

by the Federal government? Yes
 No

c. If yes, provide the following information:
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2008 To: 6/30/2009
 (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 (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? 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? 12/30/2010
 (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: Anne Louise Thompson	Title:
Signature:	Date:

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

Title :
 File : S:\SPDG 08-09\APR Information\Attachments to Submit\ED524BExecSummary.doc



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

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

PR/Award #:
(H323A50003)

The Connecticut State Personnel Development Grant (CT SPDG) was designed to support the state's overall comprehensive personnel development strategy through targeted efforts in the following four focus areas: paraprofessional recruitment, early intervention, scaling-up evidence-based practices, and enhancing collaborative relationships between parents and schools.

During the current reporting period, major activities and accomplishments in the four focus areas included:

CT SPDG Goal 1: Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE). Establish a licensure program which will recruit, enroll, support, and assist paraprofessionals currently employed in an urban school district to meet state certification requirements in special education.

- Twelve New Haven candidates have earned their initial certification and 11 of the 12 have secured a permanent teaching position in the area of special education.
- All 8 Hartford candidates have passed the Praxis II exam and are currently fulfilling or have completed the teaching expectation of the certification program (DSAP or student teaching).
- Seventeen paraprofessionals from the Bridgeport school district have been accepted into the SCSU certification program and are expected to complete their coursework this summer.
- Recruitment activities have begun in the Waterbury school district, bringing the total number of participating districts in the project to four.

CT SPDG Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development. Develop, field test, and nationally disseminate a video and training manual for early intervention providers and parents on strategies for supporting infants and toddlers with disabilities through natural routines in natural environments.

- The revised CT Birth to Three System Service Guideline #2 on Natural Environments was completed in January 2009, distributed to Birth to Three programs, and posted on the Birth to Three website.
- The caregiver and provider scripts were completed and three families and six early intervention providers were filmed. Initial editing of the provider video and caregiver segment has begun and it is anticipated that a first draft of the videos will be complete in May.

CT SPDG Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices. Provide the statewide targeted professional development required to scale-up selected practices system wide, providing general and special education

teachers and administrators with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs and improve the performance and achievement of infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and children with disabilities.

- A total of 15 model schools have been identified in the areas of PBS (n=5), EIP/RtI (n=6) and Literacy (n=4). Two PBS partner districts (four schools) have also been identified. The leadership in both of the partner districts commented on the valuable feedback they have received from their model district.
- One EIP/RtI model district shared their progress towards RtI implementation with other districts during a statewide RtI Forum in May and a PBS model district shared lessons learned with other districts during a statewide PBS training in February. Two EIP/RtI districts also hosted informational sessions for educators, with presentations on their EIP/RtI programs and the opportunity for classroom visits. An additional district is scheduled to host a similar event at the end of May.
- SERC's effort to accelerate information sharing and further establish interdependent partnerships in and around the SPDG program has been evident in the evolution of their Best Practices website, the participation of the SPDG EIP/RtI initiative leader on the CT SRBI Advisory Panel and her work as a contributing author of the publication, "Connecticut's Framework for RtI" and the continued collaboration between the SERC PBS team and the Neag School of Education and the Center for Behavioral Education and Research (CBER) at the University of Connecticut.

CT SPDG Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships between Parents and Schools. Increase parent-school collaboration in selected school district by providing training, information, and support to parents and school staff, particularly with regard to parent involvement in the development of the IEP and ongoing involvement in the child's program.

- Two additional districts were selected and began participation in the project, bringing participation to four districts. Limiting the number of participating districts to four per year has allowed CPAC to provide the intensive support needed to facilitate systemic change in the difficult area of parent involvement.
- Active FAST (Family and Staff Together) teams are present in all four of the participating districts. The FAST team approach is building the district's capacity to improve family-school relationships once CPAC's targeted assistance has ended.
- Three of the four districts have developed action plans and have successfully implemented two items on the action plan that address parent training and/or increased written or verbal communication to parents.

Evaluation of the CT SPDG Project

During the current reporting period, the project leaders and the evaluator worked together to streamline the data collection process and in a few cases, slight adjustments were made to the performance measures. More substantial performance measure adjustments occurred for the three SERC initiatives. The reason for the changes included a need to develop measures that more adequately reflected the evolution of the initiatives and a need to align the measures with present data collection efforts in the participating schools to ensure that data collection was not overly burdensome.

During the past year, the evaluator has focused on meeting the federal reporting requirements, as well as developing a data collection system that will provide the projects with ongoing formative information. During the spring and summer, the evaluator intends to provide the following information to the projects: a summary of the PACE online participant survey to the SCSU project coordinator; a summary of the FAST team online survey to the CPAC project coordinator; site visit summaries to the Literacy, PBS and RtI initiative leaders; data reports focused on the SWIS and EIP data for SERC initiative leaders; and a summary for project leaders that will highlight lessons learned and accomplishments across the projects, as noted by the project leaders.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.

Goal 1: Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE)

CT SPDG Project Objective 1: To increase the number of paraprofessionals trained to become special education teachers.

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts in which onsite recruitment meeting(s) are held in order to explain the PACE project to prospective applicants.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1	/		1	/	
1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Praxis I tutorial sessions held by the PACE project for each cohort of paraprofessionals being considered for admission to the SCSU certification program.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		12	/		31	/	
1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of paraprofessionals from participating districts that are accepted into the SCSU certification program.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		20	/		17	/	
1.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who are on schedule to complete the necessary coursework.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			42 / 42	100		37 / 42	88

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 1.a: The number of districts in which onsite recruitment meeting(s) are held in order to explain the PACE project to prospective applicants.

The "Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE)" project was designed to recruit paraprofessionals currently employed in targeted urban school districts to enroll in Southern Connecticut State University's (SCSU) comprehensive special education certification program. Four districts (New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport, and Waterbury) initially agreed

to participate in the project, as indicated by written letters of support to the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) in May 2005. The four districts have been phased in sequentially, with recruitment activities held most recently in the Waterbury school district.

On November 3, 2008, the SCSU project coordinator and staff met with 15 Waterbury district supervisors to discuss preliminary plans for the identification and recruitment of paraprofessional candidates from the district. A second meeting was held with Waterbury administrators during January, and at this time addresses for all bachelor-level paraprofessionals in the district were provided to the SCSU project coordinator. As a result of these meetings, informational letters explaining the program were distributed and a recruitment meeting was held with interested individuals. Preliminary data were collected on a total of 36 prospective candidates.

Following the recruitment meeting, prospective candidates were asked to submit, as a first step in the application process, an undergraduate transcript (demonstrating a four-year degree with a minimum 2.7 GPA) and evidence of having passed or obtained a waiver for the Praxis I exam. At the end of April, a meeting was held with Waterbury paraprofessionals who had submitted the necessary preliminary information and were ready to proceed with the application process. (The project coordinator was anticipating approximately 10 paraprofessionals would attend this meeting.)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 1.b: The number of Praxis I tutorial sessions held by the PACE project for each cohort of paraprofessionals being considered for admission to the SCSU certification program.

The PACE project design called for SCSU to provide tutoring support in each successive cohort for paraprofessionals who have difficulty passing the Praxis I exam. The Praxis I: Pre-Professional Skills Tests in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics serves as the state-approved essential skills tests for prospective educators in Connecticut. Each spring, SCSU has held a series of Praxis I tutorials for candidates in the entering paraprofessional cohort. Participants work on basic skills, complete sample exams, and receive study guides for each Praxis skills test (Reading, Writing, and Math).

The SCSU project coordinator reported that a total of 30 tutorial sessions were held in Bridgeport between March 1, 2008 and June 21, 2008 (once during the week and each Saturday). Attendance data for these sessions was not available to the evaluator. The SCSU staff have begun offering tutorial sessions for the Waterbury cohort. One session has been held to-date and three candidates participated. It is anticipated that several more sessions will occur during the next few months.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 1.c: The number of paraprofessionals from participating districts that are accepted into the SCSU certification program.

The original goal of the PACE project was to recruit and enroll 120 paraprofessionals in the SCSU certification program over the five-year period of the grant; 30 from each of the four targeted districts. However, due to a high attrition rate in the initial New Haven cohort, this original goal was revised to a target of 20 in each of the three remaining districts.

Eighty-four Bridgeport paraprofessionals attended at least one of the informational sessions offered during the previous reporting period. Twenty of these paraprofessionals began the summer coursework (June 2008) and 17 were later accepted into the SCSU certification program. The remaining three paraprofessionals have continued to participate in the coursework and their acceptance is pending the submission of their undergraduate transcripts. Across the three cohorts, a total of 42 paraprofessionals have been accepted into the program (16 in New Haven, 9 in Hartford and 17 in Bridgeport).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 1.d: The percentage of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who are on schedule to complete the necessary coursework.

The SCSU certification-only program in special education requires that paraprofessionals (with a four-year degree) accepted through the PACE project complete 30.5 credits. During this reporting period, the distribution of the coursework was revised slightly for the Bridgeport cohort in order to lighten the workload during the initial summer semester. The Bridgeport paraprofessionals completed six credits in both the summer and fall semester, and are currently taking six credits this spring. They will complete their final coursework this summer (7.5 credits), excluding the DSAP seminar. The SCSU project coordinator reported that the Waterbury cohort will also follow this revised schedule.

Except for one Bridgeport paraprofessional who withdrew from the program in the summer of 2008, all paraprofessionals in Bridgeport are on schedule to complete their coursework by the end of the summer (15 of 16 paraprofessionals). In New Haven, 14 of 16 candidates have completed or are on schedule to complete their coursework (one candidate withdrew and one candidate has just returned from medical leave) and in Hartford 8 of 10 candidates have completed their coursework (one candidate withdrew after receiving a teaching position and one candidate joined the Bridgeport cohort in order to complete her classes. In all others measures this candidate is considered part of the Bridgeport cohort).



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 1: Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE)

CT SPDG Project Objective 2: Expand the pool of licensed special education teachers from which urban LEAs can draw to fill personnel vacancies.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG program that are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8 / 8	100		8 / 8	100

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of eligible paraprofessionals in the SCSU certification program who are teaching under a durational shortage area permit (DSAP) or as a student teacher.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			16 / 16	100		16 / 16	100

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of participating districts in which a mentoring system has been established and systematically provides a locally designated mentor or support person to each participating PACE candidate in the district.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

2.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
In states with SPDG projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in state-identified professional disciplines who remain teaching after three years of employment (OSEP Program Performance Measure 3.1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2.a: The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG program that are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

The Praxis II: Subject Assessment, given in one of 27 endorsement areas, is a critical part of the Connecticut certification process. For this reason and for purposes of this performance measure, "knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices" will be defined as a passing score on the Praxis II exam in special education. (It should also be noted that applicants may be required to complete additional Praxis II tests in a core content area in order to meet the federal definition of highly qualified.)

The Praxis II is a paper-based exam given on six regularly scheduled national test dates; typically one Saturday, every other month. Paraprofessionals in the PACE project are encouraged to take the Praxis II exam in special education by the end of their first fall semester, but are not required to pass the exam until all coursework is completed in July. As of last year's APR, 12 candidates in the New Haven cohort and two in the Hartford cohort had passed the Praxis II exam. During the current reporting period, two additional candidates in New Haven and the remaining six candidates in Hartford passed the exam.

Across all participating cohorts, a total of 23 candidates have passed the Praxis II in special education (14 in New Haven, 8 in Hartford, and 1 in Bridgeport). It is expected that one candidate in New Haven and 15 candidates in Bridgeport will pass the Praxis II exam during the next reporting period, after they have completed their coursework.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2.b: The percentage of eligible paraprofessionals in the SCSU certification program who are teaching under a durational shortage area permit (DSAP) or as a student teacher.

Paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program are eligible to obtain a Durational Shortage Area Permit (DSAP) if they: 1) hold a bachelor's degree; 2) have earned a minimum of 12 credit hours; and 3) have passed the Praxis II exam in special education. Those who are teaching under a DSAP enroll in EDU 999 - Supervision and Appraisal under a DSAP. During the 6-credit graduate course, DSAP teachers are observed by department faculty at least three to five times during their 10 months of teaching, and must attend departmental seminars held periodically during their first year.

Districts are eligible to hire a DSAP candidate if they demonstrate that no certified candidate suitable for the position is available to be hired. Districts must provide: 1) dates and specific locations of advertisements for the open position; 2) the total number of candidates who applied for the position; and 3) reason(s) why certified candidates, if any, were not hired. The district's request to hire a DSAP candidate is submitted as part of the eligible candidate's application to the CSDE for issuance of the durational shortage area permit.

During the current reporting period, eight New Haven candidates completed their DSAP assignment and one candidate began student teaching (she will be finished in May). In the Hartford cohort, three candidates are student teaching until May and four candidates have fulfilled or are currently fulfilling their DSAP responsibility (two will be finished in October 2009, one in January 2010 and one is finished). The SCSU project coordinator indicated that turnover among Hartford district administrators, as well as recent layoffs of Hartford special education teachers, led to significant challenges in securing DSAP positions for the Hartford cohort.

Across the New Haven and Hartford cohort, a total of 18 candidates have completed or are currently completing their teaching requirement. Three additional candidates have fulfilled this responsibility through another endorsement area (elementary education).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2.c: The number of participating districts in which a mentoring system has been established and systematically provides a locally designated mentor or support person to each participating PACE candidate in the district.

As part of the PACE project, candidates are asked to select a mentor in the school in which they are teaching under a DSAP. Mentors receive a \$1,000 stipend from grant funds and are expected to follow a set of guidelines and responsibilities developed by project leaders, including meeting regularly with their mentee in order to discuss the DSAP teachers' professional progress. Mentors are also invited, with their mentee, to attend a series of professional development workshops at SCSU.

According to the SCSU project coordinator, a total of seven New Haven candidates participated in the mentoring system during the prior school year; three Hartford candidates participated this school year; and five candidates (2 in New Haven

and 3 in Hartford) worked with a cooperating teacher, in place of a mentor, during their student teaching placement. Overall, seven candidates did not have a mentor during their time in the program. In a few cases, these candidates finished the program early or late and as a result, their cohort's mentor-mentee workshops were not scheduled during the time they were teaching. (Note: Information regarding 2008-2009 mentor-mentee professional development workshops will be submitted to the evaluator by the end of the school year.)

The Connecticut State Department of Education has long recognized the importance of mentoring and is currently working to develop a district-based Mentoring Assistant Program (MAP) to replace the current state-based Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST). The MAP program is designed to provide beginning teachers with guided teacher support and coaching, as well as the opportunity to complete learning modules over their first two years of teaching. The MAP program will be implemented in SFY 2010.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2.d: In states with SPDG projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in state-identified professional disciplines who remain teaching after three years of employment (OSEP Program Performance Measure 3.1).

The Initial Educator Certificate is the first-level certificate issued on Connecticut's three-tier continuum and is valid for a period of three years. Eligibility for this certificate is based upon the completion of an approved preparation program at a Connecticut university or college and all required state assessments. Students must teach under DSAP for a period of ten months before they are eligible to earn initial certification.

