

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FY 2007 GRANT PERFORMANCE
REPORT FOR CONTINUATIONS
CFDA # 84.323A
PR/Award # H323A050003
Budget Period # 3
Report Type: Annual Performance**

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

****Table of Contents****

Forms

1. Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) - Revised 2005	e1
Attachment - 1	e3
2. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1	e5
3. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2	e12
4. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3	e19
5. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4	e23
6. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 5	e28
7. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 6	e35
8. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 7	e44
9. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 8	e49
10. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 9	e51
11. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 10	e53
12. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 11	e62
13. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 12	e67
14. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 13	e73
15. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 14	e82
16. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 15	e87
17. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 16	e91
18. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 17	e98
19. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 18	e108
20. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 19	e113
21. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 20	e116
22. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C	e119
Attachment - 1	e120
Attachment - 2	e122

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

etc.).



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

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.

Annual Performance Report **Final Performance Report**

General Information

1. PR/Award #: **H323A050003**
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification.)

2. NCES ID #: 09
(See Instructions.)

3. Project Title: State Program Improvement Grants
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)

4. Grantee Name*(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

5. Grantee Address *(See Instructions.):* 165 Capitol Avenue PO Box 2219
City: Hartford State: CT Zip:06145 Zip+4:

6. Project Director: First Name	Last Name	Title
Dana	Corriveau	Project Director
Phone #:	Fax #:	Email Address:
(860)713-6944	(860)713-7051	DANA.CORRIVEAU@CT.GOV

Reporting Period Information *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period: From: 5/1/2007 To: 3/31/2008 (mm/dd/yyyy)

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

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	1,396,334.00	0.00
b. Current Reporting Period	834,213.00	0.00
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	0.00	0.00

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

9. Indirect Costs

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

Human Subjects (See instructions.)

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

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status
- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? 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: Dana J Corriveau	Title: Project Director
Signature:	Date:

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

Title :
 File : S:\SPDG 07-08\Spring 08 APR\524B Section A Executive Summary.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 teacher 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.

- Nine paraprofessionals from the Hartford school district have been accepted into the SCSU certification program and are expected to complete their coursework this summer.
- Nine New Haven paraprofessionals are currently teaching under a durational shortage area permit (DSAP) and anticipate receiving their Initial Educator Certificate this fall.
- Recruitment activities have begun in the Bridgeport school district and project leaders are optimistic they can meet their goal of 20 new candidates.

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

- Filming for the early intervention video has begun. The video, training manual, and self-study guide are expected to be completed by the end of the year.
- The CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments have been revised and are expected to be published in June 2008.

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.

- Model schools/districts have been identified in all three topical priority areas: School-wide Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS); Early Intervention Project/Response to Intervention (EIP/RtI); and Prevention/Intervention. The identification of partner schools/districts has begun and is expected to continue into the 2008-2009 school year.
- SERC has provided 52 professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based practices for teachers and administrators in the model schools/districts.
- SERC staff have begun to develop a web site to disseminate information on best practices in evidence-based teaching and early intervention. The site is expected to be launched this fall.

CT SPDG Goal 4: Enhancing Collaborative Relationships between Parents and Schools.

Increase parent-school collaboration in selected school districts 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.

- Written action plans focused on enhancing collaborative family-school relationships are in place in three of the four participating districts. The action plans were developed to help districts organize identified needs and then chart a workable road map with specific strategies and activities that could be followed to meet those needs.
- Active FAST (Family and Staff Together) teams have been established in two of the four districts. Members of the FAST team are responsible for facilitating the implementation of the district's action plan.
- Project leaders anticipate that two new districts will be chosen and participate in the project during the next reporting period.

The following report is organized to sequentially address each of the four preceding goals as follows: Objectives 1-4 (Goal 1); Objectives 5-9 (Goal 2); Objectives 10-15 (Goal 3); and Objectives 16-20 (Goal 4). Progress towards individual objectives under each goal is reported by a series of performance measures, described in three sections: annual progress; evidence of progress; and looking forward. Data is reported on annual targets and long-term targets, when applicable.



**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 meetings(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	/		4	/	
1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of	PROJ						

paraprofessionals from participating districts that are accepted into the SCSU certification program.	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
	20	/		9	/	

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	%
			9 / 9	100		6 / 9	67

. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 Bridgeport school district.

In September 2007, the SCSU project coordinator and staff met with Bridgeport district officials to discuss preliminary plans for the identification and recruitment of paraprofessional candidates from the district. As a result of this meeting, informational letters explaining the program were distributed and recruitment meetings were held with interested individuals in October and November. Preliminary data were collected on a total of 80 prospective candidates from the two sessions.

Following the fall recruitment meetings, prospective candidates were asked to submit, as a first step in the application process, an undergraduate transcript (demonstrating a 4-year degree with a minimum 2.7 GPA) and evidence of having passed or obtained a waiver for the Praxis I exam. In March 2008, a meeting was held with nine Bridgeport paraprofessionals who had submitted the necessary preliminary information and were ready to proceed with the application process.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007. Preliminary data on prospective candidates was also submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 1.a was to hold onsite recruitment meeting(s) in one district. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The SCSU project coordinator reported plans for a second application meeting in Bridgeport this May and she anticipates an additional nine paraprofessionals from the district will have submitted the necessary materials (transcripts and evidence of passing Praxis I) at this time. It is expected that recruitment activities will occur in the Waterbury school district in early fall 2008.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 1.a is to hold on-site recruitment meeting(s) in four urban school districts. Progress to date: Recruitment activities have occurred in three districts (New Haven in 2006, Hartford in 2006-2007, and Bridgeport in 2007-2008).

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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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. Paper-based tests are offered on six regularly scheduled national test dates, while computer-based tests can be taken once per calendar month up to six times in a 12-month period.

Each spring, SCSU has held a series of Praxis I tutorials for candidates in the entering paraprofessional cohort. The tutorials are facilitated by SCSU staff and are conducted as half-day sessions on Saturdays, typically running from April until the beginning of summer courses in June. Participants work on basic skills, complete sample exams, and receive study guides for each Praxis skills test (Reading, Writing, and Math). During the current reporting period, tutorial sessions were held in Hartford from March 31 until April 21, 2007 (4 sessions), with attendance ranging from nine to 26 paraprofessionals. A bilingual tutor was also provided during the 2007 tutorial sessions due to a significant number of ESL candidates in the Hartford cohort.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and a spring project progress report submitted in April 2007.

The annual target for Performance Measure 1.b was to hold 12 Praxis I tutorial sessions in the Hartford school district. This target was not met. It should be noted that the SCSU project coordinator did indicate additional tutorial sessions had been scheduled during the months of May and June 2007. However, dates and attendance records for these additional meetings were not provided. Consequently, the actual performance data for this measure may be revised in future reports.

LOOKING FORWARD

The SCSU project coordinator reported that Praxis I tutorials are currently being conducted in the Bridgeport school district. As was the case in Hartford, a significant number of Bridgeport paraprofessionals are ESL candidates and as a result, a bilingual tutor has also been added to the Bridgeport sessions. It is expected that a minimum of 12 sessions will occur before the beginning of summer courses on June 30, 2008.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 1.b is 48 tutorial sessions (12 sessions in each of the four districts). Progress to date: A total of 16 tutorial sessions have been held by the PACE project (12 sessions were held in New Haven in 2006 and four sessions were held in Hartford in 2007).

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 (30 candidates began summer coursework but just 17 candidates were accepted); this original goal was revised to a target of 20 participants accepted into the SCSU certification program, in each of the three remaining districts.

During the current reporting period, 48 paraprofessionals from the Hartford school district were identified as prospective candidates to begin summer coursework in June 2007. The group was evenly divided between candidates with a 2-year degree (n=23) and those with a 4-year degree (n=22). (The degree status of 3 paraprofessionals was not reported.) Among the 48 prospective candidates, just nine paraprofessionals (all with a 4-year degree) were accepted into the SCSU certification program. The SCSU project coordinator indicated that 37 of the Hartford paraprofessionals were unable to pass the Praxis I exam. (The reason the remaining paraprofessional was denied admission was not reported.)

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007. Data on individual candidates was also submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 1.c was to accept 20 paraprofessionals from the district of Hartford into the SCSU certification program. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The SCSU project coordinator and the SPDG project director have agreed to modify the eligibility requirements in the remaining two cohorts by restricting admission to paraprofessionals who currently hold a 4-year degree. Reasons for the decision include difficulties transferring in community college credits, poor Praxis I results, and in general, a higher than expected rate of attrition among eligible candidates in the first two cohorts. The SCSU project coordinator has also indicated that the project intends to place a stronger emphasis on the importance of passing the Praxis I exam before paraprofessionals begin certification coursework in the summer.

It is expected that the PACE project will accept 20 paraprofessionals from the Bridgeport school district into the SCSU certification program in fall 2008. To date, 11 prospective candidates have submitted evidence of passing Praxis I, one candidate has received a waiver, and one candidate has filed for a waiver of the exam. All 13 candidates have previously earned a 4-year degree.

The revised long-term target for Performance Measure 1.c is to accept and enroll 90 paraprofessionals (30 from New Haven and 20 thereafter) into the SCSU certification program. Progress to date: Twenty-six paraprofessionals (17 in New Haven and 9 in Hartford) were accepted into the SCSU program.

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 accepted through the PACE project complete a 10-course sequence of 30.5 credits. (Note: This requirement assumes a 4-year degree with no deficiencies upon review of an official transcript. Paraprofessionals with deficient undergraduate coursework, including those with a 2-year degree, would be required to take additional courses dependent on their individual situation.)

During the current reporting period, Hartford paraprofessionals on-schedule to complete the necessary coursework would have taken four courses in summer 2007 and two courses this past fall. They would currently be enrolled in two spring semester courses and would complete their coursework this summer with two additional courses. Of the nine Hartford paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program, 66.7% (n=6) are currently on-schedule, having earned 18 credits to date. The remaining three candidates have earned six, nine and 15 credits, respectively.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007. Data on individual candidates was also submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 1.d was for 100% (n=9) of the Hartford paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program to be on-schedule to complete the necessary coursework. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that all paraprofessionals in the PACE project will have completed the necessary coursework (30.5 credits), or be on-schedule to complete the necessary coursework (18 credits) during the next reporting period. The SCSU project

coordinator has indicated that the current course schedule may be slightly modified this year. The option of adding at least one course during the university's winter session has been discussed, in an effort to lighten the workload during the initial summer semester. Any changes to the course schedule will be reflected in subsequent targets as appropriate.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 1.d is for 100% of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU program to complete the minimum credits needed for certification, or be on-schedule to complete the necessary coursework. Progress to date: 57.7% (n=15) of all paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU program have completed, or are on-schedule to complete, the necessary coursework; 52.9% (n=9) of paraprofessionals in New Haven and 66.7% (n=6) of paraprofessionals in Hartford. (Two candidates in New Haven withdrew from the program, one for medical reasons and one was not able to pass Praxis I, and six candidates have earned fewer than 30.5 credits to date.)



**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 (OSEP Long-Term Measure #1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			9 / 9	100		2 / 9	22
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	%
			14 / 14	100		9 / 14	64

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	%
		1	/		1	/	
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 #4).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

Note: For the following performance measures, various data collection methods (on-site meetings, semi-annual progress reports, and a paraprofessional database) sometimes produced conflicting information. As a result, the decision was made by the external evaluation team to consistently use the paraprofessional database as the primary data source. As a result, it is anticipated that the actual performance data for some of these measures may be revised in future reports.

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 (OSEP Long-Term Measure #1).

NOTE: Please see Performance Measures 6.e and 14.c for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #1.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 measured 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 no later than the end of their first fall semester. During the current reporting period, 22.2% (n=2) of paraprofessionals in the Hartford cohort passed the Praxis II exam in special education.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator, a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007, and data submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator. Additional information was taken from the Praxis Series Information Bulletin 2007-2008.

The annual target for Performance Measure 2.a was for 100% (n=9) of paraprofessionals in the Hartford cohort to have passed the Praxis II exam in special education. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that all paraprofessionals in the New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport cohorts will have passed the Praxis II exam in special education by the end of the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 2.a is for 100% of paraprofessionals in the PACE project to have passed the Praxis II exam in special education. Progress to date: 63.6% (n=14) of paraprofessionals have passed the Praxis II exam; 92.3% (n=12) of paraprofessionals in New Haven and 22.2% (n=2) of paraprofessionals in Hartford. (Two additional paraprofessionals in New Haven are undergraduate students and are expected to pass the Praxis II exam during the next reporting period.)

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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 semester hours of credit; 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 3-5 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 districts 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.

As reported under the previous performance measure, 12 New Haven paraprofessionals passed the Praxis II exam and were eligible to DSAP (or student teach) during the current reporting period. Of the 12 candidates, 75% (n=9) are currently teaching under a DSAP or as a student teacher; eight are teaching in the New Haven school district while one candidate is in the Ansonia school district.

Just two paraprofessionals in the Hartford cohort were eligible to DSAP (or student teach) during the current reporting period. At this time, neither candidate has obtained a position. The SCSU project coordinator indicated that significant turnover in the administration of the Hartford school district has contributed to significant challenges in placing eligible DSAP candidates in the district. She reported that Hartford officials have not been eager to hire the DSAP candidates, primarily due to their desire to retain them as paraprofessionals. However, she did indicate that surrounding districts have now begun to express interest in hiring the two eligible candidates.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator, a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007, and data submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator. Additional information was taken from the CSDE Bureau of Educator Preparation and Certification Durational Shortage Area Permit Application.

The annual target for Performance Measure 2.b was for 100% (n=14) of eligible paraprofessionals in the SCSU certification program to be teaching under a durational shortage area permit (DSAP) or as a student teacher. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that all eligible paraprofessionals in the SCSU certification program will be teaching under a durational shortage area permit (DSAP) or as a student teacher during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 2.b is for 100% of paraprofessionals in the PACE project to have taught under a DSAP or as a student teacher. Progress to date: 64.3% (n=9) of 14 eligible paraprofessionals have taught under a DSAP or as a student teacher.

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.

The PACE project was designed to provide a mentoring system in each district that would provide one-on-one mentoring to all paraprofessionals during their first year of teaching. 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.

During the current reporting period, a mentoring system has been established in the New Haven school district. The majority of DSAP teachers in New Haven reported that they chose their own mentors, generally teachers they had established a relationship with while employed as a paraprofessional. The DSAP teachers are required to choose someone who currently works with them in the same building. The SCSU project coordinator indicated that three meetings were held with the New Haven mentors and mentees, including an in-service presentation on RTI during the current reporting period.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and evaluator notes from focus group discussions with the New Haven paraprofessionals.

