 to maintain the current activities of the SPDG.



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

OMB No. 1890 - 0004  
Expiration: 10-31-2007  
PR/Award #:

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

Current NCSIP II Partners

**The Cooperative Planning Consortium for Special Education (CPC)** continues as a partner in NCSIP II. This organization develops recommendations for improvements in teacher education programs and reports these recommendations to the President of the University of North Carolina. The CPC consists of representatives from 29 special education university programs, community colleges, state agencies and parent associations. The CPC plays a major role in the production new teachers, upgrading the professional skills of existing teachers, and providing training for lateral entry teachers. The NCSIP II project and the Special Education Consortium partnership will continue to plan and implement an annual meeting of university program representatives to facilitate the improvement of the quality of teacher education programs in the state.

**The Principals Executive Program (PEP)** is one of North Carolina's primary providers of professional development for public school administrators. The mission of PEP is to strengthen and renew the knowledge, skills, and beliefs of public school leaders to improve the conditions for teaching and learning in schools. NCSIP II will continue to work with the PEP program providing recommendations for training of leadership personnel to improve instruction for students with disabilities.

**The NCTEACH (North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for all Children)** is a rigorous alternative teacher preparation program designed to recruit, train, support and retain mid-career professionals, as they become licensed teachers in North Carolina. This partnership provides opportunities for NCSIP II to provide recommendations on the knowledge and skills needed by new special education teachers

**The NCSIP II - Parent Partnership** will be continued but will be reduced to a two-member partnership to include NCSIP II and the Exceptional Children Assistance Center. The Learning Disabilities Association of North Carolina and the ARC of North Carolina will be included in the NCSIP II annual meeting with statewide parent organizations. The purpose of the annual parent organization meeting is to brief the parent organizations on activities of the NCSIP II project and to facilitate input from the parent organizations and improve communications between the NCSIP II project and parents of students with disabilities across the state.

**The Technical Assistance and Resources System (TARS)** at UNC will be merged with the current CPC component of the project to facilitate the improvement of the special education teacher education partnership with NCSIP II. As indicated above, CPC plays a

major role in the production of new teachers, upgrading the professional skills of existing teachers, and providing training for lateral entry teachers. The NCSIP II project and the Special Education Consortium partnership will continue to plan and implement an annual meeting of university program representatives to facilitate the improvement of the quality of teacher education programs in the state.

**The Early Literacy Network** and NCSIP II Partnership will be reconfigured to include the NCSIP II Reading and Writing sites and centers that have developed an early childhood component that includes approximately twenty existing centers and sites.

**The North Carolina Positive Behavior Supports Initiative (NCPBS)** partnership has continued to expand during the first three years of NCSIP II. The NCPBS initiative is aligned with the NCSIP II goals, objectives and evaluation system and is a program in the Exceptional Children Division of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction that has been a primary partner in NCSIP I and II. This partnership has led to establishment of sites in school districts that have implemented PBS systems and research-based reading instruction in the same schools.