



Georgia State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

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

Executive Summary

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports has conducted frequent needs assessments as part of ongoing operations and for State Performance Plan development and execution. Findings show that relative to students with disabilities, Georgia has the need to improve student reading and mathematics achievement, increase the number of students who graduate with a regular diploma, decrease the number of students that dropout, increase student graduation and better postsecondary outcomes, increase employment of fully certified special education teachers, and increase parent engagement in reading, math and social skills development.

To address these needs, the GaDOE, submitted an application for a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to the Office of Special Education Programs and received funding for five years. The SPDG has five goals: (1) Increase reading and math achievement at the middle and high school level as well as the number of students who graduate with a regular diploma (2) Reduce dropouts.(3) Increase the percent of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals (4).Increase the percent of employed special education teachers holding full certification and (5)Increase the percent of children transitioning to preschool with age appropriate skills.

In order to achieve these goals, the SPDG is partnering with other agencies, universities, parents, and regional/state/national resource centers to provide: recruitment and training for special education teachers, scientifically-based intervention strategies within the Georgia Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions, regionally/locally based coach training and onsite assistance, dropout prevention strategies, transition enhancements, family engagement activities, student achievement monitoring, and fidelity of implementation tracking.

Goals 1 and 2: At the end of Year 1, 18 middle schools, and 15 high schools (which includes 1 Ninth Grade Academy) were selected within the 17 Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) regions to participate in a dropout prevention program. Following training during Year 1 and early Year 2, each of the participating schools gathered baseline data probing in high risk areas. From an analysis of district and state probe data and other information, the participating schools selected one or more Improvement Priority Areas and developed an Action Plan of strategies, activities, and evaluation strategies within the identified improvement area(s). A Collaboration Coach was assigned to each of the participating schools to provide ongoing assistance as the schools implemented activities/initiatives related to their Action Plans. A Collaboration Coach website was developed to gather ongoing information regarding implementation fidelity. All participating schools are enhancing parent involvement and engagement. To promote additional parent participation, the Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (C.A.F.E.) project, was piloted in two schools—Manchester High School in Meriwether County and Rutland High School in Bibb County. A liaison for Hispanic families was also hired to provide ongoing support to parents within the 33 participating schools.

Goal 3: To facilitate effective transition services, Georgia's SPDG is supporting the formation of Interagency Regional Transition Councils to assist the participating middle and high schools in implementing effective transition assessments; develop measurable Individualized Education Program (IEP) transition goals, including self determination; and to implement interagency service planning for post-high school programs and services. Three of the GLRS regions already had pre-existing regional transition councils prior to the beginning of Year 2 of the SPDG. Two Regional Transition Councils were formed by the end of the Year 2 reporting period and are functioning independently. The Southwest Georgia

work group accepted the applications of 34 individuals to become members of the Southwest Georgia Regional Transition Council. The council members represent: individuals with disabilities, families of individuals with disabilities, employers, agency representatives and educators geographically distributed across the 16 school systems in the 14 county southwest Georgia region. The Middle Georgia work group accepted the applications of 32 individuals to become members of the Middle Georgia Regional Transition Council. The council members represent: individuals with disabilities, families of individuals with disabilities, employers, agency representatives and educators geographically distributed across the 11 county middle Georgia region. The long-range goal is to have regional transition councils in all GLRS districts where there is an interest—conceivably eight additional councils for a total of 17 councils.

Goal 4: A full-time recruitment and retention staff member was hired, jointly funded by the SPDG and the GaDOE'S Division of Teacher Quality. She has been meeting with an agency task force to plan the first SPDG sponsored University Forum to be held during the early part of Year 3 (fall 2009), and visiting campuses to speak to new students and meet with faculty. She has researched models and established a teacher induction task force for the state superintendent. She has also been working with the Division of Teacher Quality and the National Personnel Center to identify school districts with the lowest special education teacher retention rates so that retention plans can be developed and implemented during Years 2-5 of the SPDG.

Goal 5: The focus of Goal 5 during Year 2 of the SPDG has been to enhance interagency collaboration regarding supports for parents of young children with disabilities and other special needs. A SPDG Preschool Stakeholders Group has been meeting to identify existing programs and services for parents of young children that will be a valuable resource to Cohort I schools. The Preschool Stakeholders Group includes representatives from Georgia Head Start, the Department of Early Learning, the GaDOE, Babies Can't Wait (Georgia's Part C intervention system) and SpecialQuest.

An important mission of the GaDOE Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports is to assist as many special education students as possible to successfully complete school and transition to meaningful postsecondary positions. The percent of students with disabilities earning a general education diploma has remained relatively constant since 2003. About 67 percent of non-disabled students graduate with a regular diploma while a little over 30 percent (37.34 in 2007-2008) of students with disabilities graduate with a regular diploma. This low rate probably is a cause, in part, for the dropout rate of special education students, which was 5.27% during 2007-2008.

In addition, academic success continues to be a problem for students with disabilities. There is a gap of about 22 percentage points below regular students on the English/Language Arts examination and 40 percent below on the Mathematics examination when students with disabilities make the first attempt at passing the exit examination.

Helping students with disabilities stay in school and graduate requires well-qualified teachers. During 2007-2008, 83.9% of Georgia's special education teachers were highly qualified. An average of 60.65% of special education teachers were retained for three years over the last six year time period starting in 2000-2001.

The new SPDG targets all of the above problem goal areas and will attempt to reduce them in the 33 participating middle and high schools as well as other schools within the 17 GLRS regions over the next three years. With effective implementation of Action Plans in Priority Improvement Areas, improvement should be documented and available for others to observe and modify for use in their schools.



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

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

PR/Award # H323A070012

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

I. Federal SPDG Program Objectives and Performance Measures

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

Objective 1. 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					
OSEP Measure 1.1: The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		3,478	3,478/3,478	100

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
OSEP Measure 1.2: The percent of SPDG projects that have implemented personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan (SPP).	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		8	8/8	100

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
OSEP Measure 1.3: The percent of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically based or evidence-	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

based instructional/behavioral practices in schools.			/		1	1/8	12.5
------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---	-----	------

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

OSEP Measure 1.1: The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific or evidenced-based instructional practices

The professional development within the Georgia SPDG’s goals, objectives, and activities was selected from evidenced-based practices in the literature. Some professional development is based on more rigorous research such as meta-analyses of high quality evidence, and experiments with controls, as well as quasi-experimental designs. Other professional development content and process reflects expert opinion supported by conceptual models and generalizations from high quality research on related topics, simple correlational studies, case studies, and/or best practices. Following is a summary of the rationale for the Goal 1 and 2 professional development during Year 2.