The annual target for Performance Measure 2.c was for a mentoring system to be established in the New Haven school district. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that a mentoring system for eligible paraprofessionals will be established in the Hartford school district in fall 2008.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 2.c is for a mentoring system to be established in all participating urban districts (n=4). Progress to date: A mentoring system has been established in the New Haven school district (n=1).

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 #4).

Note: The initial certification, hiring, and early retention of PACE candidates in the selected urban districts will be reported in this and in future annual reports, until the desired 3-year retention data is available (preliminary data would be expected in 2010-11).

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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. At the present time, no paraprofessionals in the PACE project are eligible to earn the Initial Educator Certificate. However, when the PACE paraprofessionals do earn the Initial Educator Certificate it is expected that they will all be highly qualified. State policy was changed in July 2006 to ensure that all prospective certification candidates meet the federal definition of highly qualified prior to being hired under a durational shortage area permit.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator, a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007, and data submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator. Additional information was taken from the CSDE Bureau of Educator Preparation and Certification CERTALERT newsletter.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 2.d. It was not expected that paraprofessionals in the PACE project would be employed as highly qualified special education teachers for a period of three years.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is anticipated that the nine New Haven paraprofessionals who began working under a DSAP (or as a student teacher) in fall 2007 will be eligible to earn their Initial Educator Certificate in fall of 2008. Students must teach under DSAP for a period of ten months before they are eligible to earn initial certification. Depending on the date of DSAP, paraprofessionals from the Hartford cohort may also be eligible to earn certification during the next reporting period.

The SCSU project director, SPDG project director, and the external evaluation team are currently working to ensure the employment of all PACE project participants will be tracked for a minimum of three years. Discussions have included a new "Connecticut Educator Certification System" (CECS) being designed by the Bureau of Educator Preparation, Certification, Support, and Assessment. Every Connecticut educator will be assigned a unique identifier and the system is expected to facilitate Highly Qualified/Compliance reporting. It is anticipated that this new system may be able to provide employment tracking information to the SPDG project as well.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 2.d is for 100% of paraprofessionals in the PACE project to be retained as highly qualified special education teachers for a period of three years.



**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 from participating districts enrolled in preliminary summer coursework as prospective PACE candidates who are from a minority ethnic background.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			29 / 48	60		/	
3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program who are from a minority ethnic background.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6 / 9	67		4 / 9	44
3.c. 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	%
		/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3.a: The percentage of paraprofessionals from participating districts enrolled in preliminary summer coursework as prospective PACE candidates who are from a minority ethnic background.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The need for teachers from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and historically underrepresented groups has been a continued concern of officials in CT 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, but often less likely to seek a teaching certification due to family obligations and a lack of financial resources. The PACE project was designed to overcome these obstacles by providing financial assistance, flexible scheduling, and ongoing support to all paraprofessional participants.

At the beginning of the PACE project, the SCSU project coordinator indicated that the university was not comfortable asking prospective candidates to provide race/ethnicity information prior to the formal application process. As a result, and in an effort to track the ethnic diversity of paraprofessionals as they progress through program milestones (i.e., enrolled in summer courses, acceptance, and certification), the decision was made that paraprofessionals would initially be classified by the race/ethnicity identified by the SCSU project coordinator and staff. Race/ethnicity information could then be verified at the application stage when candidates for university admission are asked (although voluntarily) to identify their ethnic background.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from on-site meetings with the SCSU project coordinator and a fall project progress report submitted in October 2007.

The race/ethnicity of New Haven paraprofessionals enrolled in summer coursework was submitted by SCSU staff in a

paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator. However, this data was not provided for the current reporting period (the Hartford cohort).

The annual target for Performance Measure 3.a was for at least 60% of Hartford paraprofessionals enrolled in summer coursework, as prospective PACE candidates, to be from a minority ethnic background. The status of progress towards this target was not provided. Actual performance data for this measure may be revised in future reports.

LOOKING FORWARD

The external evaluation team anticipates working with the SCSU project coordinator and staff to confirm that race/ethnicity information for prospective PACE candidates in the Bridgeport district will be identified and tracked in the paraprofessional database.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 3.a is for at least 60% of all paraprofessionals enrolled in summer coursework as prospective PACE candidates to be from a minority ethnic background. Progress to date: In the New Haven cohort, 76.3% (n=29) of prospective PACE candidates were identified as being from a minority ethnic background.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The SCSU graduate application asks candidates for university admission to identify their ethnic background as one of the following: White/Non-Hispanic; African American/Black/Non-Hispanic; Hispanic/Latino; Native American/Alaskan Native; Asian American/Pacific Islander; Non-resident Alien; or Other/No response.

During the current reporting period, 44.4% (n=4) of the nine Hartford paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU program were reported to be from a minority ethnic background. The representation of the Hartford cohort was classified as follows: White/Non-Hispanic (n=5); African American/Black/Non-Hispanic (n=2); Hispanic/Latino (n=1), and Asian American/Pacific Islander (n=1).

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes data submitted by SCSU staff in a paraprofessional database created by the external evaluator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 3.b was for at least 60% of paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU

certification program from the district of Hartford to be from a minority ethnic background. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 3.b is for 60% of all paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program to be from a minority ethnic background. Progress to date:

53.8% (n=14) of the 26 paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program were classified as from a minority ethnic background; 58.8% (n=10) of New Haven paraprofessionals and 44.4% (n=4) of Hartford paraprofessionals.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3.c: 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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In addition to recruitment, the retention of ethnic-minority paraprofessionals as highly qualified special education teachers in CT urban school districts is also a priority of the PACE project. In the four participating urban school districts, recent data 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.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation towards this measure includes data from the Connecticut Education Data and Research (CEDAR) website, 2007-2008.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 3.c. It was not expected that paraprofessionals in the PACE project would be employed as highly qualified special education teachers during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 3.c is for 100% of ethnic-minority paraprofessionals accepted into the SCSU certification program to become highly qualified special education teachers in a state-identified professional discipline.



**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).	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 scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Long-Term Measure #2).

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).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 4.a has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Program Performance Measure #1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 6.f, 13.a, and 17.d for additional information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments measured by the a) percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress by disability subgroup; b) participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards; and c) proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

SPP Improvement Strategy: 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 with the PACE project: During the 2005-2006 school year (the most recent year for which data was available), 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 SCSU teacher preparation program offers paraprofessionals in the PACE project 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.

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: a) removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; b) removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or c) served in a public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Examine mentoring teacher qualifications and training, and availability for student teaching placements in LRE (least restrictive environment) settings. Alignment with the PACE project: 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 CT 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. In addition, during the 2005-2006 school year, three of the four urban districts in the PACE project did not meet the state target of 6.0% for SPP #5.c. 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.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the CT Part B State Performance Plan for 2005-2010; New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport, and Waterbury District Annual Performance Reports (2005-2006); CT Data Bulletin Fall Hiring Report (2006-2007); and the SCSU Graduate Course Catalog (2006-2007).

The annual target for Performance Measure 4.a was set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). This project's contribution to that target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

During the next reporting period, the PACE project will continue to address the state's need for highly qualified special education teachers (as described under SPP Indicator #3 and #5) by continuing to train paraprofessionals in urban school districts to become certified educators.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 4.a is 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.b: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP Long-Term Measure #2).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 4.b has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure #2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 8.a, 12.a and 20.a for additional information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #2.)

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The PACE project was developed with the intention of initiating a systems change planning process among various educational partners in the state. An advisory group, consisting of the SCSU project coordinator, the SPDG project director, and various education professionals and state representatives, were to gather in the beginning year of the grant and work to ensure that the initiative was sustained beyond the current funding period. The original charge of the group was to 1) produce a replication guide; 2) develop a cooperative agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between various institutions that would facilitate the movement of paraprofessionals into the teaching profession; and 3) create a long-term plan to obtain state funding of the program.

During the previous reporting period, the SCSU project coordinator reported receiving a commitment to participate from approximately one-half of the desired committee members. However, formation of the committee stalled during Year 3, and the SCSU project coordinator and the SPDG project director agreed to postpone forming a new committee until the last year of the grant. The SCSU project coordinator has indicated that the new committee will consist of administrators from participating districts, individuals who have gone through the PACE program, representatives from CSDE, and SCSU personnel. The main charge of the group will be the writing of a replication guide for the program.

During the current reporting period, the SCSU project coordinator has been involved in several activities that could indirectly assist with laying the groundwork for statewide replication. She has been working with colleagues in the SCSU education department to better facilitate the acceptance of non-traditional students into the certification program. The need for flexible GPA requirements and the acceptance of community college credits are a few of the challenges that have been discussed. In addition, the SCSU project coordinator reported that she would be presenting this April at the 2008 National Resource Center for Paraprofessionals Conference in Hartford, CT. The presentation, "Paraprofessionals as Certified Teachers: Training Paraprofessionals to Teach in Urban Districts," was to address future plans for a replication guide, as well as successes and challenges learned to date.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 4.b as it was not expected that the project would be fully prepared to replicate during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that the SCSU project coordinator will continue informal discussions with the SCSU education department in an effort to better facilitate the acceptance of non-traditional students into the certification program. In addition, the SCSU project coordinator and the SPDG project director anticipate working together to formalize plans for the development of a replication guide, as well as an overall plan for sustainability of the PACE project.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 4.b was set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). Quantitative data for this measure will be reported in the final 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.)

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 infants 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	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		

service providers and families in home/community settings will be filmed so that appropriate scenes can be chosen to produce final video segments.	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	%
			/			/	

5.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--	--

Editing of raw video footage will be completed and a final 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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 in late May 2007. Seven members of the group and associates from

the external evaluation team attended the meeting. Discussion at the meeting sought to further clarify the video content, specifically finalizing the components of a successful home visit that would be featured in the film. Families, service providers, locations and types of visits to include in the video were also discussed. The evaluation team held preliminary discussions with group members concerning the field test and subsequent evaluation of the video. The video advisory group did not meet again during the current reporting period.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from participation in the May meeting as well as notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

The annual target for Performance Measure 5.a was set at one meeting of the video advisory group. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The video advisory group was originally expected to review and comment on produced video segments and written documents (script, training manual and self-study guide) developed in association with the video project. However, delays in the filming schedule have prevented the group from fulfilling this expectation to date.

The Birth to Three project coordinator indicated there are currently no plans to reconvene meetings of the video advisory group. The external evaluation team anticipates working with the SPDG project director and the Birth to Three project coordinator within the coming month to confirm how the remaining obligations of the advisory group will be met. It is expected that as a result of these conversations the long-term target for Performance Measure 5.a will be expanded to include additional meetings of the group or will be revised to include new plans for review of produced video segments and the associated written video materials.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 5.a is currently set at six meetings of the video advisory group. Progress to date is six meetings (five meetings in Year 2 and one meeting in Year 3). This target has been met.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

At the outset of the "Early Intervention Providers Professional Development" 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 had prevented both consultants from participating in meetings of the video advisory group and as a result, group members decided to pursue replacements for the North Carolina consultants. At the May meeting of the group, two new candidates were identified, Robin McWilliam of Vanderbilt University and Yvette Blanchard of the University at Hartford. It was anticipated that a commitment from two new external consultants would be in place by fall 2007.

In follow-up discussions with the external evaluator and in her fall 2007 project progress report, the Birth to Three project coordinator indicated she still planned to request the cooperation of a national expert but had not yet done so. Most recently, the project coordinator reported that initial contact with one expert had been made and that it was anticipated she would have a commitment from this person by June 2008. Additional details were not provided.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from participation in the May video advisory group meeting as well as notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007 and notes submitted by the SPDG project director from an April meeting with the Birth to Three project coordinator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 5.b was to contract with two national experts who could consult and assist with the development of the training video package. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that a commitment from one external consultant will be received by June 2008. The status of a second consultant to the video project is not currently known.

The target for Performance Measure 5.b has been revised. The new target is for the commitment and participation of two external consultants to occur by June 2008.

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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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.

Filming to date has included three service providers and seven families currently in the Birth to Three System. 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. In addition to the home visits, one filming session was staged to model an initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007 and notes submitted by the SPDG project director from an April meeting with the Birth to Three project coordinator.

Performance Measure 5.c is a qualitative measure. The annual target was for filming to have been completed in January 2008. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The Birth to Three project coordinator is currently working to recruit two more service providers and at least two more families to participate in filming for the video.

The target for Performance Measure 5.c has been revised. The new target is for filming to be completed by the end of July 2008.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

A verbal commitment to assist with the research and writing of the video script, training manual, and self-study guide has been obtained from Dr. Keilty, an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Dr. Keilty was contracted by the project in late 2006 to revise the CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments and it is expected that these revised guidelines will serve as the foundation for the associated

training video materials.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 5.d as it was not expected that the development of the training materials would be completed during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The State Education Resource Center (SERC) is currently in the process of developing a contract with Dr. Keilty for additional services related to development of the associated training video materials. Revisions to the CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments are expected to be finalized in June (See Performance Measure 9.a) and it is anticipated that work on the training video materials will begin at that time.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 5.d is for the development of three written documents (video script, training manual, and self-study guide) to be produced by December 2008. This target has been revised from an earlier timeline of July 2008.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Filming for the training video currently continues and as such there has been no progress in editing or production of the final DVD.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 5.e as it was not expected that editing or production of the final DVD would be completed during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

As discussed under Performance Measure 5.a, the process for editing has not yet been confirmed. The external evaluation team anticipates working with the SPDG project director and the Birth to Three project coordinator within the coming month to confirm a schedule for the review and editing of raw video footage. The training video is expected to be approximately 30-minutes in length with a 5-minute segment produced for families who are currently receiving and/or eligible for Birth to Three services. It has not been determined if the family segment will be produced as a separate DVD or as an introductory clip to the full training video.

The target for Performance Measure 5.e has been revised. The new target is for editing and production of a final DVD to be completed by the end of December 2008.



**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, manual, and study guide with a selected sample of Birth to Three agencies.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1	/		1	/	
6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Birth to Three agencies who commit to participate in the field test of the training video project.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		5	/		2	/	
6.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of Birth to Three	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		

service providers who participate in the field test of the training video project.	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 scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure #2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

6.e. 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 (OSEP Long-Term Measure #1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

6.f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100

improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).	
---	--

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

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Field testing of the training video is anticipated to involve approximately 25 service providers and five agency directors from five Birth to Three agencies. All participants will be expected to attend one professional development workshop, tentatively scheduled for January 2009. During this workshop, participants will be shown the video, and the training manual and self-study guide will be used as part of an organized group activity. The service providers and agency directors will be asked to provide feedback on the film via a short evaluation form and through a focus group discussion facilitated by the external evaluator.

