U.S. Department of Education

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

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): H323A100004

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

1. Project Objective [ ] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

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

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
By the end of the 4th year of funding the NC SIP Reading Initiative, 80% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.	**Program**		**13/16**	**80%**		**14/16**	**88%**

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
By the end of the 4th year of funding the NC SIP Mathematics Initiative, 80% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.	**Program**		**13/16**	**80%**		**14/16**	**88%**

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of teachers participating in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction.	**Project**	**3,905**			**3,900**		

1.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of leadership personnel participating in evidence-based professional development provided by the NC SIP project to improve reading or mathematics instruction.	Project	44			84		

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

Performance Measure 1.a. By the end of the 4th year of funding the NC SIP Reading Initiative, 80% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.

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

As shown in Table 1.a, 14 of 16 (88%) reading initiative professional development components were rated in place. The components in place include: A(1) Clear expectations are provided for all NC SIP participants. Schools and LEAs agree to provide the necessary resources, supports and facilitative administration for the participants; A(2) Clear expectations are provided for Reading Foundations trainers and for NC SIP Coordinators who provide follow-up to training; B(1) Accountability for delivery and quality monitoring of training are in place, with responsibility assigned primarily to NC SIP Reading Consultants and district NC SIP Coordinators; B(2) Adult learning principles are used in all professional development and strategies to address them are included; B(3) Training is skill-based and provides opportunities for participants to practice what they've learned with feedback provided by the trainers. Pre- and post-testing are used to assess participant learning and identifying those needing additional coaching; B(4) Outcome and evaluation data are collected, analyzed, and used for improving the professional development and follow-up support; B(5) Trainers are trained, coached, and observed to ensure fidelity and quality. Participant feedback is used to improve training and trainer skills; C(1) Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear and this includes using data to give feedback to coaches; D(1) Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear and fidelity observation forms are provided; D(2) Data are used to make decisions at multiple levels in the state; D(3) Implementation and student outcome data are shared regularly w/stakeholders at multiple levels; D(4) Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and plans are in place to share and celebrate successes; D(5) All participants receive instructions on providing data to NC SIP; and E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation.

The components NC SIP will focus on developing and/or implementing in the coming year include: C(2) Coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling; and E(2) Leadership analyzes feedback from staff and makes changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation, including revising policies and procedures to support new way of work.

Performance Measure 1.b. By the end of the 4th year of funding the NC SIP Mathematics Initiative, 80% of evidence-based professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Rubric.

The attached worksheet (See Appendix B for Math Initiative Worksheet and supporting documents) presents detailed information about the evidence-based practices used for the NC SIP math initiative. NC SIP's evidence-based professional development components began in 2000 as part of NC SIP I. The project is continuing to revise some of the forms and processes for the math initiative to help improve its procedures.

As shown in Table 1.b, 14 of 16 (88%) math initiative professional development components were rated in place. The components in place include: A(1) Clear expectations are provided for all NC SIP participants. Schools and LEAs agree to provide the necessary resources, supports and facilitative administration for

the participants; A(2) Clear expectations are provided for Math Foundations trainers and for NC SIP Coordinators who provide follow-up to training; B(1) Accountability for delivery and quality monitoring of training are in place, with responsibility assigned primarily to NC SIP Math Consultants and district NC SIP Coordinators; B(2) Adult learning principles are used in all professional development and strategies to address them are included; B(3) Training is skill-based and provides opportunities for participants to practice what they've learned with feedback provided by the trainers. Pre- and post-testing are used to assess participant learning and identifying those needing additional coaching; B(4) Outcome and evaluation data are collected, analyzed, and used for improving the professional development and follow-up support; B(5) Trainers are trained, coached, and observed to ensure fidelity and quality. Participant feedback is used to improve training and trainer skills; C(1) Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear and this includes using data to give feedback to coaches; D(1) Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear and fidelity observation forms are provided; D(2) Data are used to make decisions at multiple levels in the state; D(3) Implementation and student outcome data are shared regularly w/stakeholders at multiple levels; D(4) Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and plans are in place to share and celebrate successes; D(5) All participants receive instructions on providing data to NC SIP; and E(1) Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation.

The components NC SIP will focus on developing and/or implementing in the coming year include: C(2) Coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling; and E(2) Leadership analyzes feedback from staff and makes changes to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation, including revising policies and procedures to support new way of work.

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

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

For measures 1.c and 1.d, only those professional development events that involved training that directly impacted teacher practice in reading or mathematics were considered. To collect these data, NC SIP sites were to submit summary forms about the type of event and numbers of participants for each training that occurred from March 2, 2013 to February 28, 2014. NC SIP sites did not submit summary forms for all of the trainings conducted. Therefore, the data for measures 1.c and 1.d under estimate the total number of teachers and leaders trained. Additionally, numbers are duplicated in that teachers and leaders could have participated in more than one type of training (see Table A) and therefore would be counted twice in the total. The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the previous year (2012-13). For measure 1.c, the target was not met as the number of teachers trained decreased slightly from 3,905 teachers to 3,900 teachers. For measure 1.d, the target was met as the number of leaders trained increased from 44 to 84. Other NC SIP events that were conducted in addition to those listed in Table A. include reading and math training of trainers and 2013 Spring Network Meeting (312 educators participated).