Goal 1 – Increased access to the general curriculum and increased literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains.

Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

In the past several years, multiple consensus reports have provided a converging body of knowledge about the nature of effective instruction for children at risk for reading problems (Donavoon and Cross, 2002; National Reading Panel, 2000; Rand Reading Study Group, 2002; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). The scientifically based researched (SBR) reading content of Goal 1 professional development incorporates the following five components identified by the National Reading Panel as essential components of an effective reading instruction program: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension. Goal 1 proposes to use other SBR interventions to enhance student engagement and learning such as the Strategic Instruction Model or SIM, which is an umbrella term that embraces a model of teacher-focused (Content Enhancement) and student-focused interventions (Learning Strategies), as well as other support pieces. The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning has shown academic gains when using several SIM strategies—see for example: Woodruff, S., Schumaker, J.B., and Deshler, D.D. (2002); Desler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Lenz, K.B. Bulgren, J.A., Hock, M.F., Knight, J., and Ehren, B.J. (2002).

Goal 1 professional development activities in mathematics are also based on scientific research or evidence-based instructional practices. Teaching and learning mathematics are complex tasks. Despite the fact that there is not a lot of rigorous scientific research in math, the number of research studies conducted in mathematics education over the past three decades has increased resulting in some promising recommendations. In reviewing studies with more rigorous criteria, Baker, et al., 2002 found that fairly good studies show when students, their teachers, and parents get ongoing feedback about every two weeks, as to student progress made in math relative to state standards or some framework, student performance is invariably enhanced. The following are other promising directions for effective math instruction, identified by Grouws and Ceulla (2000) that can increase student learning and have a positive effect on student achievement:

1. Increasing the extent of the students' opportunity to learn (OTL) mathematics content.
2. Focusing instruction on the meaningful development of important mathematical ideas.
3. Providing learning opportunities for both concepts and skills by solving problems.
4. Giving students both an opportunity to discover and invent new knowledge and an opportunity to practice what they have learned.
5. Incorporating intuitive solution methods, especially when combined with opportunities for student interaction and discussion.
6. Using small groups of students to work on activities, problems, and assignments (e.g., small groups, Davidson, 1985; cooperative learning, Slavin, 1990; peer assisted learning and tutoring, Baker, et al., 2002).
7. Whole-class discussion following individual and group work.
8. Teaching math with a focus on number sense that encourages students to become problem solvers in a wide variety of situations and to view math as important for thinking.
9. Use of concrete materials on a long-term basis to increase achievement and improve attitudes toward math.
10. Using calculators in the learning of math.

In Georgia professional development in math is incorporating these and other promising practices supported by research including well-designed tutoring programs with intensive and ongoing training for the tutors, well-structured tutoring sessions in which both the content and delivery of instruction is carefully scripted, careful progress monitoring and reinforcement of programs, frequent and regular tutoring systems with each session between 10 and 70 minutes daily, the use of technology, curriculum-based interventions, and differentiated instruction. In addition, Accelerated Math has also consistently demonstrated a dramatic rise in student math achievement (Ysseldyke and Tardrew, 2006, Spicuzza, et al., 1999). The key focus in training however reflects the work of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel's final report in March 2008 relating to curricular content, learning processes and instructional practices.

The Georgia Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions professional development has been developed within Georgia's Secondary Redesign Initiative as a way to align all efforts and ongoing initiatives within the GaDOE so that there is a common focus and language regarding instructional practices and interventions for all students. GaDOE staff have used a comprehensive review of the literature to produce a research synthesis on RTI (Coleman, et al., 2006). Coleman reported that a total of 14 studies met the selection criteria on a rating scale measuring the quality of RTI. Research synthesis findings indicated that there is an emerging body of empirical evidence to support RTI as an effective process for identifying children at-risk for learning difficulties particularly at the elementary level. GaDOE has developed a manual and ongoing webinars through Elluminate.

Parent engagement is a powerful influence in student educational success and a strong predictor of a child's achievement. Therefore, parent and family engagement activities are woven throughout all of the Georgia SPDG goals. A research review of some 300 studies by Kellaghan, et al., (1994), 49 studies by Edge and Davis (1994), 66 studies by Henderson & Berla (1994), and studies by Henderson and Mapp (2002) demonstrated that the family makes crucial contributions to student achievement. This is true across socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and educational backgrounds and for students of all ages (Mapp, 2004). These reviews also concluded that the earlier in a child's educational process the parents and family are involved, the better the results. Redding, et al., (2004) showed that a critical mass of comprehensive and focused school-home activities can be generated in a relatively short period of time.

Coleman, et al., (2006) identified three necessary components for effectively involving parents in the schools: 1. Key information for parents about what their child is learning and how well they are learning; 2. Engagement activities for the parents to provide direct support for their child's learning; and 3. Advocacy by parents so that their child receives necessary support. Epstein (2001) argued for the following parental roles to improve schools: volunteering, supporting their child's learning at home, having meaningful roles for decision making in the schools, and collaboration with the community.

Georgia's Parent Training Information (PTI) Center, Parent to Parent of Georgia, GaDOE'S Parent Mentor Program, and a coalition of Georgia parent and advocacy groups work together as strategic parent engagement activities are included in Goal 5 and imbedded into the other SPDG goals.

Selected References:

- Baker, S., Gersten, R., and Lee, D. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low achieving students. *The Elementary School Journal* 103(1), 51-73.
- Burns, M.S., Griffin, P., & Snow, C.E. (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promote children's reading success*. Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Coleman, M.R., Buysee, V., and Neitzel, J. (2006). Recognition and response; An early intervening system for young children at-risk for learning disabilities. Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.
- Coleman, A.L., Starzynski, A.L., Winnick, S.Y., Palmer, S.R., and Furr, J.E. (2006). *It takes a parent: Transforming education in the wake of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Appleseed.
- Davison, N. (1985). Small group cooperative learning in mathematics: A selective view of the research. In R. Slavin (Ed.), *Learning to cooperate: Cooperating to learn*. (211-30). NY; Plenum.
- Desler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Lenz, K.B. Bulgren, J.A., Hock, M.F., Knight, J., and Ehren, B.J. (2002). *The strategic intervention model*. Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.
- Donovan, M.S., & Cross, C.T. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Grouws, D. A. and Cebulla, K.J. (December 2002, Updated June 2003) *Improving student achievement in mathematics. Part 1: Research findings and Part 2: Recommendations for the classroom*. ERIC Digest, Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education.
- Henderson, A.T., & Berla, N. (Eds). (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. National Committee for Citizens in Education: Washington, DC.
- Henderson, A., and Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX; Southwest Educational Laboratory.
- Kellaghan, T.K., Sloane, B., and Alvarez, & Bloom, B.S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., National Early Literacy Panel. (2006, March). *Findings from the National Early Literacy Panel: Providing a focus for early language and literacy development*. Presentation.
- Mapp, K. (2004). *Family engagement*. In F.P. Schargel and J. Simink (Eds.), *Helping students graduate: A strategic approach to dropout prevention* (pp. 99-113). Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.
- National Mathematics Advisory Panel-Final Report (2008), *Foundations for Success, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC*

