



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

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

PR/Award #: **H323A050004**

Illinois State Personnel Development Grant: Closing the Gap through Research-Based Professional Development

Illinois ASPIRE (Alliance for School-based Problem-solving and Intervention Resources in Education) is the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) SPDG project. The overarching goal of Illinois ASPIRE, as stated in the original federal grant proposal, is to: *Establish and implement a coordinated, regionalized system of personnel development that will increase the capacity of school systems to provide early intervening services, aligned with the general education curriculum, to at-risk students and students with disabilities, as measured by improved student progress and performance.*

The project goal is being accomplished through four project objectives, for which anticipated outcomes were identified in the original grant application, as detailed below.

1. Deliver research-based professional development and technical assistance, based on an established training framework developed through the Flexible Service Delivery and Standards Aligned Classroom initiatives, through development of regional plans that follow a common format and criteria established at the state level and are prepared in a partnership of local education agencies (LEAs), institutes of higher education (IHEs), regional providers, and parents.
Anticipated Outcomes:
 - Increased knowledge and skills of personnel and parents.
 - Improved school performance, as measured by student performance, retention rates, suspension/expulsion, etc.
 - Improved student performance, as measured by state assessment scores (especially in reading), etc.
 - Increased number of educators and parents with current information and up-to-date knowledge and skills regarding improving results for individuals with disabilities.
2. Increase the participation of parents in decision-making across district sites.
Anticipated Outcomes:
 - Increased opportunity for parent input into regional professional development, as measured by the content of professional development for parents.
 - Improved parent awareness of training components and increased involvement in students' educational progress and achievement, as measured by parent surveys.
 - Increased parental participation in meetings for individual students, as measured by a sampling of problem-solving meeting notes and IEPs at the building level.
3. Incorporate the professional development content into IHE general and special education preservice curricula.
Anticipated Outcomes:
 - Increased knowledge and skills of IHE personnel, as measured by evaluation forms.
 - Increased preservice training on knowledge and skills required to design and implement early intervening services, as measured by preservice curricula content.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of project activities.
Anticipated Outcomes:
 - Formative data and information are available and used to evaluate progress of project activities and to continually improve project implementation.
 - Accurate student-, school-, and district-level data are available and used to measure progress.
 - Summative data provide accurate information on project effectiveness.

Key accomplishments under each objective during the current grant period include:

Objective 1: The four regional Illinois ASPIRE Centers established in the first year of the grant (one in the city of Chicago and one each in the northern, central, and southern areas of the state) continued to provide training, technical assistance, and coaching services in 2009-2010. In terms of training, the regional centers used the project training modules developed in prior years to conduct 84 small- and large-scale training events and 72 technical assistance

activities throughout the state. A total of 8,652 people (total is not unduplicated) participated in the training and technical assistance activities during the reporting period.

The technical assistance activities included coaches' networking meetings, which were conducted as a means of increasing the amount of support available for school and district problem-solving coaches throughout the state. In addition, three of the Illinois ASPIRE regional centers (north, central, and south) continued to provide training and support for the 80 external coaches recruited in February 2009 to scale up and enhance the sustainability of the project. In 2009-2010, these 80 individuals committed a portion of their time to serve as external coaches for districts in their areas and received coaching support from the ASPIRE regional coordinators via in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mails, and job shadowing.

Overall, there are now 65 schools across 41 districts serving as data collection sites under Illinois ASPIRE. The 65 schools comprise 1 high school, 3 middle schools, and 61 elementary schools. Fifty-seven of the elementary schools serve students in at least grades K-3, while the other four serve students in grades K-2 only. All sites collect and report building-level data for project evaluation. School year 2009-2010 was the fourth year of participation for 28 of the schools, the third year for 19 of the schools, and the second year for the remaining 18 schools. The level of direct technical assistance from Illinois ASPIRE to the third- and fourth-year schools was significantly reduced as their internal coaches continued to assume greater responsibility in the implementation process. In addition to the aforementioned training, each of the 65 sites received some level of onsite consultation and technical assistance (based on their levels of implementation), including coaching and mentoring from Illinois ASPIRE staff and their own district coaches. Key performance results associated with these sites include:

- Of the 65 schools, 38 submitted the Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI) in fall 2009. The SAPSI assesses the degree of implementation of the problem-solving and RtI process at the building level, as self-reported by schools. Of the 38 data collection sites, 97 percent demonstrated a level of "achieved" or "maintaining" with regard to implementation of knowledge and skills gained through participation in Illinois ASPIRE.
- SAPSI results show that the overall level of implementation of key problem-solving practices has increased in all 38 of the responding school sites over time. Specifically, the 38 sites that submitted SAPSIs reported being at the "in progress" level on 31.5 percent of the SAPSI items, at the "achieved" level on 29 percent of the items, and at the "maintaining" level on 38 percent of the items. In 2008-2009, responding sites reported the following: "in progress" on 47 percent of SAPSI items, "achieved" on 30 percent of the items, and "maintaining" on 18 percent of the items. Thus, the data from 2009-2010 demonstrate significant growth (20 percentage points) in the percentage of key problem-solving and RtI practices that the schools are implementing at the "maintaining" level.
- Analysis of grade 3 reading results on the 2008-2009 Illinois Standards Achievement Test for 25 of the then third-year Illinois ASPIRE schools shows that 71.93 percent of students scored at the "meets" or "exceeds" levels. Data from 26 matched comparison schools show that 69.23 percent of students were at these levels. Thus, it would appear that schools that have received Illinois ASPIRE training and onsite technical assistance had a somewhat higher percentage of students who met or exceeded the state reading standards than did the comparison schools.

Objective 2: In 2009-2010, membership of the SPDG Statewide Advisory Committee continued to include a representative of the Illinois Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) and a parent of a child with a disability. Each Illinois ASPIRE Center also continued to have one or more parent partners on its regional advisory committee, and these partners have been active participants in project activities. Most schools in the Illinois ASPIRE-Chicago region have at least one parent on their school teams who participates in project training. Many of the school sites in all four ASPIRE regions have convened parent meetings that include information on school-based problem solving, early intervening services, and RtI as a topic.

Assessment of parent involvement occurred through the SAPSI and the Parent Survey. Of the 38 data collection schools that submitted SAPSIs, approximately 60 percent reported being at the "achieved" or "maintaining" level in terms of parent involvement in implementation of student interventions. This represents an increase of 22 percentage points over 2008-2009, when 38 percent of schools were at the "achieved" or "maintaining" levels on this item. Based on final parent survey data from 2009-2010, 87 percent of responding parents felt they were actively involved in the problem-solving process. Further, more than 80 percent of the parents who responded felt that the communication and overall satisfaction with the problem-solving team meetings were positive.

Objective 3: Each regional Illinois ASPIRE Center continues to include one or more IHE with personnel preparation programs as a partner. Approximately 10 IHE faculty attended one or more Illinois ASPIRE training events during this reporting period. The dean of the college of education of the largest teacher preparation institute in Illinois is a member of the statewide project advisory committee. The Illinois ASPIRE regional evaluators completed a review of course syllabi for selected educator preparation programs at the partnering IHEs to determine the degree to which RtI content is included in preservice and graduate coursework and field placements. Overall, the results of this review showed low levels of implementation of RtI content in IHE educator preservice and graduate coursework.

Objective 4: The Center for School Evaluation, Intervention, and Training (CSEIT) at Loyola University Chicago continues to coordinate the statewide project evaluation. In addition, each regional Illinois ASPIRE Center employs a part-time regional evaluator responsible for overseeing data collection within the participating schools. During this reporting period, all of the key evaluation tools were administered (SAPSI, Data Protocol, Parent Survey, Fidelity of Implementation Checklist, IHE Checklist). All of the tools are available for downloading on the CSEIT website at <http://www.luc.edu/cseit/aspireprogramcoordinator.shtml>.

As detailed here, ISBE and its regional partners continued to make progress in carrying out the Illinois SPDG project plan. The regional Illinois ASPIRE Centers provide the primary infrastructure for implementation of the project and they delivered a full complement of training, technical assistance, and coaching services during this reporting period. The continuing data collection sites have made progress in their levels and fidelity of implementation as a result of their participation in the project training and technical assistance. Partnerships involving LEAs, IHEs, and parents have played a key role in project activities to date. Finally, all key elements of the project evaluation system structure are in place, which will ensure that quantitative and qualitative data are collected and used to determine project effectiveness and impact on student and school outcomes.



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

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

PR/Award #: **H323A050004**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

1. Project Objective:

Deliver research-based professional development and technical assistance, based on an established training framework developed through the Flexible Service Delivery and Standards Aligned Classroom initiatives, through development of regional plans that follow a common format and criteria established at the state level and are prepared in a partnership of LEAs, IHEs, regional providers, and parents.