Due to delays in filming, major revisions to the film after the initial viewing of the DVD by the field test audience are unlikely. Consequently, the external evaluation will be summative in focus with agency directors and service providers expected to participate in a variety of evaluation activities in the months following the January workshop. The timeline for the evaluation plan will be finalized as soon as development of the video and print materials is closer to completion. However, multiple measures, using both quantitative and qualitative data collection are anticipated (See additional performance measures under Objective 6 and 7 for further information).

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

The annual target for Performance Measure 6.a was to develop a detailed plan to field test the training video, manual, and study guide. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Although a preliminary plan to field test the video is in place, modifications to this plan are expected to occur as production

of the video progresses. However, implementation of the field test and the subsequent evaluation will be considered under separate performance measures.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.b: The number of Birth to Three agencies who commit to participate in the field test of the training video project.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In October of the current reporting period, the Birth to Three project coordinator and the external evaluation team discussed possible avenues for selecting Birth to Three agencies to participate in the field test portion of the video project. It was agreed that the project coordinator would self-select the agencies, considering the size, location, and perceived ability and willingness of particular agencies to fully participate in the project. Since providing a firm timeline for participation in the field test was still difficult, the project coordinator would first seek an informal verbal commitment from agency directors. The external evaluator drafted a letter, outlining the field test plan, which the project coordinator could use as a basis for her preliminary discussions with the directors.

In follow-up conversations in January, the Birth to Three project coordinator indicated she had not yet spoken with the agency directors but anticipated she would have a verbal commitment from five directors by April. At the time of this report, the Birth to Three project coordinator confirmed via email that two directors had provided a verbal commitment of their agencies' (Cheshire Public Schools and Children Therapy Services) participation in the project.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of evidence of progress towards this measure includes a draft letter to agency directors outlining the field test of the video project and evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator.

The annual target for Performance Measure 6.b was to obtain a verbal commitment from five Birth to Three agency directors to participate in the field test of the training video project. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that the Birth to Three project coordinator will obtain a verbal commitment from three additional agency directors to participate in the field test of the video project. As the timeline for the field test becomes more secure, the external evaluator will work with the project coordinator to revise and finalize the invitation letter. The letter will then be sent to the five agency directors who have verbally agreed to participate in the project in an effort to formalize their

commitment.

The long-term target for this measure is a signed letter of commitment from all five agency directors.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.c: The number of Birth to Three service providers who participate in the field test of the training video project.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

As discussed under Performance Measure 6.a, the plan for the field test is to involve approximately 25 service providers from five Birth to Three agencies. In an effort to maximize the project's outreach to families, the agency directors will be advised to select service providers with a minimum caseload of 10 families (See Objective 7 for further information on family participation). However, this guideline will be flexible as providers' caseloads can fluctuate rapidly from week to week or month to month.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 6.c. Due to delays in filming, it was not expected that the Birth to Three project would be prepared to involve service providers in the field test of the video during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that the service providers in the five participating service agencies will be contacted in late fall 2008.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 6.c is the participation of approximately 25 service providers in the field test component of the training video project.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6.d: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure #2).

NOTE: Please see Performance Measures 13.b and 17.e for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #2. Progress towards this measure is based on information provided by the SPDG project coordinators as to the research methodologies of their programs in general.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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 the 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 Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments (1999) is currently undergoing final revisions with publication expected in June 2008. This most recent revision was done as part of the SPDG Early Intervention project (see Performance Measure 9.a) and the guidelines have served, and are expected to continue to serve, as the foundation for the training video and its associated materials.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the CT Birth to Three System Mission Statement; CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments; CT Birth to Three Credential Manual; and the Division for Early Childhood, Council for Exceptional Children Recommended Practices in Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (2000). Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007 and information obtained from the Birth to Three website.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 6.d. It was not expected that the Birth to Three video project would be prepared to provide professional development during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The Birth to Three project coordinator has identified the "Early Intervention Providers Professional Development" project as evidence-based and as such the training workshop, tentatively scheduled for January 2009, will be considered an evidence-based professional development event.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 6.d is set at 100%.

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 (OSEP Long-Term Measure #1).

NOTE: Please see Performance Measures 2.a and 14.c for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #1.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Professional development was not provided as part of the Birth to Three video project during the current reporting period.

The external evaluation team has had preliminary discussions with the video advisory group and the project coordinator concerning the development of effective instruments that could be used to accurately assess the effects of the video on service providers' knowledge and skills. Discussions have centered on 1) what components of the didactic content and naturalistic strategies are most critical; and 2) what particular evaluation tools and/or methods would be most effective in measuring mastery of content and skill.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from participation in a May meeting of the video advisory group as well as notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 6.e. It was not expected that the video project would be prepared to provide professional development during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The external evaluator will continue to work with the Birth to Three project coordinator on the development of effective instruments to accurately measure the effects of the video on service providers' knowledge and skills. It is expected that the development of such instruments will coincide with production of the self-study guide this fall.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 6.e is set at 100% (25 of 25 service providers will demonstrate they are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices).

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).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 6.f has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Program Performance Measure #1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.a, 13.a, and 17.d for additional information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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

State Performance Plan Part C Indicator #2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

SPP Improvement Strategy: The Natural Environments Guidelines will be updated as needed to stay current with best practices. Alignment with the Birth to Three video project: In addition to the development of the training video, the Birth to Three project was also given the charge of revising the 1999 Natural Environments Guidelines. (See Performance Measure 9.a for more information on the project's progress towards revisions of the guidelines.)

State Performance Plan Part C Indicator #4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: a) know their rights; b) effectively communicate their children's needs; and c) help their children develop and learn.

SPP Improvement Strategy: The Family Survey will be repeated each spring. Alignment with the Birth to Three video project: The Birth to Three System Family Survey is distributed annually to all eligible families and is used to report on indicators 4.a., 4.b., and 4.c as defined above. Preliminary discussions between the external evaluation team and the Birth to Three project coordinator have been held on how the evaluation of the family element of the video field test can align with the Family Survey items that are used to report on indicators 4.b and 4.c.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the CT Part C State Performance Plan 2005-2010; the CT Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments Draft, April 2007; the CT Birth to Three System Family Survey; and the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007. Additional documentation includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

The annual target for Performance Measure 6.f was set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). This project's contribution to that target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is anticipated that final revisions to the service guidelines, as outlined in Part C Indicator #2, will occur within the next month and will be sent to OSEP for final approval at that time.

Under Part C Indicator #4, the external evaluation team expects to work with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the next reporting period to anchor the evaluation instrument constructed for the family element of the video to items on the annual Birth to Three System Family Survey.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 6.f is 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects).



**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 number of families of participating service providers who view the family segment of the training video.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of families viewing the family segment of the training video who participate in the evaluation of the video segment.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
7.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		

development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through on-going comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry) (OSEP Program Performance Measure #3).

Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
	/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7.a: The number of families of participating service providers who view the family segment of the training video.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

As briefly discussed under Performance Measure 5.e, the exact format of the family segment (as a separate DVD or as an introductory clip) has not been confirmed at this time. However, during the current reporting period, the Birth to Three project coordinator and members of the external evaluation team have held various discussions on how to ensure the family segment is seen by participating families in the Birth to Three System. A few of the topics addressed thus far have been the availability of DVD players in the home; offering a "viewing party" for families; and offering incentives to families who view the video at home and return a survey/response card to the external evaluator.

Although a definitive process for distribution of the film to families has not been established, the scale of the distribution of the film has been set at 250 families. The aim of the project is for each of the 25 service providers participating in the field test to have a minimum caseload of 10 families. As mentioned under Performance Measure 6.c, providers' caseloads can fluctuate rapidly and consequently this target may be adjusted slightly to reflect service providers' caseloads at the time of distribution of the DVD.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with

the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 7.a. It was not expected that the Birth to Three project would be prepared to involve families during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that further planning will occur between the Birth to Three project coordinator and the external evaluation team in the coming months. At this time, it is anticipated that a separate family DVD will be produced and providers would be given copies at the professional development workshop in January 2009 to distribute to their respective caseloads.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 7.a is for 250 families to view the family segment of the training video project (10 families for each of the 25 service providers participating in the field test).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7.b: The percentage of families viewing the family segment of the training video who participate in the evaluation of the video segment.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The evaluation plan for the family portion of the Birth to Three video project is still in the preliminary stages. Discussions during the current reporting period have centered on the distribution of a brief survey/response card fitted into the inside cover of the family DVD. A self addressed envelope would be included instructing families to return the completed survey to the external evaluator. Additional ideas proposed to date have included focus group(s) and/or phone interviews.

The external evaluator and the Birth to Three project coordinator have discussed anchoring any evaluation instrument constructed for the video to items on the annual Birth to Three System Family Survey. The annual survey, which is distributed each spring, is used to report on SPP Part C Indicator 4. It is expected that the evaluation of the family element of the video field test will align specifically with the Family Survey items that are used to report on indicator 4.b and 4.c (See Performance Measure 6.f).

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 7.b. It was not expected that the Birth to Three video project would be prepared to involve families during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The external evaluator will work with the Birth to Three project coordinator to develop an effective instrument (such as the survey/response card) to measure families' perceptions of the services they currently receive and how their expectations for future services might have changed as a result of seeing the video.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 7.b is to include 50% of families viewing the family video segment in the evaluation piece of the project (i.e., such as a 50% response rate on the survey/response card).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7.c: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through on-going comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry) (OSEP Program Performance Measure #3).

NOTE: Please see Performance Measure 13.c for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #3.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

One particular emphasis of the Birth to Three video project is to increase the family's competence and capacity to meet the needs of their child through the provision of a "coaching model" of home-based service delivery in everyday routines and activities. The training video and self-study guide is expected to demonstrate best practices in "coaching" families to take advantage of teachable moments that occur throughout the day, rather than just when the early intervention provider is present in the home. By providing service providers with the professional development necessary to facilitate an effective coaching relationship, it is expected that families will acquire new knowledge and skills as they are supported in taking an active role in their child's development.

At this time, it is expected that agency directors will conduct post-video observations of the participating service providers in an effort to measure the fidelity with which the coaching model is being implemented in the home. The CT Birth to Three System Observation Checklist, currently used as part of the system's credentialing program and as a staff development tool within particular service agencies, will be used as the primary data collection tool. The Checklist was originally developed to determine the extent to which early interventionists use best practices in their work with families of infants and toddlers with disabilities. It is anticipated that the Checklist will be modified to meet the specific needs of the video project.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period. Additional documentation includes the CT Birth to Three System Observation Checklist and Manual.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 7.c. It was not expected that the Birth to Three video project would be prepared to involve families during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The specifics of observations by the agency directors have not been finalized. The external evaluation team anticipates working with the Birth to Three project coordinator on this plan when a firm timeline for the field test has been established. It is also anticipated that the Checklist will be modified to accurately meet the needs of the project as further details on the video content and study-guide become known.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 7.c is set at 100%.



**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, manual, and self-study guide on a statewide basis and explore distribution through national venues such as professional conferences.

8.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP Long-Term Measure #2).	PRGM	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 8.a: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practice on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP Long-Term Measure #2).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 8.a has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure #2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.b, 12.a and 20.a for additional information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #2.)

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The Birth to Three project coordinator indicated that no discussions or further plans regarding replication have occurred during the current reporting period.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation towards this measure includes the original SPDG grant application. The application outlined replication for the training video, manual, and self-study guide as follows: 1) copies of the DVD will be sent to each of the 36 local Birth to Three programs in the state and to each Part C Lead Agency in states across the U.S.; 2) copies of the DVD will be made available to OSEP-funded technical assistance projects including the National Early Childhood Assistance Center (NECTAC), the National Technical Assistance Alliance for Parent Center(s), the National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY), and the Regional Resource Centers (RRCs); and 3) further dissemination of the video will occur through presentations at national or regional events such as the NECTAC Annual Early Childhood Conference, the OSEP Personnel Development Conference and/or other national meetings.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 8.a as it was not expected that the project would be replicated during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 8.a is set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). Quantitative data for this measure will be reported in the final 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.)

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	%
		1	/			/	

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 Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In addition to the development of the training video, the "Early Intervention Providers Professional Development" project was also given the charge of revising the Connecticut Birth to Three System Service Guidelines #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 typical 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.

As described in last year's annual report, 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 guidelines. She submitted a draft of her revisions in spring 2007 to the Birth to Three management team. A focus group forum was held in November 2007 to solicit comments on the revised report but no one attended the event. The Birth to Three project coordinator did receive written feedback on the drafted guidelines from four service provider agencies. Suggestions included incorporating more information on the routines based interview and adding a pull-out section for doctors, LEAs and people new to the early intervention process.

The revised guidelines were 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 was reviewing the NECTAC release to ensure that the state service guidelines were comprehensive of and aligned with the most up-to-date national standards. Once this review was complete, it was anticipated that the state guide would be sent to OSEP for final approval.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes a copy of the contract for revision of the service guidelines; a copy of the consultant's initial draft of the revised guidelines; and the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007. Additional documentation includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and emails with the Birth to Three project coordinator during the current reporting period.

The annual target for Performance Measure 9.a was for the development and dissemination (in print and via the web) of the revised Service Guidelines #2 on Natural Environments to have occurred in December 2007. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is anticipated that final revisions to the service guidelines will occur within the next month and be sent to OSEP for final approval.

The target for Performance Measure 9.a has been revised. The new target is for the service guidelines to be released by June 1, 2008.



**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 for scaling up of instructional/behavioral practices for which scientific evidence of efficacy exists.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	
10.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Establish alignment between CT SPDG/Scaling Up initiatives and three other statewide initiatives: Connecticut Vanguard Schools, the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI), and Connecticut Reading First.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	

10.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Collaborate with CSDE and UConn to develop an action plan for creation of a comprehensive system of school-based behavioral and mental health supports in schools statewide.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
10.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Participate in the founding and work of a Center for Behavioral Education and Research (CBER), to be located at the University of Connecticut.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
10.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Develop and sustain support processes for informing LEAs of opportunities and resources for scaling up evidence-based practices, including management of the application, review, and grant award process.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10.a: The number of topical priority areas for scaling up of instructional/behavioral practices for which scientific evidence of efficacy exists.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

One goal of CT SPDG is to provide statewide, targeted professional development to support scaling up of effective evidence-based practices statewide. This project establishes model districts in use of evidence-based practices, and then pairs them with partner or "scaling-up" districts in order to replicate the evidence-based practices. The State Education Resource Center (SERC), the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) designated technical assistance provider, leads the implementation of this project.

During the 2006-2007 program year, three topical priority areas were chosen to be the focus of the SERC project: School-wide Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS), Early Intervention Project/Response to Intervention (EIP/RtI), and Prevention/Intervention, which was divided between initiatives titled "School-Based Literacy Teams: A Three-Tiered Approach" (Literacy) and "Best Practices in School Counseling/Developmental Guidance Curriculum" (Counseling).