Table A. Summary of Professional Development Events that Directly Impact Teacher Practice									
Professional Development Event	**Total # Trainings**			**Total # of Teachers**			**Total # of Leaders**		
	2012	**2013**	**2014**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
Reading Foundations Training: Provides teachers with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills needed to deliver effective instruction for students, who, after several years of instruction and learning experiences in reading, still have difficulties reading fluently and are significantly behind their age peers. The training consists of nine units and provides a solid foundation on which to build an effective reading instruction program. The content and teaching techniques presented in the program are derived directly from the extensive research-based literature available on teaching students with severe reading difficulties.	71	52	64	1,721	1,065	1,250	22	13	31
Reading Model Instruction Training: As a result of the Reading Foundations Training, each new NC SIP reading site selects a reading model training program to implement in their school and school system. Models selected must reflect the instructional principles derived from the review of instruction research addressing effective reading instruction for students with serious reading difficulties and disabilities. These principles include explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory instruction and progress assessment. Training on the model is provided directly to the sites by trainers approved by the developers of the reading model.	28	105	101	340	1,576	1,576	16	17	37
Literacy Training: In addition to providing Reading Foundations Trainings and Reading Model Trainings, NC SIP provides workshops that focus on specific areas of reading instruction, presenting the most recent research-based and proven techniques in these areas. These workshops include "Investigating the Science of Reading," Reading Fundamentals," "Success with Direct Instructions," and "Production of Sounds for Reading and Spelling."	6	16	1	101	408	53	0	1	0
Mathematics Foundations Training: Provides teachers with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills needed to deliver effective instruction for students, who, after several years of instruction and learning experiences in math, still have difficulties. The content and teaching techniques presented in the program are derived directly from the extensive research-based literature available on teaching students with severe math difficulties.	27	34	32	434	681	551	19	9	6
Mathematics Model Instruction Training: Each new NC SIP math site selects a math model training program to implement in their school and school system. Models selected must reflect the instructional principles derived from the review of instruction research addressing effective math instruction for students struggling in math. Training on the model is provided directly to the sites by trainers approved by the developers of the math model.	4	18	39	39	175	470	0	4	10
TOTAL	**136**	**225**	**237**	**2,635**	**3,905**	**3,900**	**57**	**44**	**84**

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

2. Project Objective **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

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

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
One year after completing Reading Foundations Training and Reading Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP K-12 teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.	**Program**		**136/160**	**85%**		**121/160**	**75.6%**

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
One year after completing Mathematics Foundations Training and Mathematics Model Instructional Training, 85% of new NC SIP K-12 teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their final fidelity observation.	**Program**		**62/73**	**85%**		**60/73**	**82.2%**

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
85% of a sample of continuing NC SIP K-12 teachers will receive a score of 2.5 or better on their reading or mathematics fidelity observation.	**Project**		**513/607**	**85%**		**526/607**	**86.7%**

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

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

NC SIP LEAs are required to observe teachers who 1) have completed Reading/Math Foundations training, 2) have completed Reading/Math Model training, AND 3) are implementing or will be implementing a reading/math model program. For the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years, NC SIP LEAs observed all new NC SIP teachers and 50% of continuing NC SIP. (Starting in 2014-15, all new and continuing teachers will be observed.) The NC SIP evaluation team provided each LEA with a list of new and continuing teachers to be observed at the beginning of the school year. **New NC SIP teachers** are teachers who completed the series of trainings (i.e., Reading/Math Foundations and Reading/Math Model training) between November 1st of the last school year and October 31st of the current school year. **Continuing NC SIP teachers** are teachers who completed the series of trainings before November 1st of the last school year. For both new and continuing teachers, observers use a fidelity observation form that corresponds to the reading/math model being implemented by the teacher observed. Fidelity observation forms are structured classroom observation rating scales developed for each of the reading and math instruction models selected by NC SIP sites by the vendor (see NC SIP website for copies fidelity observation forms). Teachers are rated on their use of the instructional skills associated with high implementation fidelity of the instructional model.

Observations are conducted during the school year. Observers are to have completed a full training course in the reading or math model being implemented by the teacher who is to be observed. All persons in an LEA who conduct fidelity observations complete an inter-rater reliability process to ensure they are using similar criteria to assign ratings on the fidelity observation form. New teachers are observed THREE times and continuing teachers are observed ONE time. The rationale for the difference being that new teachers need additional observations to help ensure they understand and are implementing the instructional model with fidelity. All observations are submitted online using the online versions of the fidelity observation forms. Once submitted, the fidelity score is calculated and sent via email to the observer along with an electronic version of the completed observation**.** The fidelity score is calculated by dividing the total number of points by the total number of items applicable to the lesson. Valid fidelity observation scores range from 0 to 3. Teachers are considered to be implementing with fidelity if the fidelity observation score is at or above 2.5. For new teachers, the third or last fidelity observation score is used to determine whether the teacher is teaching with fidelity.

The target for these measures is for 85% of new and continuing teachers (grades k-12) to be considered implementing their evidenced based instructional model with fidelity. As shown in in Tables 2.a, 2.b., and 2.c, the target for was not met for new teachers (reading=75.6%; math=82.2%) but was met for continuing teachers (86.7%). Concerns with the 2012-13 fidelity data include the accuracy teacher designations as new or continuing and low response rates. To improve response rates for 2013-14, the lists of participating teachers and the teachers observed will be provided to consultants to determine who has not yet been observed. This information will be communicated to the NC SIP LEAs during their developmental reviews. In 2014-15, NC SIP LEAs will observe all new teachers (three times) and all continuing teachers (one time). The reasons for this change are participating teachers fluctuate across the school year making observation lists sent at the beginning of the school year inaccurate by the end of the school year and LEAs will not have to wait for observation lists to begin observations of continuing teachers.