I.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type Program	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of personnel [data collection site teams] completing training supported by the SPDG that are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices [as measured by fidelity of implementation].		51/60	85	24/38	63%

I.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type Program	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of professional development/training activities being provided through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.		425/500	85	84/84	100

I.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type Program	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, being provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through ongoing and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.) [for data collection sites only].		375/500	75	84/84	100

I.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type Project	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The number of professional development (training) activities being delivered through the SPDG.		/		84	/

I.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type Project	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The number of professional development (technical assistance) activities being delivered through the SPDG.		350		72	/

I.f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The number of personnel receiving training and technical assistance through the SPDG.	Project	20,000	/	8,652	/

I.g. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of personnel who report increased knowledge and skills as a result of professional development and technical assistance received through the SPDG.	Project	18,000/20,000	90	6,165/6,489	95

I.h.1 Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of trained new data collection schools that demonstrate implementation of knowledge and skills, as reported through the Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI) evaluation tool (i.e., overall rating of “in progress,” “achieved,” or “maintaining” in the fall of their first year).	Project	15/37	41	2/2	100

I.h.2 Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of trained continuing data collection schools that demonstrate implementation of knowledge and skills, as reported through the Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI) evaluation tool (i.e., overall rating of “in progress,” “achieved,” or “maintaining”).	Project	56/60	93	37/38	97

I.i. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of data collection schools trained and demonstrating implementation at the “in progress” level that show increased levels of implementation fidelity on the SAPSI from one year to the next (i.e., moved from an overall rating of “in progress” to “achieved” or “maintaining”).	Project	21/60	35	3/6	50

I.j. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of data collection schools trained, implementing, and showing increased levels of implementation fidelity that sustain practice over time, as documented on the SAPSI (i.e., remained at “achieved” or “maintaining” from one year to the next).	Project	20/21	95	14/16	88

I.k. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of data collection schools that demonstrate an increase in the percentage of students who meet or exceed state standards in reading, as measured by the Illinois Standards Achievement Test, over time.	Project		36/60	60	10/54	19

I.l. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of data collection schools that demonstrate an increase in student average daily attendance over time.	Project		36/60	60	5/63	8

I.m. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of data collection schools that demonstrate a decrease in the percentage of office discipline referrals per day over time.	Project		36/60	60	/	

I.n. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of data collection schools that demonstrate increased rates of placement of students with IEPs in less restrictive educational environments (i.e., removed from general education 0 percent-20 percent of the school day) over time.	Project		36/60	60	10/58	17

Explanation of Progress

Performance Measures I.a.: Illinois ASPIRE assesses the level of knowledge and skills through levels and fidelity of implementation by using the SAPSI and the Fidelity of Implementation Checklist. The performance measures identified here depict data from the winter benchmark of the 2009-2010 SAPSI. For that benchmark, 38 of the 65 ASPIRE data collection schools submitted a completed SAPSI. The data reflect the number of sites that had an overall rating of “achieved” or “maintaining” on the SAPSI.

Performance Measures I.b., I.d., I.e., and I.f.: Data were taken from final 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region and are based on simple counts. For I.b., professional development was determined to be scientific- or evidence-based if the standardized training materials developed for the project were used, as the content of those materials was developed using scientific- and/or evidence-based instructional practices. For I.d., the number of training events during this reporting period decreased somewhat in comparison with the previous reporting period. This reduced number of events is the direct result of the coaching-of-coaches component (as discussed under “Key Accomplishments”). The shift away from large-scale training and toward expanded coaching resources is supported as a more effective way to support a greater number of districts in their implementation of RtI. The total number of technical assistance activities reported in I.e. also decreased this year, primarily as a result of the fading of onsite technical assistance provided by the ASPIRE regional coordinators to all school sites. The total count for I.f. includes individuals who participated in training activities and individuals who participated in technical assistance activities and is not unduplicated.

Performance Measure 1.c.: All training in which the project data collection schools participate is sustained through onsite technical assistance and coaching from the Illinois ASPIRE regional coordinators, external coaches, and/or internal school-based coaches. In addition, all district and building coaches affiliated with each site have the opportunity to participate in regional coaches' networking meetings, through which the regional coordinators provide coaching-of-coaches and "job alike" networking.

Performance Measure 1.g.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports and are based on results of evaluation forms completed at the conclusion of each training event throughout the reporting period. Such forms are not completed for technical assistance activities. The calculation is based on the average percentage of respondents who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" to the relevant questions on the training evaluation form.

Performance Measures 1.h.1.: Among the 38 schools that completed the winter benchmark SAPSI in 2009-2010, none of these schools were new data collection schools in 2009-2010. The data reported for this performance measure include schools that completed the SAPSI in 2009-2010 and have been part of ASPIRE for two years (i.e., 2008-2009 and 2009-2010). One school reported being "in progress" and the other school reported being "achieved."