During the current period, the PBS and EIP/RtI initiatives were active in model districts, and the Literacy initiative commenced in model districts. The Counseling initiative was postponed for review and possible redesign, due in part to the unavailability of key SERC personnel.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes project documentation that provides definitions of the selected topical priority areas and copies of the requests for proposal issued for each initiative.

The annual target for Performance Measure 10.a was to finalize the selection and establishment of three topical priority areas. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Although the selection and establishment of three topical priority areas has been finalized, modifications to the Counseling initiative may occur. Progress towards implementation of the three priority areas, including Counseling will be considered under separate performance measures.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10.b: Establish alignment between CT SPDG/Scaling Up initiatives and three other statewide initiatives: Connecticut Vanguard Schools, the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI), and Connecticut Reading First.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Initial alignment between the SERC project (CT SPDG/Scaling Up) and the Vanguard, CALI, and CT Reading First initiatives was determined during the 2006-2007 program year through a review of project and initiative objectives and methodologies by SERC, CSDE, and the University of Connecticut (UConn). CALI is Connecticut's accountability and school improvement model for schools and districts that fail to meet standards for adequate yearly progress and have been designated as needing improvement. Activities within CALI include professional development and training around data driven decision making, Making Standards Work, effective teaching, and common formative assessments; all described as effective training practices in the research of Douglas B. Reeves and the Leadership and Learning Center. Alignment was explained in application materials for PBS, EIP/RtI and Literacy grants under this project, and coherence with applicable initiatives was a requirement for funding.

SERC project staff reported that alignment across SPDG and statewide initiatives provided an opportunity for targeted technical assistance designed to improve coherence among school improvement activities. They noted that discussions initially focused on alignment between SERC project initiatives and other individual initiatives led to broader discussions of alignment and interconnection among existing and new statewide initiatives.

SERC project staff met during summer 2007 to coordinate planning and activities to maximize coherence among the project initiatives. During weekly staff development, members of training and technical support teams presented information on their initiatives to all SERC staff and shared best practices. These activities ensured that the topical priority areas were aligned internally within SERC as they were externally with other statewide initiatives. They also led to coherence in implementation methods among the priority-area initiatives, such as adoption of the verification visit designed for PBS in review of potential model districts for EIP/RtI. SERC staff also made connections among SPDG funded activities and other agency work being done in participating districts and schools to maintain continuity and effective allocation of staff and resources.

The SERC project coordinator reported that alignment with the three statewide initiatives had led SERC project staff to adopt effective practices from other initiatives for use in SPDG. For example, aspects of the Vanguard Schools site visit design were used to improve PBS visits, and later, aspects of PBS visits also informed Vanguard site visits. SERC project staff involved in the Literacy initiative reported incorporating aspects of CT Reading First, Courageous Conversations about Race, and EIP/RtI work already happening throughout the state.

Applications for funding under the SERC project consistently required that selected LEAs utilize components of CALI or a similar accountability program to facilitate coherence in school improvement initiatives across the state. Selected LEAs also are required to support their participating schools in applying for designation as Vanguard Schools, which recognizes school reform efforts that improve outcomes for students of all backgrounds, either as high-achieving schools or for making progress as measured by Connecticut's statewide assessment scores (Connecticut Mastery Test and Connecticut Academic Performance Test). School and district participants in PBS and EIP/RtI activities reported that some schools have taken

preliminary steps toward application for Vanguard School status. One EIP/RtI model school already has attained Vanguard status.

SERC personnel involved in all priority area initiatives are currently participating in development and design of a Best Practices web site, the structure of which is modeled on the Vanguard Schools standards and review rubric. Members of the SERC project staff for EIP/RtI also coordinated the work of the Scientifically Research Based Interventions (SRBI) panel that developed statewide standards for Response to Intervention, an initiative which the SERC project coordinator said complemented professional development CSDE has begun offering under the Demonstration Schools initiative within CALI.

SERC project staff and district and school personnel involved in all three project initiatives reported taking steps to align activities between SPDG and statewide initiatives at the LEA level.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes project documentation such as meeting agendas and minutes, requests for proposal, and technical assistance visit reports. Documents were submitted with the October 2007 project progress report or upon request in spring 2008. Additional information was collected during evaluation site visits to SERC and to a subset of LEAs active in the project during March and April 2008.

The annual target for Performance Measure 10.b was to establish alignment with the three specified statewide initiatives (100%, alignment with 3 of 3 selected initiatives). This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

During the course of the grant, SERC will continue to seek alignment between the SERC initiative and the three specified statewide initiatives. However, since the alignment has been established it is not expected that this performance measure will be included in subsequent reports.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10.c: Collaborate with CSDE and UConn to develop an action plan for creation of a comprehensive system of school-based behavioral and mental health supports in schools statewide.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

During the prior reporting period, SERC, CSDE, and UConn personnel involved in PBS met to begin discussions about creating a comprehensive system of behavioral and mental health supports in Connecticut schools. Participants in the

meeting identified related initiatives and programs in the state and determined which were and were not evidence-based. SERC and CSDE began development of an action plan to reallocate staff and resources to science-based initiatives and programs.

The SERC project coordinator reported that progress on this initiative was delayed during much of the current period due to reorganization of CSDE and resumed with appointment of an associate commissioner who now leads it. Activities during the current period included meetings to consider the various initiatives under way in the state and to begin the process of identifying components of a comprehensive system. The coordinator noted that the meetings and involvement of UConn have helped to increase shared understanding among participants in this initiative and effectively provided opportunities to involve agencies outside education, such as Juvenile Justice.

In addition, SERC reported advocating for a comprehensive system of school-based supports, activities which resulted in discussions among researchers, public agencies, and the CSDE administrative counsel. SERC also provided statewide PBS professional development sessions, as well as networking sessions for PBS coaches and data systems training for selected model LEAs.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes meeting agendas and minutes provided with the October 2007 project progress report and information provided during the spring 2008 evaluation visit to SERC.

There was no annual target for Performance Measure 10.c as it was not expected that the action plan would be developed during this current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 10.c is to complete the action plan. This target is expected to be met during the next reporting period, with completion of the action plan projected to occur during fall 2008. It is anticipated that progress towards implementation of the action plan will be considered under separate performance measures in future reports.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10.d: Participate in the founding and work of a Center for Behavioral Education and Research (CBER), to be located at the University of Connecticut.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

SERC became a founding member of the CBER and collaborated in development of the center's purpose and goal. The CBER is intended to enable university and school personnel to effectively and efficiently enhance school learning and teaching outcomes through collaborative, applied research. Its goal is to discover and enhance strategies that promote academic and social behavior successes for all students. The CBER is located at the University of Connecticut and directed by Dr. George Sugai.

During May 2007, a CBER collaborative planning meeting was held to present the center's mission, goal, and current projects to representatives of schools and districts statewide and to invite them to become members. Members of the collaborative will have access to research resources; opportunities for consultation with researchers; and opportunities for participation in research projects, in development and dissemination of new research, and in annual meetings. Additional meetings throughout the period focused on research for practical application and were intended to inform participants of current research and to develop school involvement. Members of the SERC project staff attended meetings appropriate to their areas of expertise.

The PBS model district RFP issued in January 2008 included a requirement that selected districts participate with SERC and partners at CBER and at the OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports to identify lessons learned and to contribute to the research base.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes meeting agendas, meeting minutes, and project documents such as the PBS model district RFP. Documents were provided as supporting evidence for the October 2007 project progress report or upon request during spring 2008.

Performance Measure 10.d is a qualitative measure. The annual target for this measure was SERC's continued membership and involvement in CBER and its mission of research and support for behavioral education. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 10.d. This performance measure is an annual measure. It is expected that during each successive reporting period SERC will continue to be involved in CBER and its mission of research and support for behavioral education.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10.e: Develop and sustain support processes for informing LEAs of opportunities and resources for scaling up evidence-based practices, including management of the application, review, and grant award process.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

SERC began providing information on grant opportunities under this project and on available resources related to the three topical priority areas during the prior reporting period. Two model districts under the PBS initiative were identified in February 2007. The application process for identifying model districts under the EIP/RtI initiative began during the prior period and was completed during the current reporting period, in May 2007, with four model districts selected. Also during the prior period, data collection tools were identified for use in verification visits to applicant LEAs and schools in order to assess initial implementation of critical features of PBS and EIP/RtI. Measurement processes will be repeated to document continuous improvement and the fidelity of replication.

Applications for the Literacy initiative were distributed during April 2007, informational sessions were conducted during May 2007, and applications were reviewed during June. After verification visits, five Literacy model schools were identified in early July.

During the current reporting period, LEA projects were active in all three topical priority areas: EIP/RtI, PBS, and Prevention/Intervention (Literacy). A preliminary request for proposal was drafted for the Counseling initiative under the Prevention/Intervention priority area, but the initiative has been delayed because the SERC staff member expected to lead it is currently on medical leave. Also during the current period, one of the two model districts in the PBS initiative determined that it could not commit the necessary staff or effort to carry out the grant due to multiple initiatives and activities under way in the district that competed for resources and staff time. This district notified SERC that it would not reapply when the PBS initiative continuation application was issued in February 2008, although district personnel reported plans to continue PBS implementation in schools where it already is in place. In response, SERC issued a request for proposals for up to two additional model districts in PBS. Applicant districts were required to have at least one school effectively implementing PBS practices, interventions, and systems change strategies. Applications were due April 1, and funding decisions will be announced during the next reporting period.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes requests for proposal, funding letters, and information provided during the spring 2008 evaluation visit to SERC. Documents were submitted with the October 2007 project progress report or upon request in spring 2008.

Performance Measure 10.e is a qualitative measure. The annual target for this measure is continuation of the support processes developed during the prior reporting period. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Funding decisions for additional PBS model districts are expected to be made early in May 2008. Also in May, the application for PBS partner districts will be distributed to potential applicants, with selection expected to occur during summer 2008.

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 10.e. This performance measure is an annual measure. It is expected that during each successive reporting period SERC will continue with support processes to inform LEAs of opportunities and resources for scaling up evidence-based practices and support selection of model and partner schools and districts.



**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					
Develop SERC and other state and regional resources to facilitate replication of evidence-based practices in the selected topical priority areas.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
11.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Identify fiscal and other resources to support scaling-up programs and disseminate evidence-based information and data.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
11.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Create a web site to	PROJ						

disseminate information on best practices in evidence-based teaching and early intervention.	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 11.a: Develop SERC and other state and regional resources to facilitate replication of evidence-based practices in the selected topical priority areas.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

During the current reporting period, members of the SERC project staff involved in the EIP/RtI initiative facilitated and participated in a collaborative panel on RtI/Scientifically-Based Interventions (SRBI) that identified best practices and developed statewide guidelines for schools and districts. The executive summary of the framework, titled "Using Scientific Research-Based Interventions: Improving Education for All Students," was published during February, and the full framework is scheduled for release in June 2008. Project staff involved in the EIP/RtI initiative reported that providing support for the SPDG model districts had informed their work with the SRBI panel and that they expected a reciprocal flow of knowledge and information back from SRBI to the project. SERC also hosted and participated in RtI teleconferences with CSDE consultants during fall 2007.

During monthly meetings of the state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Council, SERC project staff participated in ongoing conversations with council members to review and strengthen the links among CSPD, SPDG, and the State Performance Plan (SPP).

SERC conducted planning meetings, training sessions and retreats for project staff across the topical priority areas and participated in meetings with CSDE and UConn to develop internal capacity to support LEAs in implementing and scaling up evidence-based practices. Project staff coordinated among the priority areas and provided presentations and training for all SERC staff to maintain coherence among the SERC SPDG initiatives and between the SERC SPDG project and other SERC initiatives. SERC also hired additional personnel to support the EIP/RtI initiative and provided training and orientation.

SERC project staff involved in the PBS initiative conducted a series of planning meetings and a team retreat during spring 2007 to plan for statewide implementation of PBS. They also developed and distributed to district and school teams a public relations calendar that featured information on PBS best practices.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes meeting agendas and minutes, draft documents, and samples of finished products. Documentation was submitted with the October 2007 project progress report and following the spring 2008 evaluation site visit to SERC.

Performance Measure 11.a is a qualitative measure. The annual target was to continue developing internal, regional, and state resources to facilitate replication of evidence-based practices. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 11.a. This performance measure is an annual measure. It is expected that during each successive reporting period SERC will continue to develop internal, regional, and state resources to facilitate replication of evidence-based practices.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 11.b: Identify fiscal and other resources to support scaling-up programs and disseminate evidence-based information and data.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

SERC reported ongoing dialogue with CSDE and meetings with the steering committee of the CSPD, CBER, the state-level PBS and EIP/RtI leadership teams, and the SRBI Advisory Panel to discuss development of human and fiscal resources to maintain, expand, and sustain initiatives in all priority areas. In some cases, meetings led to collaboration among SERC staff skilled in implementation of evidence-based practices and agency personnel knowledgeable about policy or University researchers studying the practices. These activities provided increased opportunities for SERC personnel to help schools and districts achieve success and for researchers to gain a broader perspective about practical application of evidence-based practices.

During the summer of 2007, SERC project staff working on the Literacy initiative developed a training program and related materials based on best practices for use with participating school teams. SERC personnel also met with researchers from the UConn Neag School of Education to discuss compilation of a resource guide for instructional coaching. The SERC team proceeded to compile a resource guide on literacy coaches' roles and practice, with information on 12 resources, including coaching guides, frameworks for professional development in literacy education, reference material on promoting professional growth, and an overview of the Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse developed by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English. The compiled guide was distributed by SERC to the literacy

teams at the participating schools.

As stated under Performance Measure 11.a, SERC project staff involved in the EIP/RtI initiative coordinated the work of the SRBI panel and led development of a statewide framework for implementing Response to Intervention.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes project documents such as meeting agendas and minutes, training schedules and materials, and completed publications. Additional information was collected during the spring 2008 evaluation site visit to SERC.

Performance Measure 11.b is a qualitative measure. The annual target was to continue identifying fiscal and other resources to support scaling-up programs and to disseminate evidence-based information and data. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 11.b. This performance measure is an annual measure. It is expected that during each successive reporting period SERC will continue to identify fiscal and other resources to support scaling-up programs and to disseminate evidence-based information and data.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 11.c: Create a web site to disseminate information on best practices in evidence-based teaching and early intervention.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

SERC project staff identified the audience for the evidence-based Best Practices web site, determined the purpose of the site, and developed an outline for the site in alignment with the Vanguard Schools standards during the prior reporting period. During the current period, SERC reported meetings among project staff and with the Vanguard Steering Committee and Advisory Group to discuss the web site. The collaborative meetings determined that the web site ought to be structured to reflect the Vanguard Schools review rubric, which is based on effective schools research. The site will use as an organizational framework the nine Vanguard standards: a clear and common focus; high standards and expectations; strong leadership; supportive, personalized, and relevant learning environment; parent/community involvement and collaboration; frequent monitoring accountability and assessment; curriculum, instruction, and assessment; professional development; and time and structure. During these meetings, SERC personnel also identified potential products and resources for inclusion in the site such as success stories, case studies, and links to additional resources to support each Vanguard standard.