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

3. Project Objective **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

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

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
25% of NC SIP Reading Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the reading model instructional practices.	**Program**		**$236,536/ $946,143**	**25%**		**$51,661/ $946,143**	**5.5%**

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
25% of NC SIP Mathematics Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the mathematics model instructional practices.	**Program**		**$154,952/ $619,808**	**25%**		**$41,241/ $619,808**	**6.7%**

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

Performance Measure 3.a. 25% of NC SIP Reading Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the reading model instructional practices. **Performance Measure 3.b.** 25% of NC SIP Mathematics Initiative funds are used for activities designed to sustain the use of the mathematics model instructional practices.

Nearly all NC SIP funds are awarded to LEAs to implement NC SIP reading and/or math initiatives. LEAs started tracking their expenditures of NC SIP funds in the 2012-13 school year. Overall, 71 out of 93 NC SIP reading sites (76%) and 47 out of 52 NC SIP math sites (90%) submitted expenditure forms for 2012-13. Total expenditures (i.e., denominator) included the amount allocated to NC SIP LEAs in 2012-13 that submitted expenditure forms and any carryover.

The target for the percentage of funds used for activities designed to sustain the use of NC SIP reading and math instructional practices is 25% for 2012-13 (target will be 40% for 2013-14 and 55% for 2014-15). As shown in the tables above, the target was not met as less than 25% of funds were expended on follow-up activities. Follow-up activities were defined as any activities related to improving or sustaining the use of reading or math foundations practices or

implementation of the selected reading or math instructional model including coaching, fidelity observations and feedback, mini-workshops/booster sessions, determining needs through data analysis, procedural manuals, or Communities of Practice/PLC's.

NC SIP LEAs did not use all of their 2012-13 and carryover funds (22% of reading and 36% of math funds were not spent). NC SIP funds were most often spent on program materials (reading=41%; math=33%) and on Foundations or instructional model training (reading=21%; math=18%). As coaching becomes more of a focus the percentage of funds spent on follow-up activities will increase. Additionally, while NC SIP funds may have not been used for follow-up activities, districts expended a large amount of non-NC SIP funds on NC SIP activities (reading=$1,913,326.23; math=$769,528.80). However, these expenditures are not tracked.

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

4. Project Objective **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

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

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of students in grades K-2 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who remained at or demonstrated progress toward an age appropriate level of reading or mathematics skills.	Project		195/566	34.5%		114/509	22.4%

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in reading.	Project			NA		198/4,716	4.2%

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of students in grades 3-8 with disabilities taught by NC SIP teachers who perform at or above grade level in mathematics.	Project			NA		48/1,308	3.7%

4.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities that dropped out of schools in high-implementing NC SIP districts.	**Project**	**Target**			**Actual Performance Data**		
		Raw Number	**Ratio**	**%**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**
			921/14,462	**6.4%**		**481/15,165**	**3.2%**

4.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a diploma in high-implementing NC SIP districts.	**Project**	**Target**			**Actual Performance Data**		
		Raw Number	**Ratio**	**%**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**
			1,967/3,149	**62.5%**		**2,309/3,484**	**66.3%**

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

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

Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and instructional model training courses. Teachers submitted k-2 student data from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) 6th Edition (2009-10 to 2012-13) and DIBELS Next (2011-12 and 2012-13). DIBELS 6th Edition contains five measures that assess different early literacy skills including Initial Sound Fluency (ISF), Letter Naming Fluency (LNF), Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF), Nonsense Word Fluency (NSF), and DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF). DIBELS identifies which measures and when measures should be administered to students based on when students should start developing the early literacy skill assessed by a specific measure (see Table B).

Table B. DIBELS 6th Edition Administration Schedule

Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
K	ISF LNF	ISF LNF PSF NWF	 LNF PSF NWF
1	LNF PSF NWF	 PSF NWF DORF	 PSF NWF DORF
2	DORF	DORF	DORF

The DIBELS 6th Edition Administration and Scoring Guide provides descriptive levels of performance (e.g., low risk=level 3, some risk=level 2, at risk=level 1) that correspond to a range of raw scores for each grade level, measure, and administration period (i.e., fall, winter, spring). All of the scores provided

by NC SIP teachers were converted to the appropriate performance level following the instructions provided in the DIBELS Administration and Scoring Guide. Once scores were converted to performance levels, the pattern of performance across measures was examined for each student for the fall and spring. Each student was assigned one score for the fall and one score for the spring based on the instructional recommendations for individual patterns of performance provided in the DIBELS Administration and Scoring Guide. For example, students at the end of kindergarten who scored at risk on the LNF, deficit on the PSF, and at risk on the NWF were assigned a 1 which corresponds to the instructional support recommendation "Intensive – Needs Substantial Intervention." Students were assigned a 2 if their pattern of performance indicated they needed "Strategic support – Additional Intervention" and a 3 if their pattern of performance indicated they needed no additional support or "Benchmark – At Grade Level." Once an Instructional Support Recommendation was assigned to each student for the fall and spring based on DIBELS recommendations, the fall score was subtracted from the spring score to determine if the student had shown progress from the fall to the spring.

DIBELS Next contains five measures for K-2 that assess different early literacy skills including First Sound Fluency (FSF—replaces ISF in 6th Edition), Letter Naming Fluency (LNF), Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF), Nonsense Word Fluency-Correct Letter Sounds (NSF-CLS) and Nonsense Word Fluency-Whole Words Read (NSF-WWR), and DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF). DIBELS identifies which measures and when measures should be administered to students based on when students should start developing the early literacy skill assessed by a specific measure (see Table C).

