



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/ Number #H323A040002-06

Since its inception, the California State Personnel Development Grant (CA SPDG), previously known as the California State Improvement Grant (SIG2), has strived to improve special education outcomes and services in the state of California by implementing activities such as

- Scientifically-based training and technical assistance
- Facilitating systems change at all levels of the education system (school, district, region, and state)

The following summary and performance update covers the full SIG2 time period: February 1, 2005 through August 30, 2008.

Highlights of the Project's Goals:

The CA SIG2 originally outlined six project objectives with corresponding performance measures as indicators of the progress the grant has made in the effort to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. These goals and objectives fall in the areas of

- Increasing the knowledge of personnel by providing research-based training and technical assistance
- Increasing the degree of collaboration between special and general education
- Improving student academic performance at sites receiving ongoing training and technical assistance
- Improved positive behavioral management training in order to create safe and supportive environments for students
- Improving and facilitating parent-to-school partnerships
- Building the field's capacity to make data-informed decisions

In January 2006, the CA SIG2 also received three program objectives and corresponding performance measures from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) with a request that all SIGs report findings on these measures in the next performance report. The CA SIG2 was fortunate to be implementing a number of activities aligned with these objectives and therefore we have submitted performance data. These goals and objectives fall in the areas of

- Improving the instructional practices of state personnel by providing research-based professional development
- Improving the quality of professional development training and technical assistance (TA)
- Increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in special education and related services (Note: This objective requested performance data only from states that have this objective as a SIG2 goal. In California this goal and the associated activities fall under another funded project and therefore are not reported on in this report).

Another goal has been to align the CA SIG2 goals and objectives with the indicators identified in the CA State Performance Plan in an effort to work collaboratively with all stakeholders. The activities of the CA SIG2 are listed as improvement strategies under several of the indicators outlined in the State Performance Plan and the CA SIG2 shares a number of common strategies of practices, such as ongoing support through coaching, modeling of excellent programs, and Response to Intervention (RtI).

Progress in Meeting the Project's Performance Measures:

Between 2/1/2005 and 8/30/2008, funds from the CA SIG2 have supported 565 training and technical assistance events with 21,812 personnel in attendance. Participants reported that their average level of knowledge increased by 45-percent as a result of participating in the training (from 2.9 to 4.2 on a 5-point scale). Participants rated their experience high, with an overall rating of 4.4 (on a 5-point scale), which is consistent with the average overall ratings received during SIG1.

A follow-up survey is conducted via email to determine whether participants of training and technical assistance events are implementing the research-based educational strategies presented at these events. The survey asks that participants rate how often they have used the strategies, how often the strategies have worked well to meet their needs, and how often they shared the strategies with others. Of those responding, 83 percent indicated that they had implemented the strategies learned at the event, with 53 percent having implemented the strategies repeatedly. Those responding indicated sharing these strategies with other by an even wider margin of 87 percent, with 62 percent having shared the strategies repeatedly.

Beyond these capacity-building activities, SIG2 established specific elements in sites to improve outcomes. One of these was Building Effective Schools Together (BEST), a schoolwide program implementing positive behavior supports. During SIG2, the number of California schools fully implementing BEST increased by 440%, from 5 sites to 27. Also, SIG2 has spent time developing and disturbing data tools to sites, building and enabling a culture of data throughout California. Successes during SIG2 include the development of TED, the Training Evaluation Database, and the development and distribution of over 750 copies of the California Standards Test (CST) Charting Program.

A major focus of these training and technical assistance activities was dissemination of special education/general education collaborative strategies. A survey was conducted of sites who participated in substantial TA during SIG2 (3 or more days through one or more years), finding a large increase in the degree of collaboration at these sites. In the key areas of assessment, intervention, core curriculum, and teaming, the responding sites reported an average increase in the degree of collaboration of 87 percent.

Academic outcomes were observed during SIG2 as well. The average percentage of student proficient and above on CST English-language Arts (ELA) assessments at sites receiving substantial TA increased by 8.9 percentage points for all students and 11.4 percentage points for students with disabilities between 2004 (before SIG2) and 2008. API Growth scores increased at 92% of these sites, with an average increase of 30 points.

The California Department of Education has identified parent-to-school partnerships as critical in the effort to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and to successfully change systems in California's education system. The CA SIG2 currently is implementing a number of activities focused on parent empowerment, information dissemination, and financial support. Over 4,800 stipends were issued to parents and family members of students with disabilities participating in decision-making education meetings during SIG2 through the Family Participation Fund (FPF). In depth interviews with many of these parents asked how they have participated and how they have affected change. Respondents indicated goals to empower parents and students, increasing their participation, increasing the awareness of the needs of special education students, and advocating for positive change; 92% of these parents reported that they had made a difference through their participation.

Contributions to Research, Knowledge and Practice:

The CA SIG2 has focused on communicating common messages to the field about selected topics. These common, or core messages, articulate research findings and essential components of effective application in practice. All core messages have been identified by experts in the field and have been approved by the California Department of Education, Special Education Division. The CA SIG2 supports trainings and technical assistance requests that reflect any or all of the core message areas. Efforts to update and further develop the research supporting the identified core messages are currently underway.

The CA SIG2 sustains activities and systems change through ongoing comprehensive practices. For example, after identifying the success and need for site-to-site modeling and coaching, the CA SIG2 developed the Leadership Site Program (an expansion of the Schwab Model Sites from SIG1). In this program, each year high performing sites are identified through a rigorous competitive process. These sites are awarded for their exemplary programs based on best practices in the areas of reading, positive behavioral supports, collaboration, transition, and family-school partnerships. These sites are financially supported by the CA SIG2 to share their work statewide at Regional Leadership Institutes, function as a model for other sites that come to visit the school and view the program in action, participate as an ongoing member of the State Leadership Institute community, and continuously improve their model through professional development and technical assistance. School sites that attend these events are required to send a team of 5–10 members. We encourage sites to send teams that

include administrators and teachers from both special and general education, other site staff, such as counselors, reading specialists, and paraprofessionals, and parents. By emphasizing the importance of the team, we have found that sites have been more successful in implementing and enhancing their programs when they return to their site.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

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

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SIG/SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			21,812 / 21,812	100%

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of SIG/SPDG projects that have implemented personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan (SPP).	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				100%	The California SIG2 is in alignment with the CA SPP		100%

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

1.a. Between 2/1/2005 and 8/30/2008, funds from the CA SIG2 have supported 565 training and technical assistance events with 21,812 personnel in attendance. The types of training and technical assistance provided by the CA SIG2 to educators and service providers in the state of California are outlined below in Project Performance Measure 2.b.