Performance Measure 1.h.2.: Data for this measure are from the winter benchmark SAPSI in 2009-2010. For that benchmark, 38 of the 65 ASPIRE data collection schools submitted a completed SAPSI. One school reported being "not started," 13 schools reported being "in progress," 10 schools reported being "achieved," and 14 schools reports being "maintaining."

Performance Measures 1.i.: Several overall changes were made to the SAPSI in 2007-2008 to address challenges that arose during administration of the original SAPSI. Therefore, it is no longer possible to report on the progress of school sites based on the previous version of the tool. Accordingly, data reported for this measure include only the 30 schools that have participated in ASPIRE for three years or more and completed the SAPSI in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. Among these 30 schools, 16 reported being "achieved" or "maintaining" in 2008-2009, while six reported being "in progress." In 2009-2010, three of the six schools had progressed to "achieved" or "maintaining." Finally, two schools were in their first year of participation in Illinois ASPIRE in 2008-2009, and their SAPSI scores that year showed one school as being "in progress" and the other being at the "not started" level. In 2009-2010, one school reported being "in progress" and the other reported being "achieved."

This year's results show an increased level of implementation in the continuing data collection sites with at least three years of participation in ASPIRE, which demonstrates implementation of knowledge and skills gained through training and technical assistance delivered by Illinois ASPIRE.

Performance Measures 1.j.: A key factor for any intervention is whether or not schools can implement a practice with fidelity and maintain these practices over time. Data reported for this performance indicator are taken from the SAPSI. As discussed under 1.i., changes made in the SAPSI have resulted in a smaller number of districts for which trend data can be reported from year to year. Accordingly, this year's data include only the 30 schools that have participated in ASPIRE for three years or more and completed the SAPSI in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. In 2008-2009, 16 of these schools reported being "achieved" or "maintaining." In 2009-2010, 14 of the 16 schools reported being "achieved" or "maintaining," with the other two reporting an implementation level of "in progress." Regarding the latter two schools, while this year's data seem to indicate slippage in their implementation levels, it is possible that the difference in ratings are the result of different team members completing the SAPSI from one year to the next and/or the team having a better understanding of the criteria for each SAPSI item and assigning a more accurate rating. Regardless, overall these results show that participating schools are able to maintain strong levels of implementation, which demonstrates continued implementation of knowledge and skills gained through training and technical assistance delivered by Illinois ASPIRE.

Performance Measure 1.k.: Performance results for this indicator are based on 2007, 2008, and 2009 Illinois School Report Card data for grade 3 reading performance on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT). In order to be included in the data analysis, schools must have had at least three years of participation in Illinois ASPIRE and have ISAT data for grade 3 reading for 2007-2009. A total of 54 schools met these criteria.

The data analysis results indicate that 10 of the 54 schools have increased the percentage of grade 3 students who met or exceeded state standards in reading for three consecutive years (2007-2009). It is also important to note that from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009, 23 of the 54 (43 percent) schools increased the percentage of grade 3 students who met or exceeded state standards in reading. Further, from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, 28 of the 54 (52 percent) schools increased the percentage of grade 3 students who met or exceeded state standards in reading.

Performance Measure 1.l.: Performance results for this indicator are based on attendance rate data from the 2007, 2008, and 2009 Illinois School Report Card. In order to be included in the data analysis, schools must have had at least three years of participation in Illinois ASPIRE. A total of 63 schools met this criterion.

The data analysis results indicate that 5 of the 63 schools have steadily increased their attendance rates from 2007 to 2009. It should also be noted that from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009, 9 of the 63 (14 percent) schools increased their attendance rates. Further, from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, 10 of the 63 (16 percent) schools increased their attendance rates.

Performance Measure 1.m.: Because the majority of data collection sites are elementary schools and the focus of Illinois ASPIRE has primarily been at grades K-3, ODR data have not typically been tracked by the data collection schools. While the ongoing collection of academic data for RtI is a common practice (e.g., through curriculum-based measures), the systematic collection of discipline data has been a newer endeavor for some schools, particularly at grades K-3. Accordingly, the project has been able to collect only minimal data for this performance measure. Therefore, ISBE has removed this performance measure from the project.

Performance Measure 1.n.: Performance results for this indicator are based on December 2007, 2008, and 2009 Special Education Child Count data for placement of grade 1 through grade 5 students in the disability categories of specific learning disability, speech language impairment, emotional disability, and other health impairment. In order to be included in the data analysis, schools must have had at least three years of participation in Illinois ASPIRE and serve students in all four disability categories. A total of 58 schools met these criteria.