Table C. DIBELS Next Administration Schedule

Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
K	FSF LNF	FSF LNF PSF NWF-CLS	 LNF PSF NWF-CLS
1st	LNF PSF NWF-CLS	 NWF-CLS NWF-WWR DORF	 NWF-WWR DORF
2nd	NWF-WWR DORF	 DORF	 DORF

DIBELS Next provides scoring worksheets to calculate composite scores across measures for each grade level and administration period. Composite scores were calculated using the DIBELS Next worksheets for each student for the fall and spring. Using the composite scores each student was assigned a score level (1=well below benchmark, 2=below benchmark, 3=at or above benchmark) for the fall and spring based on the benchmark goals and cut points for risks provided in the DIBELS Next scoring guide. The fall score level was subtracted from the spring score level to determine if the student had shown progress from the fall to the spring.

In 2012-13, 97 out of 118 teachers representing 25 LEAs submitted complete DIBELS 6th Edition (n=16 teachers) or Next (n=81 teachers) data. These teachers submitted valid scores for 509 out of 773 students (65.9% of the total students with data) on all of the requested DIBELS measures for the fall and the spring (see Tables B and C). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the performance from the baseline year (2009-10); however, because the first grade results were calculated differently in 2009-10, 2010-11 data is being used as baseline. As shown in the Table 4.a, 22.4% of the students with disabilities (114 out of 509) for whom complete DIBELS data were reported in 2012-13 showed progress (i.e., increase in level) from fall to spring OR scored at grade level in the fall and in the spring. The target was not met as the percentage of students remaining at or demonstrating progress toward an age appropriate level of reading decreased from 34.5% to 22.4%. However, as shown in Table D, fewer students showed a decrease in their scores (from 20.8% in 2010-11 to 15.9% in 2012-13).

Table D. DIBELS Results by Grade Level and Overall for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13												
Grade Level	**% Students Showed Progress or Remained at Grade Level**				**% Students Showed No Change (1,2)**				**% Students Showed Negative Change**			
	2009-10	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**
Kindergarten (2010n=78; 2011n=123; 2012n=133; 2013n=131)	46.2% (36)	54.5% (67)	50.4% (67)	39.7% (52)	32.1% (25)	31.7% (39)	30.1% (40)	45.8% (60)	21.8% (17)	13.8% (17)	19.5% (26)	14.5% (19)
First Grade (2010n=152*; 2011n=161; 2012n=169; 2013n=169)	77.0% (117)	39.8% (64)	23.7% (40)	16.6% (28)	13.8% (21)	31.7% (51)	40.2% (68)	63.3% (107)	9.2% (14)	28.6% (46)	36.1% (61)	20.1% (34)
Second Grade (2010n=231; 2011n=282; 2012n=310; 2013n=209)	29.0% (67)	22.7% (64)	11.0% (34)	16.3% (34)	54.1% (125)	57.8% (163)	70.6% (219)	70.3% (147)	16.9% (39)	19.5% (55)	18.4% (57)	13.4% (28)
TOTAL K-2 (2010n=461; 2011n=566; 2012n=612; 2013n=509)	**47.7% (220)**	**34.5% (195)**	**23.0% (141)**	**22.4% (114)**	**37.1% (171)**	**44.7% (253)**	**53.4% (327)**	**61.7% (314)**	**15.2% (70)**	**20.8% (118)**	**23.5% (144)**	**15.9% (81)**

*Caution should be used when interpreting first grade results for 2009-10 as the recommended instructional recommendation scores were unable to be determined using the DIBELS 6th Edition scoring guide because all of the measures for first grade were not administered.
**Results for 2011-12 and 2012-13 include k-2 student data from DIBELS 6th or DIBELS Next editions.

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

Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and an instructional model training course. Starting in the 2012-13 school year, NC SIP teachers submitted student identification numbers and contextual information (e.g., number of lessons completed, number of students taught) and the evaluation team obtained the EOG test data directly from the State to eliminate concerns about the accuracy of the data.

Overall, a total of 468 grade 3-8 teachers representing 64 LEAs and 1 charter school (90 LEAs and 3 charter schools have NC SIP reading sites) submitted useable 2013 EOG reading data. As shown in Table 4.b above, of the 4,716 students with disabilities on whom valid identification numbers were reported for 2012-13, 198 or 4.2% performed at or above grade level in reading (i.e., at level III or IV). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed performance from the baseline year (2009-10). However, due to changes in the content and proficiency levels (i.e., levels made more rigorous so fewer students scored proficient) of the reading test, the 2012-13 data is not comparable to previous years and will serve as the new baseline for the remaining years of the grant. Table E provides data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina from 2009-10 to 2012-13. Efforts being taken by NC SIP to improve student performance data include 1) providing each NC SIP LEA with a summary of their student achievement, teacher fidelity, and parent data to improve response rates related to these data collections and inform site-based efforts, 2) modifying the Developmental Review process to better assess implementation at each NC SIP site, and 3) continuing work on piloting and adopting a coaching model to be used by NC SIP sites.