Since its inception, the California State Improvement Grant effort has focused on communicating common messages to the field about selected topics. These common, or core messages, are based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices. All core messages have been identified by experts in the field and have been approved by the California Department of Education, Special Education Division. The CA SIG2 supports trainings and technical assistance requests that reflect any or all of the core message areas. These areas include:

1. Reading
2. Positive behavioral supports
3. Collaboration

4. Transition
5. Family-school partnerships
6. Least restrictive environment (LRE)
7. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, reauthorized in 2004 (IDEA)
8. Core Components of a Strong RTI Process

The events were concentrated in the core message areas of:

- Special Education/General Education Collaboration (49 percent)
- Reading (20 percent)
- Positive behavioral supports (15 percent)
- Transition (9 percent)

The remaining 7 percent of trainings provided by the CA SIG2 were evenly distributed among the remaining four core message areas: RtI, family-school partnerships, IDEA, and LRE.

Teachers were the predominant group attending the events:

- General education teachers: 31.3 percent
- Special education teachers: 23.1 percent

General and special education administrators (10.0 percent and 6.4 percent, respectively) and other certificated professionals (11.5 percent) also had a strong presence at the events. Other roles included paraprofessionals (2.9), parents and family (2.5), program specialists (1.6), and respondents indicating other (7.0) or declining to respond (3.7).

While the number of parents and family members of children with disabilities who participate in training and technical assistance are not included in this performance measure, they do represent 2.5 percent of those attending CA SIG2 events. Parents and family members have been identified by the California Department of Education as a key stakeholders in systems change; therefore, the CA SIG2 encourages, and in some cases requires, the inclusion of parents in funded activities.

Participants reported that their average level of knowledge increased by 45-percent as a result of participating in the training (from 2.9 to 4.2 on a 5-point scale). For the formula used to determine this percentage, see Project Performance Measure 4.a. below. Participants rated their experience highly, with an overall rating of 4.4 (on a 5-point scale), which is consistent with the average overall ratings received during SIG1.

1.b. The CA SIG2 has been integrated into the CA State Performance Plan (CA SPP) under the improvement activities of several key indicators, along with the following statement, which appears in the CA SPP:

“SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, and in the collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will include an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.”

The CA SIG2 works to improve outcomes for all students, especially those with disabilities. In an effort to meet this goal collaboratively with key state and federal offices and stakeholders, the CA SIG2 has aligned its goals and objectives with the activities, measures, and priorities outlined in the State of California State Performance Plan (CA SPP) for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 as developed by the California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division (SED), with input from broad stakeholder groups. This was achieved initially through the Partnership Committee on Special Education (PCSE), a group of approximately 100 stakeholders representing a diversity of roles and perspectives that advised CDE on the implementation of the SIG, and the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee, a separate group of stakeholders within CDE (including the SIG evaluator which monitored outcomes). These groups merged to form ISES, the Improving Special Education Services

stakeholder group, which has held four biannual meetings since January 2007. ISES is now the stakeholder body that advises CDE on both the CA SPP/Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) and SIG2 to ensure that all efforts and activities are aligned with the priorities and improvement strategies identified in the SPP and APR.

The CA SPP focuses on student and systems outcomes. The various activities of the CA SIG2 also work to improve outcomes in these areas. In addition, the CA SPP identifies the efforts and a number of the specific activities of the CA SIG2 under the following indicators:

1. Indicator #1 – Graduation (percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma)
2. Indicator #2 – Dropout (percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school)
3. Indicator #3 – Statewide assessments (participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments)
4. Indicator #4 – Suspension and expulsion (percent of districts with a discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities)
5. Indicator #5 – Least restrictive environment (percent of children with IEPs removed from the regular classroom more than 21 percent of the day and less than 60 percent of the day)
6. *Indicator #8 – Parent involvement (percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities). While the CA SIG2 was not specifically mentioned under this indicator, the statement included in the CA SPP regarding SIG2 acknowledges the CA SIG2's parent outreach efforts. To learn more about our parent outreach efforts refer to 4.a through 4.e below.

Examples include the following.

CA SPP: Indicator #4, Suspension and Expulsion: *Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity* (page 35 of the CA SPP).

Like many aspects of the SPP, Indicator #4 is addressed in the SPP through activities including SIG2-funded trainings. Explicit references to SIG2 activities and core messages under Indicator #4 include: IDEA 2004 trainings, LRE and RtI technical assistance, and the Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) program are all SIG2 activities.

CA SPP: Indicator #8, Parent Involvement: *Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities* (page 69 of the CA SPP).

The CA SIG2 promotes activities that model and encourage family participation and partnership with educational agencies to improve education for all children. CA SIG2 activities that focus on this goal include:

- The Family Participation Fund: Financial resources made available to family members of children with disabilities to encourage their participation in decision-making activities, events, and groups. From 2/1/2005 through 8/30/2008, 4,834 requests for financial support were funded.
- Information dissemination: *The Special EDge* is a newsletter published three times a year with roughly 50,000 subscribers. This newsletter is designed to inform and support parents, educators, and other service providers on special education topics, focusing on research-based practices, legislation, technical support, and current resources. Other publications include guides for transitioning to adult living and the rights of parents and children with disabilities.
- Parent involvement in professional development training and technical assistance: We ask that parents of children with disabilities be represented at all training and technical assistance activities funded by the CA SIG2 where programmatic and systems change decisions are being made. During SIG2, the parents represented 2.5 percent of attendees at these events.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
 Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

Improve the quality of professional development available to meet the needs of personnel serving children with disabilities.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SIG/SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			5 / 5	100%

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SIG/SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.).	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			4.5 / 5	90%

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

2.a. Between 2/1/2005 and 8/30/2008, funds from the CA SIG2 have supported 5 major activities: centrally coordinated technical assistance (TA), Building Effective Schools Together (BEST), the Leadership Site Program, the State Leadership Institute, and Regional Leadership Institutes and wrap-around TA. These five activities generated 565 training and technical assistance events, with 21,812 personnel in attendance. Each activity provided by the CA SIG2 to educators and service providers in the state of California are outlined below in Project Performance Measure 2.b.

Since its inception, the five major activities of the California State Improvement Grant effort have focused on communicating common messages to the field about selected topics. These common, or core messages, are based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices. All core messages have been identified by experts in the field and have been approved by the California Department of Education, Special Education Division. These core messages are articulated on the CalSTAT website, including links to research supporting each core message. The CA SIG2 supports trainings and technical assistance requests that reflect any or all of the core message areas. These areas include:

1. Reading
2. Positive behavioral supports
3. Collaboration

4. Transition
5. Family-school partnerships
6. Least restrictive environment (LRE)
7. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
8. Core Components of a Strong RTI Process

Regional Leadership Institutes and State Leadership Institutes are two- to three-day intensive events with multiple training strands in multiple core message areas. To reflect the number of events held at these events, the following formula was used: number of days of the event multiplied by the number of core message training strands.

The events were concentrated in the core message areas of:

- Special Education/General Education Collaboration (49 percent)
- Reading (20 percent)
- Positive behavioral supports (15 percent)
- Transition (9 percent)

The remaining 7 percent of trainings provided by the CA SIG2 were evenly distributed among the remaining three core message areas: RtI, family-school partnerships, IDEA, and LRE.