- National Reading Panel (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching students to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Reports of the subgroups. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.
- Rand Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Slavin, R.E. (1990). Student team learning in mathematics. In N. Davidson (Ed.), *Cooperative learning in math: A handbook for teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, (69-102).
- Spicuzza, R., and Ysseldyke, J. (1999). Using accelerated math to enhance instruction in a mandated summer school program. Minn, MN: National Center on Educational Outcomes. Available at; <http://education.umn.edu/nceo/onlinepubs/amreport.pd>.
- VanKleek, A., Gillam, R., & McFadden, T. (1998). "A study of classroom-based phonological awareness training for preschoolers with speech and/or language disorders." *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 7, 65-76.
- Wilcox, M. (1999). "Considerations in promoting language-based learning readiness for children enrolled in Head Start." In J. Heller (Ed.). *Head Start University Partnerships: Issues in Child Development Research*.
- Woodruff, S., Schumaker, J.B., and Deshler, D.D. (2002). *The effects of an intensive reading intervention on the decoding skills of high school students with reading deficits*. (Research Report No. 15). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.
- Ysseldyke, J. & Tandre, S. (2006). Use of a program monitoring system to enable teachers to differentiate math instruction. Manuscript in Progress.

Goal 2 – Reduction of students with disabilities dropping out of school through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavioral interventions.

Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

Professional development within Goal 2 is incorporating findings from the dropout prevention literature. For example, an early 1990's study of three dropout prevention programs for students with disabilities found that six components were common to all effective programs: persistence, continuity and consistency; monitoring; relationships; affiliation; and problem-solving skills (Lehr et al., 2004). Lehr et al (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of dropout research and found that of the 300 studies reviewed, only forty-five studies could be coded; and only nine had some form of randomized design. Only two conducted since 1994 were focused on high school students and had a randomized-control element in the evaluation. The following, however, were identified as promising practices and are being incorporated within the Georgia SPDG:

- *Personal/affective interventions*. Examples include activities designed to enhance self-esteem, regularly scheduled classroom-based discussion, individual counseling, and participation in lessons on interpersonal relations.
- *Academic interventions*. Examples include provision of special academic courses, individualized methods of instruction, and tutoring.
- *Family outreach strategies*. Examples include increased feedback to parents or home visits.
- *Interventions addressing school structure*. Examples include creating schools within schools, re-defining of the role of the homeroom teacher, and reducing class size.
- *Work-related interventions*. Examples include vocational training and participation in volunteer or service programs.

Bost and Riccomini (2006) researched effective instruction and school engagement strategies to prevent students with disabilities from dropping

out and to assist students in an effective planning process. They reported on the following principles of effective instructional and school engagement strategies: (1) Maximize active engagement (i.e., time on task) or the amount of work that is diagnostically and instructionally appropriate; (2) Create an instructional environment that encourages successful social and academic experiences; (3) Provide maximum time for students to have opportunity to learn content; (4) Group for instruction to facilitate the teacher's ability to keep students engaged in the classroom; (5) Scaffold instruction with carefully and systematically sequenced series of prompted content, materials, tasks, and teacher support; (6) Address all forms of knowledge (procedural, declarative, and conditional knowledge); (7) Organize information so that the student can build on previously learned knowledge and skills; (8) Provide instruction that teaches students how to learn; (9) Make instruction explicit; and (10) Purposefully design instruction to help students recognize patterns and organize knowledge.

Lehr, et al., (2003) found the Check and Connect Model to be effective in preventing dropout and increasing school engagement. The Check and Connect Model is designed to engage students in school and learning via a mentor/monitor who establishes a long-term relationship and maintains regular contact with the student, family, and teachers. Risk factors are systematically monitored, and interventions are tailored to meet individual student needs such as increased communication with parents, tutoring, problem-solving (Sinclair, et al., 1998; and Lehr, et al., 2005). Ninety-four students were randomly assigned to a treatment or control group (n=47 each). Analysis found that students who received the Check and Connect intervention were more likely to still be enrolled after one year in the program (ninety-one percent vs. seventy percent) and more likely to graduate from high school within four years (46 percent vs. 20 percent). SPDG schools use models based on the principles of Check and Connect.

Dropout prevention and increased graduation are the broad framework in the Georgia SPDG within which dropout prevention research findings are being incorporated, as well as the implementation of scientifically based reading and math strategies, co-teaching, and a number of other interventions to improve the school climate and educational program to support student engagement and achievement.

Number of Total Persons Trained (Goals 1 and 2): 3,234

Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instructional Practices: 3,234 – 100%

Selected References:

- Bost, L. and Riccomini, P.J. (September-October, 2006). Effective instruction: An inconspicuous strategy for dropout prevention. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(5), 301-311.
- Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., & Thurlow, M. L. (2005). Promoting school completion of urban secondary youth with emotional or behavioral disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 71(4), 465-482.
- Lehr, C.A., Sinclair, M.F., and Christenson, S.L. (2004). Addressing school engagement and truancy prevention in the elementary school: A replication study of the check and connect model, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9(3), 279-301.
- Lehr, C. A., Hansen, A., Sinclair, M. F., & Christenson, S. L. (2003). Moving beyond dropout prevention to school completion: An integrative review of data-based interventions, *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 342-364.
- Sinclair, M.F., Christenson, S.L., Lehr, C.A., and Anderson, A.R. (2003). Facilitated student engagement: Lessons learned from *check and connect* longitudinal studies. *The California School Psychology*, 8, 29-42.

Goal 3 – Increase in the number of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals through the implementation of effective transition strategies.

Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

Goal 3 professional development activities being planned and implemented within Goal 3 are based on the scientific or evidenced-based instructional practices within the transition literature. Even though there is limited scientific rigor in the transition literature, the National Council on Disability (2004) reported that there are “pockets” of innovation that are worthy of discussion. For instance, Benz, Lindstrom, and Yovanoff (2000) reviewed the research on transition factors associated with secondary and postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities. Their search yielded six programmatic factors that resulted in better opportunities for students with disabilities:

- Participation in paid work experience during the last two years of high school;
- Competence in functional academic skills, community living skills, personal-social skills, vocational skills, and self-determination skills (e.g., self-advocacy, goal setting);
- Participation in transition planning;
- Participation in vocational education classes during the last two years of high school, especially classes that offer occupationally-specific instruction;
- Graduation from high school; and
- Absence of continuing instructional needs in functional academic, vocational, and personal-social areas after leaving school. (Benz et al., 2000).

The National Council on Disability (2004) identified a taxonomy of transition practices for students with disabilities, developed jointly by Western Michigan University and the Transition Research Institute at the University of Illinois, (ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education, 2000). Based on an exhaustive review of the literature and reviews of model projects and exemplary programs, five program components were found to be important: student-focused planning; student development; interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration; family involvement; and effective program structures.

Skinner and Lindstrom (2003) identified several factors that have shown empirical evidence influencing success: (1) the extent of student knowledge, the nature of his or her disability, and compensatory strategies; (2) how able a student is to manage a disability in a proactive manner (e.g., self-advocacy, goal setting, knowledge of disability law, selection of an appropriate college, self-identification, and organizing for living and learning); (3) the availability of emotional and academic support; (4) the severity of the disability; (5) strength of the student's motivation; and (6) willingness to persevere under adverse conditions.

Research by Hasazi et al. (1999), Kohler (1993), and Benz et al. (2000) identified organizational factors associated with exemplary secondary and transition programs and better outcomes for students, including the use of written interagency agreements between schools and adult agencies to structure the provision of collaborative transition services.

Beginning in the late 1980s and continuing through the 1990s and into 2000, interagency transition teams were widespread, generating information and strategies that are useful now as important examples of both effective and ineffective interagency teaming (Blalock & Benz, 1999; Blalock, 1996; Everson & Guillory, 1998). Over the years, interagency transition teams at the local, regional, and/or state level have continued to function with varying degrees of success. Those that have not attained a level of desired success might not have generated appropriate membership, elicited the desired level of commitment, implemented guidelines on how to operate, or conveyed an understanding of what they were convened to do.

State, regional, and local interagency committees or councils focused on transition have emerged and expanded due to several factors. First, it just makes good sense for professionals to work collaboratively to provide and coordinate services for youth with disabilities. Second, federal legislation in the fields of education, employment, health, mental health, and others have strongly encouraged cross-agency collaboration in addressing individual and family needs. Finally, families need to be engaged in coordinating community services needed by their child as he/she transitions from school to adult life.

The multi-faceted needs of individuals with disabilities led to the belief that effective interagency transition would require collaboration. So, interagency transition services became a coordinated set of activities designed to achieve specific outcomes. Individual needs are meant to be the first priority, taking into account preferences, potential, abilities, and interests. The goal of transition services is to develop the linkages and skills necessary for success in postsecondary education, adult education and training, adult services, independent living, community participation, a specific job or career, and/or integrated community living.

Number of Total Persons Trained: 244

Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instructional Practices: 244 – 100%

Selected References:

- Benz, M. R., Lindstrom, L., & Yovanoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children, 66*(4), 509-529.
- Blalock, G. (1996). Community transition teams as the foundation for transition services for youth with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29*(2), 148–159.
- Blalock, G., & Benz, M. R. (1999). *Using community transition teams to improve transition services*. (Pro-Ed Transition Series). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. (2000). *New ideas for planning transitions to the adult world*. Arlington, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education.
- Everson, J. M., & Guillory, J. D. (1998). Building statewide transition services through collaborative interagency teamwork. In F. R. Rusch & J. Chadsey-Rusch (Eds.), *Transition from school to work: New opportunities for adolescents* (pp. 299-317). Pacific Grove, CA: Brookes/Cole.
- Hasazi, S. B., Furney, K. S., & DeStefano, L. (1999). Implementing the IDEA transition mandates. *Exceptional Children, 65*(4), 555-566.
- Kohler, P. D. (1993). *Best practices in transition: Substantiated or implied? Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 16*, 107-121.
- National Council on Disability (2004). *Improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities*. Washington DC: Author.
- Skinner, M. E., & Lindstrom, B. D. (2003). Bridging the gap between high school and college: strategies for the successful transition of students with learning disabilities. *Preventing School Failure, 47*(3).

Stodden, R. A., Conway, M. A., & Chang, K. B. T. (2004). *Essential tools: Understanding and utilizing services, supports, and accommodations for youth with disabilities as they transition between secondary school and postsecondary school* (in press). National Center on Secondary Education and Transition.

Stodden, R. A., & Smith, G. J. (1996). *Handbook for improving special needs programs and practices through quality partnerships*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii UAP Multimedia Productions

Goal 4 – Increased teacher competency and skills by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

Goal 4 is focused on the development of alternative routes to certification, stipends, and other support for special education teachers with non-regular special education certificates, as well as expanded courses so that less than fully certified teachers can take coursework close to home. Goal 4 activities also involve aggressive recruitment efforts to place fully certified special education teachers within Georgia schools. The Georgia SPDG is collaborating with the state agency responsible for teacher preparation, recruitment, retention and certification, the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) Educator Workforce Division and the federally funded National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Services Providers (National Personnel Center) to develop and implement a statewide recruitment plan and local school district recruitment plans.

While the above special education recruitment strategies within Goal 4 are not based on scientific research, they are based on effective practices reported in the literature and reported by other State Departments of Education across the country. For example, research findings, including that of the Education Alliance (Torres and Peck, 2004; Vegas et al., 2001; and Ingersoll, 2001) will be utilized relative to successful minority teacher recruitment strategies within higher education training programs (i.e., diagnostic student assessment, tutoring services, peer mentoring, academic advising, study and test-take skills assistance, and monitoring of student progress).

Non-traditional sources of recruitment are being planned, including “grow-your-own” high school programs that encourage interest by juniors and seniors to become special education teachers. Effective strategies are identified in the literature (Spradlin, T.E. and Prendergast, K.A., 2006; Guarino, et al., 2004; Haselkorn, 2000; Clewell and Veillegas, 2001) and through the experience of other states (e.g., Illinois Oregon, and Idaho). Both found implementation of Future Educators of America (FEA) clubs an effective strategy.