Table E. EOG Reading Results for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13				
Group	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13***
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	30.5% (total n=4,374)	30.0% (total n=5,611)	32.1% (total n=5,328)	4.2% (total n=4,716)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	40.6% (total n=86,850)	40.8% (total n=88,284)	40.7% (total n=90,551)	12.9% (total n=91,407)
NC State: All students	70.1% (total n=681,460)	70.7% (total n=688,428)	71.2% (total n=694,016)	43.9% (total n=687,054)

*Note: Due to changes in the reading test content and new proficiency levels, 2012-13 results are not comparable to previous years

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

Data for this measure are to be submitted by teachers at NC SIP schools (i.e., schools located within NC SIP sites) who have completed a foundations and an instructional model training course. Starting in the 2012-13 school year, NC SIP teachers submitted student identification numbers and contextual information (e.g., number of lessons completed, number of students taught) and the evaluation team obtained the EOG test data directly from the State to eliminate concerns about the accuracy of the data.

Overall, a total of 151 grade 3-8 teachers representing 35 LEAs (52 LEAs have NC SIP math sites) submitted useable 2013 EOG math data. As shown in Table 4.c. above, of the 1,308 students with disabilities on whom valid data were reported for 2012-13, 48 or 3.7% performed at or above grade level in math (i.e., at level III or IV). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed performance from the baseline year (2009-10). However, due to changes in the content and proficiency levels (i.e., levels made more rigorous so fewer students scored proficient) of the mathematics test, the 2012-13 data is not comparable to previous years and will serve as the new baseline for the remaining years of the grant. Table F provides data for students with disabilities and all students in North Carolina from 2009-10 to 2012-13. Efforts being taken by NC SIP to improve student performance data include 1) providing each NC SIP LEA with a summary of their student achievement, teacher fidelity, and parent data to improve response rates related to these data collections and inform site-based efforts, 2) modifying the Developmental Review process to better assess implementation at each NC SIP site, and 3) continuing work on piloting and adopting a coaching model to be used by NC SIP sites.

Table F. EOG Math Results for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13

Group	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13*
NC SIP: Students w/disabilities	40.7% (total n=907)	40.2% (total n=1,313)	22.6% (total n=1,034)	3.7% (total n=1,308)
NC State: Students w/disabilities	57.0% (total n=86,830)	57.6% (total n=88,274)	57.3% (total n=90,539)	12.4% (total n=91,355)
NC State: All students	81.8% (total n=681,509)	82.4% (total n=688,443)	82.8% (total n=694,032)	42.3% (total n=687,048)

*Note: Due to changes in the reading test content and new proficiency levels, 2012-13 results are not comparable to previous years

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

For Performance Measures 4.d and 4.e NC SIP districts (i.e., traditional LEAs only; not charter schools) were classified as high implementing if they: 1) participated continuously in NC SIP for 7 years or more (i.e., since 2006-07), 2) submitted 2012-13 EOG test data, 3) had 50% or more of their schools participating in NC SIP OR had an average of 2 or more teachers participating per NC SIP school, and 4) had 75% or more of their K-12 teachers with fidelity scores meeting or exceeding the fidelity threshold score of 2.5. Additional sites were considered high implementers if they were close to but did not meet either #3 OR #4 but received a high implementation ranking from their regional consultant. Because there are more elementary and middle schools than high schools participating in NC SIP, we focused on districts involved in NC SIP for at least seven years as they would have had some elementary (i.e., grade 5) and middle school students who participated in the program complete high school. It is expected that the definition for high implementing will continue to evolve as more complete and accurate data become available on the quality of implementation via the new developmental review and fidelity checks process. Due to the evolving definition and the fact that more schools will meet the seven-year requirement as the grant progresses, the NC SIP schools considered to be high implementing are expected to change each reporting period.

The dropout percentage represents the number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 who dropped out in a given year divided by the total number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 for that year (i.e., December EC count). These data were obtained directly from NC DPI. The graduation percentage represents the number of students with disabilities who graduated with a diploma in their fourth or fifth year of high school divided by the total number of students with disabilities who were in grade 9 in 2005-06 for 2009-10 graduates, or 2006-07 for 2010-11 graduates, or 2007-08 for 2011-12 graduates, or 2008-09 for 2012-13 graduates. These data were obtained for each LEA from the NC DPI website at http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgradrate.

As shown in Table 4.d above, the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out from schools in high implementing NC SIP districts slightly decreased from 2009-10 to 2012-13. This also was the trend for the other NC SIP districts (i.e., those not identified as high implementing), non-NC SIP districts, and the state overall (see Table G). The target for this measure was to meet or decrease the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out the baseline year (2009-10). Based on these data, the target was met as the percentage of students with disabilities who dropped out decreased from 6.4% in 2009-10 to 3.2% in 2012-13.

As shown in Table 4.e above, the percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a diploma in four or five years from schools in high implementing NC SIP districts slightly increased from 2009-10 to 2012-13. This also was true for the other NC SIP districts (i.e., those not identified as high implementing), non-NC SIP districts, and the state overall (see Table G). The target for this measure was to meet or exceed the percentage of students with disabilities graduating the baseline year (2009-10). Based on these data, the target was met as the percentage of students with disabilities graduating increased from 62.5% in 2009-10 to 66.3% in 2012-13.