Participants reported that their average level of knowledge increased by 45-percent as a result of participating in the training (from 2.9 to 4.2 on a 5-point scale). For the formula used to determine this percentage, see Project Performance Measure 4.a. below. Participants rated their experience high, with an overall rating of 4.4 (on a 5-point scale), which is consistent with the average overall ratings received during SIG1.

2.b. Between 2/1/2005 and 8/30/2008, SIG2 delivered four activities that were sustained through ongoing and comprehensive practices: Building Effective Schools Together (BEST), the Leadership Site Program, the State Leadership Institute, and Regional Leadership Institutes and wrap-around TA. The majority of the fifth activity, Centrally Coordinated TA, was also sustained through reoccurring access of the resource by sites and reinforcing support through other activities, but there are some sites who do not pursue these follow-up activities. The types of training and technical assistance provided by the CA SIG2 to educators and service providers in the state of California are outlined below.

The following is a brief description of each CA SIG2 activity and how each is sustained through comprehensive practices.

1. Centrally Coordinated Technical Assistance (TA): This activity was developed to meet the need for a centralized system of easy-to-access technical assistance for educators, service providers, and families that focuses on the CA SPP goals and objectives and that prioritized strengthening partnerships between consumers, parents, and professionals at all levels. This activity was sustained through repeated delivery of TA to sites over the course of in this and other activities; over 670 sites accessed three or more days of TA during SIG2. The intent of this activity was to provide TA in the form of trainings, facilitation, site-to-site visits, and coaching to schools, parent organizations, education agencies, and other organizations throughout the state. From 2/1/2005 through 8/30/2008, the CA SIG2 supported 472 days of technical assistance with over 13,000 participants attending. These funds are available for school sites and LEAs throughout the state of California to continue their training in core message areas. For example, a site might receive training in BEST (Building Effective Schools Together, see #2 below) or literacy and then use TA assistance to leverage resources and continue to meet with field experts for ongoing coaching and implementation support. The majority of the days were concentrated in the core message topic areas of collaboration (51 percent) and literacy education (19 percent). Teachers were the predominant group attending the events (general education teachers comprised 30 percent and special education teachers comprised 26 percent).
2. Building Effective Schools Together (BEST): The need for improved, positive behavioral management training for educators, service providers, and families/consumers was identified and found to be a critical element in creating a safe and supportive environment for students that encouraged academic achievement and healthy social development. BEST is a schoolwide discipline program based on positive behavioral supports; the program trains school teams to develop and implement positive school rules, rule teaching, and positive reinforcement systems. This activity was sustained through ongoing coaching, frequent delivery of

capacity-building training events, and longitudinal outcomes monitoring over the course of SIG2. Developed by the Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior at the University of Oregon, this program encompasses needs assessment, implementation, and evaluation that continually informs program planning. School sites that attend these trainings are required to send a team of 5–10 members. We encourage sites to send teams that include administrators and teachers, from both special and general education, and other site staff such as counselors, behavior specialists, and paraprofessionals. By emphasizing the importance of the team, we have found that sites have been more successful in implementing the program when they return to their site.

To increase the capacity of the state and the sustainability of the program, the CA SIG1 prepared a cadre of trainers to provide BEST trainings to school sites in their geographical area and throughout the state. These trainer cadres have, to date, trained over 450 sites and 5,000 people. During SIG2, over 100 sites and 1,000 people were newly trained, while many other sites received sustaining trainings. To continue to build the capacity of these coaches, the CA SIG2 annually brings the coaches together for a two-day meeting, at which progress, continuous improvement, and action plans are the main focus. At this event, cadre trainers are asked to bring a team representative from each of the school sites to which they are currently providing coaching services to ensure vested interest in the process by all stakeholders. The CA SIG2 also supports capacity building and continuous improvement at the local level by providing financial support for each of the seven subcontractors to hold a similar meeting. At this meeting, cadre teams bring together implementation teams from each of the schools they are training for a single-day event focused on progress made, continuous improvement, and action plans for the coming year. To ensure sustainability of this program, the CA SIG2 has also encouraged the cadre to train sites outside of CA SIG2 funding. During SIG2, over 200 sites were trained by the cadre outside of CA SIG2 funding, and Los Angeles Unified School District initiated the district-wide Discipline Foundation Policy. BEST cadre trainers are key members of this PBS program's Implementation Task Force. For research supporting the effectiveness of the BEST training, go to www.uoregon.edu/~ivdb/.

3. **Leadership Site Program:** After identifying the success and need for site-to-site modeling and coaching, the CA SIG2 developed the Leadership Site Program (an expansion of the Schwab Model Sites from SIG1). This activity is sustained through program development funding, ongoing TA delivery, and an annual reapplication process for existing sites. In this program, each year high performing sites are identified through a rigorous competitive process. Eligible sites must be public schools serving the needs of elementary, middle and high school students, including students with disabilities. These sites are awarded for their exemplary programs based on best practices in the areas of reading, positive behavioral supports, collaboration, transition, and family-school partnerships. These sites are financially supported by the CA SIG2 to share their work statewide at Regional Leadership Institutes, function as a model for other sites who come to visit the school and view the program in action, participate as an ongoing member of the State Leadership Institute community, and continuously improve their model through professional development and technical assistance. From 2/1/2005 through 8/30/2008, 10,982 participants attended 321 face-to-face events, such as Regional Leadership Institutes or site-to-site visits, and were supported by the CA SIG2. The majority of the events were concentrated in the core message topic area of collaboration (64 percent). Teachers were the predominant group attending the events (general education teachers comprised 34 percent and special education teachers comprised 22 percent). School sites that attend these events are required to send a team of 5–10 members. We encourage sites to send teams that include administrators and teachers from both special and general education, other site staff, such as counselors, reading specialists, and paraprofessionals, and parents. By emphasizing the importance of the team, we have found that sites have been more successful in implementing the program when they return to their site.
4. **State Leadership Institute:** The goal of the State Leadership Institute is to support the development of collaborative systems involving general and special educators and families and to support the implementation of effective, research-based, educational programs and strategies. The State Leadership Institute brings together regional institute host teams and leadership site teams to share learning, develop skills, make long-term connections, and plan for action. These sites established a learning community that was sustained through annual meetings, with new sites being selected each year as leadership sites and regional institute host sites, the learning community continues to grow. In the three State Leadership Institutes held during SIG2, a total of 663 participants attended the face-to-face portion of the three-day learning community events. Each site sent a team including administrators and teachers from both special and general education, and often including parents and other site staff such as counselors, reading specialists, and paraprofessionals. We have found the team focus to be key in successful implementation of the strategies learned when the attending teams return to their school sites. Participants of the State Leadership Institute form a learning community that remains connected over the three years of the CA SIG2 through the use of a variety of communication and information-sharing strategies. These include an online conference that occurs the two weeks prior to and after the face-to-face, three-day event; site profiles available online to encourage networking; and presentations by leading experts in the field, initially accessible through a conference call and then later available as media files on the CalSTAT website. The participating sites also receive three days of technical assistance over the course of the year to assist them in implementing strategies of systems change and in continuing their learning.