Alternative routes for certifying teachers are growing at a rapid rate across the nation. In 2006, 47 states and the District of Columbia reported that they had at least one type of alternate route to teacher certification, with 538 different alternate route programs (Feistritzer, 2006). As more states have implemented alternative routes to teacher certification, an increasing number of Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) have initiated non-traditional alternative programs that include on-the-job training for the preparation of post-baccalaureate candidates to teach, structured help for individuals on emergency permits, and well-designed alternative certification programs of study. Feistritzer (2005) reported that nearly half (47 percent) who entered teaching through alternate routes indicated that they would not have become a teacher if an alternate route had not been available.

Number of Total Persons Trained: 0

Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instructional Practices: 0 – 0%

Selected References:

- Clewell, B.C. and Villeges, A.M. (1998). Diversifying the teaching force to improve urban schools; Meeting the challenges. *Education and Urban Society*, 31(1), 3-17.
- Feistritzer, C.Emily (2006). *Profiles of Alternate Route Teachers*. Washington DC, U.S. Department of Education: Office of Innovation and Improvement.
- Guarino, G., Santibanez, L., Dailey, G., and Brewer, D. (May 2004). *A review of the research literature on teacher recruitment and retention*. Rand Education, Prepared for the Education Commission of the States.
- Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Spradlin, T.E., and Prendergast, K.A. (2006). Emerging trends in teacher recruitment and retention in the No Child Left Behind Era, *Education Policy Brief*, 4(12). Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.
- Torres, J., and Peck, N.L. (2004). *Minority teacher recruitment, development, and retention*. Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory: The Education Alliance at Brown University.
- Vegas, E., Murnane, R.J., and Willet, J.B. (2001). From high school to teaching: Many steps, who makes it? *Teachers College Record*, 103(3), 427-449.

Goal 5 – Increased participation of parents of preschool children within Cohort 1 and 2 schools to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.

Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

Goal 5 SPDG activities are based on research that has clearly shown the importance that early language and literacy plays in the later achievement of children (Wilcox, 1999; VanKleek, Gillam & McFadden, 1998; and Dickinson & Smith, 1994). Burns, Griffin, and Snow (1999) identified the following key aspects of language and literacy skill development of preschool/K-3 grade children: extended vocabulary, language development, phonological awareness, speech discrimination, knowledge of narrative, book and print awareness, functions and concepts of print, letters, early word recognition, and comprehension. The SPDG activities focused on preschool are also based on the research synthesis of the National Early Literacy Panel and a secondary research synthesis conducted by Dunst, Trivett, and Hamby (2007) of the work of the National Early Literacy Council, in which 234 studies were identified as scientifically based and having a predictive relation between a skill measured during preschool and a convention literacy outcome measured at some later point.

As indicated previously parent engagement is a powerful influence in student educational success and a part of all SPDG activities—see Goal 1 for scientifically based rationale.

Selected References:

- Burns, M.S., Griffin, P., & Snow, C.E. (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promote children's reading success*. Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Dickinson, D., & Smith, M. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's vocabulary, story comprehension, and print skills.. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 105-122.
- Dunst, C.J., Tirvett, C.M., and Hamby, D.W., *Predictors of and Interventions Associated with Later Literacy Accomplishments*. Centerscope - Publication of the National Center for Early Literacy Learning.
- Edge, D., & D.T. Davis. (1994). *Inclusion of parents and families of children with disabilities in the educational process: Issues, concerns, and paradigm shifts*. Plantation, FL: South Atlantic Regional Resource Center.
- National Research Council (2003). *Assessment in support of instruction and learning: Bridging the gap between large-scale and classroom assessment*. Washington DC; National Academy Press.
- Wade, B., & Moore, M. (2000). A sure start with books. *Early Years*, 20, 39-46.

Number of Total Persons Trained: 0

Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instruction: 0 – 0%

OSEP Measure 1.2: Number and Percentage of SPDG projects that have implemented personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in the Georgia State Performance Plan (SPP)

As stated earlier, in order to provide consistency within Measure 1.2, 1.3, and 4.1, the term “project” is being defined as objectives of each Goal. Using this definition, there are eight projects (eight objectives) within the Georgia SPDG. Some of the original project objectives have been combined because they are similar and/or overlap because Cohort schools are implementing several Improvement Areas (scientifically based programs/interventions—reading, math, and other dropout prevention initiatives). This provides parameters within which consistent evaluation counts and percentages can be made, as required in these Performance Measures.

The SPDG Goals 1-4 are a part of the GaDOE’s implementation of the State Performance Plan (SPP) for Part B. Specifically, SPDG Goals 1-4 will impact Georgia Performance Goal 1: Increase high school graduation rate, decrease dropout rate, and increase postsecondary enrollment rate and Goal 3 Improve workforce readiness skills and its Indicator 2 (Decrease the percent of students with disabilities who dropout of school); Indicator 1 (Increase the percent of students with disabilities who earn a regular high school diploma); Indicator 14 (Increase the percent of students with disabilities who transition to employment or post-secondary education); and Indicator 13 (Increase the percent of transition aged students with disabilities who have coordinated and measurable IEP goals and transition services that will lead to attainment of post-secondary goals). SPDG Goal 5 will impact Georgia Performance Goal 5 – Improve the SAT,ACT and the achievement scores of Georgia students.

SPP Indicators	SPDG Goal 1	SPDG Goal 2	SPDG Goal 3	SPDG Goal 4	SPDG Goal 5	Comments:
1	X	X	X			<p>The APR reports on the development and implementation of a Transition Plan to help students with disabilities achieve post-secondary goals. Goals 1, 2, and 3 activities will assist in the implementation of effective transition, reduction of dropout rates, and increased students who graduate with a regular diploma. The GaDOE is working with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to provide in-depth training in proven research based strategies to improve graduation rates and decrease dropout rates. Consistent with activities within the Georgia APR, local graduation coaches at the high and middle school levels will assist in the implementation of research-based dropout prevention strategies by providing in-depth training to school teams within the SPDG Cohort schools.</p> <p>The Georgia APR also documents collaboration by the Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports and other divisions within the GaDOE, including School Improvement and Curriculum. The SPDG is collaborating in support of the implementation of research-based reading and math strategies to improve student achievement, reduce dropout rates, and increase graduation rates with a regular diploma.</p> <p>SPDG Cohort 1 middle and high schools are receiving training by the NDPC-SD and GaDOE staff on research-based strategies that were supported in the first Georgia SPDG to increase access to the general education curriculum, including co-teaching and the variations of teaching styles, resulting in increased access to general education, fewer dropouts, increased achievement, and increased graduation rates with a regular diploma.</p> <p>Consistent with the Georgia APR, Special Education Services and Supports continues to support research-based positive behavior supports and functional behavior assessments with the expected outcomes stated above. Behavior strategies have been included within the training provided by the NDPC-SD for participating Cohort schools.</p> <p>The Georgia APR uses the services of the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) in 17 regions throughout Georgia to lead and support</p>