Currently, 12 New Haven candidates have earned their initial certification in the endorsement area Comprehensive Special Education, K-12. Three of these PACE graduates also earned certification in an additional endorsement area (two in Elementary, K-6, and another in Integrated Early Childhood/Special Education, Nursery-3). All 12 graduates have a permanent position, all are teaching in an urban district (11 in New Haven and one for the Unified School District, which operates within the Department of Children and Families); and 11 of the 12 are teaching in the area of special education (one at the early childhood level, six at the elementary level, and four at the high school level). It is expected that three additional New Haven candidates will earn their initial certification during the next reporting period.

In the Hartford cohort, one candidate has completed her DSAP, and her initial certification is pending. It is expected that the remaining Hartford candidates will apply for certification once they have completed their student teaching or DSAP placements. All Hartford candidates have passed the Praxis II exam in both special education and elementary education, which will allow them to meet the federal definition of highly qualified.

Although the desired three-year retention data is not yet available, in an online survey currently being conducted by the evaluation team, PACE respondents to-date have felt that they would still be teaching in an urban district in five years. In addition, a new Connecticut Educator Certification System (CECS) being designed by the Bureau of Educator Preparation, Certification, Support, and Assessment, should allow the state to track the employment of the PACE graduates at the three-year milestone.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.

Goal 1: Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE)

CT SPDG Project Objective 3: To increase the diversity of the special education teaching workforce in targeted districts.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who are from a minority ethnic background. (The target was 50%, the denominator of 100 is arbitrary.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			50 / 100	50		8 / 17	47
3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of ethnic-minority paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who become highly qualified special education teachers in a CT urban school district.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			10 / 10	100		9 / 10	90

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3.a: The percentage of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who are from a minority ethnic background.

The need for teachers from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and historically underrepresented groups has been a continued concern of officials in Connecticut urban school districts, particularly in the field of special education. The PACE project was designed to specifically address this problem by recruiting paraprofessionals already working, and in many cases living in the urban districts. Demographically, these paraprofessionals are more likely to come from diverse backgrounds.

During the current reporting period, 47% (n=8) of the 17 Bridgeport paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU program were reported to be from a minority ethnic background. The representation of the Bridgeport cohort was classified as follows: White/Non-Hispanic (n=9); Black/Non-Hispanic (n=5); and Hispanic/Latino (n=3). Overall, 23 of the 42 candidates (55%) accepted across the three cohorts are from a minority ethnic background (ten in New Haven, five in Hartford, and eight in Bridgeport). In addition, eight of the 42 candidates (19%) accepted are bilingual (four in New Haven, three in Hartford and one in Bridgeport).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3.b: The percentage of ethnic-minority paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who become highly qualified special education teachers in a CT urban school district.

In addition to recruitment, the retention of ethnic-minority paraprofessionals as highly qualified special education teachers in Connecticut urban school districts is also a priority of the PACE project. In the four participating urban school districts, recent data from the Connecticut Education Data and Research website (CEDAR, 2007-2008) demonstrates that the

percentage of diverse certified teachers does not reflect the demographics of the student population. The minority student population in New Haven is 88.0%; in Hartford, 93.8%; in Bridgeport, 91.0%; and in Waterbury, 73.3%. By comparison, only 23.1% of certified teachers in New Haven are from minority groups; in Hartford, 27.0%; in Bridgeport, 24.5%; and in Waterbury, 11.9%. In addition, only 5.6% of certified special education teachers statewide are from a minority group.

Currently, 9 of the 10 (90%) New Haven PACE participants from an ethnic-minority background have earned their initial certification and are employed as special education teachers. One candidate withdrew from the program in fall 2006 for medical reasons, but has returned to the program this year, recently passed the Praxis II exam, and it is expected that she will DSAP this fall.

It was not expected that any of the candidates in the Hartford or Bridgeport cohort would be employed as a certified special education teacher at this point in time. However, four of the five Hartford candidates and all eight Bridgeport candidates from ethnic-minority backgrounds are on schedule to become special education teachers (one Hartford candidate withdrew after receiving an elementary teaching position).



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.

Goal 1: Paraprofessionals as Certified Educators (PACE)

CT SPDG Project Objective 4: To develop a long-range plan for sustaining recruitment and retention of teachers in urban areas.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100
4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.a: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).

SPP indicators and the respective improvement strategies that are currently aligned with the PACE project include:

Indicator 3: Strategy: 1) Disseminate information and partner with the Connecticut Institutes of Higher Education to provide resources and essential components of the Leadership and Learning Center trainings so that these concepts can be integrated into teacher preparation programs. Alignment: During the 2007-2008 school year, all four urban districts in the PACE project failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) for students with disabilities. Given the link between teacher quality and student outcomes, such data suggests targeted efforts to increase the number of highly qualified special education teachers in the four participating urban districts is well warranted. The PACE project offers paraprofessionals a comprehensive selection of courses and professional development opportunities founded in the fundamental principals of effective educational strategies for students with special needs. These educational strategies are aligned with many of the essential components taught during the Leadership and Learning Center trainings.

Indicator 5: Strategy: Examine mentoring teacher qualifications and training, and availability for student teaching placements in LRE settings. Alignment: The availability of qualified special education teachers is a significant concern, particularly due to the considerable implications these shortages could have for the provision of a free appropriate public

education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for Connecticut students with disabilities. District Reference Group (DRG) I, comprised of the four urban districts targeted in the PACE project, has continually had the highest number and percentage of vacancies due to a lack of qualified applicants. The PACE project seeks to alleviate these concerns by expanding the pool of licensed special education teachers from which these four urban districts can draw to fill personnel vacancies in LRE settings.

Although SPP indicators 1, 2, 9 and 10 do not include specific strategies related to teacher preparation programs, the SCSU project coordinator indicated that the certification of paraprofessionals in the PACE program, specifically a large number of paraprofessionals from an ethnic-minority background, will help to address these indicators in the schools in which the graduates are employed.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.b: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 4.b have been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure.

During the previous reporting period, the SCSU project coordinator and the SPDG project director agreed to postpone forming an advisory group until the final year of the grant. Originally, the goal was for the committee to form during the first year of the grant in order to focus on creating a long-term plan to obtain state funding for the program. Instead, in the final year, a committee, consisting of administrators from participating districts, individuals who have gone through the PACE program, representatives from CSDE, and SCSU personnel, will focus on creating a replication guide that other universities can utilize to implement a similar program. The replication guide will incorporate lessons learned and may also include suggested modifications to the PACE program, based on pending changes in Connecticut's certification regulations.

The SCSU project coordinator also described other areas in which the program could indirectly assist with laying the groundwork for sustainable changes. At the university level, the coordinator reported that she has continued to work with university departments (i.e. bursar and admission) to streamline the process for acceptance of non-traditional students and reimbursement of tuition benefits through grant funds. She also indicated that there has been a shift in the philosophy of some faculty members who now, after teaching the PACE participants, see the benefits of accepting students who have experience in urban schools, even if these students' entering GPA is not equivalent to traditional students'.

The PACE program has also facilitated the development of relationships between the university and four of the largest urban districts in Connecticut, which will allow for future partnerships. The challenge of the PACE program will be future funding. The SCSU project coordinator reported that they have discussed the possibility of the districts funding additional paraprofessionals in the program, if these paraprofessionals commit to working in the district for three years, but noted that this is unlikely given the financial status of the urban districts. The SCSU project coordinator continues to examine other options, including possible partnerships with other universities in Connecticut.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development

CT SPDG Project Objective 5: Plan and develop a training video package for use by early intervention providers who work with infant and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of meetings of the video advisory group.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1	/		1	/	
5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of national experts contracted to consult and assist with the development of the training video package.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2	/			/	
5.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Adequate raw video footage of service providers and families in home/community settings will be filmed so that appropriate scenes can be chosen to produce final video segments.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
5.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of written materials produced in association with the development and distribution of the training video.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		2	/	
5.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Editing of raw video footage will be completed and a final training DVD will be produced.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5.a: The number of meetings of the video advisory group.

The video advisory group (VAG) was initially formed during Year 2 of the "Early Intervention Providers Professional Development" project. The group consists of 11 members, including the Birth to Three project coordinator, two parents, four service agency providers, two State Education Resource Center (SERC) consultants, and two representatives from the Department of Developmental Services (DDS)/Birth to Three.

During the current reporting period, the VAG met once during December 2008. Prior to the meeting, the script for the provider training video was e-mailed to each of the members for their review. Possible revisions to the script were discussed at the meeting, and the script has since been revised to reflect their comments. The provider script is currently being matched to the video segments, and the VAG anticipates that the video will be approximately 30 minutes in length. The VAG had also anticipated meeting to discuss the caregiver script but members were able to provide their comments to each other informally. As with the provider script, edits have been made to the caregiver script as a result of the VAG's feedback, and the script is currently being matched to video segments. It was decided that the five-minute caregiver segment will be added to the current Birth to Three orientation video. The orientation video is provided to all families after the referral process, and therefore will facilitate distribution of the caregiver segment to a larger audience. The VAG plans to reconvene in May to review the provider video and the caregiver segment of the orientation video.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5.b: The number of national experts contracted to consult and assist with the development of the training video package.

At the outset of the project, two national experts from the Family, Infant, and Preschool program in North Carolina were contacted to consult and participate in the video project. However, scheduling difficulties prevented both consultants from participating in meetings of the VAG and as a result, group members decided to pursue replacements for the North Carolina consultants. The VAG identified potential candidates, including experts from Vanderbilt University and the University at Hartford, and initial contact was made with one expert. However, due to scheduling difficulties and continued delays with video development, the VAG later decided not to pursue the involvement of this person or other external consultants. As a result, this performance measure will no longer be included in future performance reports.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5.c: Adequate raw video footage of service providers and families in home/community settings will be filmed so that appropriate scenes can be chosen to produce final video segments.

In early fall 2007, a video production company was contracted through the State Education Resource Center (SERC) and filming for the project began in November 2007. The selection of families and providers to appear in the film largely occurred through recommendations of the video advisory group and the Birth to Three project coordinator. Diversity in the areas of race/ethnicity, language, disability, and socioeconomic status were all considered in the selection process.

During the current reporting period, three families and six early intervention service providers were filmed, bringing total participation to ten families and nine early intervention service providers. Filming sessions have occurred during regular home visits in an effort to show how the unique characteristics of the family and the development of natural supports within that family can be used to reflect current values and best practices in early intervention. Filming has also included one routines-based interview, as well as a staged initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting. In addition to the home environment filming, a meeting between Birth to Three program staff and staff from an Early Head Start program was filmed in February to demonstrate how these organizations work together to serve children and families.

Editing of the provider video and caregiver segment is currently taking place, and unusable footage is being removed. As a result, it may be necessary to videotape additional scenes after the initial editing process is completed in May. Filming has taken much longer than originally anticipated, and as a result the revised target of July 2008 for filming completion was not met. The Birth to Three project coordinator reported several challenges that contributed to the delays in filming, including difficulty finding families and providers willing to be filmed, scheduling conflicts for filming, and the extensive time needed to coordinate between the several entities involved in the project (i.e. videographer, script writer, and VAG). A definitive date for completion of the provider video and caregiver segment has not been determined, as it will depend on the amount of unusable footage and the extent of revisions requested by the VAG in May.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5.d: The number of written materials produced in association with the development and distribution of the training video.

In August 2008, Dr. Bonnie Keilty, an assistant professor in the College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, entered into a contract with the State Education Resource Center (SERC) indicating agreement to assist with

the research and writing of the video scripts and training manual. Dr. Keilty was contracted by the project in late 2006 to revise the CT Birth to Three System Service Guideline #2 on Natural Environments, and it is expected that these revised guidelines will serve as the foundation for the associated video materials. (See Performance Measure 9.a.)

As discussed in Performance Measure 5.a, during this reporting period, the scripts for both the provider video and the caregiver segment were completed, reviewed by the VAG, and revised to reflect the VAG's feedback. The training manual cannot be completed until Dr. Keilty has had the opportunity to view the provider video and determine appropriate questions and activities targeted to the video content. Originally, the VAG also planned to have Dr. Keilty develop a separate self-study guide to accompany the provider video, but questions and items for discussion will now be incorporated into the training manual.

The project has met the revised target of December 2008 (from an earlier target of July 2008) for the script development but not for the training manual development. It is anticipated that a working draft of the provider video will be available to Dr. Keilty in May and she will begin the training manual at that time. A date for completion has not yet been set.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5.e: Editing of raw video footage will be completed and a final training DVD will be produced.

Editing of the provider video and caregiver segment has not been completed at this time. However, initial editing is anticipated to end in May at which time the VAG will reconvene to suggest additional edits. The provider video and the caregiver segment will then be shared with the Birth to Three management team for final edits.

In last year's APR, a target of December 2008 was set for the editing and production of a final DVD. However, as described in Performance Measure 5.c., filming of the video has continued to take longer than envisioned. The Birth to Three project coordinator reported that scheduling and coordination among contractors have been barriers to timely completion. She added that it would have been beneficial to have one contractor with expertise in the area of video production conduct the filming and writing with oversight and input from the lead agency. The SPDG project director, the Birth to Three project coordinator and the video consultant are scheduled to meet in June to set a firm timeline for video completion.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development

CT SPDG Project Objective 6: Provide early intervention providers with the knowledge and skills necessary to describe and implement best practices in early intervention.

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Develop a detailed plan to field test the training video and manual with a selected sample of Birth to Three agencies.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Birth to Three agency directors who commit to send a minimum of 5 service providers to attend the video-viewing session/focus group.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	
6.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Birth to Three service providers who attend the video-viewing session/focus group.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
6.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 1	100		/	
6.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG program that are	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw	Ratio	%	Raw	Ratio	%

knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.		Number			Number		
			/			/	
6.f. Performance Measure							
	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.a: Develop a detailed plan to field test the training video and manual with a selected sample of Birth to Three agencies.

Due to significant delays in filming, the Birth to Three project coordinator and the SPDG project director agreed to significantly scale back the plan for field testing of the provider video and manual. It is still expected that staff members from a sample of Birth to Three agencies will view the video during a workshop and participate in an organized activity. The service providers and agency directors will also be asked to provide feedback on the film through a focus group discussion facilitated by the external evaluator. However, it is anticipated that revisions to the completed DVD will only occur if there are significant errors or omissions.

It is now expected that the production of the final DVD will signify the completion of the Birth to Three SPDG project. Therefore, follow-up activities with the workshop participants will not occur. Since there are no longer plans for a detailed field test of the video and manual, this performance measure will not be included in future reports. Activities related to the video-viewing workshop and focus group discussion will be reported in Performance Measures 6.b, 6.c and 6.d.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.b: The number of Birth to Three agency directors who commit to send a minimum of five service providers to attend the video-viewing workshop/focus group.

This performance measure has been revised to reflect the change from Birth to Three agencies' participation in a detailed field test of the video and manual to their participation in a video-viewing workshop and focus group. At the time of last year's APR, two agencies (Cheshire Public Schools and Children Therapy Services) had verbally agreed to participate in the field test. These agencies will now participate in the video-viewing workshop. Three additional agencies (Building Bridges EI program, REACHOUT Inc. and Wheeler Clinic) have also verbally agreed to participate. The Birth to Three project coordinator reported that she self-selected all five of the agencies, based on their sizes and locations, as well as their professional development needs.