The data analysis results indicate that 10 of the 58 schools (17 percent) increased the percentage of students with IEPs who were removed from general education 0 percent to 20 percent of the day for three consecutive years. It is also important to note that from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009, 32 of the 58 schools (55 percent) increased the percentage of students placed in general education classrooms for the majority of their school day (i.e., removed 0 percent to 20 percent). Further, from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, 15 of the 58 schools (26 percent) increased the percentage of students placed in general education classrooms for the majority of their school day.

Overall, actual performance on each of the measures for which data are reported this year shows expected progress in comparison with the established targets.

With regard to delivery of training and technical assistance, all four of the Illinois ASPIRE regions used standardized professional development materials, which demonstrates progress in achieving Objective 1. There are eight core training modules, plus a supplemental module on determining special education eligibility within an RtI framework:

Modules

ED 524B

1. Overview of 3-Tier Problem-Solving Model, including RtI
2. Universal Screening and Benchmarking for Success
3. Problem Identification and Problem Analysis
4. Documenting for Success: Scientifically Based Progress Monitoring
5. Collaborating for Success: Team Building and Leadership in an RtI Model
6. Advanced Problem Analysis in Reading
7. Scientific, Research-Based Reading Instruction and Interventions
8. RtI at the Middle and High School Levels
9. Special Education Eligibility and Entitlement within an RtI Framework

Training and technical assistance participants represented a wide variety of disciplines, including general and special education teachers, related service providers, school principals, special education administrators, paraprofessionals, external and internal coaches, higher education personnel, and parents. The four ASPIRE regions provided varying levels of services to continuing data collection sites based on each site's level of need and number of years participating in the project. Onsite technical assistance occurred more frequently in the Chicago region, as these sites had greater levels of need. In other regions, onsite assistance from ASPIRE staff was significantly reduced as external coaches and/or internal building coaches assumed increased levels of responsibility for supporting school teams; this trend supports sustainability of the project. All ASPIRE data collection sites increased their levels and fidelity of implementation of school-based problem solving; early intervening services; scientific, research-based reading instruction; and student progress monitoring. Each of the 61 elementary school sites also conducted universal screening of reading skills three times during the school year for all students in grades K-3. To facilitate collaboration of coaches across school sites, all four Illinois ASPIRE regions continued to conduct networking sessions for data collection site coaches and district coaches, with coaches in other schools and districts invited to attend.

In December 2009, a new set of projectwide resource materials specifically targeted for parents was completed and posted on the Illinois ASPIRE website at http://www.illinoisaspire.org/welcome/parent_resources.php. Each Illinois ASPIRE region also continued to use other parent materials developed within their respective regions. The new resource materials include:

- Response to Intervention (RtI)—A Parent's Guide
- Reading and Response to Intervention (RtI): Putting it All Together
- Parents' Frequently Asked Questions on Response to Intervention (RtI)

The coaching-of-coaches component added in February 2009 was fully implemented in 2009-2010. As discussed in the executive summary under "Key Accomplishments," 80 individuals committed a portion of their time to serve as external coaches for districts in their areas and received coaching support from the ASPIRE regional coordinators. These external coaches also participated in professional development focused on coaching skills and on content-specific knowledge and skills pertinent to RtI implementation. They also received coaching support from the ASPIRE regional coordinators in the form of in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mails, a coaches' blog, and job shadowing. The coaching-of-coaches component has resulted in an increase in the number of trained problem-solving coaches throughout the state and, in turn, has leveraged the resources of the project and increased sustainability of practices.



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

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

PR/Award #: H323A050004

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

2. Project Objective:

Increase the participation of parents in decision-making across district sites.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of professional development/training activities [for parents] being provided through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.	Program		45/75	60	17/17	100

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The number of training activities being provided to parents through the SPDG.	Project	75	/	17	/	

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The number of parents receiving training and technical assistance through the SPDG.	Project	2,000	/	28	/	

2.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of parents reporting increased knowledge and skills as a result of participation in training received through the SPDG.	Project		1,440/1,600	90	26/28	93

2.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
		Target		Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio	
The percentage of parents in data collection schools reporting involvement over time in their children's educational progress and achievement.	Project		215/250	86	22/22	100

2.f. Performance Measure	Measure Type Project	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of data collection schools reporting parents' involvement in their children's educational progress and achievement over time.		52/60	87	23/38	61

2.g. Performance Measure	Measure Type Project	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of data collection schools reporting representative teams that include parents at meetings for individual students.		52/60	87	24/38	63

Explanation of Progress

Performance Measure 2.a.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region and are based on simple counts. Professional development was determined to be scientific- or evidence-based if the standardized training materials developed for the project were used, as the content of those materials was developed using scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.