5. Regional Leadership Institutes and wrap-around TA: This activity was developed to support regional networks of individuals with disabilities, parents, and professionals working together to effect systems change in California's public education system. The objective of this activity was to support the development of collaborative systems involving general and special educators and families in implementing effective, research-based educational programs and strategies. These events were coordinated through a regional system in order to efficiently serve local and regional needs, to build local capacity, and to support sustainable change. From 2/1/2005 through 8/30/2008, 49 Regional Leadership Institutes, with 5,850 participants attending, were supported through the CA SIG2. The majority of the events were concentrated in the core message topic areas of Collaboration (59 percent) and Reading (18 percent). Teachers were the predominant group attending the events (general education teachers comprised 31 percent and special education teachers comprised 21 percent). The eight to ten school site teams that attend these events are required to each send a team of 5–10 members. We encourage sites to send teams that include administrators and teachers from both special and general education, other site staff such as counselors, reading specialists, and paraprofessionals, and parents. By emphasizing the importance of the team, we have found that sites have been more successful in implementing the program when they return to their site. School sites attending the events accessed technical assistance prior to and after the Regional Leadership Institute, and a number of Regional Leadership Institute host sites provide online wrap-around conferences similar to the one provided for the State Leadership Institute.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

Implement strategies that are effective in meeting the requirements described in section 612(a)(14) of IDEA to take measurable steps to recruit, hire, train and retain highly qualified personnel in areas of greatest need to provide special education and related services.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
In States with SIG projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the Statewide percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in State identified professional disciplines (e.g., teachers of children with emotional disturbance, deafness, etc.) who remain teaching after the first three years of employment.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

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

3.a. Through a number of activities, California has focused on the intense need to recruit, prepare, and retain highly qualified teachers, particularly in the area of special education. Currently these efforts are funded under the California Department of Education’s contract with CalSTAT (California Services for Technical Assistance and Training). These efforts are not funded by the CA SIG2 and are not an identified goal of the CA SIG2. However, the CA SIG2 is continuing to attend to and work with state partners in this area.

California is in the process of implementing the California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES), which will allow improved monitoring of teacher retention outcomes in the future. Recruitment efforts throughout California have been successful, with an 8.5% increase in the number of newly credentialed special education teachers and a 15.9% increase in the number of out-of-state teachers becoming newly credentialed in California. The overall number of newly credentialed teachers decreased 7% over the same time period.

California’s SIG3/SPDG has a component of teacher recruitment, preparation, and retention of underrepresented teacher candidates to work with low-incidence populations delivered through a partnership with California State University Los Angeles (CSU LA) that involves follow-up evaluation of teacher retention one year after completion of the program.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

To increase the quality of personnel through the provision of core message, research-based, in-service professional development through technical assistance (TA) and Regional Institutes

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing skills/knowledge of the targeted core message subject areas by at least 15% for all TA and Regional Institute participants, as measured by end-of-event surveys completed by all participants	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		15%		See narrative *

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing implementation of the core message, research-based knowledge/skills as demonstrated by at least 50% of TA and Regional Institute participants reporting having repeatedly implemented their learning in practice, as measured by a 3-month follow-up survey administered to all participants via e-mail	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		50%		1,341 / 2,530

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing dissemination of the core message, research-based knowledge/skills as demonstrated by at least 50% of TA and Regional Institute participants reporting having repeatedly shared the knowledge/skills learned with other professionals or parents, as measured by a 3-month follow-up survey administered to all participants via e-mail	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		50%		1,569 / 2,530

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

A major objective of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation is to ensure that all students—regardless of their ethnicity, income, or disability—will be taught by highly qualified teachers. This priority is reflected in the CA SIG2 in its goal to improve the quality of California’s teachers by providing professional development, offering models of school sites that excel in core message areas, and disseminating information.

Training and technical assistance are vehicles used by the CA SIG2 to disseminate practices that are research- and evidenced-based to teachers, administrators, families, and other service providers throughout the state of California. For a description of CA SIG2 activities, refer to Project Performance Measure 2.b.

4.a. Training and technical assistance events were evaluated through paper-and-pencil surveys conducted at the end of each event. Participants reported that their average level of knowledge increased by 45-percent as a result of participating in the training (from 2.9 to 4.2 on a 5-point scale). This is an increase of over 15 percentage points larger than the average knowledge increase during SIG1, which is in part due to the new focus on school site teams and site-to-site modeling of successful and research-based educational strategies. As described in a number of the activities listed above, school sites that attend CA SIG2-funded trainings are required to send a team of 5–10 members. We encourage sites to send teams that include administrators and teachers, from both special and general education, and other site staff such as counselors, behavior specialists, and paraprofessionals. By emphasizing the importance of the team, we have found that sites have been more successful in implementing the program when they return to their site. The CA SIG2 has also increased its focus on site-to-site modeling. At these events participants either view successful strategies first hand during site-to-site visits or work in small groups to discuss how successful strategies from one site can be translated to another site.

The formula used to determine the average increase in knowledge is the following:

$$\frac{\text{the average self-reported knowledge level of participants after the event (4.2)} - \text{the average self-reported knowledge level of participants prior to the event (2.9)}}{\text{the average self-reported knowledge level of participants prior to the event (2.9)}}$$

This formula allows us to evaluate the increase in participant knowledge in relation to the level of knowledge participants carried into the training event.

4.b. A follow-up survey is conducted via email to determine whether participants of training and technical assistance events are implementing the research-based educational strategies presented. Event participants who provide an email address on the sign-in registration form will receive an electronic survey about 3 months after the event occurs. The survey asks that they rate how often they have used the strategies, how often the strategies worked well to meet their needs, and how often they shared the strategies with others. The scale is a 1 to 5 Likert Scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (many times). Follow-up surveys were sent via email to approximately 9,500 participants of SIG2 training and technical assistance events. From that group, 2,530 responses (27 percent return rate) were received.

Of those responding, 83 percent indicated that they had implemented the strategies learned at the event, with 53 percent having implemented the strategies repeatedly. 90 percent indicated that the strategies have worked well to meet their needs, with 62 percent indicated that the strategies have repeatedly worked well.

4.c. When asked on the follow-up survey how often they had shared the strategies learned at the event, 87 percent indicated that they had shared the strategies, with 62 percent having shared the strategies repeatedly.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

To improve collaboration between special education (SE) and general education (GE)

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Project	Target		Actual Performance Data		
			Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio
Increasing the degree of collaboration in the areas of assessment, intervention, core curriculum, and teaming by at least 20% for the Core Message Learning Sites [Leadership Sites] and school/district sites that receive 3 or more days of Site-to-Site TA in collaboration and have ≥ 1 year of involvement in these SIG2 activities, as determined through follow-up surveys			/	20%		/	87%

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

5.a. A survey conducted in July 2008 asked sites to describe collaboration at their site before and after receiving TA. The average increase in the degree of collaboration in the areas of assessment, intervention, core curriculum, and teaming at responding sites was 87 percent, exceeding the target increase of 20 percent. 51 of the 63 responding sites (81 percent) reported an increase in collaboration of 20 percent or more in one of these indicators, and 33 sites (52%) reported increases of at least this much in all four indicators.