The Birth to Three project coordinator will identify one to two additional programs to participate in the video-viewing workshop once there is a definitive date. A total of approximately 25 service providers are expected to participate. Once a timeline for the workshop is secure, the evaluator will develop the focus group protocols and submit an IRB application for expedited review to the Department of Developmental Services IRB Coordinator.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.c: The number of Birth to Three service providers who attend the video-viewing workshop/focus group.

In August 2008, the SPDG project director, Birth to Three project coordinator and the evaluator met to discuss a timeframe for completion of the video, including the expected date for the video-viewing workshop. It was decided that the Birth to Three project coordinator would contact service providers in late fall 2008 to secure their participation, and the video-viewing workshop would occur by January 2009. However, due to delays in filming, these activities have not yet occurred. As mentioned in previous performance measures, it is anticipated that the VAG will review a draft video in May and the video will be finalized shortly thereafter, unless significant revisions are needed. The Birth to Three project coordinator

will contact the service providers at least one month prior to the scheduled video-viewing workshop.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.d: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1).

The CT Birth to Three System continuously seeks to align with the current evidence base of early intervention in three main areas of practice: evaluation, IFSP development, and service delivery. Best practices of the agency include: 1) building on child and family strengths versus focusing on deficits; 2) identifying and achieving both family and child outcomes; 3) assessing and intervening in child functioning within the routine activities of the child's life; and 4) supporting the family in learning and implementing intervention strategies between visits.

Serving children in natural settings has been part of the CT Birth to Three System Mission Statement since 1996, and the agency first published service guidelines on providing services in natural environments in 1997. The service guidelines are revised as necessary in order to stay current with best practices. The CT Birth to Three System Service Guideline #2 on Natural Environments (1999) has undergone revisions as part of the SPDG Early Intervention project (see Performance Measure 9.a) and the guideline has served, and is expected to continue to serve, as the foundation for the training video and its associated materials. As a result, the planned video-viewing workshop will be considered an evidence-based professional development event.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.e: The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG program that are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.

As was discussed in Performance Measure 6.b., it is anticipated that approximately 25 service providers will attend the video-viewing workshop. The providers will be asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire and participate in a focus group discussion related to the video. However, given that the focus of the video-viewing workshop will be to gather participants' feedback on the video, rather than provide extensive professional development, information collected during this workshop will be reported under Performance Measure 6.c in future reports. The video-viewing workshop will be the culminating activity for the Birth to Three project. Additional professional development activities are not expected to occur under this project.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.f: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 6.f have been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure.

SPP indicators and the respective improvement strategies that are currently aligned with the Birth to Three video project include:

Part C Indicator 2: Strategy 1) The Natural Environments Guideline will be updated as needed to stay current with best practices. Alignment with the Birth to Three project: See Performance Measure 9.a for information on updating the Natural Environment Guideline.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development

CT SPDG Project Objective 7: Provide parents with the knowledge and skills necessary to use natural routines in their home or community setting to promote their child's learning and development.

7.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The existing Birth to Three orientation video will be updated to include the 5-minute caregiver segment filmed as part of the SPDG video project.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of families who participate in the evaluation of the Birth to Three orientation video (including the 5-minute family segment).	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7.a The existing Birth to Three orientation video will be updated to include the 5-minute caregiver segment filmed as part of the SPDG video project.

This performance measure has been revised to reflect the changes in distribution of the caregiver segment. At the time of last year's APR, options under consideration included offering a 'viewing party' for families or asking the 25 service providers participating in the field test to share the video with at least 10 of their families. However, after further discussions, it was decided that the caregiver segment would be included on the current Birth to Three orientation video. The orientation video is provided to all families when they are referred to the Birth to Three system, and as a result this will facilitate the distribution to a larger audience. A definitive date for completion of the caregiver segment has not yet been set.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7.b: The number of families who participate in the evaluation of the Birth to Three orientation video (including the 5-minute family segment).

The evaluation team will prepare a survey response card approximately one month prior to the release date of the orientation video. For an identified period of time, the survey card will be inserted into the inside cover of the DVD along with a postage-paid envelope. Families will be encouraged to complete the survey card and return it to the evaluator. Since the caregiver segment is only a portion (5 minutes) of the orientation video, the comments received will most likely indicate viewers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the video in general. The Birth to Three project coordinator reported that discussions have occurred regarding possibly dividing the orientation video into chapters, which would allow for information to be collected on the specific chapter developed through this project.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development

CT SPDG Project Objective 8: Disseminate the training video and manual on a statewide basis and explore distribution through national venues such as professional conferences.

8.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of DVDs and training manuals distributed to Birth to Three providers.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
8.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practice on a statewide or district-wide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 8.a: The number of DVDs and training manuals distributed to Birth to Three providers.

In August 2008, the Birth to Three project coordinator, the SPDG project director and the evaluator met to discuss future plans and timelines related to the video project. One goal outlined during this meeting was the distribution of 200 copies of the provider video and training manual to service providers across the state by spring 2009. Once the video is finalized, the Birth to Three project coordinator anticipates that the video will be mailed to each of the 50 Birth to Three programs in the state and will also be available to staff on the Birth to Three website.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 8.b: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practice on a statewide or district-wide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).

The Birth to Three project coordinator reported that once complete the provider video will continue to be available to Birth to Three programs. Birth to Three agencies in Connecticut will be encouraged to utilize the video for professional development so that providers will be better equipped to help families meet the needs of their children in the home environment. The Birth to Three project coordinator added that there have also been discussions regarding possibly requiring new service coordinators to watch the video and complete a quiz online as part of their initial training.

Once finalized, the caregiver segment will be distributed to families across Connecticut on an ongoing basis as part of the Birth to Three orientation video. Beyond the continued distribution of the provider video and the caregiver segment, further plans for replication of the project are not expected.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 2: Early Intervention Providers Professional Development

CT SPDG Project Objective 9: Revise and update the CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments so that they are more consistent with the way in which providers are currently being trained to deliver early intervention services.

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The development and dissemination (in print and via the web) of the revised Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
					/		

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 9.a: The development and dissemination (in print and via the web) of the revised Service Guideline #2 on Natural Environments.

In addition to the development of the training video, this project was also given the charge of revising the Connecticut Birth to Three System Service Guideline #2 on Natural Environments (1999). The purpose of the original guideline was to inform early childhood providers about how to provide services in natural environments (in the home and community) using the family's everyday routines. However, the CT early intervention community had come to consensus that the 1999 guideline placed too much emphasis on the physical location of service delivery, focusing more on where services are delivered as opposed to how services are delivered. Consequently, the goal of the revisions was to highlight strategies that providers can use to embed learning within natural activities across a variety of everyday settings.

Dr. Bonnie Keilty, an assistant professor at the College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, was contracted as an external consultant in late 2006 to revise and update the CT guideline. She submitted a draft of her revisions in spring 2007 to the Birth to Three management team. The revised guideline was originally expected to be printed and distributed to service agencies in December 2007. However, the Birth to Three project coordinator indicated this timeline was extended due to the release of similar materials by the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). The Birth to Three management team reviewed the NECTAC release to ensure that the state service guideline was comprehensive of and aligned with the most up-to-date national standards.

During the current reporting period, the revised guideline was completed (January 2009). It has been posted on the Birth to Three website (<http://birth23.org/publications/naturalenvironments.pdf>) and copies have been distributed to Birth to Three programs requesting paper copies. The guideline is also included in the training packet for new service coordinators.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 10: Through shared meaning and vision, groundwork will be laid for systemic changes, long-term sustainability and institutionalization of evidence-based practices.

10.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of topical priority areas chosen to form the foundation for the SPDG scaling-up project based on a thorough review of procedures and practices supported by rigorous research evidence.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		3	/	
10.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Inter- and intra-agency, state, and/or university partnerships have been developed and maintained in order to facilitate systems change and the institutionalization of evidence based practices.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
10.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/ training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their SPP (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100

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

Performance Measure 10.a: The number of topical priority areas chosen to form the foundation for the SPDG scaling-up project based on a thorough review of procedures and practices supported by rigorous research evidence.

The Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices project is led by the State Education Resource Center (SERC), the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) designated technical assistance provider. Beginning in November of 2006, SERC rolled out a series of competitive grants for "model" and "partner" districts and schools to implement and scale-up evidence based practices in three priority areas: 1) Positive Behavior Supports; 2) Early Intervening Service/Response to Intervention; and 3) School-Based Literacy Teams: Decision-Making in A Three-Tiered Approach. A fourth initiative in school counseling had originally been under consideration; however, a shortage of key SERC and CSDE personnel in 2007-2008, followed by a reduction in SPDG funding in 2008-2009 has subsequently led project leaders to postpone the initiative indefinitely.

During the current reporting period, the PBS initiative has been active in both model and partner districts, and the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives continue to focus on work in selected model districts and schools, respectively. Both the EIP/RtI and the Literacy initiative are expected to issue RFPs for partner districts and schools in the fall of 2009.

Performance Measure 10.b: Inter- and intra-agency, state, and/or university partnerships have been developed and maintained in order to facilitate systems change and the institutionalization of evidence based practices.

Statewide initiatives such as the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI), the Vanguard Schools Initiative, and Reading First were embedded and integrated into the original design of the SPDG Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices project. Applications for funding under all three initiatives of the Scaling-Up project required that selected LEAs utilize components of these and other statewide initiatives in an effort to facilitate coherence in school improvement efforts across the state.

The importance of a systemic approach to the state's educational change efforts has become increasingly important as fiscal constraints at the district, state, and federal level continue to mount. Both Reading First and the Vanguard Initiative are currently being phased out, highlighting the value of their established connection to the strategies and best practices of the Scaling-Up project. In addition, SERC's approach to SPDG, focused on information sharing and efficiency, as opposed to new mandates and "add-ons," has become even more essential given district layoffs and a state department hiring freeze.

During the current reporting period, SERC's efforts to accelerate information sharing and further establish interdependent partnerships in and around the SPDG program has been evident in the evolution of their Best Practices website (<http://ctserc.org/s/>); the participation of the SPDG EIP/RtI initiative leader on the CT SRBI Advisory Panel and her work as a contributing author of the publication, "Connecticut's Framework for RtI" (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/pressroom/SRBI_full.pdf); and the publication of "Positive Behavior Support: Data Report and Summary: A Look at Connecticut" (<http://www.pbis.org/common/pbisresources/publications/0309pbsdataCT.pdf>), a result of the continued collaboration between the SERC PBS team and the Neag School of Education and the Center for Behavioral Education and Research (CBER) at the University of Connecticut.

Performance Measure 10.c: The percent of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their SPP (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).

Note: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 10.d have been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Performance Measure 1.2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure.

SPP indicators and the respective improvement strategies that are currently aligned with the SERC project include:

Indicator 4: Strategy - Provide professional development activities statewide on positive behavioral supports, a systems approach to effective school-wide management. Alignment: SERC has provided professional development on PBS for identified SPDG districts and statewide. This improvement strategy also addresses Indicator 5. (See Performance Measure 13.a-13.c for further details).

Indicator 4: Strategy - Identify and disseminate information regarding model programs in the area of reducing suspension and expulsion. Alignment: The PBS and EIP/RtI initiatives are designed to replicate practices intended to decrease suspension and expulsion by identifying and disseminating information regarding model programs. Both initiatives have offered statewide training and are working with model districts and schools to refine implementation of evidence-based practices. The PBS initiative also has been active in partner districts, where model programs are being replicated. The EIP/RtI initiative is expected to establish such partnerships during the next reporting period.

Indicator 4: Strategy - Use the resources and technical assistance of The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Alignment: Since 2005-2006, SERC has trained CT districts and schools in collaboration with the OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). All SPDG PBS schools must complete this training series prior to or during their participation in the SPDG project. Various documents supported in part by the OSEP Center on PBIS have also been provided as resources to SPDG districts and schools.

Indicator 5: Strategy - Continue emphasis on Positive Behavior Supports training and technical assistance. Alignment: The SERC project staff involved with the PBS initiative have provided both training and technical assistance related to implementation and monitoring of PBS. (See Performance Measures 13.a-c for additional details.).

Indicator 5: Strategy - Investigate reading and behavioral supports and methods of delivery that can be implemented at

younger ages to reduce later out-of-district placements of students for reading difficulties and behavioral concerns.

Alignment: The Literacy initiative focuses specifically on use of three-tier instructional practices to support development of pre-reading and early reading skills (grades K-5). The PBS and EIP/RtI initiatives support implementation of evidence-based practices intended to improve academic and behavioral outcomes for students in all age groups, including those in elementary grades.

Indicator 9 and 10: Strategy - Coordinate activities with early intervention initiatives, including Connecticut's Response to Intervention (RtI) framework, called Scientific Research Based Interventions (SRBI), to ensure appropriate identification of students with disabilities. Alignment: The SERC EIP/RtI initiative is intended to replicate the implementation of RtI practices in early intervening services programs. This is expected to reduce the incidence of inappropriate identification, especially among students of certain racial and ethnic groups.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 11: To develop a multi-component system to facilitate statewide replication of evidence-based practices.

11.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
An internal SERC leadership team will be established for each of the scaling-up initiatives with each team meeting on a regular basis to lead and coordinate their respective initiatives.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	
11.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
A multi-step, scaling-up application process has been developed and implemented in each of the scaling-up initiatives, with clearly defined obligations for selected grant recipients.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	
11.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
SERC's capacity for broad-scale implementation and/or dissemination in the scaling-up priority areas has increased or been sustained.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	

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

Performance Measure 11.a: An internal SERC leadership team will be established for each of the scaling-up initiatives with each team meeting on a regular basis to lead and coordinate their respective initiatives.

SERC leadership teams have been established for each of the Scaling-Up initiatives and are led by a designated initiative leader responsible for the overall management and implementation of the initiative. The composition of the teams vary slightly, but for the most part consist of a core group of four to five SERC staff members, complemented by one or more technical assistance providers, and an administrative support person. The teams provide direct assistance to district and school personnel, monitor data collection, assess program fidelity, and as applicable, ensure that districts are on target with respect to their scaling-up plans. All three initiative leaders reported that their teams meet on a regular basis, or use alternative methods of communication (such as email) when difficulties with coordinating schedules occur.

Performance Measure 11.b: A multi-step, scaling-up application process has been developed and implemented in each of the scaling-up initiatives, with clearly defined obligations for selected grant recipients.

Districts and schools interested in the SPDG Scaling-Up project were required to meet certain eligibility criteria prior to submitting an application for a particular initiative. In the PBS and EIP/RtI initiatives, grants were awarded at the district level. Eligibility criteria for PBS required that at least one school in the district already be trained in the three tiered model of SW-PBS; and eligibility criteria for EIP/RtI required that at least one school in the district had participated (within the past three years) in SERC's EIP professional development series. In the Literacy initiative, grants were awarded at the school level and schools were eligible to apply if staff members had participated, within the past three years, in SERC's Literacy Coaches Consortium.

Proposals were selected through a multi-step process including 1) review and analysis of CSDE student achievement data in order to ensure positive trends; 2) paper screening of all applicants; and 3) on-site verification visits of the highest ranked applicants (PBS and EIP/RtI only). Selected recipients in all three initiatives were required to sign a written Statement of Assurances, which explicitly defined the obligations and expectations of the grant. Common obligations across all three initiatives included identification of a district-level team and district-level coordinator (or a school-based team and coach for the Literacy initiative); demonstrated "buy-in" from administrators and teachers; and a commitment to release time and substitute coverage, as needed, for staff to access professional development, coaching, and training.