Table G. Dropout and Graduation Results for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13

Group	% Students w/Disabilities Dropping Out (Number 9-12 dropouts/EC December 9-12 Count)				% Students w/Disabilities Graduating (5 Year Cohort)			
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
High Implementing NC SIP Districts (n=29)	6.4% (921/14,462)	3.9% (566/14,533)	4.5% (675/14,868)	3.2% (481/15,165)	62.5% (1,967/3,149)	63.9% (2,114/3,310)	63.4% (2,124/3,348)	66.3% (2,309/3,484)
All Other NC SIP Districts (n=65)	6.7% (1,843/27,551)	6.8% (1,859/27,404)	5.4% (1,496/27,847)	3.2% (907/28,024)	63.6% (3,854/6,062)	64.9% (4,041/6,227)	63.5% (3,922/6,174)	64.2% (4,121/6,423)
Non NC SIP Districts (n=21)	5.7% (280/4,926)	6.0% (302/5,063)	4.4% (227/5,176)	2.8% (148/5,214)	68.3% (680/995)	70.1% (730/1,042)	68.2% (769/1,128)	70.2% (866/1,234)
NC State (n=115)	6.5% (3,044/46,939)	5.8% (2,727/47,000)	5.0% (2,398/47,891)	3.2% (1,536/48,403)	63.7% (6,501/10,206)	65.1% (6,885/10,579)	64.0% (6,815/10,650)	65.5% (7,296/11,141)

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

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

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

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The number of faculty members at NC SIP partnership IHEs that receive NC SIP training.	Project	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		Greater than 0	/		8	/	

5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The number of courses at NC SIP partnership IHEs for teachers pursuing initial teacher licensure in special education that have been revised to reflect NC SIP instructional practices.	Project	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		Greater than 0	/		7	/	

5.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The number of students enrolled in teacher education and lateral entry programs for initial teacher licensure in special education in NC SIP partnership IHEs.	Project	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		212	/		383	/	

5.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of new special education teachers produced by teacher education and lateral entry programs in NC SIP partnership IHEs.	Project	121	/		124	/	

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

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

The NC SIP partnership IHEs are currently the University of North Carolina (UNC) at Charlotte and Eastern Carolina University (ECU). UNC-Chapel Hill is no longer a partner. Since the start of the grant, eight faculty members have received Foundations training. Specifically, four faculty members at UNC-Charlotte (two full-time and two part-time staff trained in Math and/or Reading Foundations) and four faculty members at ECU (all Reading Foundations) have completed or are in the process of completing Foundations training. The target for this measure was to show an increase in the number of faculty members trained until all relevant faculty members are trained. This target was met as the number of trained faculty members has increased from zero in 2010-11, to five in 2011-12, to eight in 2012-13.

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

Four special education courses offered at UNC-Charlotte (SPED 4272-Undergraduate/5272-Graduate: Teaching Mathematics to Learners with Special Needs and SPED 4275-Undergraduate/5275-Graduate: Teaching Reading to Learners with Special Needs) and three special education courses offered at ECU (SPED 3001: Assessing students with disabilities, SPED 3005: Instructional Programming in Special Education, and SPED 3100/3109: Instructional Methods for Students with Disabilities in the General Curriculum) have been modified to reflect NC SIP instructional practices. The target for this measure is to show an increase in the number of courses modified to reflect NC SIP instructional practices. This target was met as the number of courses modified has increased from zero in 2010-11, to two in 2011-12, to seven in 2012-13.

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

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

The NC SIP partnership IHEs have different routes for persons to pursue initial teacher licensure in special education. UNC-Charlotte offers a bachelor's degree and MAT program and ECU offers a bachelor's degree, licensure only, and lateral entry program.

Enrollment and graduation data for the UNC-Charlotte degree programs were obtained from their Fact Book published by the UNC-Charlotte Office on Institutional Research and available online at https://ir.uncc.edu/fact-book (Table III-2, Table III-3, Table VII-2a, and Table VII-2b). The Fact Book data for the MAT program only captures Phase II students or students pursuing an SP 2 license. Enrollment and completion data for Phase I students or students pursuing only an SP 1 license are currently not included in Fact Book and would be burdensome for the Education Department to provide.

The enrollment and graduation data for the ECU degree programs also were obtained from their Fact Book published by the ECU Office of Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research and available online at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/research/FactBook.cfm (from the tables Unduplicated Undergraduate Fall Enrollment History by Unit and Major and Undergraduate Degrees Conferred by Unit and Major). The ECU enrollment data represent undergraduate students

who "intend" to major in as well as students officially admitted to teacher education programs in special education. Licensure only and lateral entry program data (i.e., enrollment and completion) were provided by the ECU Office of Teacher Education.

With regard to student enrollment in special education programs leading to initial licensure, the target is for the number of students enrolled to increase from the baseline year (2009-10). As shown in Table 5.c, this target has been met as the number of students enrolled increased from 212 in 2009-10 to 383 in 2012-13. With regard to student graduation from and completion of special education programs, the target is for the number of students completing/graduating to increase from the baseline year (2009-10). As shown in Table 5.d, this target has been met as the number of students graduating/completing programs slightly increased from 121 in 2009-10 to 124 in 2012-13. Table H provides enrollment and graduation/completion data in special education programs for each IHE.

Table H: IHE Partner Enrollment and Graduation/Completion Data for Special Education Teachers for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13

Type of Program	UNC-Charlotte				ECU				TOTAL			
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
ENROLLMENT NUMBERS												
Degree	107	129	125	164	87	130	196	202	194	259	321	366
Lateral Entry	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	7	11	11	10	7	11	11
Licensure Only	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	4	5	6	8	4	5	6
TOTAL	**107**	**129**	**125**	**164**	**105**	**141**	**212**	**219**	**212**	**270**	**337**	**383**
GRADUATION/COMPLETION NUMBERS												
Degree	44	47	44	68	47	20	50	42	91	67	94	110
Lateral Entry	NA	NA	NA	NA	27	32	15	10	27	32	15	10
Licensure Only	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
TOTAL	**44**	**47**	**44**	**68**	**77**	**55**	**69**	**56**	**121**	**102**	**114**	**124**

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

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

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

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of parent involvement opportunities provided by NC SIP.	Project	Greater than 0	/		10	/	

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

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

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

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

NC SIP has partnered with the Exceptional Children's Assistance Center (ECAC), a private non-profit organization operated and staffed primarily by parents of children with disabilities, to strengthen and expand upon the parent component of the project. This year ECAC provided five different opportunities/resources through which parents could receive information related to supporting the education of their children with special needs. The target for this measure was to show an increase from the previous year in the number of parent involvement opportunities provided. This target was met as the number increased from 0 in 2010-11, to 5 in 2011-12, to 10 in 2012-13. Table I provides an overview of the different opportunities and resources provided as well as the number of NC SIP LEAs and parents served.