Before TA, respondents described their sites as more separate than collaborative, with an average collaboration of 5.0 on the 10 point scale across all 10 collaborative areas. 62% of sites described Overall collaboration at their site with a 5 or less. This was also true in the key areas of Assessment (average 4.5), Intervention (4.6), Core Curriculum (5.0) and Teaming (5.0).

After TA, respondents described their sites as more collaborative than separate, with an average collaboration of 7.3 on the 10 point scale across all 10 collaborative areas. 93% of sites described Overall collaboration at their site with a 6 or more. This was also true in the key areas of Assessment (7.1), Intervention (7.4), Core Curriculum (7.4) and Teaming (7.4).

The Collaborative Sites Survey asked respondents to evaluate the degree of collaboration at their site on a 10 point scale between “totally separate” (1) and “fully collaborative” (10). This question was asked as “Prior to the Training/TA” and “Now” across ten items, including the four areas mentioned above. The average increase in collaboration and number of sites showing 20 percent increases or more follow:

- Assessment: 86% average increase
- Intervention: 98% average increase
- Core Curriculum: 90% average increase
- Teaming: 80% average increase

- Accountability: 95% average increase
- The Role of Parents: 45% average increase
- Administration: 70% average increase
- Resources: 80% average increase
- Professional Development: 81% average increase
- Overall: 65% average increase

The Collaborative Sites Survey included “Overall” as a separate question. The 65% average increase in collaboration at sites overall is a direct reflection of survey responses, not an average or index of the other survey areas.

Survey comments included:

“SE and GE staff collaborates more effectively. School sites have GE interventions and most referrals for SE assessments happen after it is clear the interventions were not working. SDC students are more integrated in GE classes when appropriate. GE teachers and administrators are more engaged in the IEP process to determine needs, goals, and services.”

“One of the most dramatic results of our changing our service delivery is that we have decreased the number of students in SE by 1100 over the last 5 years. Based on annual data we have found that those students who are now being referred for assessment more consistently meet eligibility criteria for SE. Therefore, we spend less time assessing students who do not qualify. Additionally, many regular education students are successfully served in collaborative classrooms that might otherwise be referred for SE. Several of our schools have seen a steady rise in test scores of their students with disabilities. School staff have received training in how to review data and change their instruction based on the data. Now they look at the scores of the students with disabilities with the same scrutiny that they look at GE students. This is an area we are working on as often times schools do not have numerically significant numbers of students with disabilities thus their scores are not reported. When we hear our teachers, parents, and students speak about collaboration they are passionate and enthusiastic and they state they would never turn back to the way it used to be.”

“Each district has a collaboration and intervention plan. New service delivery systems started in all districts. Training more focused on specific needs and interventions.”

“Our district scores have continued to improve, we have more students moving into a less restrictive environment. One of our middle schools has a model intervention program for behavioral and academic support for GE students. We have schools that are CA Distinguished Schools and Title I Achieving schools.”

“[Our district] began attending CalSTAT Institute's in 2002. Each year we brought different teams and broadened the involvement of many departments in the district. What the district has gained from being involved in the 'system of CalSTAT' has probably been the most powerful change force for many of our initiatives. The network that has been created has been our statewide support system for collaboration at all levels of our organization. Of the 60 schools in our district, the majority has implemented collaboration between SE and GE to some degree. There is a continuum of implementation, with the elementary and middle school leadership sites being the strongest. Many sites have embrace collaboration as they have seen how effective it is in delivering services to students with IEPs and how proactive it is in intervening for students without IEPs who are at risk of failure. Teachers who are participating in this delivery system speak with passion in improvement of their own practice and skill as teachers. They learn a tremendous amount from one another and are continuously refining their methods and strategies. Collaboration has extended to our site administrators as well and that effort is reflected in an improvement in articulation between schools in the same high school feeder pattern. Our school leaders, through collaborative conversations and observations, have seen the power of collaboration and how it can lift the level of instruction and learning at their site for all students.”

“There is constant communication, formally and informally. We make time to hold collaborative meetings.”

“Training, discussions, and groups of site teams going to conferences where other teams are to share their successes and challenges and how they overcame the failures and implemented the successes. Once a site team gets excited and learns to facilitate the processes and has good data to measure progress, we have seen great movement.”

“We hope to sustain the changes we have seen by creating the foundational systems that will support this work regardless of who is in charge or who is involved. Our teachers would never want to return to the old model of doing school. Our district is providing the resources we need to implement assessments and interventions with fidelity. We benefited from visiting [one Regional Institute Host Site] and learning from their experiences and if we can assist anyone from our experiences we would be honored to do this.”



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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.

To increase the academic performance of students with disabilities

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing proficiency in reading for middle/high school students, resulting in an average 5 percentage point increase for all students and students with disabilities as a subgroup who score “Proficient/Advanced” on the CST E/LA at all Reading Core Message Model and Learning Sites [Reading Leadership Sites] and school/district sites that receive >3 days of TA in reading and have >2 years of involvement in these SIG2 activities	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		5 percentage points	/			8.9 and 11.4 percentage points	/

6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing proficiency in reading for middle/high school students, resulting in an average 10 percentage point decrease in all students and students with disabilities as a subgroup who score “Far Below Basic” on the CST E/LA, at all Reading Core Message Model and Learning Sites [Reading Leadership Sites] and school/district sites that receive >3 days of TA in reading and have >2 years of involvement in these SIG2 activities	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		10 percentage points	/			Not Available	/

6.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing academic literacy and overall knowledge/skills, resulting in increases of >40 points on the California Academic Performance Indicator (API) scores of school/district sites, for all students and students with disabilities as a subgroup, when comparing the baseline year (2003-2004) with the final year (2006-07 2007-08) in at least 75% of the Core Message Model Sites, Core Message Learning Sites [Leadership Sites], and schools/districts that receive >3 days of TA and have >2 years of involvement in these SIG2 activities	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	75%		216 / 438	49%

6.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing academic literacy and overall knowledge/skills, resulting in increases of ≥ 2 decile levels in the site's Similar Schools Ranking of the API scores comparing the baseline year (2003-2004) with the final year (2006-2007) for at least 50% of the Core Message Model Site and Learning Site schools [Leadership Sites] and schools/districts that receive >3 days of TA and have >2 years of involvement in these SIG2 activities	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	50%		67 / 169	40%

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

6.a. The average increase in CST ELA percent proficient and above at sites receiving substantial TA in reading was 8.9 for All Students and 11.4 for the Students with Disabilities subgroup. A majority of sites met or exceeded the OSEP project objective of a 5 percentage point increase, with 345 of the 437 sites (79%) meeting it for All Students and 301 of 392 sites (77%) meeting it for the Students with Disabilities subgroup.