During the current reporting period, the PBS initiative leader developed Implementation Guides for model school/districts and partner school/districts in order to provide further clarity on reporting and evaluation requirements of the SPDG grant. Each document contains an explanation of the goals and objectives of the SPDG program, outlines roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders, describes the expectations of "model" and "partner" status, and details the reporting requirements as needed for evaluation and monitoring. The Implementation Guides have served as a resource, for both model and partner sites, of practical, feasible, and concrete strategies that can be used to monitor implementation and maintain or achieve model status. The EIP/RtI and the Literacy initiative leaders are considering developing similar documents as they begin to expand their initiatives to partner districts and schools.

Performance Measure 11.c: SERC's capacity for broad-scale implementation and/or dissemination in the scaling-up priority areas has increased or been sustained.

PBS

Since the first year of SPDG (2005-2006), SERC, in collaboration with the University of Connecticut and the National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS), has provided PBS training to 99 schools representing 21 districts throughout the state of Connecticut (See Table 11.c.1). Ten SERC consultants have been trained in School Wide Information Systems (SWIS), 17 consultants have been trained to conduct the SET, and over 100 schools have had a SET evaluation (See Table 11.c.2).

Despite this increased capacity, demand by Connecticut school districts for participation in School-wide Positive Behavior Support training continues to exceed available resources. An information session regarding the 2009-2010 PBS training series was held in January 2009 and district application materials were due to SERC on April 15. SERC expects to accept 15 new schools to the 2009-2010 training series (with 15 schools returning from last year); however, the demand for new schools interested in the training is estimated at approximately 25 districts.

In an effort to build capacity at the school and district level, SERC has begun to institute a number of changes statewide. In January 2009, SERC began providing SET training to district and school personnel, and beginning in 2009-2010, district coaches will be required to participate in SET training and become a SET evaluator. The PBS initiative leader reported that SERC's experience in SPDG districts, as well as in other districts statewide, has shown that building capacity SET evaluators is an essential component of district sustainability. In addition, the demonstrated value of SPDG school's monitoring their student referral data on a regular basis, has contributed to the decision to require all schools involved in PBS training to use the SWIS beginning in 2009-2010.

EIP/RtI

As briefly mentioned under Performance Measure 10.b, a statewide Advisory Panel was convened in the fall of 2006 to address Connecticut's efforts to establish a continuum of scientifically research-based intervention in CT schools, and provide guidance on best practices in providing interventions for students who are in need of academic and behavioral interventions. Both the SERC Executive Director and the EIP/RtI initiative leader were appointed to serve on the panel and reported that the experiences of the EIP/RtI model sites were frequently used to inform the work of the panel. At the same time, feedback and advice from panel members created a reciprocal flow of knowledge and information back to the SPDG schools.

Another charge of the Advisory Panel was to provide guidance regarding the implementation and roll-out of RtI training

statewide. The outcome was a series of forums offered by SERC, in collaboration with CSDE, focused on building the capacity of districts to implement Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI) that are aligned with Connecticut's Framework for RtI. Five forums (with two available sessions each) were held during the 2007-2008 school year, and each session was attended, on average, by 80 participants from 61 schools and 27 districts. Two of the three forums planned for 2008-2009 have been held, and each session was attended, on average, by 112 participants from 32 schools and 15 districts.

Literacy

The SERC Executive Director and the Assistant Director of Program Development both indicated that the Literacy initiative has significantly impacted the agency's overall approach to literacy instruction. Similarly, the SERC Literacy leader reported that the integration of RtI into the Literacy initiative has increased SERC's capacity to support broad-scale dissemination of the three-tier approach to literacy instruction. She reported an increase in the ability of SERC staff members to effectively respond to individual schools' needs, and to provide job-embedded training and support individualized to the expertise levels of school personnel. Efforts to advance the sustainability of three-tier instruction included mapping of existing curricula, development of pacing guides, and the introduction of a tool used in Reading First schools to help plan tiers of instruction.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 12: To replicate evidence based practices with fidelity in selected school districts.

12.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Participating schools and/or districts demonstrate a sustained commitment to the goals and objectives of the scaling-up initiative through consistent, thorough and accurate documentation and reporting of core program elements. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.2)	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
12.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in model districts that have implemented the respective scaling-up initiative with fidelity. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 4.1.)	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6 / 6	100		5 / 6	83
12.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of partner schools in partner districts in which the implementation of the respective scaling-up initiative has been replicated with fidelity. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 4.1.)	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		3 / 4	75
12.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools that sustain implementation of the respective scaling-up initiative with fidelity across academic years. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			2 / 2	100		2 / 2	100

2.2)

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

Performance Measure 12.a: Participating schools and/or districts demonstrate a sustained commitment to the goals and objectives of the scaling-up initiative through consistent, thorough and accurate documentation and reporting of core program elements. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.2)

PBS

Districts and schools participating in the PBS initiative must meet a series of evaluation and reporting requirements in order to be considered actively participating in the grant. The evaluation requirements (which are the same for the statewide PBS program) include submission of the following documents: Team Implementation Checklist (twice a year), Self-Assessment Survey (once a year), and the School-wide Evaluation Tool (once a year).

SPDG districts and schools are also required to maintain, throughout the school year, records of PBS activities and documents such as budget allocations and spending reports, district and model school team meeting records, district and model school PBS activity reports, district and model school action plans, and project implementation artifacts. All documentation is submitted on an annual basis as part of the grant continuation process. This year, all four districts provided complete applications, most well over a 100 pages, to SERC by the March 31, 2009 deadline.

EIP/RtI

An annual continuation application requirement was not included as a component of the EIP/RtI initiative; however, model districts are required to submit EIP student data, on an annual basis, as part of SERC's Early Intervention Project (EIP). The goal is for the model schools to utilize this information to make informed decisions about their current early intervention process, as they work to implement Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI). Data are collected via an Excel spreadsheet available at SERC's EIP Home Page (www.ctserc.org/eip) and include: student demographics, the primary reason for a teacher's request for an intervention, the level of intervention the student received, end-of-year status, and if applicable, the rationale for the student referral to a PPT, the PPT status, and the student's primary disability.

Each year, districts involved in the EIP/RtI initiative are also asked to participate in a series of networking meetings in order to facilitate collaboration, celebrate successes, and share lessons learned. The first meeting of the school year was held in December 2008 and was attended by both district-level team members and model-school personnel from all four participating districts. District leaders gave short presentations on topics unique to their individual districts and provided guidance in areas of particular expertise. Topics included: ensuring fidelity of reading instruction, using Excel for progress monitoring, using PBS to build a continuum of support, and replicating evidence-based practices across a district. Participants reported that they found the day to be both informative and enjoyable, and as a result, a second meeting has been scheduled for this May.

Literacy

Similar to PBS, the Literacy initiative required participating schools to complete an annual continuation application process in order to be considered for grant participation in the following year. Each school was asked to submit a written request that addressed: an accurate accounting of the progress made towards items on their action plan; a summary of the school's culture of coaching, and an analysis of the three-tiers spreadsheet, including lessons learned and questions generated.

Participating schools also were asked to submit a plan for the upcoming year focused on one of the following three goals: 1) to develop a system of assessments aligned with the school's curriculum, 2) to develop well-defined tiers of instruction, common assessments and interventions at two grade levels, or 3) to develop well-defined tiers of instruction, common assessments and interventions in one literacy content area. The first round of applications were due this past summer and four of the five participating schools applied for continuation funding. The fifth school did not respond to the request for applications, nor to follow-up telephone inquiries by SERC staff.

Throughout the 2008-2009 program year to date, all participating schools in the Literacy initiative have provided documentation of their continued commitment to implementing three-tier literacy instruction. Submitted information has included updated action plans, materials from internal training and working sessions, budget information, and agendas and minutes from grade-level and data-team meetings. Documentation indicated that all schools sustained collaborative and active literacy teams, provided coaches and additional resources to facilitate professional development, collected and analyzed assessment data to inform instruction, and held either formal or informal study groups.

Performance Measure 12.b: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in model districts that have implemented the respective scaling-up initiative with fidelity. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 4.1.)

Note: At this time, quantitative data on implementation fidelity are not yet available for the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives. As such, only qualitative information regarding the two initiatives is provided under Performance Measure 12.b. The current status of model and scaling-up school participation for each of the initiatives are as follows: 1) two PBS model districts, including a total of five PBS model schools and three PBS scaling-up schools (See Table 12.b.1); 2) four EIP/RtI model districts, including a total of six EIP/RtI model schools and 18 EIP/RtI scaling-up schools (See Tables 12.b.2 - 12.b.5); and 3) four Literacy model schools with no scaling-up schools participating at this time (See Table 12.b.6).

PBS

Schools in PBS model districts were included in Performance Measure 12.b if 1) the school was trained in PBS, and 2) was identified as a model or scaling-up school for the 2008-2009 school year. Applicable schools were then considered implementing PBS with fidelity if the school received a score on the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) of 80% for "Expectations Taught" and 80% for an overall average score. In 2008-09, five of six (83.3%) schools in the model districts were implementing with fidelity (See Table 12.b.7). No data were available for two additional schools as the SET evaluations had to be rescheduled for later this school year.

EIP/RtI

During the initial EIP/RtI application process, a "School Readiness Assessment/Verification Instrument" was used by SERC staff during an on-site visit to determine the district's readiness for "scaling-up" and sustaining the provision of early intervening services through a continuum of support district-wide. The instrument consisted of a 31 item checklist across four focus areas. While the instrument provided a systematic method to determine the overall effectiveness of a district's current processes, there was consensus that a more sensitive tool would be needed to measure implementation fidelity.

After several iterations, the EIP/RtI team is currently piloting a "SRBI Self-Assessment" instrument intended to assist schools in determining the current status of the fidelity of their RtI implementation. The instrument is designed to be completed in two steps. In the first step, the school based team and a SERC technical advisor independently evaluate the current status of a series of SRBI indicators by ranking each item as not in place, or as in the initial, partial, or completed stages of implementation. The indicators are organized into four sections: 1) effectiveness of core curriculums; 2) universal common assessment and progress monitoring; 3) collaborative strategic decision-making using data; and 4) leadership and climate for student improvement.

The second step is done collaboratively and involves coming to consensus on the implementation status and then working to rate (high, medium, or low) each indicator with regard to priority for improvement. Action steps are then developed based on these priority rankings. The EIP/RtI initiative leader reported that the self-assessment process has helped school personnel more fully understand how a consistent and comprehensive focus on implementation fidelity can enhance the potential efficacy of an RtI system.

Literacy

During the 2008-2009 program year, SERC project staff involved in the Literacy initiative and members of the evaluation team developed a review protocol, the Literacy Implementation Tool (LIT), in order to measure school-wide implementation of three-tier literacy instruction. The LIT was designed to rate a school's implementation of four aspects of three-tier literacy instruction: the assessment of students, the reading curriculum and intervention programs, response to intervention, and the systems in place or systems change. The instrument also includes open-ended questions on overall implementation, successful aspects of the school's approach to three-tier instruction, areas of greatest need for improvement, and the training or technical assistance needed to address those needs. The SERC school liaisons field-tested the tool in planning discussions with school principals and literacy coaches in the fall of 2008, and expect to use the tool to gauge implementation this May, and annually thereafter.

Performance Measure 12.c: The percentage of partner schools in partner districts in which the implementation of the respective scaling-up initiative has been replicated with fidelity. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 4.1.)

Note: Partner districts and schools were not involved in the EIP/RtI or the Literacy initiative during the current program year. However, partnerships are expected to begin in both initiatives during the 2009-2010 school year. In the PBS initiative, two districts, including four model schools, were awarded partnership grants in June 2008 (See Table 12.c.1).

PBS

Participating schools in PBS partner districts were included in Performance Measure 12.c if 1) the school was trained in PBS, and 2) was identified as a model or scaling-up school for the 2008-09 school year. Applicable schools were then considered implementing PBS with fidelity if the school received a score on the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) of 80% for "Expectations Taught" and 80% for an overall average score. In 2008-2009, 3 of 4 (75%) schools in partner districts were implementing with fidelity (See Table 12.c.2).

Performance Measure 12.d: The percentage of schools that sustain implementation of the respective scaling-up initiative with fidelity across academic years. (Aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.2)

Note: As discussed under Performance Measure 12.b, quantitative data on implementation fidelity are not yet available for the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives and as such, are not discussed under this measure. Subsequent collection of annual implementation data will be used to identify schools that sustain implementation with fidelity.

PBS

Participating schools in PBS model and partner districts were included in Performance Measure 12.d if 1) the school was implementing with fidelity in 2007-2008 and 2) was identified as a model or scaling-up school in 2007-2008 or 2008-2009. Applicable schools were then considered to be sustaining PBS with fidelity if the school received a score on the SET of 80% for "Expectations Taught" and 80% for an overall average score during the current and previous school year. Only two model schools were included in the measure but both schools (100%) had sustained PBS implementation with fidelity in 2008-2009, and one of the schools had sustained implementation with fidelity over the past two academic years (See Tables 12.b.7 and 12.c.2).



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 13: Selected LEAs will receive job-embedded and evidence- or scientifically based professional development.

13.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1.)	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			20 / 20	100		20 / 20	100

13.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices. (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.1.)	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			160 / 160	100		160 / 160	100

13.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
SERC technical assistance providers provide technical assistance (through the request of the district coordinator, district and/or school teams, coaches, and/or a needs assessment), to participating schools or districts in order to achieve and maintain the goals of the SPDG program.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

13.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Participating schools and/or districts designate adequate resources (space, time, substitute coverage, etc.) for school- and/or district-sponsored professional development and training	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

activities, including coaching as needed.												
13.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data										
The model school/district team and coach(es) provide the guidance and support necessary to effectively facilitate the implementation of the scaling-up initiative in the partner schools/districts.	PROJ	Target										
		Actual Performance Data										
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th>%</th> <th>Raw Number</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>/</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%		/		
Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%							
	/			/								

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

Performance Measure 13.a: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1.)

Note: For the purposes of Performance Measure 13.a and 13.b, professional development has been restricted to include training sessions that have occurred as part of the statewide PBS and SRBI Training Series. While the sessions are held statewide, involvement by SPDG districts and schools is expected either prior to or during participation in the SPDG grant.

While numerous other school-based, job-embedded professional development and training activities have occurred in all three initiatives, these activities have been customized and incorporated to fit particular school and district needs. Given the size of the Scaling-Up project (now at 8 districts, 20 model schools and 21 scaling-up schools), and the difficulty in aggregating attendance across such varied sessions, qualitative information regarding these activities are provided throughout this report, more specifically under Performance Measures 13.c and 13.d.

PBS

The CT statewide PBS professional development training series is conducted each year by SERC in collaboration with the University of Connecticut and the National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS). The 12 day training series consists of six full-days of team training in year one, followed by three full-days of team training in years two and three. Additional training for school and district coaches is also held across the three years. All PBS training sessions are considered to be based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices. For supporting documentation of the research base for PBS and the SERC PBS training series, visit the SERC website at <http://ctserc.org/s/>.