Performance Measure 2.b.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region and are based on simple counts. It should be noted that most data collection schools also provided information on problem solving, early intervening services, and RtI as part of evening parent events, such as Open House; however, such events are not included in the data for this performance measure.

The SAPSI is an additional measure that provides relevant information about training provided to parents (Item #12b, re: comprehensive and ongoing training provided to parents), although it is not an official part of this performance measure. For the 2009-2010 winter benchmark, 19 of the 38 schools (50 percent) that submitted a SAPSI reported being "in progress" on providing parent training. Ten of the 38 schools (26 percent) reported being "achieved" or "maintaining," which is an increase of 14 percentage points over 2008-2009.

Performance Measure 2.c.: Data on parent participation in training and technical assistance are based on parent attendance at Illinois ASPIRE-provided training events, as reported in each Illinois ASPIRE region's 2009-2010 comprehensive performance report. The raw number reported is based on a simple count, and this count is not unduplicated. In comparison with the previous reporting period, the number of parents participating in Illinois ASPIRE training and technical assistance has decreased, due in part to a decrease in the number of training events delivered in each ASPIRE region during the reporting period (see related discussion under Performance Measure 1.d.). Most data collection schools also provided information on problem solving, early intervening services, and RtI as part of evening parent events, such as Open House; however, the number of parents attending such events is not included in the data for this performance measure.

The SAPSI is an additional measure that provides relevant information about training provided to parents (Item #12b, re: comprehensive and ongoing training provided to parents), although it is not an official part of this performance measure. For the 2009-2010 winter benchmark, 19 of the 38 schools (50 percent) that submitted a completed SAPSI reported being "in progress" on providing parent training. Ten of the 38 schools (26 percent) reported being "achieved" or "maintaining," which is an increase of 14 percentage points over 2008-2009.

Performance Measure 2.d.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region and are based on results of training evaluation forms completed at the conclusion of each training event throughout the reporting period. The calculation is based on the average percentage of respondents who responded “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” to the relevant questions on the evaluation form.

Performance Measure 2.e.: Data reported are based on the winter 2009–2010 administration of the Parent Survey (agreement with 60 percent or greater of the items presented) in each region. Surveys were administered to parents who participated in problem-solving meetings for individual students who required Tier 3 interventions. Unfortunately, a low percentage of parents returned a completed survey; therefore, results for this performance measure reflect surveys received from only 22 parents.

Performance Measure 2.f.: The primary data source for this measure is Item #21 (re: parent involvement in interventions) on the SAPSI. Results for this performance measure reflect data from the 2009-2010 winter benchmark of the SAPSI for 38 of the 65 data collection sites and are based on schools that performed at the “achieved” or “maintaining” level on Item #21. When compared with 2008-2009 SAPSI data, these results represent an increase of 23 points in the percentage of schools reporting high levels of parent involvement in student interventions.

Performance Measure 2.g.: The primary data source for this measure is Item #16 (re: parent involvement during Tier 3 team meetings for individual students) on the SAPSI. Results for this performance measure reflect data from the 2009-2010 winter benchmark of the SAPSI for 38 of the 65 data collection sites and are based on schools that performed at the “achieved” or “maintaining” level on Item #16. When compared with 2008-2009 SAPSI data, these results represent an increase of 14 points in the percentage of schools reporting high levels of parent involvement in Tier 3 meetings for individual students

Overall, actual performance on each of the measures for which data could be reported this year shows progress, in comparison with the established targets.



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

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

PR/Award #: **H323A050004**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

3. Project Objective:

Incorporate the professional development content into IHE general and special education preservice curricula.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The number of IHE personnel receiving training and technical assistance through the SPDG.	Project	300	/	85	/

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of IHE personnel reporting increased knowledge and skills as a result of professional development and technical assistance received through the SPDG.	Project		270/300	90	82/85

3.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data			
		Target		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	Raw Number	Ratio
The percentage of IHEs with education preparation and graduate programs that have preservice curricula that address knowledge and skills required to implement school-based problem solving, including designing and implementing early intervening services.	Project		17/57	30	2/5

Explanation of Progress

Performance Measure 3.a.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region. Data are based on a simple count of the number of training participants and the count is not unduplicated.