6.b. It was believed when this objective was written that CDE would publish this data for schools aggregated at the site level, but that has so far not happened. Instead, student achievement is reported in five proficiency levels (of which far below basic is one) by grade level only, forcing crude aggregation of data to produce a measure of change at the site level. Further, CDE policy does not allow scores to be published for groups of students numbering 10 or less; because Students with Disabilities are a small population at most schools, especially divided out by grade level, there are large gaps in the available data for student achievement relating to this measure. The measure of students proficient and above referenced in objective 6.a., on the other hand, is published as a site-level aggregation, making it a much more reliable indicator of student outcomes.

6.c. Of the 438 sites who received substantial TA and for whom API Growth scores were available, 216 showed increases of 40 API Growth points or more (49%). Another 187 showed smaller increases (43%), while only 35 sites showed no change or a decline in this measure (8%). The average increase in API Growth scores at all sites who received substantial TA was 30 points.

CDE did not begin publishing the API scores of the Students with Disabilities subgroup until the 2005-06 school year. These outcomes were instead monitored through the API Growth scores of All Students only, comparing the 2003-04 and 2007-08 school years.

6.d. Among Leadership Sites and sites receiving substantial TA during SIG2, 67 of 169 sites (40%) showed an increase of 2 or more deciles in their Similar Schools Ranking.

Over the course of SIG2, the Similar Schools Ranking was discontinued by CalSTAT as an indicator of school improvement. It was discovered that the Similar Schools Ranking for many sites could fluctuate from year to year regardless of other academic outcomes (CST English Language Arts and Math percent proficient and above, API). This is attributable to the Similar Schools Ranking being based on a site's API score relative to 100 other schools of similar socio-economic character; because these 100 school groupings are reassigned yearly, Similar Schools Ranking can be influenced by a number of factors besides academic outcomes.

The Similar Schools Ranking is not published by CDE for school districts, resulting in the smaller number of sites for which this performance measure could be applied (169 compared to the 438 schools and districts for whom API Growth scores were available).



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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

7. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

To improve behavior supports and outcomes for students with disabilities

7.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing by >50% the number of California cadre-trained BEST school sites that have fully implemented BEST comparing the baseline year (2003-2004) with the final year (2006-2007 2007-2008) using the BEST Combined Self-Assessment Survey and the System-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		50%		27 / 5

7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Decreasing by >30% the office discipline referrals and discipline suspensions for at least 50% of the cadre-trained BEST school sites comparing the baseline year (2003-2004) with the final year (2006-2007) as measured through the annual School Profile Report	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		50%		6 / 30

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

7.a. The number of sites fully implementing BEST increased from 5 to 27 (a 440% increase) between the 2003-04 and the 2007-08 school year.

Measurement of implementation at BEST sites was modified from the Combined Self-Assessment Survey and System-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) in the beginning of SIG2 to the Team Implementation Checklist (TIC) developed by Rob Horner and George Sugai for the final year of SIG2. The earlier instruments required a larger time commitment from sites than was warranted for yearly monitoring of implementation and was found to be a burden to sites. These instruments continued to be recommended as a self-diagnostic tool for newly trained BEST sites while the primary implementation monitoring instrument shifted to the TIC. Both instruments used the same scale for determination of full or partial implementation of BEST, with 80% or more instruments fully in place being described as “full implementation” and 50% or more being described as “partial implementation.”

7.b. The number of sites seen to have a decline in office discipline referrals (ODRs) and suspensions of 30% or more between a baseline year and the 2006-07 school year was found to be 20%. Among sites fully implementing BEST, 25% of sites met this reduction goal.

One of the goals of the BEST program has been to increase the use of data at the school level. Early in implementation of SIG2 BEST, it was recognized that suspension data was often incomplete and ODRs may not have been quantified over the course of the year. CalSTAT and BEST cadre coaches responded with a renewed emphasis on the collection of behavior incidence data (BID), resulting in a 76% return rate on the School Profile Report for the 2006-07 school year. However, because no previous BID records existed for many of these sites, it was impossible to measure change in a majority of BEST sites. New policies are in place for the SIG3/SPDG implementation of BEST and are expected to create a much richer body of data for evaluation purposes and decision-making at the site level.

These challenges in early data collection created a number of difficulties in monitoring this outcome. In order to create a larger picture of BEST behavior outcomes, the earliest available year's BID was used as a baseline; the baseline for individual sites ranging from 2003-04 to 2005-06. However, this change in evaluation protocol did not fully compensate for gaps in early data collection, with pre and post BID available for change comparisons available for less than a third of participating BEST sites.



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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

8. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

To increase the participation of parents/family members of children with disabilities in the systems change process

8.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the participation of parents/family members of students with disabilities in TA and Regional Institutes, resulting in an average of 7% of participants being parents/family members annually as determined through event sign-in sheets	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	7%		244 / 10,328	2.5%

8.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the participation of parents/family members as part of site teams at State Leadership Institutes, resulting in 80% of site teams having a parent/family team member as determined through teams' event registrations	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	80%		60 / 130	46%

8.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the participation of low income parents/family members of students with disabilities in local/regional special education advisory bodies, resulting in 5 Community Advisory Committees (CACs) serving high poverty areas demonstrating a 30% increase in active low income members as determined through CAC progress reports	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		5	/		3	/	

8.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the participation of low income parents/family members in non-special education decision-making committees, by ensuring that at least 15% of the Family Participation Fund is used to support parent/family member participation in local, regional, or statewide general education committees such as school site councils, bilingual advisory committees, and task forces as determined through examination of fund invoices	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	15%		1,982 / 4,834	41%

8.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the influence of parents/family members of students with disabilities in advisory and decision-making committees at the local, regional, and statewide levels, resulting in 50% of all Family Participation fund recipients who participated in >3 committee meetings reporting that their participation has made a difference, as determined by end-of-event feedback forms and phone interviews	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	50%		37 / 38	97%

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

The California Department of Education has identified parent-to-school partnerships as critical elements in the effort to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and to successfully change systems in California’s public education system. The CA SIG2 has aligned with this goal through a number of activities focused on parent empowerment, information dissemination, and financial support.

8.a. Between 2/1/2005 and 8/30/2008, 244 parents attended CA SIG2-funded training and technical assistance events (2.5 percent of all participants). These figures are based on 10,270 event evaluations that were collected during SIG2; 96% of responding participants described their role. Evaluations were used to measure outcomes for this objective rather than sign-in sheets because participation in evaluations was greater than participation in sign-in sheets.

8.b. Leadership site teams and regional institute host site teams attending the State Leadership Institute were strongly encouraged to include a parent on their team, though parent participation in these events fell short of the goal for parent inclusion. Attending the three State Leadership Institutes during SIG2, 60 of the 130 teams (46%) included at least one parent participant. However, the number of site teams including a parent at each individual Institute increased each year, with 29% in 2005 (9 of 31 teams), 44% (20 of 45 teams) in 2006, and 57% in 2007 (31 of 54 teams). Recruitment efforts have gained ground over the course of SIG2 and are expected to continue increasing through SIG3.