EIP/RtI

As previously discussed under Performance Measure 11.c, a series of RtI (SRBI) professional development opportunities were offered to districts from across the state in the spring of 2008 and two of three scheduled forums have occurred thus far in 2009. Speakers have included well-respected RtI experts, members of the statewide RtI Advisory Panel, and district and school representatives from SPDG EIP/RtI model schools. The forums have provided guidance to school district personnel regarding the practical application and implementation considerations of SRBI and have sparked conversations in districts throughout the state of the potential of SRBI to improve student outcomes. For supporting documentation of the research base for RtI and the RtI (SRBI) training series, see "Connecticut's Framework for RtI: Using Scientific Research Based Interventions" (found on the CSDE website at <http://www.sde.ct.gov>).

Performance Measure 13b: The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices. (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.1.)

PBS

In 2008-2009, school and district personnel from all four PBS districts attended the 12-session statewide PBS training series. Year-one team training included district and school personnel from one model and one partner district, year-two team training included personnel from all four districts, and year-three team training included staff from the two model districts. Total participation (including duplicative counts) was 273; the non-duplicative total was estimated at approximately 90 participants (See Table 13.b.1).

EIP/RtI

Teams of school and district personnel from all four EIP/RtI model districts attended the six-session RtI series in 2008, as well as the two sessions held in 2009. Total participation (including duplicative counts) was 149 (74 in 2008 and 75 in 2009); the non-duplicative total was estimated at approximately 72 (37 and 35 participants, respectively) (See Tables 13.b.2 and 13.b.3).

Performance Measure 13.c: SERC technical assistance providers provide technical assistance (through the request of the district coordinator, district and/or school teams, coaches, and/or a needs assessment), to participating schools or districts in order to achieve and maintain the goals of the SPDG program.

PBS

The number of SERC technical assistance sessions to be provided to the model schools was not pre-determined at the outset of the 2008-2009 school year. Model schools were informed that SERC assistance was available as needed, but the focus was to build capacity within the district and schools. Extensive technical assistance by SERC to the partner schools was intentionally not provided, as this is the role of the model district (see Performance Measure 13.e). A SERC technical assistance provider was present during the initial meetings (fall 2008) of model and partner districts. She assisted the districts in identifying future partnership activities, with a specific focus on the intended outcomes of these activities.

Technical assistance visits were provided to model and partner schools this spring, as part of the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) process. SETs were conducted at three of the five model schools (the remaining two are scheduled for the end of this school year); three scaling-up schools in the model districts; and at all four model schools in the partner districts. Following each of the SET visits, a SERC technical assistance provider discussed the results, including areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with the building administration. Formal written reports were also provided to the schools, approximately one week after the SET visit.

EIP/RtI

Three of the four EIP/RtI districts were allocated 10 technical assistance visits for the 2008-2009 school year; the fourth district was allocated 20 visits. SERC records indicated that district- and school-specific plans for technical assistance were developed during initial visits, most during the fall of 2008. In most cases, these visits included a review of progress, observation of EIP or data team meetings, and a discussion of strengths, areas of need, and priorities. In two districts, initial visits also included distribution or completion of RtI/SRBI self-assessments. Subsequent visits included presentations or training for school or district staff, facilitated reviews of school processes or organization, and support for specific technical aspects of EIP/RtI.

SERC personnel presented overviews of EIP/RtI and grant expectations, RtI/SRBI, common formative assessments, and data team processes, and modeled team processes for schools in two districts. They conducted Reflective Team Practice (RTP) reviews with teams in four schools new to the initiative also assisting with development of initial action plans. The technical assistance visits also included "mapping" exercises to determine school-based teams currently in place to provide student support services. Additional activities included assistance with ongoing efforts to develop a comprehensive early intervention process to unify behavior and academic support; and assistance in developing a school-level method for tracking assessment data. A self-assessment tool to support schools' work in Responsive Classroom, an approach to elementary education that emphasizes social, emotional, and academic growth, was also shared with team members.

Literacy

During the 2008-2009 school year, each of the four continuing schools were to receive up to six technical assistance visits during the program year. In the fall, SERC staff met with the principal and literacy coach at each school to plan and identify priority areas for the year's visits. A draft implementation protocol (the LIT, described under Performance Measure 12.a) was used to review schools' progress and identify areas of need related to three-tier literacy instruction.

A total of nine technical assistance visits have been conducted to date, with SERC staff modeling, observing, and coaching school teams in implementation of evidence-based practices. Specific visit activities reported in technical assistance logs included modeling of data-team processes and using data-driven decision making, reviewing current assessments and their use in response to intervention, assisting school personnel with the connections between assessments and instructional strategies, discussing tools for comprehension instruction and methods for selecting intervention strategies, and presenting a review of the processes for designing common formative assessments.

The SERC Literacy initiative leader reported that the technical assistance visits have highlighted a need for additional training in data analysis. The professional development program for 2009-2010 will focus on this need, as well as include training on the critical aspects of three-tier instruction that the schools are still struggling to implement effectively.

Performance Measure 13.d: Participating schools and/or districts designate adequate resources (space, time, substitute coverage, etc.) for school- and/or district-sponsored professional development and training activities, including coaching as needed.

PBS

Administrators at both the district and school level have been asked to provide release time and substitute coverage, as needed, for staff to participate in district- and school-based teams. Documentation from both the model and partner district continuation applications provide substantial evidence of team activities, including the use of SWIS data to guide their own work, as well sharing student referral data with staff at school-wide meetings. Team meeting agendas and minutes were submitted, with the majority of school and district based teams meeting on a monthly basis,

In addition to the team meetings, several of the districts also provided professional development related to PBS or allowed staff members to attend PBS workshops outside of the district. The PBS team from one of the model districts attended a workshop in February, per SERC's request, to share PBS implementation examples and lessons learned with other districts just beginning implementation. According to the evaluation forms, the presentation by the model district was very well-received.

Other examples of district support across the model and partner districts included, training of bus drivers to use PBS strategies, use of district funds to pay teachers during the summer to develop activity guides related to positive behavior, use of grade level meeting time to develop PBS related action plans and common planning time for PBS coaches. The districts and schools also sent staff members to outside training, such as training in de-escalation strategies; as well as providing additional time for the turn keying of this information to other staff. All of the districts also provided time for PBS team staff to participate in the partnership activities described in Performance Measure 13.e.

EIP/RtI

Documentation provided by the districts and school participating in the EIP/RtI initiative identified a number of ways in which they provided resources to support professional development and training, as did SERC technical assistance logs. Three districts hosted professional development delivered by SERC staff members. These programs included three days of training on core skills, involving staff from between seven and 12 of the district's 15 schools; training on SRBI at two schools for a total of 60 participants; and a behavior case study prepared by one elementary school team and shared with other elementary schools.

Informational sessions (open houses) were also hosted at two model schools, with presentations on their EIP/RtI programs, classroom visits, observations of team processes, discussion sessions, and information on related topics provided. One school is scheduled to host a similar event on May 20, 2009.

One district that has been especially focused on their scaling-up plan is currently working with representatives from the RtI/SRBI committee to define a district-level view of student assistance teams and how they work in conjunction with data teams, SRBI, and RtI. The director of curriculum convened a committee to determine what reading approaches and protocols will be used for intervention in tiers 2 and 3 and a district-level training team was established to begin building internal capacity for providing professional development. Eventually this team will become trainers in the district. In addition, during the past year, this team has worked with SERC consultants to deliver core team training for four elementary schools, one middle school, and one house at the high school. In year three, it is expected to deliver core training for the remaining four elementary schools, while SERC consultants provide intensive training at the remaining two middle schools and the remaining four houses at the high school.

Literacy

The Literacy initiative award letter sent to continuing schools in fall 2008 enumerated the schools' obligations related to professional development. Responsibilities included maintaining a team of teachers that meets regularly and coordinates training sessions at the school, establishing a culture of coaching, with coaching activities that include both classroom visits and literacy team meetings, conducting study groups on professional books and articles and hosting at least two professional development sessions to present initiative content to all staff members. Qualitative information regarding the school's commitment to these responsibilities was gathered from schools' continuation applications, SERC documentation, an interview with the SERC Literacy initiative leader, and visits to two continuing schools in spring 2009.

Literacy teams (including coaches) were found to be active in all four schools with team members collaborating on school-wide planning and development initiatives and coordinating professional development activities that included study groups,

professional learning communities, and peer observations. Coaches provided modeling and support to classroom teachers, participated in literacy team meetings, and in some schools delivered professional development through staff and grade-level team meetings.

In each of the four schools, one or more professional development sessions were provided for all staff members. Examples included a workshop led by the EASTCONN Regional Education Service Center on designing and implementing CFAs and a session conducted by SERC introducing Connecticut's Framework for RtI and how the RtI model is implemented. In addition, literacy team members reported sharing information from professional development programs with colleagues through grade-level team meetings, peer modeling and coaching, and creation of professional development programs that were offered after school.

Performance Measure 13.e: The model school/district team and coach(es) provide the guidance and support necessary to effectively facilitate the implementation of the scaling-up initiative in the partner schools/districts.

PBS

During the current reporting period, the model-partner relationship was a focus for the PBS initiative. Beginning in the fall, both model districts met with their partner district to formally introduce themselves and begin outlining the goals of the partnership through the completion of a partnership map. The partnership map was developed by SERC to provide the districts with a realistic planning tool for outlining Year 1 partnership activities and the expected outcomes of the activities. The SERC TA provider attended these initial meetings to guide the districts through the process.

After the initial meeting in November, the following activities occurred between the Colchester and Hebron teams: teams met to finalize the partnership map, staff from the partner schools attended PBS meetings at the model schools (two meetings), the partner school principals attended a Colchester District PBS meeting and toured one of the model schools; and Colchester staff attended a staff meeting in the partner school to answer teachers questions regarding PBS. The partnership between the Windham and Region 1 teams has also included visits to the model schools by the partner district. The leadership and coaches from the partner district have visited Windham schools twice so far this year. Geographic distance (approximately 90 minutes) between Windham and Region 1 has been a challenge for the partnership, but has not prevented the development of a beneficial relationship. The districts reported that they have found creative ways to communicate with each other, including meeting at the SERC statewide professional development sessions and using email and fax to facilitate the sharing of information.

According to their continuation applications, both of the partner districts have found the opportunity to learn from a model PBS district very beneficial. The partners noted that the model districts have shared lessons learned as well as tools and strategies they have found to be successful. They added that working alongside a model has been "reassuring", has provided them with validation and confidence to implement PBS, has helped them to anticipate needs and concerns, and has provided them with tools to sustain the momentum of the initiative.

EIP/RtI

Partner district were not involved in the EIP/RtI initiative during the current program year. However, partnerships are expected to begin during the 2009-2010 school year and the initiative leader reported that preliminary discussions around the partnership concept has begun. Model districts are currently working on providing a written summary of what the district's focus will be in the new school year; as well as what they hope to accomplish in their work with a partner district. The SERC EIP/RtI team has discussed two options in choosing partner districts: 1) creating a model-partner match focused on the strength of the model districts, or 2) creating a model-partner match focused on a gap or need that the two districts share.

Literacy

Similarly, Literacy partner schools have also not been selected at this time, but are expected to be selected during the 2009-2010 school year. As with EIP/RtI, the Literacy initiative leader also reported two options under consideration for the selection process: 1) linking schools in the current cohort to schools just beginning implementation of three-tier instruction, for which they would model and act as mentors, or 2) linking them to partner schools that are more advanced in implementation of certain aspects of three-tier instruction, such as data teams, providing opportunities to visit and observe.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 14: Skills of general and special education teachers, staff, administrators, and parents will increase.

14.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
School/district personnel report increased knowledge and skill, as evidenced by written comments provided on professional development evaluations and verbal comments provided in evaluator focus groups and/or interviews.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

14.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
SPDG schools and districts regularly work to implement policies and procedures that ensure families have access to information, support, and services that will improve their ability to guide their children toward academic and/or behavioral success.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

Performance Measure 14.a: School/district personnel report increased knowledge and skill, as evidenced by written comments provided on professional development evaluations and verbal comments provided in evaluator focus groups and/or interviews.

PBS

At each of the statewide PBS training workshops, an evaluation form consisting of four open-ended questions was distributed to participants to collect their feedback on the session. According to the completed evaluations, participants, overall, felt that the sessions provided them with increased knowledge of PBS. A few specific examples included increased knowledge of classroom behavior management strategies and strategies for preventing the escalation of behaviors, as well as an increased understanding of functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans. Workshop participants found it especially beneficial to share ideas and practices with other districts implementing PBS and to collaborate with their school-based team. Some participants noted areas in which they would like additional information, including strategies for PBS implementation at the high school level and ways to increase staff or administrator buy-in.

During May and June, the evaluation team is scheduled to attend PBS team meetings in each of the model and partner districts. Focus groups will also be conducted with each team and it is anticipated that additional information related to this performance measure will be collected at that time.

EIP/RtI

In early spring 2009, the evaluation team visited all four of the EIP/RtI model district sites. The visits typically consisted of a focus group with the district-level RtI team, a teacher focus group at the model school(s), and interview(s) with building administrators. The purpose of the focus groups and interviews was to gather information related to the EIP/RtI process, and generate discussion on how the SPDG grant had contributed to changes or enhancements during the past year.

District-level teams reported that SERC had provided them with technical assistance based on their identified needs such as training on common formative assessments and the data team process, assistance with the development of a continuum of behavior supports, and the creation of universal district-wide EIP paperwork. Participants across the four sites mentioned similar challenges including a shortage of staff and instructional time for interventions, a lack of time for interventionists and classroom teachers to collaborate, and a need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. However, focus group and interview participants frequently noted that SERC's outside perspective helped them to address these challenges, as well as critically examine their everyday practices.

Literacy

During the current reporting period, evaluation site visits were conducted at two of the four Literacy schools and included interviews with principals and literacy coaches, and focus groups with participating teachers. Literacy team members in both schools reported that the initiative has helped teachers develop a stronger foundation in literacy instruction and has improved their ability to identify students' problems and potential solutions. Team members also reported an increase in the use of appropriate intervention strategies for individual students, improved data-team processes and data-driven decision making, and a greater understanding of common formative assessments and diagnostic use of assessment results. One principal noted that SERC's technical assistance visits have helped teachers integrate instruction in multiple reading components, such as combining instruction in comprehension strategies with instruction in fluency or oral language.

The SERC Literacy initiative leader noted that the SERC consultants had observed a number of improvements during their technical assistance activities, including an overall increase in teachers' and team members' awareness of vital factors affecting evidence-based instructional methods. She also mentioned that it was evident that the modeling of data team processes had led to a deeper understanding among teachers of the importance of identifying specific instructional strategies to address challenges identified through assessment data. An increased understanding of the need to establish a common approach to assessing comprehension, as well as set benchmarks across grades, were also noted as areas of improvement.

Performance Measure 14.b: SPDG schools and districts regularly work to implement policies and procedures that ensure families have access to information, support, and services that will improve their ability to guide their children toward academic and/or behavioral success.