The SERC project coordinator reported that development of the web site provided opportunities for staff members to focus on implementation of evidence-based practices and to assemble rich resources for information and training that illustrate what standards look like in practice. SERC project staff reported that the "back end" structures and systems for the site were completed during the current period, and writing of content began. SERC personnel noted that this phase of development required increased involvement among partners in other agencies, universities, and schools.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes meeting notes and working documents such as web-site outlines. Additional information was collected during the evaluation site visit to SERC, conducted during March 2008.

The annual target for Performance Measure 11.c. was to create the website by April 1, 2008. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Due to delays, the web site is expected to be released during the next reporting period in sections as they are completed. Initial sections will allow users to reference information according to the Vanguard Schools standards, to enroll in workshops, to view presentations and listen to segments of related audio, and to learn about school success stories.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 11.c is to place all aspects of the web site in operation and to publicize it to potential users statewide. Progress to date includes identification of the site's purpose, audience, and alignment with the Vanguard Schools initiative, development of the technology infrastructure to support it, and initial development of content.



**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					
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
12.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools in the Literacy initiative that have implemented the three-tier model for literacy instruction.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
12.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of LEAs in the	PROJ						

EIP/RtI initiative that replicated the Response to Intervention model with fidelity in early intervening services.	Target			Actual Performance Data			
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
		/			/		
12.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools participating in the PBS initiative that have completed a full year of implementation and have achieved overall SET scores of 80% or higher.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6 / 6	100		5 / 6	83

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 12.a: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis.

Note: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 12.a has been aggregated across the 4 SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure #2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.b, 8.a and 20.a for additional information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #2.)

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Current activities with district sites are centered on supporting efforts to provide technical assistance, training and support to ensure the fidelity of implementation for model sites in each topical priority area. Model sites are expected to assist partner schools/districts with replication in their third year of implementation. Topical priority areas are currently in their first and second year of grant participation. SERC reported meeting with CSDE and UConn to discuss the definition of "replication with fidelity" among project directors. As a result of those meetings, logic models were developed to support the ongoing evaluation of fidelity of implementation by serving as an accountability measure, communication tool, and training guide. The logic models foster consistency across initiatives to ensure each site is working towards similar intended outcomes, and to support program evaluation for the future.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes dates of meetings held to develop logic models, copies of logic models, and information submitted in the October 2007 project progress report.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 12.a as it was not expected that the project would be replicated during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

Model schools and districts will assist partner schools and districts with the replication and implementation of best practices. Ongoing data collection will guide training and technical assistance to support effective use of related best practices.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 12.a is set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). Quantitative data for this measure will be reported in the final year.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 12.b: The percentage of schools in the Literacy initiative that have implemented the three-tier model for literacy instruction.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The Literacy initiative is based upon a series of five professional development programs, each of which includes a session for principals and literacy coaches, and a session for complete literacy teams, including principals, and literacy coaches, and teachers. At each professional development session for full literacy teams, each school team develops an action plan for implementing the current training. SERC project staff visit schools between training programs to provide technical assistance with implementation.

As of March 31, 2008 three of the five professional development programs had been presented. The fourth program, scheduled for April, concerns establishing three tiers of instruction through assessment, intervention, and response to intervention. SERC project staff reported that for this reason, the expectation was that schools would not have implemented three-tier instruction by the end of the current reporting period. However, all schools were expected to have implemented the first tier of the three-tier model by the end of the reporting period. Tier one is described as "comprehensive and coordinated reading instruction for all students," including a continuum of instruction, universal assessment to identify students' needs and monitor progress, and analysis of data to guide instruction. SERC project staff reported that all five participating schools implemented tier-one instructional strategies as determined by SERC review during technical assistance visits. In site visit meetings, coaching logs, or action plans, representatives of all schools reported or noted activities related to implementation

of tier-one strategies.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes information provided during evaluation visits to SERC and to three Literacy schools during spring 2008, sample action plans for all five schools, and sample coaching logs for three schools.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 12.b as it was not expected that the five participating schools would have implemented three-tier instruction by the end of the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

Further professional development activities and continued steps towards implementation of three-tier instructional strategies at the participating model schools are expected during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 12.b is set at 100% of the participating schools implementing all three tiers of instructional strategies. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 12.c: The percentage of LEAs in the EIP/RtI initiative that replicated the Response to Intervention model with fidelity in early intervening services.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

RtI grants were awarded in May 2007, so implementation began during the current period. The grant was only available to districts that had participated in EIP training within the prior three years. Districts had to identify schools that had active early intervening services and that were situated to become model schools quickly. Under the grant, model districts are expected to develop the RtI model in 1-3 model schools during years 1-2, and to scale up to additional schools in the district during years 2-3. They are expected to have plans in place to expand early intervening services through a continuum of support for all students to all schools within 3-6 years.

During the 2007-2008 project year, (Year 1) all participating districts made steps towards complete implementation with fidelity, and two districts began preparation for replication at partner schools within their districts. One district was described as still in their planning phase, and the model school in another district was reportedly at an independent stage, and ready to expand to other schools.

While two districts were ahead of schedule in preparation to replicate RtI within the district, the definition of replication with fidelity had not been defined. Fidelity levels will be defined after the second set of data is collected with the verification tool. According to the SERC project coordinator, baseline verification data was collected during the application review, and the second batch will be collected at the end of the 2007-2008 school year. The verification tool is a list of 20 indicators based on four areas: leadership, assessment, curriculum instruction, and decision making.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes technical assistance reports and discussions with the SERC project coordinator during the spring 2008 visit.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 12.c as it was not expected that participating LEAs would replicate the RtI model with fidelity during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

SERC will use the verification instrument to develop the definition of fidelity after data is collected in spring 2008. SERC also will use the tool to continue provision of technical assistance to both model and partner schools. Current partner schools will continue to meet to prepare for the implementation of RtI. Additional partner schools also will be selected to begin preparation for replication of RtI.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 12.c is set at 100% of model districts replicating RtI within their districts.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 12.d: The percentage of schools participating in the PBS initiative that have completed a full year of implementation and have achieved overall SET scores of 80% or higher.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

PBS projects use the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) to assess and evaluate implementation of the features of effective behavior support school-wide. The overall SET score is an average of seven areas: expectations defined, expectations taught, system to reward expectations, system for responding to violations, monitoring/decision-making, management, and district support. The SET assessment includes interviews with the school administrator, at least 10 staff members, at least 15 students, and the school's PBS team. A tour of the school and review of school documents regarding behavior prevention, intervention, and discipline are also conducted. Schools with average scores of 80% or above are said to be implementing PBS with fidelity.

Two districts were selected to participate in the PBS initiative, with three model schools within each district. Among the six model schools, data was received from five, all of which achieved an overall SET score of 80% or above after one year of implementation. One of the two participating districts has since chosen to cease participation in the grant, due to competing district initiatives that prevent them from meeting grant requirements.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes baseline SET scores and SET scores following the first year of implementation for the selected model schools.

The annual target for Performance Measure 12.d was set at 100% of schools receiving SET scores of 80% or better. This target has not been met, as data was not provided for one of the six model schools. As a result, 83.3% (5 of 6) of schools were documented as implementing with fidelity. However, the school with missing SET scores dropped-out of the PBS initiative prior to completing year one of the SET evaluation.

LOOKING FORWARD

SERC issued an RFP at the end of this reporting period to identify two model districts to replace the one that dropped out, and to meet the original goal of three districts. Identified districts are expected to begin participating in fall 2008. When identifying potential districts, SERC has discussed the need to ensure districts are capable of implementing all aspects of the project. SERC also intends on selecting partner districts during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 12.d is set at 100% of model and partner schools receiving SET scores of 80% or higher. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.

Progress to date is 83.3% (5 of 6 schools active during the current reporting period).



**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 scientific- or evidence-based professional development.

13.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 (OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		4 / 4	100
13.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence- based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			52 / 52	100		52 / 52	100

Performance Measure #2).							
13.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry). (OSEP Program Performance Measure #3).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			44 / 44	100		43 / 44	98

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 13.a: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).

Note: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 13.a has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Program Performance Measure #1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.a, 6.f and 17.d for additional information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #1.)

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The SERC project is designed to address six of Connecticut's SPP indicators: Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10. The indicators are listed below, along with improvement strategies with which components of the SERC project were aligned during the current reporting period.

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #1 and #2: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma (#1) and percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school (#2).

SPP Improvement Strategy: Meet with State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address graduation and dropout. Alignment with the SERC project: All CT SPDG Scaling Up topical priority area initiatives are aligned with this improvement strategy. All have provided training at the district or school level intended to improve student academic or behavioral outcomes and increase graduation rates among students with disabilities. SERC has provided statewide training related to PBS and RtI. Also, the SERC EIP/RtI initiative team coordinated development of the state's RtI framework. (See Performance Measure 11.a and 13.b for additional details.)

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #4: Rates of suspension and expulsion: the percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Provide professional development activities statewide on positive behavioral supports, a systems approach to effective school-wide management. Alignment with the SERC project: SERC has provided professional development on PBS for identified SPDG districts and statewide. (This improvement strategy also addresses Indicator #5).

SPP Improvement Strategy: Identify and disseminate information regarding model programs in the area of reducing suspension and expulsion. Alignment with the SERC project: Two of the three topical priority areas selected for the SERC project are aligned with this improvement strategy. 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, are working with model districts and schools to refine implementation of evidence-based practices, and are expected to establish partnerships during the next reporting period to replicate the model programs. As noted above, the SERC EIP/RtI initiative team coordinated development of the state's RtI framework. The executive summary of this document was disseminated during February 2008, and the complete framework is expected to be distributed during June.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Use the resources and technical assistance of The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (CPBIS). Alignment with the SERC project: The SERC PBS initiative has cited the CPBIS as a resource and has included participation with CPBIS as a requirement for districts participating in this initiative.

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: 1) removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; 2) removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or 3) served in a public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Continue emphasis on Positive Behavior Supports training and technical assistance. Alignment

with the SERC project: 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 Measure 13.b for additional details.)

SPP Improvement 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 with the SERC project: 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.

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #9 and #10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (#9) and percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification (#10).

SPP Improvement Strategy: Coordinate activities with the Positive Behavioral Supports initiative, a systems approach to effective school-wide management that provides a comprehensive system of supports. Alignment with the SERC project: The SERC PBS initiative is intended to replicate school-wide PBS practices, which are expected to reduce inappropriate referral and identification of students who are members of certain racial and ethnic groups.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Coordinate activities with early intervention initiatives, including Response to Intervention (RtI) to ensure appropriate identification of students with disabilities. Alignment with the SERC project: 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 of students who are members of certain racial and ethnic groups.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Professional development activities will be provided statewide [on a list of 15 instructional and administrative practices]. Alignment with the SERC project: The list of practices includes embedding early intervention in the culture of daily practice, and use of the Reflective Team Process to enhance the effectiveness of early intervention teams, both of which are aspects of the EIP/RtI initiative; and determining eligibility for special education speech and language services (focus on culturally and linguistically diverse students), culturally responsive instruction in grades 1-8, and differentiated instruction in the kindergarten classroom, all of which are aspects of the Literacy initiative.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the CT Part B State Performance Plan 2005-2010; the October 2007 project progress report; and additional documentation submitted upon request in spring 2008.

The annual target for Performance Measure 13.a was set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). This project's contribution to that target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 13.a is 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 13.b: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure #2).

Note: Please see Performance Measures 6.d and 17.e for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #2. Progress towards this measure is based on information provided by the SPDG project coordinators as to the research methodologies of their programs in general.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

EIP/RtI:

SERC program staff involved in the EIP/RtI initiative provided a total of 28 technical assistance visits to model schools and districts during the current reporting period. Visit activities were tailored to district and school needs, as identified during verification reviews and in ongoing discussions with district and school teams. Activities were aligned with the key elements of scientific research-based interventions (SRBI) as defined in Connecticut's Frameworks for RtI, as well as with three "basic factors" the framework identifies as important to making RtI work. These factors are effective leadership, high-quality teaching and professional development, and access to and use of technology.

Literacy:

SERC reported developing a series of training programs for the Literacy initiative during the current reporting period. Each program consists of an evening session for principals and literacy coaches and a daylong session for entire literacy teams (principals, literacy coaches, teachers, and other school personnel). According to the documentation provided, sessions for principals and coaches address evidence-based practice in administrative and planning areas such as systems change, curriculum and universal design, change theory, and leadership. Sessions for literacy teams focus on evidence-based strategies in five areas: reading, writing, comprehension, assessment and intervention, and culturally relevant pedagogy. Scheduled presenters included recognized researchers on literacy instruction, such as Michael Coyne of the University of Connecticut (three tiers of instruction and response to intervention) and Nancy Boyles of Southern Connecticut State

University (comprehension). Scheduled presenters also included experienced teachers and providers of literacy-related professional development from SERC and the Connecticut State Department of Education. Copies of two presentations used in professional development sessions were provided among project documents, both of which included specific citations of educational research.

During the current reporting period, three professional development programs (a total of six sessions) were provided, and the remaining two were scheduled. In addition, a total of 10 technical assistance visits were conducted at the five participating schools.

PBS:

During the current reporting period, SERC personnel provided three technical assistance visits for participating schools in model districts, as well as five professional development activities, including data systems training for schools in one model district; a statewide training session for administrators, coaches, and teachers on conducting Functional Behavioral Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans; and three PBS-related training and networking sessions for school and district coaches. Members of model district teams attended the latter training activities along with representatives of other districts instituting PBS.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure included the Literacy calendar of professional development, sample presentations from Literacy initiative training sessions, the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Implementers' Blueprint and Self-Assessment, materials related to the design and research base of the EIP/RtI initiative, including the executive summary of the Connecticut Framework for RtI, and technical assistance visit reports for all three initiatives. Additional information was provided during the spring 2008 evaluation visit to SERC.