8.c. The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) activity originally paired five CACs in low-income areas with a Family Empowerment Center (FEC), of which four continued their partnership through SIG2. Of these remaining CACs, three increased the participation of low-income members by 30% or more during SIG2.

The CAC and FEC work as a team to increase the CACs membership to include a greater number of low-income parent and family members of students with disabilities so that the representation on the CAC is aligned with the demographics of the community it is serving. The FECs provided a number of services including demographic research, marketing suggestions, overview of CAC responsibilities, and capacity training.

Three out of the five CACs selected for participation in this activity did not have a membership or had a small membership that had not yet received approval from the school board as is required. Due to the initial membership shortage, the FECs worked to build a more sizeable membership and a closer relationship with the SELPA throughout SIG2.

While this was not the original intent of this activity, it has been worthwhile. All four continuing CACs now have a consistent membership and are continuing to recruit members and align their membership with the demographics of the community. During this effort to improve membership, the number of regularly attending participants at CAC meetings increased by 52% (from 27 to 41 members). The four CACs together increased low-income membership by 46%, ethnic minority membership by 50%, and the membership of parents and family members of students with disabilities by 80%.

These four CACs currently benefit from the participation of 41 active members. According to a survey of these members conducted in June 2008, 19 of these members had an annual household income of under \$30,000 (46%), 18 members were ethnic minorities (44%), and 36 members had a family member with a disability (88%). These members described their CACs as reflecting the incomes of the population served by the CAC with an average of 4.4 on a 5-point scale. Members also described their CAC as being representative of ethnicities (4.0) and disabilities (4.0) in the served population.

8.d. The Family Participation Fund makes financial resources available to family members of children with disabilities to encourage their participation in both special education and general education decision-making activities and groups. During SIG2, 4,834 requests for financial support were funded. Of these requests, 1,982 were for a general education meeting (41 percent).

According to surveys completed by FPF stipend recipients, most FPF stipends were accessed by ethnic minorities and low-income parents.

80 percent of recipients identified themselves as ethnic minorities. Responses included:

- African American: 2,259 recipients, 49%
- Latino/Hispanic: 1,198 recipients, 26%
- Caucasian/White: 904 recipients, 20%
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 194 recipients, 4%
- Other: 52 recipients, 1%

227 recipients did not specify their ethnicity.

82 percent of recipients described their annual household income as less than \$30,000. Responses included:

- Under \$10,000: 2,562 recipients, 57%
- \$10,000 to \$19,999: 736 recipients, 16%
- \$20,000 to \$29,999: 430 recipients, 9%
- \$30,000 to \$39,999: 221 recipients, 5%
- \$40,000 to \$49,999: 208 recipients, 5%
- \$50,000 or more: 371 recipients, 8%

306 recipients did not specify their income.

8.e. In an effort to give parents a voice in the systems change process and a venue through which to communicate the importance of parent participation, the CA SIG2 interviewed 38 parents who had accessed the Family Participation Fund (FPF) three or more times between 2/1/2005 and 1/31/2006. Parents were asked open-ended questions about their experience with the education system and related meetings and committees in which they participate. They were also asked to respond on a 1 to 5 scale (1 being “not at all” and 5 being “many times”) as to whether they felt their participation made a difference in the discussions and decisions made at the meeting.

Of the 38 FPF recipients interviewed, 97 percent (37 parents) responded that they felt they had **made a difference specifically in discussions at meetings** (response of 3, 4, or 5); and 84 percent (32 parents) responded that they felt they had made a difference repeatedly during discussions at meetings (response of 4 or 5).

Of the 38 FPF recipients interviewed, 92 percent (35 parents) responded that they felt they had **made a difference specifically in decisions at meetings** (response of 3, 4, or 5); and 82 percent (31 parents) responded that they felt they had made a difference repeatedly in decisions made at meetings (response of 4 or 5).

While analysis of the information collected from these interviews will continue, initial findings suggest the following:

There is a correlation between the number of years a parent has been actively participating in the education system and the level of the system they are trying to improve. Parents who have just begun joining committees and attending meetings are more focused on the local and community level that will directly effect outcomes for their child. As parents become more experienced in working to change the education system, they become more likely to work for that change at higher levels: district, regional, and state. There is also a positive correlation between the number of years a parent has been actively participating in the education system and their personal sense of influence.

Parents were also asked to share stories of how they have participated in the system. The following are a few examples:

Paraphrased: This year I was the president of the District Advisory Committee. For the past seven years, we have not signed off on District X's budget. But this year we worked closely with the district and ultimately voted to sign the budget.

Paraphrased: A number of parent stakeholders, including myself, attended the IDEA Summit hosted by the California Department of Education. The parents were asked to give their input, which was then incorporated into a document for distribution.

Paraphrased: At most schools there is not a medical facility onsite. This was the case at our school for a number of years. But as the number of students with disabilities increased and the need for a facility became obvious, I campaigned to have a nurse on staff. At first, they hired a nurse to come once or twice a week, but now she is here full time.

Paraphrased: Our school did not have wheelchair ramps to most of the building, which kept students in wheelchairs from getting into certain classrooms. This affected their attendance and their education. I went out into the community and raised money to build these ramps. Now all buildings have multiple ramps.

Quote: *It's vitally important that this program [FPF] continue and expand so that all parents can join in and advocate for rights of children. This program [FPF] has enabled me and many others to be able to be strong advocates for the children.*

Quote: *Whoever funded this program [FPF] has been instrumental in helping a lot of different families at a lot of different income levels and a lot of different brackets.*

Quote: *We felt our voice wouldn't make a difference. I found this not to be true. Because one voice, then another voice, then another voice can make a difference.*

Each of the parents and family members interviewed shared their individual goals for making a difference. These goals fell predominantly into the following five categories.

1. Empowerment – Empowering parents and/or students (18 out of the 38 participants expressed goals in this area)
2. Accountability – Holding schools and districts accountable for what they have done and should do (6 out of the 38 participants expressed goals in this area)
3. Advocate – Being an advocate for students with disabilities (6 out of the 38 participants expressed goals in this area)
4. Participation – Increasing parent participation (5 out of the 38 participants expressed goals in this area)
5. Awareness – Increasing the awareness within the general education community of the needs of students with disabilities (3 out of the 38 participants expressed goals in this area)



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

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H323A040002**

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

9. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

To improve data collection and the use of data by local educational agencies in identifying and addressing the need for T/TA to support the continuous improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increasing the number of Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) organizations, County Offices of Education (COEs), [school districts, schools, or other organizations] using databases to monitor their 1) T/TA offerings, including the core message areas being covered; 2) the district and school site origins of their attendees; and 3) the roles of the participants at those sites, resulting in at least 20 agencies adopting the Training Evaluation Database (TED) and using it to track trainings as determined by annual TED pilot site reports and analysis of their electronic data	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		20	/		15	/	

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

9.a. The CA SIG2 has supported the development of tools that allow users at the local level (SELPA, COE, district) to evaluate student achievement and professional development activities offered through their site. The Training Evaluation Database (TED) was developed and piloted during SIG2 as a tool that will build the evaluative capacity of the field so that all LEAs are making data-informed decisions concerning the design and implementation of instructional and professional development programs. Sites were recruited to install and pilot test TED, providing feedback as part of the development process. While recruiting 20 sites was the original goal, it was found that 15 sites were sufficient to complete this activity successfully. After a number of revisions and updates during SIG2, TED is ready for wider release during SIG3/SPDG.