						school systems in the above areas. The GLRS is an integral support system for the SPDG in supporting Cohort participating schools who have been receiving training during Year 1 from the NDPC-SD and GaDOE staff and who have selected priority areas for improvement and are implementing scientifically based strategies in those areas.
2	X	X	X			“ “ “ “ “
3	X	X	X			“ “ “ “ “
4	X	X	X			“ “ “ “ “
5	X	X	X			“ “ “ “ “
8	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The Georgia APR calls for the SPDG and other state initiatives to infuse parent engagement as a critical and integral component. As with other schools, the participating Cohort schools are being encouraged to partner with the Parent Leadership Coalition (PLC), a statewide collaboration of organizations aimed at increasing information to families, including Parent to Parent of Georgia (the state’s Parent Training Information Center).</p> <p>The PLC has developed training, and supported Navigation teams in local communities to increase the availability of information on supports and services to families.</p> <p>The Georgia APR supports the use of a “C.A.F.E.” (Circles of Adults Focusing on Education), a state initiative that was launched in 2006 for use by parent mentors and other family engagement leaders. Parent Mentors have C.A.F.E.s surrounding local issues to encourage collaboration between educators, community members and parents. The SPDG has been piloting CAFES in two high schools during Year 2 and is encouraging increased family support and engagement within the SPDG participating Cohort schools.</p> <p>The Georgia APR specifically references the work by a SPDG supported Latino Family Outreach Liaison who participated in monitoring districts for the Divisions for Special Education and ESOL. During Year 2, this liaison continued to provide information on the special education process to families and taught educators how to make schools more welcoming. The parents not only became better equipped to participate in the education process, including IEP meetings, but they were required to volunteer at a school in exchange for the classes.</p>

12					X	During Year 2, the SPDG Parent Engagement Coordinator is working with the SPDG Cohort schools in the implementation of parent engagement strategies.
13			X			Goal 3 is specifically addressing SPP Indicator 13 aimed at the development and implementation of research-based transition strategies related to IEP goals. Two Regional Transition Councils were formed by the end of the Year 2 reporting period and are functioning independently.

1. Objective 1.1/2 and 2.1. – Implementation of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 29 –100%

2. Objective 1.3 – Increased reading and math skills because of the use of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 29 –100%

3. Objective 1.4 - Increase parent/family engagement in Cohort schools implementing scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 29 –100%

4. Objective 1.5/2.2 – Infusion of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies into preservice training programs.

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 29 –100%

5. Objective 3.1/2 – Training of local transition specialists and district/regional interagency transition councils to implement effective transition assessments; develop measurable IEP transition goals, including self determination; and implement interagency service planning for post-high school programs and services.

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 13.

6. **Objective 4.1 – Decrease in the number of special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate.**
7. **Objective 4.2 – Aggressive recruitment of fully certified/qualified special education teachers.**

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1 and 8.

8. **Objective 5.1 – Use of SBR strategies for home use to produce effective transition and peer level skills upon entry to preschool/school.**

Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8

Total SPDG Professional Development Initiatives: 8

Percent Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 8 – 100.0%

OSEP Measure 1.3: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools.

As stated earlier, in order to provide consistency within Measure 1.2, 1.3, and 4.1, the term “project” is being defined as objectives of each goal. Using this definition, there are eight projects (eight objectives) within the Georgia SPDG. Some of the original project objectives have been combined because they are similar and/or overlap because Cohort schools are implementing several Improvement Areas (scientifically based programs/interventions—reading, math, and other dropout prevention initiatives).

This definition of ‘project’ provides parameters within which consistent evaluation can be made and replicated by others, thus providing some inter-observer reliability to the evaluation. Replication for purposes of 1.3 will be considered short-term—since the end of the Year 1 reporting period and the end of the Year 2 reporting period (March 30, 2009). Examples will be provided under each of the project objectives.

1. **Objective 1.1/2 and 2.1. – Implementation of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.**
2. **Objective 1.3 – Increased reading and math skills because of the use of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.**

Scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs and interventions are being implemented within 18 middle and 15 high schools (Includes Ninth Grade Academy) throughout Georgia (33 total schools). This is a baseline year—replication efforts will be reported in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

3. Objective 1.4 - Increase parent/family engagement in Cohort schools implementing scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

During Year 1, Georgia C.A.F.E. DIALOGUES were created utilizing the IDEA Partnership’s Dialogue Guide Facilitator’s Handbook, published by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education to be used in facilitating pilot C.A.F.E. meetings. These dialogues are being used in the implementation of a pilot C.A.F.E (Circle of Adults Focusing on Education) in two schools/counties—Manchester High School, Meriwether County and Rutland High School, Bibb County. Replication efforts will occur in Year 3 and be reported in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report.

4. Objective 1.5/2.2 – Infusion of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies into preservice training programs.

No replication efforts to be reported in Year 2.

5. Objective 3.1/2 – Training of local transition specialists and district/regional interagency transition councils to implement effective transition assessments; develop measurable IEP transition goals, including self determination; and implement interagency service planning for post-high school programs and services.

Three of the GLRS districts already had pre-existing Regional Transition Councils prior to the beginning of Year 2 of the SPDG. Two additional Regional Transition Councils were replicated during Year 2 reporting period and are functioning independently.

6. Objective 4.1 – Decrease in the number of special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate.

No replication efforts to be reported in Year 2.

7. Objective 4.2 – Aggressive recruitment of fully certified/qualified special education teachers.

No replication efforts to be reported in Year 2.

8. Objective 5.1 – Use of SBR strategies for home use to produce effective transition and peer level skills upon entry to preschool/school.

No replication efforts to be reported in Year 2.

Total SPDG Professional Development Initiatives: 8

Percent Replicated: 1– 12.5%



**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): _____

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.

Objective 2. 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					
OSEP Measure 2.1: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	100	68	68/68	100.0

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
OSEP Measure 2.2: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific or evidence based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.).	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	80	47	47/68	69.1%

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

OSEP Measure 2.1: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices – See Rationale for Scientific Based in Indicator 1.1.

Goal 1 – Increased access to the general curriculum and increased literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains –See Rationale for Scientific Base in Indicator 1.1.

Combined with Goal 2

Goal 2 – Reduction in numbers of students with disabilities dropping out of school through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavioral interventions – See Rationale for Scientific Base in Indicator 1.1.