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

Opportunity/Resource	Number of NC SIP LEAs Served		Number of NC SIP Parents Served	
	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14
1. Literacy Information Packet The literacy packet contains information for families and care givers to help them gain a better understanding of the process their child is likely to go through in learning how to read and how they can help their child become a better reader. Handouts include information on how children learn to read, tips for working with their child's teachers, activities families can do at home and additional resources that support literacy. These activities are meant to be fun and to encourage the love of reading.	46	51	143	158
2. Reading Improvement Tool for Parents –Questions Parents Can Ask About..Reading Improvement This tool was created to help parents not only start the conversation but feel more confident when talking with their child's teacher about their child's progress. The format is parent friendly providing space for parents to write the responses and allowing parents to identify specific questions that address the areas of concern that relate to their child. This reading tool helps parents gather specific information about their child's progress in reading and how to help their child be successful.	90	84	934	948
3. Reading Improvement Tool for Parents –Questions Parents Can Ask..About Spelling, Writing and Assessments/Testing This is a companion handout to the "Questions Parents Can Ask About ....Reading Improvement" Space is provided for parents to write the responses and allow parents to identify specific questions about spelling, writing and assessments.	NA	84	NA	456
4. Literacy is for All Workshop This workshop outlines the skills that children need to become better readers, and how families can support their child's reading progress. Families will understand the basic structure (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary) and how it relates to important reading skills. Participants will also learn the basic vocabulary of reading, learn what questions to ask in order to understand how their child is progressing, and identify key strategies to support their child's reading at home and in the community. Each participant receives a literacy packet. The workshop and literacy packet is available in Spanish.	1	5	12	49
5. Workshop in a Box-Literacy is for All: Tools to Engaging Families The "Literacy is for All: Tools to Engage Families" workshop-in-a-box includes the "Literacy is for All" workshop for families and the "Making the Connection" workshop for staff on engaging families along with supporting handouts. *The goal of this toolkit is to provide resources that will enable school personnel to conduct their own literacy workshop /activities for families.* The toolkit includes physical copies of the planning tools to help sites get started by involving parents, school staff, and community partners early in the planning process of literacy activities. (Literacy workshop and handouts are also in Spanish.) Toolkits were disseminated at the Exceptional Children's Conference and the remainder will be distributed at the NCSIP Spring Institute. To encourage the use of the toolkit a NCSIP webinar has been scheduled for April. NCSIP sites are invited to participate in this one hour interactive session followed by a 30-minute question and answer session. This webinar will focus on the tools that can help assess, plan and implement activities to engage families in Literacy and math.	NA	15	NA	NA

6. Video Clips These are 3-minute video clips that model literacy activities that families can do at home. All five video clips (i.e., Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension) will be placed on the ECAC NCSIP and DPI NCSIP websites. Currently two of the five videos (Comprehension and Fluency) are on the ECAC/NCSIP website and Comprehension is on the DPI/NCSIP website. The video clips were also shown at the Exceptional Children's Division conference at the display table. We are in process of re-editing the remaining 3 videos (Phonics, Phonemic Awareness and Vocabulary). In April 2014, each NCSIP site will be sent a DVD including all 5 video clips. The video clips can be used by teachers as a teaching tool with families, accessed by families on the website or DVD in the comfort of their own home and for use with the Literacy for All workshop. We are currently working on the content for the videos in Spanish. It will not be a translation of the English version but based on the input from ESL families who participated in ECAC's "Parents as leaders" institute for Spanish speaking families.	NA	2	NA	62
7. Math Improvement Tool for Parents- Questions Parents Can Ask..About Math Instruction This easy-to-use tool is designed to help parents feel more confident when talking with their child's teacher about their child's math progress. The format is parent friendly including space for parents to write the responses and allowing parents to identify specific questions that address the areas of concern that relate to their child. This math tool helps parents obtain specific information to help them encourage and support their child in developing and building math skills.	35	48	410	960
8. Newsletter ECAC's semi-annual newsletter, Newsline, features information related to the education of infants, toddlers, children, youth, and young adults with disabilities. The newsletter has a designated NC SIP page with reading resources and/or math resources for parents.	94	84 Reading & 48 Math sites	19,420 (for all LEAs)	17,400 (for all LEAs)
9. Parents As Leaders The NCSIP Parents as Leaders Institute was held on November 20, 2013 from 9 am – 2:30 pm in Greensboro. Forty-two people registered and thirty-five attended the institute. The "Parents As Leaders" institute was one of the pre-conference Institutes prior to the NCDPI's Exceptional Children's Conference. The purpose of this Institute was to help participants gain the knowledge and skills needed to become more actively involved in helping improve educational outcomes and services for all children with disabilities. The skill development activities in this training support and guide families in their role as a parent, volunteer, school improvement team member, advisory council member or any of the roles parents play. The participants also learned more about NCSIP and some of the effective education practices happening in North Carolina. We are planning on conducting regional "Parents as Leaders" institutes in both English and Spanish in this upcoming reporting period.	NA	17	NA	35
10. Math Is Everywhere Workshop "*Math is Everywhere*" is a workshop for parents. Participants receive a math packet with information and resources to help parents support their child in learning math. The math workshop focuses on the following components: Connecting Math to Everyday Living, Creating Home Math Toolbox, Helping Your Child with Math Homework, Questions to Ask About Math Instruction, Math websites, and Books that bridge literacy and math. There have been two trial math workshops facilitated in order to get feedback before the workshop was finalized and included in the toolkit.	NA	2	NA	15
Math Information Packet The math packet is currently under development. At the present time available resources are: Questions to Ask about Math Instruction, Helping Your Child Learn Math: *Math at the Grocery Store*, Helping Your Child Learn Math: *Math at Home*, Math Websites, List of books that bridge Reading/Math, Math Homework tips for Parents, and the IEP Checklist. These resources have been compiled into a half packet that we have used for the two trial workshops. When completed the packet will include additional handouts covering all six the components of the workshop. The information in this packet will be accessible through the website.	NA	4	NA	12
Workshop in a Box-Math Is Everywhere: Engaging Families This toolkit is in the final stage of development. It will have a similar format as the Literacy Workshop-in-a-Box toolkit. The	NA	2	NA	NA