PBS

The characteristics of a PBS model school, as defined in the SPDG Implementation Guides, must include a concentrated effort to integrate families into the school's PBS program. Although SPDG districts and schools are not required to specifically report on parent involvement, documentation submitted as part of the continuation application process provided evidence of policies and procedures geared toward family involvement in all four participating districts. Examples included parent and student participation on the PBS team, "Catch a Student Doing Good" note cards sent home for good performance or behavior, student of-the-month awards, parent newsletters, and school open houses. Community PBS sponsored activities included staff versus student basketball games, field days, open gym nights, and talent shows, as well as town forums on community partnerships and "community activism" courses offered through the school.

EIP/RtI

Since its inception, SERC's Early Intervention Project (EIP) has been focused on creating collaborative partnerships among families and schools in order to help all students learn and experience success. As discussed in the publication, "A Family Guide to SRBI" (available online at <http://ctpirc.org/docs/family-rti.pdf>), implementation of RtI (SRBI) requires the same proactive, comprehensive approach to family involvement. At this year's evaluation site visits, focus group participants noted a need to look beyond traditional definitions of family involvement to practices that accommodate the specific needs and cultures of their students. One district with a large Spanish speaking population discussed their efforts to facilitate parent communication by inviting staff from the bilingual department to join the EIP/RtI team. Additional strategies reported by focus group participants included developing a parent liaison program, the use of the IRIS online training modules, introducing a parent newsletter, and holding open houses throughout the school year.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 3: Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Practices

CT SPDG Project Objective 15: Results for students with disabilities in selected districts will improve.

15.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts that are using the School-wide Information System (SWIS) to monitor student behavior data.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			12 / 12	100		11 / 12	92
15.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the percentage of students with 0-1, 2-5, and 6+ referrals is within the suggested ?triangle? distribution.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3 / 4	75		2 / 4	50
15.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of referrals per year per 100 students has declined across academic years. (The target was 75%, the denominator of 100 is arbitrary.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			75 / 100	75		2 / 2	100
15.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of in-school suspensions per year has declined across academic years.(The target was 75%, the denominator of 100 is arbitrary.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			75 / 100	75		1 / 2	50
15.e. Performance Measure	Measure	Quantitative Data					

	Type						
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of out-of-school suspensions per year has declined across academic years. (The target was 75%, the denominator of 100 is arbitrary.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			75 / 100	75		2 / 2	100
15.f. Performance Measure							
	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG EIP/RtI districts that are using the Early Intervention Project data system to monitor inappropriate referrals to special education.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
15.g. Performance Measure							
	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of model schools in SPDG EIP/RtI districts for which the rate of inappropriate referrals to special education has decreased across academic years.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			5 / 5	100		4 / 5	80
15.h. Performance Measure							
	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG Literacy model schools in which data indicates improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

Note: At the time of this report, student outcome data is considered to be a preliminary snapshot of findings. SWIS data have not been disaggregated by IEP or ethnicity status and EIP data have also not been disaggregated by ethnicity (See Performance Measures 15.a and 15.f for more information). A more comprehensive analysis of SWIS and EIP data is expected during the summer of 2009 (as complete data from the 2008-2009 school year becomes available). A student outcomes report will be delivered to SERC and CSDE at that time.

Performance Measure 15.a: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts that are using the School-wide Information System (SWIS) to monitor student behavior data.

Schools in model and partner PBS districts were included in Performance Measure 15.a if the school had been identified to participate as a model or scaling-up school during the 2008-2009 school year. A total of 12 schools met this criteria, and 11 of the 12 (91.7%) schools are using the School-wide Information System (SWIS) to monitor student behavior data during the 2008-2009 school year (See Table 15.a.1).

During the current reporting period, it came to the attention of the PBS initiative leader that many of the schools participating in the SPDG program (from both partner and model districts) were not using all the required features of the SWIS. The majority of schools were not reporting ethnicity or special education data for their students, and were also not entering data on administrative decisions involving in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions.

In February, the PBS initiative leader sent a letter reminding all PBS district coordinators that accurate and complete reporting of office discipline referrals, and suspension and expulsion data was a requirement of their district's participation in the SPDG grant. The SERC PBS team has begun monitoring the SWIS data on a bi-weekly basis and it is expected that the 2008-2009 SWIS data will provide for a more reliable and comprehensive analysis of student outcomes. However, due to the partial reporting of the SWIS data mentioned, the findings presented here could not be disaggregated by special education or ethnicity status.

Performance Measure 15.b: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the percentage of students with 0-1, 2-5, and 6+ referrals is within the suggested "triangle" distribution.

SWIS referral data for students in 2007-2008 were available in four of five model schools in the PBS model districts. (One school is in the process of entering back data for the past two school years.) Referral data for these schools were compared to the "triangle" which includes the following guidelines: at least 80-90% of students receive one or no referrals; 10-15% of students receive between two and five referrals, and no more than 1-5% of students receive six or more referrals

In 2007-2008, two of the four (50%) model schools met this criteria (See Table 15.b.1). In the two elementary model schools, approximately 90% of the student population received one or no referrals; whereas, in the middle and high school, only two-thirds of the student population received one or no referrals. (Note: Fidelity of implementation information (SET scores) for the four model schools are available in Table 12.b.7.)

Year-to-year referral data were available for the two elementary model schools and has also been included in Table 15.b.1. Both school's "triangle" data has remained fairly consistent from year-to-year.

Performance Measure 15.c: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of referrals per year per 100 students has declined across academic years.

Year-to-year data on referrals per 100 students were available for two elementary model schools. Both schools experienced a decline in the number of referrals per year per 100 students from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 (See Table 15.c.1).

Performance Measure 15.d: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of in-school suspensions per year has declined across academic years.

Year-to-year data on in-school suspensions were available for the same two elementary schools referred to in Performance Measure 15.c. One of the two (50%) schools experienced a decline in the number of in-school suspensions across three consecutive academic years (2005-2006 to 2007-2008); as well as a decline in the number of students contributing to the in-school suspension total. The second school experienced a slight increase in the number of in-school suspensions across academic years (2006-2007 to 2007-2008); as well as an increase in the number of students contributing to the total (See Table 15.d.1).

Performance Measure 15.e: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG PBS districts for which the number of out-of-school suspensions per year has declined across academic years.

Both of the elementary schools referred to in the previous two measures, experienced a decline in the number of out-of-school suspensions from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008. A similar reduction occurred in the number of students contributing to the out-of-school suspension total (See Table 15.d.1).

Performance Measure 15.f: The percentage of model and/or scaling-up schools in SPDG EIP/RtI districts that are using the Early Intervention Project data system to monitor inappropriate referrals to special education.

Schools in model EIP/RtI districts were included in Performance Measure 15.b if the school had been identified to participate as a model or scaling-up school during the 2008-2009 school year. A total of 24 schools met this criteria, and six of the 24 (25%) schools are using the Early Intervention Project (EIP) data system to monitor inappropriate referrals to special education during the current school year. The six schools represent the six EIP/RtI model schools. A target has not been established for this measure.

Given the small number of schools (and students) from SPDG schools currently using the EIP data system, disaggregating student outcomes by variables of interest (such as ethnicity) has not been done at this time. Such analyses, when based on small numbers, can be potentially unreliable and misleading and consequently, these analyses were postponed until the stability of the estimates could be further explored.

Performance Measure 15.g: The percentage of model schools in SPDG EIP/RtI districts for which the rate of inappropriate

referrals to special education has decreased across academic years.

In 2007-2008, the most recent year for which EIP data is available, 5,880 students in 124 schools from 34 CT school districts received EIP services. In the six model SPDG schools, there were a total of 261 students receiving EIP services.

The profiles of EIP participants in SPDG schools were similar to the statewide EIP population. Approximately 95% of EIP students from the SPDG schools were in Kindergarten through grade 5; close to two-thirds (61%) of students were male; and over one-half (57%) of students were new members of the EIP process this year. There was a greater percentage of Hispanic students from SPDG EIP/RtI schools (35% compared to 27% statewide); and a greater percentage of EIP students who speak Spanish at home (22% from SPDG schools versus 14% statewide). However, it should be noted that the largest district participating in the SPDG EIP/RtI initiative has an overall Hispanic student population of close to 50%.

In 2007-2008, approximately 19% of EIP students in SPDG model schools were referred to PPTs for special education evaluation, slightly higher than the 14.8% referred in 2006-2007 (See Tables 15.g.1 and 15.g.2) and in both years, close to 90% of the referrals occurred as a result of an EIP team determination (See Tables 15.g.3 and 15.g.4).

Of those referred, over two-thirds (68.6%) of students were determined eligible for special education and related services, and increase of approximately 10 percentage points from 2006-2007. Four of five (80%) SPDG EIP/RtI model schools increased the percent of students determined eligible for special education and related services between 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 (See Tables 15.g.5 and 15.g.6). (One model school did not refer any students to the PPT.)

Performance Measure 15.h: The percentage of SPDG Literacy model schools in which data indicates improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities.

Assessment data for students with disabilities in Literacy initiative schools was not available during the 2008-2009 school year. The SERC Literacy leader noted that participating schools were focusing on formative data during 2008-2009, and that no single formative measure was used in all four schools. The SERC Literacy initiative leader reported that formative data collected for data team sessions in one school had shown progress among all students, but had not been analyzed for change specifically among students with disabilities.

Beginning in grade three, the reading skills of all Connecticut students are assessed each year using the Connecticut Mastery Tests (CMTs). However, given the small number of students with disabilities in Literacy initiative schools, these data are not made publicly available.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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.
Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools

CT SPDG Project Objective 16: Participating districts will develop or enhance an action plan which details specific strategies and/or activities for enhancing collaboration.

16.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts who orally agree to participate in the project.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2	/		2	/	
16.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts to sign a contract with CPAC to formalize the district-CPAC partnership.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2	/		2	/	
16.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts to hold at least one needs assessment forum in order to collect feedback from parents and staff regarding family-school partnerships.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2	/			/	
16.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts with a written action plan outlining measurable objectives and strategies to build family-school partnerships.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		3	/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 16.a: The number of districts who orally agree to participate in the project.

During the current reporting period, two districts (Killingly and Waterbury) who had previously given an oral commitment to take part in the project, withdrew their participation in the grant. There was consensus among all parties (CPAC and district contacts) that neither district had the time, resources, or political will to fully participate and engage in grant activities. However, CPAC was able to recruit two new districts (Waterford and Vernon), thus bringing participation back to four districts (Waterford, Vernon, Montville and Norwich). The CPAC project director reported that narrowing the focus

to a limited number of districts (from a target of ten to a revised target of six) has allowed CPAC to provide the intensive support needed to facilitate systemic change in the difficult area of parent involvement. Currently, there are two CPAC representatives providing direct support to the districts. The CPAC project director and her staff plan to meet this spring to discuss the possibility of selecting two new districts to participate in the project during the 2009-2010 school year.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 16.b: The number of districts to sign a contract with CPAC to formalize the district-CPAC partnership.

A contract has been in place in each of the Cohort 2 districts (Montville and Norwich) since last school year and contracts were finalized in both of the Cohort 3 districts during the current school year (Waterford in August 2008 and Vernon in November 2008). All contracts were signed by the district superintendent and special education director, as well as by a CPAC and CSDE representative.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 16.c: The number of districts to hold at least one needs assessment forum in order to collect feedback from parents and staff regarding family-school partnerships.

A needs assessment forum has not been conducted in either of the Cohort 3 districts. Both districts felt it would be more effective to conduct a needs assessment or a parent survey at a later date and begin implementation of activities previously identified as district priorities. Both districts have begun to implement many of the strategies the Cohort 2 districts found to be successful. Both of the Cohort 3 districts have discussed conducting a parent survey during the 2009-2010 school year in place of the needs assessment forum.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 16.d: The number of districts with a written action plan outlining measurable objectives and strategies to build family-school partnerships.

As part of the project, participating districts are encouraged to develop an action plan that identifies need statements and the associated activities and strategies to meet those needs. The CPAC representative and the Waterford FAST (Family and Staff Together) team have developed a simplified version of the action plan. In Vernon, the CPAC representative and the FAST team have identified areas of need and strategies to meet those needs but a formal action plan still needs to be developed. In both of the Cohort 2 districts, the 2007-2008 action plans were updated at the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year to reflect the current needs and goals of the district FAST teams. The action plans have served as a practical and realistic planning tool for the FAST teams.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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

17. **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools

CT SPDG Project Objective 17: Pre-service and practicing school personnel will be prepared to collaborate with families.

17.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts with active FAST (Family and Staff Together) teams whose membership includes the active participation of school personnel.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		4	/	
17.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of universities contacted by CPAC in which they conducted presentations during student teaching seminars.(The target was 25%, the denominator of 100 is arbitrary.)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			25 / 100	25		/	
17.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts in which CPAC has held at least one SPDG professional development activity for staff members during the past year.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		4	/	
17.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their SPP (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100
17.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

program that are based on scientifically- based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1).						
		4 / 4	100		6 / 6	100

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.a: The number of districts with active FAST (Family and Staff Together) teams whose membership includes the active participation of school personnel.

The contract developed for the project requires participating districts to develop a FAST team who is responsible for facilitating the implementation of the action plan. FAST teams are present in all four of the participating districts. In the Waterford and Vernon districts (Cohort 3) a total of five FAST team meetings have occurred this year. In the Montville and Norwich districts (Cohort 2), a total of two and four meetings occurred, respectively. The number of staff members to attend the meetings varied slightly across the districts from an average of five staff members in Waterford to an average of eight in Norwich. All district teams have representatives from general education and special education, as well as representatives from building and district administration.

The evaluation team, in collaboration with CPAC, is currently conducting an online FAST team survey to gather the perceptions of the FAST team members. Almost three-quarters of the FAST team members (28 out of 38) have already responded to the survey. Survey respondents, as well as CPAC leaders, have reported that the FAST team approach has been successful and is building the district's capacity to improve family-school relationships. Reported challenges of the FAST team approach included securing the participation of staff and parents on the team, when they already have multiple responsibilities; and finding a meeting time that accommodates the schedules of both parents and staff.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.b: The percentage of universities contacted by CPAC in which they conducted presentations during student teaching seminars.

One of the goals of the project is to help better prepare pre-service teachers to communicate and work with families who have children with disabilities. Originally, CPAC intended to meet this goal by collaborating with other organizations in the state to develop a training video that would be available to all CT teacher preparation programs. CPAC began collaborating with the CT Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Family Work Group in January 2007. However, due to Work Group delays in video development, CPAC refocused their efforts to include direct involvement with higher education institutions and thus the performance measure has been revised accordingly.

In July, CPAC hired an individual to begin outreach to local universities. The CPAC representative has met with the Coordinator of Student Teaching at the University of Hartford, and the Chairperson for the Department of Special Education and Reading at Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU). CPAC is tentatively scheduled to present at a SCSU class in June for paraprofessionals preparing to be teachers (also part of the SPDG grant) on the topic of advocating for students and understanding parents' needs. The Coordinator of Student Teaching at the University of Hartford has asked CPAC to contact him again in early- to mid- summer to further discuss CPAC's possible participation in a student teaching seminar in the fall. CPAC plans to continue its outreach to other local universities during the summer.

The CPAC project director has also attended a series of meetings regarding the state's efforts to revise the teacher certification regulations currently in place. In the past and during these meetings, the project director has continually stressed the importance of training teachers to support and work with diverse families. Despite her efforts, a specific parent involvement competency was not included in the revised certification regulations. However, the project director's presence at these meetings continues to raise awareness regarding the importance of family-school collaborations and the role of the university in this preparation.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.c: The number of districts in which CPAC has held at least one SPDG professional development activity for staff members during the past year.