**Total SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities (Goals 1 and 2): 69
Number and Percent of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence Based Practices: 62 – 100%**

Goal 3 – Increase in the number of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals through the implementation of effective transition strategies – See Rationale for Scientific Based in Indicator 1.1.

**Total SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 6
Number and Percent of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence Based Practices: 6 – 100%**

Goal 4 – Increase teacher competency and skills by employing only fully certified special education teachers – See Rationale for Scientific Base in Indicator 1.1.

**Total SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: NA
Number and Percent of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence Based Practices: NA**

Goal 5 – Increased participation of parents of preschool children within Cohort I and 2 schools to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs – See Rationale for Scientific Base in Indicator 1.1.

**Total SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: NA
Number and Percent of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence Based Practices: NA**

OSEP Measure 2.2: The percentage of professional development/training activities, based on scientific or evidence based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.)

Goal 1 – Increased access to the general curriculum and increased literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains.

Goal 2 – Reduction of students with disabilities dropping out of school through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavioral interventions.

Follow-up for Sustainability:

Following is a summary of follow-up activities to sustain trainings within Goals 1 and 2:

- Each of the Cohort I schools had a trained Collaboration Coach to provide ongoing support and assistance. These Collaboration Coaches provided planned, systematic follow-up support for the middle and high school teams receiving on-site and webinar via Elluminate trainings. In addition, support and assistance to Cohort I middle and high schools was provided by the SPDG Latino Outreach Parent Specialist and the Parent Enhancement Coordinator.
- One Recruitment/Retention Task Force Training/Meeting was held that had a planned follow-up meeting to be held in June 2009.
- Quarterly Coaches' Trainings were held with support from coach trainer between meetings with informal email follow-up or visits as needed —no planned systematic follow-up.
- Thirteen presentations were made at state and/or national conferences. Conference call trainings were held with informal email follow-up—no planned systematic follow-up.
- Three consultant trainings were provided with informal email/telephone follow-up as well as webinars via elluminate—no planned systematic follow-up.
- Other follow-up to CAFÉ work included developing follow-up resource materials, reviewing materials and plans, on-going meetings, on-going technical assistance and/or consulting, and follow-up reports.
- The IRIS Center conducted a two-day seminar for the institutions of higher education (IHEs) focusing on infusing scientifically based interventions into their preservice training classes. Six of the Georgia IHEs were represented at this seminar. In addition, the Elluminate sessions were available to IHE personnel; however, planned systematic follow-up was not provided.

Total SPDG Projects: (Goals 1 and 2): 62

Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: 42 – 67.7%

Goal 3 – Increase in the number of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals through the implementation of effective transition strategies.

Follow-up for Sustainability:

Five Transition Council informational trainings/meetings were held that had monthly follow-up meetings. An additional session was held for the purpose of writing and implementing transition that did not have systematic planned follow-up. However, email assistance was provided.

Total SPDG Projects: 6

Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: 5 – 83.3%

Goal 4 – Increased teacher competency and skills by employing only fully certified special education teachers -See Rationale for Scientific Base in Indicator 1.1

A meeting was held with the National Personnel Center to review recruitment and retention data and identify priority initiatives to be carried out. For example, school districts with the highest numbers of non-regular special education teaching certificates were identified. Activities were identified to support these districts so that special education teachers with non-regular certificates can become fully certified. A second meeting is planned for June 2009.

Total SPDG Projects: NA

Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: NA

Goal 5 – Increased participation of parents of preschool children within Cohort 1 and 2 schools to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.

Follow-up for Year 1 professional development activities within Goal 1 included planned follow-up meetings and trainings (e.g., task force and planning meetings). The SPDG Parent Engagement Coordinator and the Latino Outreach Specialist provided follow-up training, on-site technical assistance, and telephone support to participating middle and high schools to enhance their parent engagement strategies for Latino and other parents of children with disabilities. Parent engagement was embedded within the regional trainings provided for Cohort 1 schools; however, specific follow-up was less formal. Email and telephone assistance was available for those schools requesting assistance.

Total SPDG Projects: NA

Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: NA



**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): _____

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.

OSEP Measure 3.1: 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					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number and percent of special education teachers, who remain teaching after the first three years of employment state-wide.	Project		/	100%		/	65.6%

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

OSEP Measure 2.2: Retention of highly qualified special education teachers after five years of employment.

Of the total special education teachers who began teaching in 2005-2006, 17.5% left after one year (compared to 11.3% for general education); and 34.4% left after three years (compared to 25.3% for general education). Thus, 65.6% of special education teachers remained teaching in special education for 3 years. Of the teachers who began teaching in special education during 2003-2004, 47.4% left after five years—with 52.6% remaining in special education.

Following is a summary of 3-year special and general education attrition rates 2000-01 to 2005-06:

- Beginning 2000-2001 and no longer teaching after three years: 43.7% attrition rate – compared to 25.3% for general education teachers
- Beginning 2001-2002 and no longer teaching after three years: 40.7% attrition rate – compared to 28.8% for general education teachers
- Beginning 2002-2003 and no longer teaching after three years: 42.5% attrition rate – compared to 33.1% for general education teachers
- Beginning 2003-2004 and no longer teaching after three years: 36.0% attrition rate – compared to 29.6% for general education teachers
- Beginning 2004-2005 and no longer teaching after three years: 38.8% attrition rate – compared to 28.7% for general education teachers
- Beginning 2005-2006 and no longer teaching after three years: 34.4% attrition rate – compared to 25.3% for general education teachers

As can be seen by this information, there is a downward trend in the special education teacher attrition rate from 2002-2003 to 2005-2006. The attrition rate for general education teachers has also showed a downward trend.

Following is an analysis of 5-year special and general education attrition rates from 2000-01 to 2003-04:

Beginning 2000-2001 and remaining five years: 50.5% attrition rate – compared to 33.4% for general education teachers

Beginning 2001-2002 and remaining five years: 51.6% attrition rate – compared to 35.8% for general education teachers

Beginning 2002-2003 and remaining five years: 53.2% attrition rate – compared to 40.0% for general education teachers

Beginning 2003-2004 and remaining five years: 47.4% attrition rate – compared to 37.6% for general education teachers

Again, this data shows a slight reduction in the 5-year attrition rates for special education teachers from 2000-01 to 2003-04. There is a similar slight reduction in attrition rates for general education teachers from 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.

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

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

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.

Objective 4: Expand the use of scientifically based or evidence based instructional/behavioral practices in schools.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
OSEP Measure 4.1: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools. (Long-Term),	GPRA Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2		NA for Year 2

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

OSEP Measure 4.1: Percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate.