"Math is Everywhere" workshop has been completed with revisions being made based on input from the two trial workshops. Additional handouts are being developed to support the workshop topics. The planning tools from the literacy toolkit will be used in the math toolkit adding math activity ideas for home and school.				
Big Tent The Big Tent is being created primarily as a follow up to the "Parents As Leaders" institute. This will be an ongoing online community where participants can interact with each other, ask questions, share resources and keep informed. Big Tent Invitations are going out in April.	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

As part of their developmental review in the spring of 2014, LEAs will be asked to report on the NC SIP parent involvement opportunities that occurred in their NC SIP schools and/or on the total number of parents who participated in these opportunities. Results will be reported in 2015.

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

As part of their parent-teacher conference, NC SIP reading and math sites are asked to conduct the NC SIP Parent Satisfaction Reading or Math Survey with parents. Sites are to provide parents with a hard copy of or link to the NC SIP survey and discuss the purpose of the survey as well as how the information will be used. The survey was revised for the 2012-13 school year. A comparison of the old and new version of the survey questions can be found in Table J.

Table J: Old and New Version of NC SIP Parent Satisfaction

Old Parent Survey (from 2009-10 to 2011-12) Scale: Not Helpful (0), Somewhat Helpful (1), Helpful (2) and Very Helpful (3)	**New Parent Survey (starting in 2012-13)** Scale: Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (4)
1. How helpful has the reading/mathematics instruction that your child has received been in improving his/her ability to read/in mathematics? 2. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in explaining the reading/mathematics instruction procedures your child is receiving and how the instruction addresses your child's needs? 3. How helpful has the information provided by the reading/mathematics program been in understanding your child's reading difficulties/difficulties in math and the school's plans for improving your child's reading abilities/abilities in math? 4. How helpful has the information provided by the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in providing you with activities to help your child's reading improvement/improvement in math at home and over the summer? 5. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in improving your child's motivation and positive attitude toward school? 6. How helpful has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been in improving communication between you and the school staff? 7. Has the reading/mathematics teacher/staff been helpful in improving your child's performance across other areas besides reading/math?	1. I am satisfied with the way the teacher has explained how the reading program works and why it was selected to improve my child's specific problems in reading/math. 2. I believe the reading program matches the needs of my child in reading/math and addresses the goals and modifications on his/her Individual Educational Plan (IEP). 3. The reading/math teacher has shared ideas and activities that I can use at home to support my child in math. 4a. The reading/math teacher has been helpful in explaining the progress my child has made in this reading/math program. 4b. The reading/math teacher has shared examples of my child's work that demonstrate how my child is performing in reading/math. 4c. I am satisfied with how often the reading teacher communicates with me about my child's progress in reading/math. 5a. I think the reading/math instruction my child receives has improved his/her ability in reading/math. 5b. I think the reading/math instruction my child receives has improved his/her ability across different subject areas/classes. 6. I think my child's reading/math teacher has motivated and helped my child have a positive attitude towards reading/math. 7. Overall, I am satisfied with the support and reading/math program instruction my child has received this school year

Parents rate their agreement to each question on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Once parents submit their surveys (either to the school or online), data for hard copy surveys is entered, hard copy data and online data are merged, the average rating across questions is calculated for each parent, and then the mean of the parent average ratings is calculated to determine the overall average parent satisfaction rating. As shown in Table 6.c, the mean satisfaction

rating for reading and math was 3.42 for 2012-13 (Reading: 3.44, n=2,022; Math: 3.38, n=655). Table K provides the average parent satisfaction rating across years; however, 2012-13 results are not comparable to previous years because of changes to the survey questions and rating scale.

Table K: NC SIP Parent Satisfaction Ratings

2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
2.69 (n=1,055)	2.43 (n=1,187)	2.27 (n=2,886)	3.42 (n=2,677)

*Note: Results for 2012-13 are not comparable to previous years due to changes in the survey questions and rating scale.

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

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

Included in the $1,411,339.30 on line 8b for the Current Budget Period is $152,047.60 obligations (encumbrances) not expended and drawn down as of 02/28/14.

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