All four FAST teams have held a professional development activity for staff members during the 2008-2009 school year. These professional development activities have included, 1) a CPAC-led workshop in Montville (3/12, n=12) for building administrators that focused on increasing collaboration and deescalating conflict, specifically related to the PPT process; 2) a training during a Waterford staff meeting (3/26, n=12) that focused on parent participation in the PPT, led by the school psychologist and a teacher, who is also a parent of a special needs child; 3) a training for Vernon parents and staff (3/18, n=8 professionals and n=12 parents) that focused on developing measurable goals and objectives for the IEP; and 4) two

CPAC-led workshops in Norwich (April 2009) that focused on managing difficult behaviors and the effects of sensory integration dysfunction on behavior. (Note: The attendance data for the Norwich sessions will be submitted to the evaluator during the project's May submission of data. The sessions were open to both parents and staff.)

Evaluations completed after the professional development activities indicated that participants were very satisfied with the trainings. All Montville administrators agreed that the tools discussed could help them reduce the conflict that is sometimes present during PPT meetings; and the majority of the Vernon and Waterford staff agreed that the discussions were useful and the time was well-spent. The Waterford staff specifically mentioned the benefit of hearing from someone who sits "on both sides of the PPT table."

In addition to formal professional development, the CPAC representatives have also provided district staff ongoing and extensive informal support. Examples have included, 1) attending all FAST team meetings, 2) attending the 21st Century National Conference at Yale University (7/14-15) with other FAST team members; 3) meeting with four Norwich principals (9/22) to brainstorm additional avenues for parent involvement, including a "Welcoming Atmosphere Walk-Through" tool kit; 4) assisting with PPT or family-staff meetings; 5) meeting with school psychologists and social workers regarding supporting families; and 6) providing one-to-one consultations with staff via phone and email.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.d: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their SPP (OSEP Program Performance Measure 1.2).

Note: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 17.d have been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Performance Measure 1.2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure.

SPP indicators and the respective improvement strategies that are currently aligned with the CPAC project include:

Indicator 8: Strategies: 1) Develop and provide training to LEAs and families regarding tools for writing measurable postsecondary goals and objectives. Alignment: See Performance Measure 17.c regarding training in Vernon and Performance Measure 18.b regarding training in Waterford. 2) Pilot use of a post-PPT meeting comment postcard. Alignment: See Performance Measure 19.a. regarding PPT postcards. 3) In connection with SPDG, partner with selected LEAs to develop and implement individualized local plans to enhance collaboration between families and schools. Alignment: See Performance Measure 16.d regarding action plans in the participating districts.

Indicator 9: Strategy: Coordinate activities with early intervention initiatives, including Response to Intervention (RtI) to ensure appropriate identification of students with disabilities. Alignment: The project director continues to serve on the RtI statewide planning team and has provided input during the development and roll-out of the statewide SRBI/RtI document. The CPAC project director has also presented at the ConnCase annual leadership conference (October 2008) on the topic of involving families in SRBI; and participated on a panel discussion, hosted by the National Center on Response to Intervention, to share how CPAC, in collaboration with the state, is promoting RtI practices. Additionally, CPAC has distributed a newsletter to over 19,000 parents and professionals with information about RtI/SRBI.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.e: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientifically- based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure 2.1).

CPAC has a long history of preparing parents to be active partners in the education decisions that affect their children. Over the years, CPAC has relied on a growing body of research and evidence-based practices to further strengthen the family-school connection. All six of the formal workshops conducted by CPAC have been based on scientifically- based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. Documents from various organizations have informed these presentations, including resources from the National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools (SEDL); the Consortium For Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE); the PACER Center; the National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY); and the Harvard Family Research Project. CPAC has also utilized the book, "Beyond the Bake Sale: The Essential Guide to Family-School Partnerships" (by Henderson, Mapp, Johnson and Davies) to inform the FAST team activities.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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

18. **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
 Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools

CT SPDG Project Objective 18: Parents of students with disabilities, ages 3-21, will participate as full partners in the planning and implementation of their child's program.

18.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts that have identified parent leaders to regularly participate in activities to enhance family-school relationships.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		4	/	
18.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of districts to develop and/or implement annually two items outlined in the action plan that address parent training and/or increased written or verbal communication to parents.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		3	/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 18.a: The number of districts that have identified parent leaders to regularly participate in activities to enhance family-school relationships.

All participating districts are expected to provide opportunities for parents to be involved in the initiative, including actively recruiting and securing the participation of parents on the FAST team. Currently, across the participating districts, Waterford has the most parent participation on the FAST team, with three parents attending the meetings on a consistent basis (two attended all 5 meetings and one attended 4 of the 5). The FAST teams in Norwich and Vernon each have one active parent on their team (the Vernon parent attended 3 of 5 meetings and the Norwich parent attended all 4 meetings), and an additional parent was just recently recruited to the Norwich team (she has attended the last two meetings). In Montville, two parents have each attended one of the two FAST team meetings held this year.

The FAST teams continue to discuss ways to increase parent participation on the team. Strategies implemented have included, securing the commitment of staff members who are also parents of children with special needs; requesting each FAST team member to bring a parent to the meeting; having the CPAC representative and the Director of Pupil Services attend the PTO president's meeting (3/16 in Norwich) to encourage PTO members to join the team; and having the parent FAST team members attend parent workshops to encourage other parents to join the team. In addition to these efforts, CPAC staff also provides ongoing telephone assistance to parents across the four participating districts on topics such as district resources and activities, the IEP, the PPT process and RtI (from July to March, CPAC provided telephone assistance to 138 parents in the four districts). Increasing parent involvement on the FAST team and other leadership teams will continue to be a focus during the next school year.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 18.b: The number of districts to develop and/or implement annually two items outlined in the action plan that address parent training and/or increased written or verbal communication to parents.

During the current reporting period, three of the four districts (Waterford, Montville and Norwich) have implemented two action plan items related to parent training and/or increasing the written or verbal communication to parents. The Vernon district implemented one item and anticipate that they will implement another item by the end of the school year.

All three districts have assembled a parent packet containing resources such as commonly used special education terms, district contact information, and CPAC resources. In Montville, the resource packet was developed last year and updated this year, while in Norwich and Waterford the resource packets were newly developed this year. The packets have been distributed to parents of identified children by the case managers in Waterford and by the office staff, with FAST team assistance, in Norwich and Montville.

All three districts have also developed PPT-related resources for families. In Montville, the FAST team created a document to help parents understand what they should do before, during, and after the PPT meeting. The CPAC representative shared this document with the Waterford team and this resource is now included with the PPT invitations in both Waterford and Montville. As a result of the FAST team efforts in Norwich, families now receive a letter informing them of their child's PPT date, and receive a folder and bookmark at the PPT meeting to help them organize their child's home file. In addition to PPT resources for families, the Waterford FAST team also developed a checklist for case managers, which outlines various steps they should follow throughout the year, including how to prepare for the PPT meeting.

FAST teams in all four of the districts have also coordinated parent training or information sessions (See Performance Measure 17.c for details regarding the Vernon and Norwich spring workshops). In Norwich, the FAST team hired a former educator to conduct a book talk with families and children during an October PTO meeting, which was attended by over 40 people, and very well-received. In Montville, the CPAC representative met with parents (n=4) during a July parent forum to collect their thoughts on ways the district could enhance family-school collaborations. The FAST team in Waterford has also provided parent training opportunities, including two workshops in April: one focused on various strategies parents of children with learning disabilities or attention deficit disorders can utilize; and a second focused on ways parents can help their children transition from school to adult life. (The attendance data for Waterford sessions will be submitted to the evaluator during the project's May submission of data.)



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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

19. **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools

CT SPDG Project Objective 19: Prepared with better information and increased knowledge, parent and school relationships will be strengthened.

19.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The number of districts in which a data collection system was developed to collect data on family-school relationships.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4	/		3	/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 19.a: The number of districts in which a data collection system was developed to collect data on family-school relationships.

Currently, the evaluation team is gathering FAST team members' perceptions of family-school relationships through an online survey. Summary results of the survey will be provided to CPAC at the end of May.

A "Post-PPT postcard," was developed by CPAC and piloted in Montville beginning in May 2007 to gather parents' and staff members' perceptions of the PPT process. At the end of the 2007-2008 school year, the FAST team reviewed a summary of the PPT postcards (104 were received out of approximately 300 students with IEPs) provided by the evaluation team. The responses were, overall, very positive but the open-ended comments did provide some insight into additional areas for improvement. In an effort to increase the response rate, FAST team members volunteered to monitor postcard distribution at each of the schools during the 2008-2009 school year. The postcards are returned to CPAC on a continual basis, and the evaluator will provide a summary of the information to the FAST team after the spring PPT season. A modified version of Montville's "Post-PPT postcard" is also being used by the Vernon FAST team. The Vernon team made revisions to the questions, based on their specific needs, and the case managers will be responsible for postcard distribution during the spring 2009 PPT meetings.

The CPAC representative also shared the PPT postcard with the Norwich and Waterford school districts. At this time, neither district has committed to using the postcard. Waterford already has a system in place to gather parent feedback on the PPT process. A short survey ("Parent Survey of the Planning and Placement Team Process") is sent to parents after the PPT and they are asked to return the survey to the school office.



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

PR/Award #: **H323A050003**

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

20. **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools

CT SPDG Project Objective 20: A working framework for continued family and school collaboration will be sustained in participating districts, with the prospect for replication in additional districts across the state.

20.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically- based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a district-wide or statewide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).	PRGM	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
					/		

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 20.a: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically-based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a district-wide or statewide basis (Aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1).

Note: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 20.a have been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure 4.1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure.

CPAC project leaders have reported that the work required to build relationships within the districts, the time to identify, implement, and adjust activities, and the time to replicate the activities across each district is much greater than they originally anticipated. However, both CPAC and the district representatives feel confident that the work being done is likely to create a framework for efforts that will be sustained.

The model of the FAST team will allow districts to continue parent involvement efforts even after CPAC's assistance has ended. The presence of FAST teams has not only built each member's capacity to increase family-school relationships, but the teams have also begun to share this information school- and district-wide. A few examples include, the sharing of the FAST team's work by the Norwich Director of Pupil Services with all administrators during a February council meeting and with the community through Community Access Television; the distribution of a FAST team brochure to all elementary families in Waterford, as well as families of identified children in the middle and high school (1500 brochures created); the district-wide use of the PPT postcard in Montville and Vernon; and the training by CPAC of all administrators in Montville. The FAST teams continue to discuss creative and sustainable ways of strengthening family-school relationships, such as utilizing current teachers, who are also parents of special needs children, to provide training during existing staff meetings. The teams, with the assistance of CPAC, will continue to focus on integrating their efforts with current school and district initiatives in order to facilitate sustainability.

The project director noted that CPAC's involvement in SPDG has given CPAC project leaders an in-depth understanding of both the districts' and parents' perspectives related to family-school collaboration. Lessons learned by the project leaders have included the importance of selecting districts that have already experienced some successes related to strengthening family-school relationships, and the importance of working with fewer districts so that intensive support can be provided. Once they are confident that the activities being implemented are sustainable, CPAC will begin to share specific examples

in their newsletter, on the CPAC website, in materials to be distributed at conferences, and by working with additional districts (possibly districts previously involved in the 2000-2005 State Improvement Grant). CPAC project leaders have already shared some of this knowledge with other members of state-level stakeholder groups, including members of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Council (CSPD) and the Connecticut State Department of Education Parent Work Group. The knowledge they have gained has also informed their work with individual families, professionals, and districts, including the workshops they provide professionals and parents on RtI and PBIS, and the telephone consultation they provide on an ongoing basis. CPAC will continue to integrate what they have learned from SPDG into their existing efforts.



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

PR/Award #:
H323A050003

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

Title : Section B Budget Information

File : K:\ColonD\SPDG\Evaluation\OSEP Performance reports\May
2009\budget524BSectionBC.doc

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

Title :

File : S:\SPDG 08-09\APR Information\Attachments to Submit\Other524BSectionBC.doc



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

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

PR/Award #:
H323A050003

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

A. Actual Expenditures for Reporting Period (May 1, 2008 – March 31, 2009)

\$ 836,750

B. Provide explanation if you are NOT expending funds at the expected rate.

Some activities have been delayed due to:

- Other agencies' requirements in securing appropriate personnel to carry out project activities
- Reduction in federal funds have caused one project to significantly delay activities

However, it is expected that funds will be fully expended by the end of the budget period as activity increases in the spring and summer.

C. Describe any changes to your budget that affected your ability to achieve your approved project activities and/or project objectives.

- Reduction in federal funds had an impact on the rate and amount of activity taking place, however, the project objectives are planned to be met.

D. Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modifications of project activities.

- None

E. Do you expect to have any unexpended funds at the end of the current budget period? (Explain why, provide an estimate, and indicate how you plan to use the unexpended funds (carryover) in the next budget period.)

- No

F. Describe any anticipated changes in your budget for the next budget period that require prior approval from the Department.

- None



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

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

PR/Award #: H323A050003

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

Report Tables

The following section includes tables and figures included as supplementary information to the narrative provided under each of the status charts.

CT SPDG PROJECT OBJECTIVE 11: To develop a multi-component system to facilitate statewide replication of evidence-based practices.

Table 11.c.1

Schools & Districts Trained in PBS	Prior to 2005-06	SPDG Period				After 2005-06	Total
		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# of schools trained per year	27	23	10	53	13	99	126
# of districts trained per year	9	13	6	11	10	21	27

Note: The number of districts trained across years includes duplicative counts.

Table 11.c.2

SERC Consultants Trained & SETs Conducted Statewide	SPDG Period				Total
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
# of SERC consultants trained in SWIS	0	5	3	2	10
# of SERC consultants trained to SET	1	10	5	1	17
# of SETs conducted statewide	16	27	45	13	101

Note: SET evaluations in non-SPDG schools in years 1 and 2 of training are conducted in April and May and are therefore not included in the 2008-09 total. All 13 schools are SPDG schools.

CT SPDG PROJECT OBJECTIVE 12: To replicate evidence based practices with fidelity in selected school districts.

Table 12.b.1

PBS Model District Schools		Yr. Trained in PBS	Model District Scaling-Up Plan				
			2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Windham	Windham Middle*	06-07	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Windham High*	06-07	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Natchaug Elem.*	06-07	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	North Windham Elem.	07-08	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Eastern Regional Academy	08-09	-	-	-	-	-
	Windham Center Elem.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. B. Sweeney Elem.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colchester	Colchester Elem.*	07-08	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Jack Jackter Elem.*	07-08	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	William J. Johnson Middle	08-09	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Bacon Academy High	08-09	-	-	✓	✓	✓

Note: The table includes all schools located in the PBS model districts. A (*) indicates SPDG PBS model school designation.