The annual target for Performance Measure 13.b was set at 100% for the current reporting period. According to SERC documentation, 28 of 28 technical assistance visits conducted under the EIP/RtI initiative and eight of eight technical assistance and training activities conducted under the PBS initiative were based on science- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, as were 16 of 16 professional development sessions and technical assistance visits provided under the Literacy initiative. In total, 100% of professional development or training activities (52 of 52 activities) provided under the SERC project were based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional or behavioral practices. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

EIP/RtI: Technical assistance and professional development services are expected to be provided to participating model and

partner schools during the next reporting period.

Literacy: Professional development activities are expected to occur at the participating schools during the next reporting period. An additional two sessions for principals and coaches and two sessions for entire literacy teams were scheduled for April and June 2008. Additional technical assistance visits are expected to be conducted, as well.

PBS: According to project plans, technical assistance services will be provided for model schools as requested. As partner schools begin participation during the next reporting period, schools are expected to receive four days of training in Year 1, and three days in Year 2 of PBS implementation. Two coaches from each school are expected to attend three days of training, in addition to attending coaching sessions related to each training event.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 13.b is set at 100%.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 13.c: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry) (OSEP Program Performance Measure #3).

Note: Please see Performance Measure 7.c for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #3.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Note: SERC project staff involved in the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives reported that they consistently used comprehensive practices during technical assistance visits to provide professional development and to sustain practices presented in prior training programs. A review of technical assistance reports confirmed use of coaching, modeling, and structured guidance. For this reason, technical assistance visits were counted among both professional development activities and comprehensive practices for the purposes of this report.

EIP/RtI:

All LEAs currently participating in the EIP/RtI initiative are developing model schools, based upon early intervening services already in place, and had participated in EIP training within three years of applying for funding. For this reason, professional development during the current reporting period was provided through technical assistance visits based upon the findings of verification visits conducted during application review. SERC project staff reported that technical assistance activities were matched to identified school needs and to district and school EIP teams' implementation plans. They stated

that virtually all technical assistance was delivered on-site in participating schools to small groups of educators and administrators through modeling and reflective practice. As part of the technical assistance process, SERC consultants helped district and school teams conduct a Reflective Team Process review, a facilitated dialogue designed to enhance the effectiveness of early intervention teams. Reports of technical assistance visits indicated that comprehensive practices were used to sustain evidence-based instructional or behavioral practices in 27 of 28 visit activities.

Literacy:

Professional development for the Literacy initiative consists of a series of professional development programs, each of which comprises a session for principals and literacy coaches, and a session for entire literacy teams. SERC documentation indicated that all professional development was based on scientific- or evidence-based practices. In the periods between professional development programs, school literacy coaches provided coaching and modeling for members of the literacy team to implement new strategies in the classroom. Also between sessions, SERC consultants conducted technical assistance visits, during which they reviewed school action plans, provided coaching for literacy coaches, conducted classroom observations, and modeled evidence-based practices. School coaching logs and SERC technical assistance reports provided evidence of comprehensive practices in the support coaches provided for participating teachers and the support SERC consultants provided for school literacy teams. In addition, teachers and school literacy coaches reported during evaluation site visits that they had participated in internal coaching, modeling and mentoring activities. They also reported that SERC personnel used such comprehensive practices to help them implement literacy instruction practices introduced in professional development sessions. Information provided during evaluation visits to participating schools and to SERC, and through technical assistance visit reports indicated that 16 of 16 professional development activities were sustained through comprehensive practices.

PBS:

SERC project staff indicated that coaching data were not collected during the current reporting period for two reasons. First, all schools participating in the initiative during the current period were model schools that already had undergone professional development before beginning participation in SPDG activities. In such schools, coaching is provided on an ad hoc basis to support implementation, rather than regularly to sustain specific professional development activities. Second, the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Implementers' Blueprint does not include a tool for tracking coaching activities within participating schools and tying them to specific training. During evaluation site visits, school personnel confirmed that coaching was provided as needed and was not tied directly to professional development activities.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes documentation of Literacy project training sessions, technical assistance reports for EIP/RtI and Literacy visits, and sample coaching logs from Literacy model schools. Additional

information was collected during spring 2008 evaluation site visits to SERC and to EIP/RtI, Literacy, and PBS model schools and districts.

The annual target for Performance Measure 13.c has been revised. The PBS initiative was not included in this target since the coaching provided during this period was not intended to be tied directly to specific PBS professional development activities. However, the PBS initiative will be included in future reports (see below). The revised annual target was set at 100% among the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives. Comprehensive practices were reported as sustaining professional development activities in 98.2% (43 of the 44 activities under the EIP/RtI and Literacy initiatives) of activities reported. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Coaching activities are integral to all three active SERC project initiatives and are expected to continue in all participating LEAs during the next reporting period. PBS partner schools are expected to be selected and begin participation during the next reporting period. Their participation will provide an opportunity to gather data on use of comprehensive practices to sustain professional development. The evaluator will collaborate with SERC project staff to identify or develop tools and protocols for collecting and submitting coaching data for PBS partner schools.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 13.c was set at 100% of professional development 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.)

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, and administrators will increase.

14.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of schools participating in the Literacy initiative in which the average increase in student assessment scores was higher in classrooms where teachers received coaching compared to classrooms where teachers were not coached.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		5	/		1	/	
14.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools implementing the PBS initiative for which year-to-year comparison of monthly School-Wide Information System (SWIS) data indicates a reduction in office referrals.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

14.c. 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.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 14.a: The number of schools participating in the Literacy initiative in which the average increase in student assessment scores was higher in classrooms where teachers received coaching compared to classrooms where teachers were not coached.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Under the Literacy initiative, each school is expected to assess the effectiveness of teacher coaching at one or more grade levels. Schools are to establish an experimental group and a comparison group, and administer common assessments three times (pre, mid and post) related to a specific literacy skill as teachers implement evidence-based practices. The teacher of the experimental group is to receive coaching following the pre-test, and the teacher of the comparison group is to receive coaching after the mid-test. Differences between the two classrooms are to be reviewed by the school team and coaches. Students' performances on the assessments are then used to gauge increases in teachers' skills.

Schools participating in the Literacy initiative planned to begin collecting information on the effectiveness of literacy coaching for teachers during the current reporting period. Three schools submitted coaching logs with student test data. One school submitted a review of differences in assessment data between the experimental and comparison classes. Students in the experimental class showed an average increase of 0.34 points in their overall literacy scores (on a two-point scale) from the pre-test to the mid-test, while students in the comparison class had an average increase of 0.26 points on their overall literacy scores, a difference of .08. Students whose teacher received coaching during the test period increased their scores more rapidly than did students whose teacher did not receive coaching. More data is expected to be available at the end of the school year (June 2008). Based on the initiative's assumption, coaching activities increased the skills of teachers in that one classroom as evidenced by the larger increase in student performance.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes coaching logs with assessment data.

The annual target for Performance Measure 14.a was set at five participating schools. Three of the five schools submitted assessment data, however two were indecipherable. Therefore, this target has not been met as only 1 of 5 of participating schools provided understandable assessment data.

LOOKING FORWARD

Collection and analysis of classroom data is expected to continue among the Literacy schools during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 14.a is set at five participating schools for which coaching will increase teachers' knowledge and skills related to scientific- or evidence-based practices.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 14.b: The percentage of schools implementing the PBS initiative for which year-to-year comparison of monthly School-Wide Information System (SWIS) data indicate a reduction in office referrals.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

SERC indicated that they are using data regarding office referrals as a measure of teacher skill. Discipline data will be compared across years for each school that implements PBS with fidelity (SET score of 80% or higher). Data will be compared by month across years because historical data indicates fluctuations in student behavior throughout the school year. Comparing September to September, October to October, etc. should eliminate the effects of seasonal variations. Because data will be analyzed across years, the current report contains only baseline data. Only one school provided baseline data which covers the period of September 2007 to February 2008. Data for the other participating schools were not available due to problems with operation of the SWIS. Personnel at both schools have been scheduled to receive additional training on operation of the system. Data from both are expected to be available near the end of the current school year (June 2008).

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes baseline office referral data from one school. The SERC project staff also submitted office discipline data for both districts for school year 2005-2006.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 14.b as comparison data will not be available until the 2008-2009 school year.

LOOKING FORWARD

Collection, monitoring and analysis of referral data is expected to continue in all model schools and to begin in partner PBS schools during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 14.b is set at 100% of participating PBS initiative schools experiencing a reduction in office referrals. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 14.c: 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.

Note: Please see Performance Measures 2.a and 6.e for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #1.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Projects have submitted information on the numbers and types of training provided to SERC project participants. A total of 52 professional development and training activities have been provided through the SPDG grant to the three topical priority areas. The impact of those activities cannot be determined, as data regarding the effects of training on teachers' knowledge and skills have not been collected.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes professional development schedules, technical assistance reports, coaching and attendance logs, and written action plans.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 14.c.

LOOKING FORWARD

Technical assistance visits, professional development, and coaching activities are expected to occur during the next reporting period. The evaluator will coordinate with SERC to develop data collection tools and protocols for measuring

effects on educator skills and knowledge.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 14.c is set at 100% of personnel completing training activities supported by SPDG indicating increased knowledge and skill in scientific- or evidence- based practices.



**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 schools in the Literacy initiative for which data indicates improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
15.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools implementing EIP/RtI for which the rate of inappropriate referrals to special education decreased across years.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
15.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of schools fully implementing PBS at	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		

which the rate of suspension and expulsion decreased among students with disabilities.

Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
	/			/	

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

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 15.a: The percentage of schools in the Literacy initiative for which data indicate improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In the Literacy initiative there is currently no collection of data specifically for students with disabilities. However, the Literacy initiative does include grade-level comparison groups that are assessed formatively to document the growth of all students in settings with and without coaching support for teachers. In each coaching cycle, all students are pretested, then one teacher receives coaching while implementing an evidence-based practice, and the teacher of a comparison class implements the practice without coaching. After a mid-point assessment, the teacher of the comparison class receives coaching as well, and a post-test is administered to all students in both classes. During evaluation site visits, members of school literacy teams stated that it was too early to tell whether the Literacy initiative and coaching had affected students' academic performance, as all data collected was from preliminary, formative assessments. One teacher reported that students progressively improved academically across the pre-, mid-, and post-tests conducted during a coaching cycle.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes coaching logs and formative student data, as well as information from evaluation spring 2008 site visits to participating schools and to SERC. Participating schools have not yet identified outcomes measures for literacy, and outcome assessment is expected to occur at the end of the school year. Therefore no outcome data was submitted.

No annual target was set for Performance Measure 15.a because outcome data are not yet available for participating grades or schools.

LOOKING FORWARD

Schools participating in the Literacy initiative are expected to select literacy outcomes assessments and to submit data during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 15.a is set at 100% of participating schools for which data indicates improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 15.b: The percentage of schools implementing EIP/RtI for which the rate of inappropriate referrals to special education decreased across years.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Connecticut's Framework for RtI states that RTI models grew out of research suggesting that traditional approaches to identifying learning disabilities are seriously flawed and that students sometimes end up in the special education system not due to genuine disabilities, but other factors, such as inadequate general education practices and limited opportunities for extra help for struggling students..." (Executive Summary, p.1). By matching research-based instruction and intervention to student needs, RtI is expected to reduce inappropriate referral of students for special education evaluations.

Implementation of EIP/RtI began during the current school year, therefore, only baseline data from a prior year are available. Data from the current year will be submitted at the end of the school year in June 2008. Model schools, which already have early intervention programs in place, have submitted data in prior years as well. These schools, along with partner schools, will continue to submit data, and trends regarding referral to and placement in special education will be analyzed.

Five model schools in three districts were implementing the EIP/RtI model during the current reporting period, while two schools in a fourth district prepared for implementation. Data provided by SERC show that during school year 2005-2006, only 54% of students referred to special education were identified and placed in special education among the current EIP schools, which translates to a rate of inappropriate referral of 46%.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes a copy of the Early Intervention Program (EIP) Student Data for the 2005-2006 school year, which provides a baseline for identifying future progress towards this measure.

No annual target was established for Performance Measure 15.b because only historic baseline data were available.

LOOKING FORWARD

EIP/RtI schools are expected to continue collecting and submitting student data. The two additional model schools are expected to begin implementing EIP/RtI during the next reporting period. An unknown number of partner schools also are

expected to begin preparing for implementation and data collection.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 15.b is set at 100% of schools implementing EIP/RtI for which the rate of inappropriate referral to special education decreased across years. Progress to date cannot be determined, as only baseline data is available. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 15.c: The percentage of schools fully implementing PBS at which the rate of suspension and expulsion decreased among students with disabilities.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The School-Wide Information System (SWIS), a web-based data system designed to provide real-time data for monitoring and decision making around suspension and expulsion was slated to be used to track student outcomes. This information was to be submitted quarterly to SERC. However, only one school has begun collecting data using the SWIS database, as the other participating schools experienced problems with the operation of the database. Personnel at both schools have been scheduled to receive additional training on operation of the system.

CSDE data submitted by SERC does indicate concerns regarding the discrepancies in suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities compared to general education students. The data from the two participating districts active during the current reporting period showed that 13.1% (678 of 5,162) of general education student were suspended or expelled during the 2005-2006 school year, whereas, 32.3% (305 of 945) of special education students were suspended or expelled.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes 2005-2006 discipline data for the two districts.

No annual target was set for Performance Measure 15.c because progress cannot yet be determined. Only baseline data are available.

LOOKING FORWARD

Participating LEAs are expected to begin tracking student disciplinary outcomes, and submitting quarterly discipline data using the SWIS database.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 15.c was set at 100% of schools reporting decreased suspension and expulsion rates among students with disabilities. This target is expected to be met by the end of the grant.



**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	%
		1	/		1	/	
16.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage 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 / 2	100		2 / 2	100
16.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of districts	PROJ						

with a written action plan outlining measurable objectives and strategies to build family-school partnerships.	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4 / 4	100		3 / 4	75

16.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage 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	%
			/			/	

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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In the summer of 2007, a revised contract for the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" project was finalized between the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Organization (CPAC). Revisions reflected an agreement among all project leaders that certain modifications were necessary if the project was going to succeed in its efforts to facilitate systemic change in the difficult area of parent involvement.

Project modifications were implemented in two major areas 1) the number of districts selected to participate in the project was scaled back from an original target of 10 districts to a target of six districts (three cohorts each consisting of two districts) and 2) the parent-involvement model was adjusted to reflect a more team-based approach (moving from the selection and training of parent advisors to the development of a district team of administrators, parents, general and special education staff, and a CPAC representative).

Upon finalization of the contract, the Norwich school district was identified as a replacement for the New Haven school district, which had declined to participate in the 2nd cohort. An invitation to participate in the project was accepted by the Norwich special education director in September of the current reporting period, bringing participation in the project back to four districts.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes a copy of the revised CSDE-CPAC contract and the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007.