Performance Measure 3.b.: Data were taken from 2009-2010 comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region and are based on results of training evaluation forms completed at the conclusion of each training event throughout the reporting period. The calculation is based on the average percentage of respondents who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" to the relevant questions on the evaluation form.

Performance Measure 3.c.: Data were taken from the results of the IHE Checklist, which is used to review preservice and graduate curricula and evaluate the extent to which they include school-based problem solving and early intervening services content. Illinois ASPIRE regional evaluators used the checklist to

review syllabi submitted by five of the IHEs partnering in the project. A total of 85 syllabi were submitted for review; programs represented included special education, school psychology, general education, and administrative programs. Checklist ratings were based on the following scale: 0 = No evidence that the component is included in the class; 1 = Component is mentioned in the class; 2 = Component is mentioned in the class AND there are required readings, assignments, and/or projects for application. A higher rating indicates that the curriculum included problem solving, Rtl, and early intervening services content. The results for this performance measure are based on IHEs that had more than 50 percent of checklist items rated at Levels 1 and 2 (combined). It was originally intended that project staff would complete IHE Checklists for all Illinois IHEs with educator preparation programs; however, delays in finalizing the checklist, combined with challenges in securing participation by IHEs, resulted in participation by only five IHEs. In an effort to encourage continued work by the participating IHEs to increase Rtl content in their educator preparation programs, each IHE received the results of their individual IHE Checklists. The checklist is also available to all Illinois IHEs for use in conducting internal reviews of their programs for improvement.

Overall, actual performance on each of the measures this year shows progress, in comparison with the established targets. IHE faculty participation in training and technical assistance occurred primarily through attendance at large- and small-scale training events in each region. In at least two of the regions, IHE faculty participated in the delivery of technical assistance to school sites. All four regions continued to have active involvement by IHE partners:

- Illinois ASPIRE–Chicago: University of Illinois–Chicago
- Illinois ASPIRE–North: Northern Illinois University, National-Louis University, and Loyola University Chicago
- Illinois ASPIRE–Central: Illinois State University, Eastern Illinois University, and Western Illinois University
- Illinois ASPIRE–South: Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville and Southern Illinois University–Carbondale

The dean of the college of education of the largest teacher preparation institute in Illinois is a member of the Illinois ASPIRE Statewide Advisory Committee. IHE faculty continue to be invited to and attend large- and small-scale training events. There was increased participation by such individuals during this reporting period (85 individuals, compared with 11 in the previous reporting period). This increase can be partially attributed to increased outreach efforts to IHEs in terms of notifying them of ASPIRE training events.



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

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

PR/Award #: H323A050004

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

4. Project Objective:

Evaluate the effectiveness of project activities.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target		Actual Performance Data		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of regional centers that collect and report evaluation data to the statewide evaluation coordinator within the established timelines.	Project	4	/		4		

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target		Actual Performance Data		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of regional centers that use evaluation data to make project improvements.	Project	4	/		4		/

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target		Actual Performance Data		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of data reports completed each year by the statewide evaluation coordinator and submitted to ISBE within the established timelines.	Project	2	/		2		/

4.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target		Actual Performance Data		Actual Performance Data	
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of annual reports completed by the statewide evaluation coordinator and submitted to ISBE within the established timeframe.	Project	1	/		1		/

Explanation of Progress

Performance Measure 4.a.: On-time submission of data improved this year, in that all four regions submitted data within the established timelines. The online availability of the evaluation tools contributed to the improvement on this performance measure.

Performance Measure 4.b.: All four regional Illinois ASPIRE centers used data from training evaluations to make refinements in the delivery of training. In addition, the three ASPIRE regions in which external coaches were recruited used feedback from the external coaches to refine and expand training, technical assistance, and coaching support for these individuals.

Performance Measure 4.c.: All data reports were prepared and submitted on time.

Performance Measure 4.d.: The annual report referenced here is based on data taken from the comprehensive performance reports submitted by each Illinois ASPIRE region, along with data taken from the various other reporting measures (e.g., SAPSI, Data Protocol, Parent Surveys, Training Evaluation Forms, Illinois School Report Cards, and Special Education Child Count). In addition, all data collection schools housing at least grades K-3 collected student-level data through universal screening of reading skills for all students in grades K-3 using DIBELS or AIMSweb. For those students requiring Tier 2 reading interventions, schools conducted progress monitoring one to two times per month. Progress monitoring occurred weekly for any student receiving Tier 3 reading interventions. All universal screening data collected during this reporting period were downloaded to the state evaluation platform (VIMEO) and incorporated into the annual report prepared by CSEIT.

Overall, actual performance on each of the performance measures shows that the established targets have been reached.