Table 12.b.2

EIP/RtI Model District Schools		Model District Scaling-Up Plan				
		May 07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Greenwich	Hamilton Ave Elem.*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Cos Cob Elem.	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	New Lebanon Elem.	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Glenville Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Dundee International Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Julian Curtiss Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	North Mianus Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	North Street Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Old Greenwich Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Parkway Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Riverside Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Central Middle	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Eastern Middle	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Western Middle	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Greenwich High	-	✓	✓	✓	✓

Note: The table includes all schools located in the EIP/RtI model districts. A (*) indicates SPDG EIP/RtI model school designation.

Table 12.b.3

EIP/RtI Model District Schools		Model District Scaling-Up Plan				
		May 07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
CREC	Two Rivers Magnet Middle*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	E. Hartford/Glastonbury Magnet	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Great Path Academy	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Montessori Magnet	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Metropolitan Learning Center	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Hartford Academy of the Arts	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Hartford Academy of Math/Science	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Public Safety Academy	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	University of Hartford Magnet	-	-	✓	✓	✓

Note: The table includes all schools located in the model districts. A (*) indicates SPDG EIP/RtI model school designation.

Table 12.b.4

EIP/RtI Model District Schools		Model District Scaling-Up Plan				
		May 07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Bristol	Ivy Drive Elem.*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Greene Hills Elem.*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Edgewood Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Ellen Hubbel Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	John J. Jennings Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Mountain View Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	South Side Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Stafford Elem.	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Chippins Hill Middle	-	-	-	-	✓
	Memorial Blvd Middle	-	-	-	-	✓
	Northeast Middle	-	-	-	-	✓
	Central High	-	-	-	-	✓
	Eastern High	-	-	-	-	✓

Note: The table includes all schools located in the model districts. A (*) indicates SPDG EIP/RtI model school designation.

Table 12.b.5

EIP/RtI Model District Schools		SPDG Involvement			
		May 07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Waterbury	Regan Elem*.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Wendell Cross Elem*.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Note: Waterbury does not have a scaling-up plan established at this time. The district includes 18 additional elementary schools, 4 middle schools and 4 high schools. A (*) indicates SPDG EIP/RtI model school designation.

Table 12.b.6

Literacy Model Schools	SPDG Involvement		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Griswold Elementary	✓	✓	✓
Chaplin Elementary	✓	✓	✓
Killingly Memorial Elementary	✓	✓	✓
Bowers Elementary	✓	✓	✓
Poquonock Elementary	✓		

Note: The Literacy initiative does not have a scaling-up plan established at this time.

Table 12.b.7

PBS Model Districts	Schools	Yr. Trained in PBS	Yr. Joined SPDG	School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)					Sustain 07-08 to 08-09
				05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09		
				Score	Score	Score	Score	Fidelity	
Windham	Windham Middle*	05-06	06-07	10/28	100/98	100/100	100/99	Y	Y
	Windham High*	06-07	06-07	-	30/50	70/92	100/86	Y	na
	Natchaug Elem.*	06-07	06-07	-	-	100/95	90/87	Y	Y
	North Windham Elem.	07-08	07-08	-	-	30/47	100/96	Y	na
Colchester	Colchester Elem.*	05-06	07-08	90/58	100/92	30/62	-	na	na
	Jack Jackter Elem.*	05-06	07-08	20/43	70/78	80/88	-	na	na
	William J. Johnson	07-08	08-09	-	-	30/62	100/100	Y	na
	Bacon Academy	07-08	08-09	-	-	20/46	70/73	N	na

Note: A (*) indicates SPDG PBS model school designation. A (-) indicates a SET was not conducted or is not available (SETs are scheduled in the 2 Colchester model schools for later this school year).

Table 12.c.1

PBS Partner District Schools		Yr. Trained in PBS	Partner District Scaling-up Plan		
			2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hebron	Gilead Hill Elem.*	07-08	✓	✓	✓
	Hebron Elem.*	07-08	✓	✓	✓
Region 01	Housatonic Valley High*	07-08	✓	✓	✓
	North Canaan Elem.*	07-08	✓	✓	✓
	Sharon Center Elem/Middle	-	-	✓	✓
	Lee Kellog Elem/Middle	-	-	✓	✓
	Salisbury Central Elem/Middle	-	-	-	✓
	Cornwall Consolidation Elem/Middle	-	-	-	✓

Note: The table includes all schools located in the PBS partner districts. A (*) indicates SPDG PBS model school designation.

Table 12.c.2

PBS Partner Districts	Schools	Yr. Trained in PBS	Yr. Joined SPDG	School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)					Sustain 07-08 to 08-09
				05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09		
				Score	Score	Score	Score	Fidelity	
Hebron	Gilead Hill Elem.*	07-08	08-09	-	-	10/56	100/97	Y	na
	Hebron Elem.*	07-08	08-09	-	-	50/57	100/85	Y	na
Region 01	Housatonic Valley High*	07-08	08-09	-	-	30/63	90/89	Y	na
	North Canaan Elem.*	08-09	08-09	-	-	-	30/56	N	na

Note: A (*) indicates SPDG PBS model school designation. A (-) indicates a SET was not conducted or is not available.

CT SPDG PROJECT OBJECTIVE 13: Selected LEAs will receive job-embedded and evidence- or scientifically based professional development.

Table 13.b.1

2008-09 PBS Team Training	Date	Statewide # of Participants	SPDG-PBS Districts and Schools		
			# of Participants	# of Districts	# of Schools
Year 1 Team Training	10/14/2008	88	16	2	3
	10/15/2008	85	16	2	3
	2/4/2009	108	17	2	3
	2/5/2009	106	17	2	3
	4/29/2009 4/30/2009	not yet available			
Year 2 Team Training	11/5/2008	194	59	4	7
	1/15/2009	199	59	4	6
	4/1/2009	203	60	4	6
Year 3 Team Training	11/25/2008	48	7	2	2
	12/2/2008	58	11	2	3
	12/3/2008	58	11	2	3
Totals		1147	273	4	9

Note: The total # of participants includes duplicative counts, whereas totals for districts and schools are non-duplicative.

Table 13.b.2

2007-08 RtI Training Series	Date	Statewide # of Participants	SPDG-EIP/RtI Districts and Schools		
			# of Participants	# of Districts	# of Schools
Forum 1.A	2/28/2008	188	19	3	3
Forum 1.B	2/29/2008	163	2	1	1
Forum 2.A	4/3/2008	141	23	3	4
Forum 2.B	4/4/2008	151	4	1	1
Forum 3.A	5/8/2008	135	4	2	2
Forum 3.B	5/9/2008	105	4	1	1
Forum 4.A	5/29/2008	157	9	2	2
Forum 4.B	5/30/2008	116	3	1	1
Forum 5.A	6/11/2008	111	5	2	2
Forum 5.B	6/12/2008	88	1	1	1
Totals		800	74	4	5

Note: The total # of participants includes duplicative counts, whereas totals for districts and schools are non-duplicative.

Table 13.b.3

2008-09 SRBI Training Series	Date	Statewide # of Participants	SPDG-EIP/RtI Districts and Schools		
			# of Participants	# of Districts	# of Schools
Forum 1.A	12/4/2008	231	21	3	4
Forum 1.B	12/5/2008	77	12	2	2
Forum 2.A	2/26/2009	117	33	4	5
Forum 2.B	2/27/2009	21	9	2	2
Forum 3.A	4/8/2009	not yet available			
Forum 3.B	4/9/2009				
Totals		446	75	4	5

Note: The total # of participants includes duplicative counts, whereas totals for districts and schools are non-duplicative.

CT SPDG PROJECT OBJECTIVE 15: Results for students with disabilities in selected districts will improve.

Table 15.a.1

Districts	Schools	School-wide Information System (SWIS)				
		Available Data				
		05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Windham (Model)	Windham Middle*	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Windham High*	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Natchaug Elem.*	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	North Windham Elem.	-	-	-	✓	✓
Colchester (Model)	Colchester Elem.*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Jack Jackter Elem.*	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	William J. Johnson	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	Bacon Academy	-	-	-	✓	✓
Hebron (Partner)	Gilead Hill Elem.*	-	-	-	✓	✓
	Hebron Elem.*	-	-	-	✓	✓
Region 01 (Partner)	Housatonic Valley High*	-	-	-	✓	✓
	North Canaan Elem.*	-	-	-	-	✓

Note: A (*) indicates SPDG PBS model school designation. A (-) indicates the SWIS was not being used to track school data .

Table 15.b.1

Office Discipline Referral (ODR) Triangle Data	PBS Model Schools						
	Colchester Elementary			Jack Jackter Elementary		Windham Middle	Windham High
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2007-08
% of students with 0-1 referrals	91.0%	90.7%	90.3%	89.1%	90.1%	62.4%	66.3%
% of students with 2-5 referrals	6.8%	7.0%	8.3%	9.1%	7.9%	17.0%	16.8%
% of students with 6+ referrals	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	20.5%	16.8%
Total # of students	900	700	700	735	685	969	909

Note: Referral data for Natchaug Elementary was not available. The school is currently entering back data from the past two years.

Table 15.c.1

Referrals per 100 Students	PBS Model Schools				
	Colchester Elementary			Jack Jackter Elementary	
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2006-07	2007-08
# of referrals per year per 100 students	53.9	54.6	47.6	58.9	53.7

Table 15.d.1

In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions	PBS Model Schools				
	Colchester Elementary			Jack Jackter Elementary	
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2006-07	2007-08
# of in-school-suspensions	19	7	2	46	47
# of students contributing to in-school suspensions	12	7	2	26	32
# of out-of-school suspensions	26	8	5	12	6
# of students contributing to out-of-school suspensions	15	5	2	10	4

Table 15.g.1

2007-2008 Case Status at End of Year	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	Two Rivers Middle	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)	(Waterbury)	(CREC)				
Goals Achieved, Case Closed	44.2%	0.0%	6.1%	5.6%	18.2%	0.0%	18.8%	13.6%
Goals Not Achieved, Case Closed	0.0%	8.7%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	2.7%	8.2%
Case On-going	50.0%	78.3%	70.7%	50.0%	31.8%	66.7%	58.2%	60.0%
Referred to 504	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%
Referred to PPT	5.8%	13.0%	19.5%	41.7%	50.0%	0.0%	19.2%	17.3%
Total	86	23	82	36	22	12	261	5761

Note: All schools, with the exception of Two Rivers, are elementary schools. Districts are included in parenthesis.

Table 15.g.2

2006-2007 Case Status at End of Year	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	Two Rivers Middle	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)	(Waterbury)	(CREC)				
Goals Achieved, Case Closed	19.2%	5.9%	15.2%	9.8%	9.1%	10.2%	11.6%	11.0%
Goals Not Achieved, Case Closed	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	24.4%	10.3%	7.4%
Case On-going	57.7%	58.8%	66.7%	63.4%	51.5%	65.4%	62.9%	63.5%
Referred to 504	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%
Referred to PPT	23.1%	35.3%	16.7%	24.4%	39.4%	0.0%	14.8%	16.8%
Total	26	17	66	41	33	127	310	5810

Note: All schools, with the exception of Two Rivers, are elementary schools. Districts are included in parenthesis.

Table 15.g.3

2007-2008 Rational for Student Referral to PPT	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)		(Waterbury)			
Request prior to completion of EIP	20.0%	33.3%	18.8%	6.7%	0.0%	11.8%	18.2%
EIP team determination	80.0%	66.7%	81.3%	93.3%	100.0%	88.2%	81.8%
Total	5	3	12	16	15	51	931

Note: Districts are included in parenthesis. Two Rivers Middle did not have any referrals to the PPT.

Table 15.g.4

2006-2007 Rational for Student Referral to PPT	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)		(Waterbury)			
Request prior to completion of EIP	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	10.0%	7.7%	10.6%	18.7%
EIP team determination	100.0%	83.3%	83.3%	90.0%	92.3%	89.4%	81.3%
Total	6	6	12	10	13	47	1035

Note: Districts are included in parenthesis. Two Rivers Middle did not have any referrals to the PPT.

Table 15.g.5

2007-2008 PPT Status	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)		(Waterbury)			
PPT determined evaluation not warranted at this time	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	8.3%	5.9%	2.4%
Evaluation incomplete at date of submission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	25.0%	11.8%	14.9%
Student determined ineligible	20.0%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%	8.3%	13.7%	20.0%
Student determined eligible for special education & related services	60.0%	66.7%	75.0%	73.3%	58.3%	68.6%	62.7%
Total	5	3	12	16	15	51	926

Note: Districts are included in parenthesis. Two Rivers Middle did not have any referrals to the PPT.

Table 15.g.6

2006-2007 PPT Status	Hamilton Avenue	Greene Hills	Ivy Drive	Regan	Wendell Cross	SPDG Total	CT Total
	(Greenwich)	(Bristol)		(Waterbury)			
PPT determined evaluation not warranted at this time	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	4.3%	7.4%
Evaluation incomplete at date of submission	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%	30.0%	50.0%	32.6%	19.2%
Student determined ineligible	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	17.3%
Student determined eligible for special education & related services	16.7%	100.0%	66.7%	70.0%	41.7%	58.7%	56.0%
Total	6	6	12	10	12	46	1067

Note: Districts are included in parenthesis. Two Rivers Middle did not have any referrals to the PPT.

Key Personnel and Current Partners

The following list includes key personnel and current partners of the CT SPDG grant. Changes are noted below where applicable.

CT State Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education

Anne Louis Thompson is the Bureau Chief of Special Education for the Connecticut Department of Education. **Dana Corriveau**, Education Consultant at the Bureau of Special Education is managing the SPDG for the Bureau of Special Education.

Current Partners

Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) is a public, comprehensive, coeducational institution offering 115 undergraduate and graduate degree programs in the full range of academic and professional disciplines. SCSU has both Bachelors and Masters level programs leading to special education certification in Connecticut. SCSU is the institute of higher education (IHE) with whom the paraprofessional recruitment and training program is affiliated. The project coordinator for the SCSU project is Dr. Pamela Brucker, Chair of the Special Education and Reading Department.

Connecticut Department of Developmental Services (DDS), formerly known as the Department of Mental Retardation, is the designated Lead Agency for Part C of the IDEA. DDS, through the Connecticut Birth to Three System, provides families with early intervention services to strengthen their capacity to meet the developmental and health-related needs of their infants and toddlers who have delays or disabilities. DDS received a subcontract to implement the Birth to Three component of the SPDG project. The project coordinator for the Birth to Three project is Deborah Resnick, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Coordinator.

State Education Resource Center (SERC) is a nonprofit agency primarily funded by the Connecticut State Department of Education. SERC provides professional development and information dissemination in the latest research and best practices to educators, service providers, and families throughout the state, as well as job-embedded technical assistance and training within schools, programs, and districts. The project coordinator for the SERC project is Dr. Marianne Kirner, Director.

Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) is Connecticut's federally funded Parent Training and Information Center established under IDEA. CPAC offers information and support to families of children with any disability or chronic illness, age birth through 26. The project coordinator for the CPAC project is Nancy Prescott, Executive Director. Colleen Hayles, Education Consultant at the Bureau of Special Education also serves in a leadership capacity on this project. She has taken the place of Mary Jean Schierberl.

Glen Martin Associates is the external evaluator for the SPDG project. Glen Martin Associates (GMA) is a research and program evaluation consulting firm serving local, regional and state organizations and agencies in New York and New England. Glen Martin Associates has been the evaluator for the project since its inception. Rebecca Walker is the Director of GMA and serves as the primary evaluator for the SPDG.