The annual target for Performance Measure 16.a was to obtain an oral agreement from one district to participate in the CPAC project. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Preliminary discussions regarding the selection of two new districts have occurred between the CPAC project leaders and the external evaluator. Several districts were considered as possible candidates and CPAC plans to select and contact two new districts this summer. It is expected that preliminary activities would begin in these two districts in the fall of the 2008-2009 school year.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 16.a is to obtain an oral agreement from six districts to participate in the CPAC project. Progress to date: A total of four districts, Killingly and Waterbury (Cohort 1) and Montville and Norwich (Cohort 2), have agreed to participate in the CPAC project.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The first step in the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" model was to hold needs assessment forums in participating districts in order to gather information on the current family-school climate in the district. A needs assessment forum was held in the Killingly district during the prior reporting period. During the current reporting period, forums were held in the Montville and Norwich school districts. The forums in both districts were facilitated by a representative from LEARN, one of six Regional Educational Service Centers (RESA) in Connecticut.

Montville:

In August 2007, a flyer advertising a needs assessment forum in Montville was developed and the forums were advertised in the local newspaper and free press. The forum was held at the Montville middle school in a split-session (one in the morning

and one later the same evening) but turn-out was low with a combined attendance of just seven staff members and one parent. In an effort to gather additional feedback, questions asked of forum participants were mailed to parents and emailed to district staff. Responses to this request were received in writing from seven respondents.

Norwich:

In October and November 2007, three needs assessment forums, all advertised in the local newspaper were held in the Norwich school district. In an effort to facilitate attendance, forums were held in split-sessions (both morning and evening) at three different schools in the district. Overall, 15 parents, 11 staff members and one member of the Board of Education participated.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007; forum flyers; forum attendance records; and a summary of forum questions and responses.

The annual target for Performance Measure 16.b was to hold at least one needs assessment forum in the two school districts in Cohort 2. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Although Waterbury was selected to participate in the 1st cohort in October 2006, no forum has been held to date. The CPAC project coordinator has reported limited contact with personnel in the district (See Performance Measure 16.d for more information). It is expected that a forum will take place during the next reporting period in Waterbury and in the two newly identified districts.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 16.b is to hold at least one needs assessment forum in 100% of the districts initially identified and committed to the CPAC project. Progress to date: Three of the four districts (75%) initially identified and committed to the CPAC project have held at least one needs assessment forum.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The next step in the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" model was for CPAC project leaders to schedule a planning meeting of parents and district staff to begin developing a written action plan that would enhance communication and trust, and also address any other issues discovered at the needs assessment forums.

The external evaluator began working with CPAC in late summer 2007 to develop an "action plan template" that could serve as a practical, realistic planning tool for districts. Using the SPDG project objectives as a guide, the template was created to help districts organize identified needs and then chart a workable road map with specific strategies and activities that could be followed to meet those needs. Specific attention was given to the roles each partner (parent, staff, and CPAC) would play in implementing and sustaining the plan after CPAC's involvement in the district had ended.

Killingly:

As reported in the prior year's annual report, a preliminary action plan was drafted in the Killingly school district in Year 2 of the project. After the new template was developed, a CPAC representative attended a follow-up meeting in Killingly to discuss revisions to the action plan format and next steps for the district. Six parents and two staff members attended the October 2007 meeting and during this meeting, the new action plan was finalized.

Montville:

Following the August needs assessment forums, a follow-up session was held in the Montville school district in the beginning months of the 2007-2008 school year. During this session, the CPAC representative discussed the action plan concept with the three parents and three staff members in attendance. Based on the information collected at the needs assessment forums and this follow-up session, a CPAC representative used the new action plan template to draft an initial plan for the Montville district. This plan was initially shared with district staff members in November 2007 with further discussions and revisions to the plan occurring in January and February 2008. The written action plan has been finalized but it is expected that the plan will continue to be reviewed and updated in order to meet the changing needs of the school district and families.

Norwich:

Similar to the situation in Montville, a CPAC representative used the new action plan template and information gathered at the needs assessment forums held at the end of the year, to draft an initial action plan for the Norwich school district. This plan was shared with the district's special education director in January 2008 and with district staff members in March. The Norwich written action plan is considered to be finalized but will continue to evolve as the initiative progresses.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007 and written action plans for three of the four participating districts.

The annual target for Performance Measure 16.c was to have written action plans submitted in all four participating districts. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

A written action plan in Waterbury has not been developed (See Performance Measure 16.d for more information). It is expected that a written action plan will be developed during the next reporting period in Waterbury and in the two newly identified districts.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 16.c is to develop written action plans in 100% of the districts initially identified and committed to the CPAC project. Progress to date: Three of the four districts (75%) initially identified and committed to the CPAC project have written action plans.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

During the current reporting period there has been steady progress in Montville and Norwich (Cohort 2) but progress has been limited in Waterbury and Killingly (Cohort 1). Although Waterbury and Killingly had orally agreed to participate in the project, it became apparent during the current reporting period that a district's oral agreement to participate was not sufficient evidence that the district was prepared to meet the expectations of the grant. To address this challenge, the external evaluator, in collaboration with CPAC, developed a written contract outlining the expectations of the participating district's responsibilities in the project, as well as the responsibilities of CPAC. The written contract requires signatures from the district superintendent and special education director, as well as a CPAC and CSDE representative.

The written contract was distributed by CPAC staff to the Montville and Norwich school districts. Officials in both districts returned a signed contract. In March, the CPAC representative also mailed the contract to the Killingly special education director along with a cover letter requesting that the district examine their capacity to participate in the project at this time. The Killingly district has not signed the contract to date.

The contract has not been distributed by CPAC staff to Waterbury district personnel. The reason for the delay was not provided. The CPAC project coordinator has indicated in the past that lack of time and multiple initiatives in the district have been challenges associated with Waterbury's involvement in the project.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes contracts signed by the district superintendent and special education director, as well as by a CPAC and CSDE representative, for two of the four participating districts.

There was no annual target for Performance Measure 16.d as the contract was just developed in March 2008.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is anticipated that the Waterbury contract will be distributed and a decision regarding both Waterbury's and Killingly's involvement will be determined by the end of the 2007-2008 school year. CPAC will identify two additional districts to replace Waterbury and Killingly if signed contracts are not received.

It is also expected that contracts will be distributed and signed by two newly identified districts during the next reporting period. Districts will be required to sign the contract before CPAC begins providing technical assistance related to the project.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 16.d is to have signed contracts submitted for a total of 6 districts committed to the CPAC project. Progress to date: Two of the four districts (50%) initially identified and committed to the CPAC project have submitted signed contracts.



**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 percentage 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	100		2 / 4	50
17.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Development of a DVD and manual focused on school climate and culture to compliment the existing curriculum for pre-service teachers.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
17.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of districts in	PROJ						

which CPAC has held at least one SPDG professional development activity for staff members during the past year.	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		4 / 4	100		2 / 4	50

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).	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 program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure #2).	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4 / 4	100		2 / 2	100

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)
 PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.a: The percentage of districts with active FAST (Family and Staff Together) teams whose membership includes the active participation of school personnel.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The project contract developed for the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" project requires participating districts to develop a FAST (Family and Staff Together) team who is responsible for facilitating the implementation of the action plan. Districts are expected to actively recruit staff members to participate on the team with the goal of obtaining commitment from at least five staff members including administrators, and general and special education providers. Active FAST teams are present in two of the four participating districts.

Killingly:

Efforts to recruit school personnel to participate on a FAST team have not been successful in Killingly. In November 2007 an email invitation was sent to all principals and social workers in the district asking them to send at least one staff member to the first meeting but only one staff member attended. CPAC staff and the special education director later met in January 2008 to discuss the expectations of the grant including the development of the FAST team. The district has not made any further progress on developing the team since this meeting.

Montville:

There is an active FAST team present in the Montville district. The Montville special education director emailed school personnel inviting them to be a part of the team. There have been seven regular participating staff members including the special education director, two special education teachers, a teacher of the hearing impaired, a paraprofessional, a preschool teacher and a high school teacher. The district social worker and two principals have also attended some of the meetings. The FAST team has met four times during the current school year, beginning in November 2007.

Norwich:

There is also an active FAST team present in Norwich. Eight staff members have committed to the team including the special education director, three school psychologists, a speech language pathologist and three principals. The FAST team has met once in March 2008 and will meet again on April 24th, 2008.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007; FAST team meeting agendas; minutes from the FAST team meetings; FAST team attendance information; and phone interviews by the external evaluator with the special education directors from Montville and Norwich.

The annual target for Performance Measure 17.a was to have active FAST teams in the four participating districts with the

regular participation of school personnel. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The established FAST teams in Montville and Norwich will continue to meet throughout this school year and in subsequent years. The Montville special education director indicated that she is pleased with the commitment of the staff members on the FAST team. The director is currently trying to recruit more general education teachers to participate on the team and has encouraged the building administrators to attend the meetings more regularly. Similarly, in Norwich the special education director reported that she is pleased with the FAST team and is hoping that she can recruit general and special education teachers to also participate on the team.

It is expected that FAST teams will be implemented in Killingly and Waterbury or in the two districts selected as their replacement (See Performance Measure 16.d.). FAST teams will also be implemented during the next reporting period in the two newly identified districts. As specified in the project contract, it is expected that the FAST teams will meet monthly during the first three months of the project and then at least every other month thereafter.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 17.a is to have active FAST teams in 100% of the districts committed to the CPAC project. Progress to date: Two of the four districts (50%) committed to the CPAC project have active FAST teams.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.b: Development of a DVD and manual focused on school climate and culture to compliment the existing curriculum for pre-service teachers.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

In addition to CPAC's involvement with individual school districts, CPAC is working to fulfill this objective by collaborating with other organizations in the state to develop a training video that will be available to all CT teacher preparation programs. As reported in the prior year's annual report, CPAC began collaborating with the CT Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Family Work Group in January 2007. The CSPD Work Group includes representatives from a variety of organizations including universities, public schools, state agencies and CPAC.

The CSPD Family Work Group met twice during the current reporting period (August and September 2007) to finalize the plan for the development of the video. The purpose of the video is to better prepare pre-service teachers to communicate and work with diverse families, including those who have children with disabilities. The Work Group has decided that the video will include 15-minute segments that address four specific areas: 1) school climate and culture; 2) culture and family; 3) communication and relationship building; and 4) family systems and parenting. The video will also be accompanied by a manual that will help professors integrate the DVD into their existing curriculum. The Work Group has hired a writer from

Yale University for the writing of the script and manual. Filming of the video began in March 2008.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007 and a power point presentation developed by a member of the CSPD Work Group which outlines the progress of the video development.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 17.b as it was not expected that the video and manual would be completed and disseminated during this reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

During the next reporting period it is expected that CPAC will review the video script and help to identify families that would be willing to appear in the video. CPAC has also agreed to contribute funds to help pay for the writer.

Preliminary discussions regarding the plan for dissemination of the video have occurred but a finalized plan will be developed during the next reporting period. Ideas discussed have included mailing the video to university education departments and personally contacting department chairs to ask them to share the video with their colleagues. A CPAC representative has discussed the video with a professor at the University of Connecticut who is interested in using the DVD in her department.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 17.b is to develop one training manual and video aimed at increasing pre-service teachers' ability to communicate and work with diverse families.

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

Through the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" model, CPAC has agreed to hold at least one professional development activity for staff members each year to help staff collaborate with families. One professional development session has been held in two of the four participating districts.

Waterbury:

CPAC has not held any SPDG professional development events in Waterbury. The project coordinator indicated that contact with district personnel has only been via email and through in-person contacts at events not sponsored by the CPAC initiative. Although not through this initiative, staff members in Waterbury have utilized CPAC's resources and CPAC has worked to involve Waterbury in their trainings.

Killingly:

During the current reporting period, CPAC and the Killingly district worked together to offer a professional development session focused on the IEP for interested staff and parents. A total of two staff members attended the October 2007 training to learn how to create measurable IEP goals and objectives for students. Although not recognized as formal professional development, the CPAC representative also attended three PPT/504 meetings to help staff and families more effectively communicate and met three times with district staff to brainstorm strategies to increase family-school partnerships.

Montville:

During the past year, a SPDG professional development session focused on understanding challenging behavior in young children was provided for staff members and parents. A total of four staff members attended the April 2008 session. A training related to the IEP process has also been scheduled by the FAST team for April 28, 2008 and two additional workshops are currently being planned. One workshop will be designed to help administrators effectively run PPT meetings and the other will focus on helping special education teachers communicate effectively with parents.

Norwich:

There has not been any formal SPDG professional development offered in Norwich. However, the CPAC representative has provided informal professional development through her attendance at the FAST team meeting in March and at two PPT meetings in September and October 2007.

Although not directly an outcome of this project, CPAC has collaborated with LEARN (a Regional Education Service Center), the Norwich school district and the local community college to plan a series of six workshops for staff and family on Autism. The workshops have been provided throughout the year by LEARN. One of the sessions, "Parent as Partners: Home/School Connections", scheduled for May, specifically addresses parent involvement.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the

project coordinator in October 2007; workshop flyers; workshop attendance information; FAST team meeting minutes; and phone interviews by the external evaluator with the special education directors from Montville and Norwich.

The annual target for Performance Measure 17.c was to offer at least one professional development activity in the four participating districts. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

It is expected that at least one professional development session for school personnel will be held during the next reporting period in the six participating districts.

Overall, CPAC has found that professional development calendars in the districts are tightly scheduled, which has made offering professional development for staff challenging. To facilitate increased opportunities for professional development through this project, CPAC and the CSDE have discussed the possibility of CPAC offering continuing education units (CEUs) for their trainings. This will be explored in more detail during the next reporting period.

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 17.c. This performance measure is an annual measure.

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).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 17.d has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Program Performance Measure #1. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.a, 6.f and 13.a for additional information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #1).

ANNUAL PROGRESS

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

State Performance Plan Part B Indicator #8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services for children with disabilities.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Pilot use of a post-PPT meeting comment postcard in two LEAs. Alignment with the CPAC project: CPAC developed a post-PPT meeting postcard and began piloting it in the Killingly and Montville schools districts in May 2007. The postcards are distributed to parents and staff at the end of the PPT meeting, providing them the

opportunity to comment on the PPT process. Parents are provided a stamped postcard that they can mail directly to CPAC. CPAC has reviewed the parent postcards and shared the information with the districts while staff postcards are being reviewed at the district-level. The CPAC representative indicated that the postcards are valuable in that they require all of the participants to examine the way a team meeting should function but acknowledged that they have not yet been used to improve services since the feedback on the postcards has been mostly positive.

SPP Improvement Strategy: Partner with selected LEAs to develop and implement individualized local plans to enhance collaboration between families. Alignment with the CPAC project: Through the CPAC project, individualized action plans have been developed in three of the four participating districts (See Performance Measure 16.c).