TED (Training Evaluation Database):

The CA SIG2 developed a database that tracks professional development trainings and technical assistance (T & TA) and aids in program evaluation. This database, which compiles, analyzes, and presents data, helps meet the needs of educational agencies as they plan and implement professional development trainings. The database is a dynamic system that holds T & TA event, participant, presenter, and evaluation data and allows users to extract usable, summarized information through automated standard reports that are easy to understand. The intended use of these reports is to inform the program activity decision-making process of its users, which could include the state, COEs, SELPAs, LEAs, and others who provide professional development training.

Several of the reporting functions available in TED that meet this objective include:

1. Single Event Summary report: summarizes the event information, the number of participants, the distribution of roles (represented in a pie chart), the distribution of evaluation responses (in a bar chart), the average evaluation responses (in a line chart), and a calculation of the average gain in knowledge based on self-reported pre- and post-participant knowledge

2. Written Comments report: a listing of the written comments given by participants in training and technical assistance events at the end of the event evaluation form. These comments are listed with the role of the person from whom it was made to give context to the response, and the comments are placed in columns so that a reader could scan a single column and read all of the response to the same question.
3. Multiple Event Summary report: summarizes information on multiple events, including the number of participants, the distribution of roles represented (in a pie chart), the distribution of evaluation responses (in a bar chart), the average evaluation responses (in a line chart), and a calculation of the average gain in knowledge based on self-reported pre- and post-participant knowledge
4. Events Listed by Core Message Area report: lists all the events provided categorized by the main core message area presented at the event. For each event, the name, presenter, date, overall rating, and number of participants and their role are provided.
5. Events and Participants Listed by Core Message Area report: summarizes the number of events provided in each core message and the number of participants attending events in each core message. This information is presented in pie charts for comparison purposes. Also included is a summary of the number of events where additional core message areas were presented.
6. Several reports that summarize data and participant attendance by specified LEA: this tool was designed to be used by SELPAs, COEs, and districts. To help these LEAs determine which sites are sending participants to events in the different core message areas, we have designed a number of reports to help summarize events and participation information by site.

When asked to describe their experience, 12 sites responded and rated the TED program highly on a 5-point scale. Respondents were asked whether TED was user friendly (4.7 average rating), saved their staff time in tracking training events (4.5 average rating), and whether the reports provided useful information (4.5 average rating). Overall, respondents indicated that TED was effective at tracking all the components of the professional development their site provided and made preparing for events easier. Of the functions provided in TED, each site indicating using a different assortment and thereby customizing their use to meet their need. The following are several comments given by survey respondents regarding their use of TED.

User comments included:

“One of the important features of TED (for us) is the ability to run reports for our Human Resources Department to show what trainings a particular employee has had. This is also useful in due process hearings to show what trainings a particular employee has had to demonstrate their qualifications for a particular position, e.g. BICMs. Also, when participants call in asking for proof of their attendance (for CEU purposes), we are able to locate the events they attended easily.”

“I have worked with “TED” for two years. The program has been a great tool. As with any new program there have been growing pains but [the SIG2 Evaluation Team] has always stepped right in and given immediate assistance. I am amazed at how many of our requests and needs that have been implemented into the program since I first started using this program.”

“We love TED. We use it for all of our staff development workshops. It really makes tracking things over multiple years easy.”

“We provide copies of event summary reports to our special education directors to review. We also provide them with copies of the evaluation summaries and have found this a really helpful way to provide them with feedback on events.”

The TED program has also assisted CalSTAT in tracking SIG2-funded events. Currently the TED program holds information on 570 training events, 8,257 unique participants, and 12,136 training evaluations. A number of the evaluation data-points presented throughout this report were generated by the automated reporting function in TED. The capacity of this database to hold this level of information has allowed CalSTAT to track the large number of training events it has supported over the course of SIG2 and to easily summarize the information my multiple criteria.

With the close of SIG2, TED is a user-friendly training and evaluation tracking database that will continue to be made available to sites in the state of California to support their efforts in making data-informed decisions regarding the professional development they offer in their local area.

The following is a list of sites equipped with TED:

1. Santa Barbara County SELPA
2. Ocean View School District
3. Westminster School District
4. San Luis Obispo County SELPA
5. Redding School District
6. Southern Diagnostic Center
7. Special Education Early Childhood Administrators Project (SEECAP)
8. West San Gabriel Valley SELPA
9. Solano County SELPA
10. San Joaquin County SELPA
11. San Mateo County SELPA
12. Val Verde USD
13. Lassen County Office of Education
14. Vallejo City USD
15. Folsom Cordova County SELPA

Literature and demonstration software, along with the offer of on-site demonstrations and training, were sent to 289 sites.

For more information on this program or to request a demonstration copy, go to www.calstat.org/ted.html.

California Standards Test (CST) Charting Program

This tool developed by the CA SIG2 allows users at any level of the educational system to evaluate student achievement on the California Standards Tests. The program was developed in Microsoft Excel to increase accessibility and allows users to easily take student proficiency level data provided on the California Department of Education website and enter it into a program that will visually illustrate these levels. This format enhances understanding and makes comparisons across years easier. For example, teachers could use this tool to chart data for their classrooms and then use it to facilitate discussion on what is happening at their site; or an administrator could use the tool to determine how his/her school site compares to the district or state averages in order to determine which areas might require additional interventions or professional development.

To enhance the usability of this program, several brief instructional movies were created and placed on the CD-ROM with the program and on the CalSTAT website for download. These movies visually walk a user through the process of finding the data, entering the data, generating the charts, and interpreting the charts.

For more information on this program or to request a copy, go to www.calstat.org/CSTProficiencyCharting.htm.

To date, we estimate that 760 copies of this program have been distributed, both by mail, at meetings, and through the CalSTAT.org website. Examples of distribution include:

- 100 participants in the 2006 meeting of PCSE (Partnership Committee on Special Education) received an informational email with links to the website where the program could be downloaded.
- 100 handed out to representatives of sites implementing positive behavior supports at the December 2007 BEST Statewide Meeting.
- 70 handed out at the 2006 Leadership Institute, where the program was also demonstrated to participants in two Roundtable sessions.
- 50 CDs mailed to contacts at California Department of Education for distribution.
- Hundreds more have been handed out and mailed to contacts showing interest at smaller meetings, trainings, and other professional events.