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

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

PR/Award #: H323A050004

SECTION B - Budget Information

GAPS Draw Down: Not all of the total budget expenditures reported on line 8b of the cover sheet may have been drawn down from GAPS yet because ISBE draws federal cash based upon need. Federal funds are drawn down by ISBE when funds are vouchered to LEAs. The payments are made based upon LEA cash needs, which are monitored by comparing LEA expenditure reports with the amount of funds disbursed, in order to avoid excess cash on hand.

Indirect Cost Rate: When ISBE submitted its original federal SPDG application, its existing federal Indirect Cost Rate Agreement was in effect (19.3 percent for the period 7/01/2004 to 6/30/2005). In formulating the five-year project budget, ISBE applied this rate to those budget line items subject to the indirect cost calculation. Three Indirect Cost Rate Agreements have been in effect for ISBE during this budget period: a fixed rate of 19.0 percent in effect from 7/01/2008 to 6/30/2009, a fixed rate of 18.6 percent in effect from 7/01/2009 to 6/30/2010, and a fixed rate of 13.4 percent in effect from 7/01/2010 to 06/30/2011. However, during the entire multi-year grant period of the SPDG, ISBE is using the restricted rate in effect at the time, capped at 19.3 percent, to calculate indirect costs for those grant expenditures subject to the indirect cost calculation (i.e., personnel salary, fringe benefits, and travel and project advisory committee travel and meeting expenses).

Unexpended Funds: ISBE had unexpended contractual funds at the end of the budget period, as follows:

- Administrative Funds: As of September 30, 2010, ISBE had unexpended administrative funds totaling \$125,900, which resulted from lower than expected costs for travel and other meeting expenses of the SPDG Project Advisory Committee, project director travel, and supplies. All unexpended funds have been reallocated for use during the no-cost extension budget period (Year 6).
- Subgrants: As of September 30, 2010, expenditures by the regional subgrants were less than budgeted. Not all subgrantees had submitted final expenditure reports at the time of report preparation; however, it is estimated that unexpended funds will total approximately \$800,000. This balance is primarily the result of the decision to conduct fewer training activities and shift resources to the coaching-of-coaches model (as discussed in the executive summary under "Key Accomplishments"). The coaching-of-coaches model had lower associated costs than the training activities. ISBE has reallocated all unexpended funds for use during the no-cost extension budget period (Year 6) for continued project activities to support external coaches, school teams, and parent training.

All remaining funds allocated for this budget period have been expended according to the approved budget.

Based on the details provided here, ISBE underspent its SPDG funding amount of \$1.85 million during the federal budget period. The unexpended balance has been reallocated and to be spent during the no-cost extension budget period.

SECTION C - Additional Information

Current partners in Illinois ASPIRE:

- IHEs: Illinois State University and Loyola University Chicago continue to serve as two of the required IHE partners with ISBE. In addition, Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville and Southern Illinois University–Carbondale are partners in the project through their role in administering the Illinois ASPIRE Center–South. The following IHEs are involved as partners through their work with the regional Illinois ASPIRE Centers: University of Illinois–Chicago, Northern Illinois University, National-Louis University, Illinois State University, Eastern Illinois University, and Western Illinois University.
- State Agencies: The Illinois Department of Human Services, which serves as the lead agency for IDEA, Part C, continues to serve as a required partner.
- LEAs: The Northern Suburban Special Education District continues to serve as a required LEA partner. In addition, City of Chicago School District 299 and Peoria Regional Office of Education 47 are partners in the project through their role in administering the Chicago and central regional Illinois ASPIRE Centers, respectively. Numerous other LEAs serve as partners at the regional level within each of the Illinois ASPIRE Centers.
- Parents: The two Illinois PTIs continue as partners in the project. At the regional level, Family Matters, the downstate Illinois PTI, serves as the parent partner in the Illinois ASPIRE Center–South project. The other Illinois ASPIRE Centers also have parent partners, including individuals who serve as parent mentors under the ISBE Parent Mentor Project and/or individuals from other local parent organizations. Membership on the SPDG Statewide Advisory Committee includes a representative from the Illinois PTA and the parent of a student with a disability. ISTAC-Parents also serves as a partner in dissemination of information about RtI to ISBE-funded Parent Mentors, other parent leaders in the state, and parents of students with disabilities.

The project partners have enhanced the ability of ISBE to achieve the approved SPDG project objectives and activities. The regional partnerships within the Illinois ASPIRE Centers have been key to the successful implementation of training and technical assistance activities in each of the Illinois ASPIRE regions.