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the CT Part B State Performance Plan 2005-2010; evaluator notes from various phone conversations; and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007; PPT parent postcards returned by parents in the Montville and Killingly districts; and written action plans for three of the four participating districts.

The annual target for Performance Measure 17.d was set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). This project's contribution to that target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The CPAC representative indicated that the Montville district has been diligent in distributing the postcard and the FAST team continues to discuss ways they can increase the use of this tool. The team is currently developing a PPT meeting checklist to help staff members prepare for the PPT meeting and use of the PPT postcard will be included on this checklist. The CPAC representative has also discussed the postcard with the Norwich district and they are considering piloting it next year.

Development of action plans as outlined in Indicator #8 are expected to continue during the next reporting period.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 17.d is 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects).

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 17.e: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (OSEP Program Performance Measure #2).

NOTE: Please see Performance Measures 6.d and 13.b for additional data and descriptive information aligned with OSEP Program Performance Measure #2. Progress towards this measure is based on information provided by the SPDG project coordinators as to the research methodologies of their programs in general.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

CPAC has a long history of preparing parents to be active partners in the education decisions that affect their children. Over the course of the past several years, CPAC has also recognized the need to provide resources to school districts that may be struggling with how to engage parents in the life of the school. Through professional development and training for parents and professionals, CPAC has relied on a growing body of research and evidence-based practices to further strengthen the family-school connection. Two SPDG professional development events were conducted by CPAC staff during the current reporting period.

IEP Goals 101: A Guide for Monitoring Student Learning (held in the Killingly school district) teaches participants how to identify key information and incorporate that information into their child's present level of academic and functional performance. Participants also learn how to create measurable goals and objectives.

Understanding Challenging Behaviors in Young Children (held in the Montville school district) helps participants change the way they view and react to their child's challenging behavior. Participants learn what their child's behavior is communicating, how to use positive behavior supports to encourage the development of new communication skills, and practical tips for promoting their child's success.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes the following sources: "Developing Your Child's IEP," National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities, 2002 and "Positive Solution for Families: Eight Practical Tips for Parents of Young Children with Challenging Behavior," Center for Evidence Based Practices: Young Children with Challenging Behavior, 2006.

Additional documentation includes various resources from the National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools (SEDL); Consortium For Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE); the PACER Center; and the National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY).

The annual target for Performance Measure 17.e was for 100% of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program to be based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. The CPAC project coordinator has identified the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships between Parents and Schools" project as evidence-based and as such the two trainings held during the current reporting period were considered evidence-based

professional development events. This target has been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

The long-term target for Performance Measure 17.e is set at 100%.



**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 percentage 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	100		1 / 4	25
18.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage 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	%
			3 / 3	100		2 / 3	67

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

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

A key component of the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" project is to identify parent leaders who regularly participate in activities in the district to enhance family-school relationships. All participating districts are expected to provide opportunities for parents to be involved in this initiative including actively recruiting and securing the participation of at least two parents on the FAST (Family and Staff Together) team. One of the four participating districts has successfully recruited parents to actively participate in the CPAC project.

Killingly:

In Killingly there has not been any parents actively participating in the CPAC project. Six parents attended a meeting in October 2007 related to the development of the action plan and four of them volunteered to be members of the FAST team. However, these parents did not attend the FAST team meeting held in November 2007 and no additional meetings have been held.

Montville:

Parent leaders have emerged in the Montville district. At an initial action planning meeting in October 2007 parents were invited to be members of the FAST team. Four parents volunteered to be members of the team and have consistently attended the team meetings. In addition to attending the FAST team meetings, two of the parents have agreed to serve as "resource parents" who will be available to answer questions or concerns from other parents of children with special needs. Contact information for these two parents was included in a mailing sent to 343 parents of children with special needs in April 2008.

Norwich:

In Norwich, parents have not yet been involved in the CPAC project activities as parent leaders. However, the Norwich project is still in its initial stages. The special education director indicated that the team is currently trying to recruit parents to participate in the initiative. The director has asked the student services staff to assist with the recruitment of parents since they often have daily contact with parents. CPAC staff has also been working to identify parents and has recruited one parent who has agreed to attend the next FAST team meeting scheduled for April 24, 2008. There were no parents in attendance at the first FAST team meeting in March 2008.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007; FAST team attendance information; and phone interviews by the external evaluator with the special education directors from Montville and Norwich.

The annual target for Performance Measure 18.a was to have all districts identify parent leaders in the district who would be willing to participate in activities to enhance family-school relationships. This target was not met.

LOOKING FORWARD

In Montville it is expected that the parent leaders will continue to participate in the FAST team meetings and serve as resource parents. The FAST team plans to track the number of calls the resource parents receive to determine if this is a service that is needed in the district. The FAST team has also discussed recruiting a sub-committee of parents to review the district's current policies, practices and website. The sub-committee of parents will report back to the FAST team any areas where parental involvement could be enhanced or where language could be more welcoming and inclusive of families.

During the next reporting period, it is expected that parent leaders will be identified in the Waterbury, Killingly and Norwich school districts as well as in the two newly identified districts.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 18.a is to identify parent leaders in 100% of the districts committed to the CPAC project. Progress to date: One of the four districts (25%) committed to the CPAC project has identified parent leaders.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE 18.b: The percentage 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.

ANNUAL PROGRESS

All participating districts are expected to develop an action plan that outlines specific strategies and activities to increase family-school partnerships. The goal for the current reporting period was for the Waterbury, Killingly and Montville districts to assemble a FAST team that would work towards implementing at least two action plan items related to parent training and/or increasing written or verbal communication to parents. Due to Norwich's late start in the project, it was not expected that the FAST team would implement two action plan items during the current reporting period.

Killingly:

Although there has been limited progress in Killingly in recent months, there had been progress during the fall of 2007 when the special education director and a CPAC representative were working together until a formal FAST team was developed. During this time, two action plan items were implemented: 1) distribution of a packet of resources to parents of identified students and 2) parent training. The director and the CPAC representative assembled a packet of special education information including school and district contact information and community resources. The packets have been distributed to parents at PPT meetings. In the fall of 2007, CPAC staff also provided a training on the IEP process for parents. A total of six parents attended this October training.

Montville:

During the current reporting period, the Montville FAST team has successfully implemented two items on their action plan: 1) distribution of a packet of resources to parents of identified students and 2) parent training. In fall 2007, the CPAC representative worked with district staff to develop a packet of information regarding special education rights, practices and resources. The informational packets were mailed to all families with identified children and continue to be distributed to parents of newly identified students. During the past reporting period, one training was also offered for parents and staff on understanding challenging behavior in young children, which nine parents attended. An upcoming training for parents is planned for April 28th on understanding the IEP process.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007; workshop flyers; workshop attendance information and phone interviews by the external evaluator with the Montville and Norwich special education directors.

The annual target for Performance Measure 18.b was to have the Waterbury, Killingly and Montville districts implement two items on their action plan. This target has not been met.

LOOKING FORWARD

Waterbury has not developed an action plan so there has been no progress related to this performance measure (See Performance Measure 16.d). It is expected that during the next reporting period Waterbury will develop an action plan and implement at least two items from the plan.

The district of Norwich is in the initial stages of the project so it was not expected that two action plan items would be implemented. Although two items have not yet been implemented, the CPAC representative is encouraged by the level of

commitment already displayed by the FAST team. It is anticipated that the Norwich FAST team will implement two action plan items during the next reporting period.

In addition to Waterbury and Norwich, it is expected that the Montville district and the two newly identified districts will implement two items on their action plan related to parent training and/or communication to parents.

There is no long-term target for Performance Measure 18.b. This performance measure is an annual measure.



**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, family-school relationships will be strengthened.

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

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

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

ANNUAL PROGRESS

The overarching goal of the "Enhancing Collaborative Relationships Between Families and Schools" project is to strengthen family-school relationships in the participating districts. During the previous reporting period, the outside evaluator and CPAC representatives discussed possible measures of family-school relationships. The evaluator also discussed this area with the special education directors from two of the participating districts during phone interviews. The development of a data collection system to collect data on family-school relationships is in the initial stages in these two districts.

Montville:

During the current reporting period, the outside evaluator conducted a phone interview with the Montville special education director to discuss her perceptions of the project and how it has affected family-school partnerships thus far. The director indicated that she is pleased with the project and is hopeful that their involvement in the project will help the district and parents focus on more effective means of communication. She added that parents trust CPAC and that she believes this trust will in turn foster increased trust among parents, staff and administration.

The director also provided the evaluator with contact information for the parents and staff members on the FAST team. The evaluator is currently developing a questionnaire that will be sent to the FAST team members in June. The questionnaire will ask respondents to comment on the initiative, the activities of the FAST team and how the initiative has affected family-school partnerships.

Norwich:

Similar to Montville, the outside evaluator also conducted a phone interview with the Norwich special education director. Since the project is in its beginning stages, the director could not comment on changes in family-school relationships as a result of the project. She did report being hopeful that working with CPAC will create more open communication with parents and provide parents with more resources.

The evaluator and the CPAC representative decided that conducting a focus group or survey with Norwich FAST team members was premature at this time since they have had only one FAST team meeting.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes phone interviews by the outside evaluator with the Montville and Norwich special education directors as well as preliminary discussions regarding measuring family-school relationships with CPAC representatives.

There was no annual target for Performance Measure 19.a as it was not expected that a data collection system would be fully developed during this reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

As additional activities are implemented, the evaluator will work with CPAC and the district to develop additional data collection tools to collect information related to family-school partnerships. The evaluator and the Montville special

education director have discussed the possibility of developing a system to collect the number of parental complaints related to special education that are filed at the school and district level. This will be further explored during the 2008-2009 school year. Other data collection activities could include focus groups with FAST team members, interviews with the special education directors, and focus groups with a selection of parents in the participating districts.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 19.a is to develop data collection systems to collect data on family-school relationships in 100% of the participating districts. The data collection systems developed for each of the districts may vary in order to align the system with the unique activities of each district's plan.



**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 scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP Long-Term Measure #2).	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 scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices on a statewide or district-wide basis (OSEP Long-Term Measure #2).

NOTE: Quantitative data entered in the target and actual performance data boxes for Performance Measure 20.a has been aggregated across the four SPDG projects in order to address OSEP Long-Term Measure #2. The descriptive information provided below is specific to this project's contribution to the measure. (See Performance Measures 4.b, 8.a and 12.a for additional information aligned with OSEP Long-Term Measure #2.)

ANNUAL PROGRESS

CPAC has had some discussions with the participating districts regarding replication district-wide and sustainability of the project once CPAC's assistance ends. As a result of the discussions, items related to replication and sustainability have been included on the action plans in Killingly, Montville and Norwich. Examples include 1) district staff facilitating the FAST team meetings in place of CPAC; 2) electing officers of the FAST team; and 3) making changes in district-wide policies and practices. It is expected that the districts will work to implement these items during the next reporting period.

During the current reporting period, CPAC has been involved in activities that may assist with laying the groundwork for statewide replication. In October and November 2007 CPAC representatives presented at two regional special education directors meetings to discuss the CPAC project effort thus far, the benefits of working pro-actively with parents, and how CPAC can partner with districts to affect positive change. In addition, CPAC was invited to distribute resources to parents and teachers at parent-teacher conferences in one district in December 2007. Another district also approached a CPAC representative for help in facilitating a resolution between the district and a parent, which CPAC provided during March 2008.

The CPAC project coordinator also participated in a presentation at the ALLIANCE National Conference: Parent Centers United for Excellence in Washington D.C. in January 2008. The coordinator's presentation focused on the role of CPAC as a cultural broker and how they are working to assist local school districts through the SPDG initiative. The session was facilitated by Larry Wexler from OSEP and was attended by directors or staff of Parent Training and Information Centers and Community Parent Resource Centers.

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

Documentation of progress towards this measure includes evaluator notes from various phone conversations and on-site meetings with CPAC representatives. Additional documentation includes the fall project progress report submitted by the project coordinator in October 2007.

There was no annual target set for Performance Measure 20.a as it was not expected that the project would be replicated during the current reporting period.

LOOKING FORWARD

During the next reporting period, CPAC will work with the six participating districts to implement activities on the action plans related to district-wide replication and sustainability. CPAC will also continue to reach out to other districts and share the lessons they have learned through the CPAC project. In the last year of the initiative, CPAC also plans to conduct a statewide networking conference to disseminate and share information from this project.

The long-term target for Performance Measure 20.a is set at 100% (4 of 4 SPDG projects). Quantitative data for this measure will be reported in the final year.



**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 :

File : C:\Documents and Settings\colond\Desktop\SPDG\Evaluation\OSEP Performance reports\May 2008\budget524BSectionBC.doc

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

Title :

File : S:\SPDG 07-08\Spring 08 APR\524B Section C Additional Information.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, 2007 – March 31, 2008)
committed \$ 834,213

B. Provide explanation if you are NOT expending funds at the expected rate.
Some activities have been delayed due to:

- Alignment of initiative goals and objectives has taken longer than expected, in relation to other initiatives occurring within a district
- Project activities have been modified to provide more sustainable, effective and achievable systems change outcomes - ongoing
- Other agencies' requirements in securing appropriate personnel to carry out project objectives
- Continued difficulty in obtaining district-level commitment to implement project activities

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

- None

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.)

- Yes ~ \$ 450,000
- The CSDE has carried out a number of activities, however, there continues to be competing time and human resources for districts to maintain a consistent level of activity and focus around certain goals and objectives. The CSDE has addressed this with programs and continues to work towards ensuring the SPDG is aligned with district needs and objectives already in existence, as well as alignment with CSDE objectives for ensuring a quality education for students and involvement of families.
- Carryover funds will be absorbed thru grant activities.

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 #: H323A50003

SECTION C - Additional Information

The following list includes key personnel and current partners of the CT SPDG grant. During the current reporting period, changes occurred within the Connecticut State Bureau of Special Education and the external evaluation firm, Glen Martin Associates. Changes are noted below where applicable.

CT State Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education

Anne Louis Thompson was appointed Bureau Chief of Special Education for the Connecticut Department of Education in February of 2008. She replaced Acting Bureau Chief Brain J. Cunnane.

Dana Corriveau, Education Consultant at the Bureau of Special Education is the SPDG project director. Dana Corriveau has served in this role since the inception of the SPDG project.

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 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. Mary Jean Schierberl, Education Consultant at the Bureau of Special Education also serves in a leadership capacity on this project.

Glen Martin Associates is the external evaluator for the SPDG project. Glen Martin Associates 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. However, due to the death of the firm's founder, ownership of the company was in transition during the previous reporting period. New management was established in July of 2007.