As stated earlier, in order to provide consistency within Measure 1.2, 1.3, and 4.1, the term “project” is being defined as objectives of each Goal. This definition provides parameters within which consistent evaluation counts and percentages can be made across these three Performance Measures, thus providing some inter-observer reliability to the evaluation. Using this definition, there are eight projects (eight objectives) within the Georgia SPDG. Some of the original project objectives have been combined because they are similar and/or overlap because Cohort schools are implementing several Improvement Areas (scientifically based programs/interventions—reading, math, and other dropout prevention initiatives). Examples of long-term replication efforts will be provided, as appropriate, under each of the eight Georgia projects.

1. Objective 1,1/2 and 2.1. – Implementation of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

It is too early to report long-term replication as last year’s data was baseline data and this year’s data will not be available until June 2009 and will be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports

2. Objective 1.3 – Increased reading and math skills because of the use of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

3. Objective 1.4 - Increase parent/family engagement in Cohort schools implementing scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

4. Objective 1.5/2.2 – Infusion of scientifically based reading, math, and dropout prevention programs/strategies into preservice training programs.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

5. Objective 3.1/2 – Training of local transition specialists and district/regional interagency transition councils to implement effective transition assessments; develop measurable IEP transition goals, including self determination; and implement interagency service planning for post-high school programs and services.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

6. Objective 4.1 – Decrease in the number of special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

7. Objective 4.2 – Aggressive recruitment of fully certified/qualified special education teachers.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

8. Objective 5.1 – Use of SBR strategies for home use to produce effective transition and peer level skills upon entry to preschool/school.

It is too early to report long-term replication – To be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

Total SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 0
Number and Percent of Professional Development Activities Replicated 0 – 0%



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

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

PR/Award # H323A070012

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

II. Georgia specific SPDG project objectives and performance measures

The Georgia SPDG goals and objectives are being carried out within the context of the GaDOE Secondary Redesign Initiative using the Georgia Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions (GPI). A description of the GPI is found in the SPDG Year 1 Annual Performance Report narrative. Within the GaDOE, the Divisions of Curriculum (including Reading First), School Improvement, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Career Technology, and Agriculture Education (CTAE) are all collaborating with the Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports to ensure that the needs of all students (including students with disabilities) are addressed.

The SPDG activities are also being carried out in coordination with the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS). GLRS is a statewide network of 17 regional centers focused on providing ongoing professional learning to teachers and administrators that will assist them in implementing effective instructional strategies that impact the performance of students with disabilities and other struggling students. The GLRS Centers collaborate with a statewide network of 16 Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs), that have been established to assist school systems in improving educational programs and services for all children

The SPDG goals are aimed at providing support to 34 participating high and middle schools in the following Priority Improvement Areas:

- Goal 1:**
 - **Improved Reading and Math Achievement**
 - **Increased Number Who Graduate with a General Education Diploma (Goals 1 and 2)**
- Goal 2:**
 - **Decreased Numbers Who Dropout**
- Goal 3:**
 - **Increased High School Completion and Attainment of Better Postsecondary Outcomes**

Goal 4 ▪ **Increased Recruitment of Fully Certified Special Education Teachers**

Goal 5 ▪ **Increased Parent Support in Pre-literacy, Math, and Social
Skills Development for Young Children**

All Goals: ▪ **Embedded Parental Engagement**

Following training provided during Year 1 of the SPDG, the 18 middle and 15 high schools (total of 33) within the GLRS regions were selected to participate in the SPDG improvement efforts. A chart in the Year 1 Annual Report provides a listing of these middle and high schools within 15 of the 17 GLRS regions of Georgia.

The SPDG Collaboration Coaches are a critical component of the support infrastructure for each of the middle and high schools participating in the SPDG-supported dropout prevention program. Thus, a Collaboration Coach has been assigned to each high school and middle school in his or her region of participating schools. Collaboration Coaches received NDPC-SD and SPDG staff training during Year 1 as a member of the school's teams. They also participated in Year 2 Illuminate sessions.

Following training from the GaDOE and the NDPC-SD during Year 1, the school teams from each of the 33 middle and high schools engaged in significant baseline data analysis during both Years 1 and 2. Teams compiled the following data probes with the support of their Collaboration Coach, the GaDOE, and the NDPC-SD: Graduation Rate, Dropout Rate, Discipline Incidents, Absenteeism Rate, Grade Retention, School Climate, Parent Engagement, and Post Secondary/Transition. Based on the analysis of this data, the school-level teams selected one or more Priority Improvement Areas to focus on during Year 2 and the upcoming SPDG project years. The SPDG Annual Report Attachment provides a summary of Priority Improvement Areas selected by the participating middle and high schools.

Baseline data will be provided in this Report for the Georgia SPDG performance measures that cut across both Goal 1 and Goal 2. Data within each of the Goal 1 and Goal 2 performance indicators is being gathered again in spring 2009, but will not be available for analysis until after the Year 2 SPDG performance period. Thus, this change data for performance measures 1/2.c-j below will be reported in the Year 3 SPDG Annual Performance Report.



**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): _____

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.

Goal 1: Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.

Goal 2: The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of school will be reduced by 50% through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavior interventions.

Objective 1.1: The GaDOE will enhance its infrastructure providing coordinated resources for Cohort schools, thereby facilitating planning and implementation in all 33 schools.

Objective 1.2: The math, reading specialists and other staff within the Cohort schools will increase their awareness and skills in providing SBR math and reading strategies for students with disabilities in the GPI by attending summer training with periodic updates during the year.

Objective 1.3: The reading and math skills of secondary students with disabilities will attain statistical significance above their baseline because of increased implementation and use of SBR reading (English/Language Arts), particularly comprehension, and math, monitoring of student achievement and use of increasingly more intense interventions within the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions.

Objective 2.1: Effective dropout prevention programs/strategies will be implemented within participating Cohort schools.

1/2.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools successfully implementing effective reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention programs, as measured by evidence of implementation of Action Plans.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		33	33/33	100%

1/2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of special and general education teachers in the Cohort schools who report that the on-going support received from their SPDG Collaboration Coaches was helpful or very helpful in assisting them to implement scientifically based reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention strategies for students with disabilities.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	80		/	75.5

1/2.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased rate of graduation with regular diplomas for students with disabilities.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

1/2.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an reduced rated of students with disabilities dropping out of school.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

1/2.e Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting reductions in discipline referrals by students with disabilities.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

1/2.f Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting increased attendance rates by students with disabilities.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year
--	--	--	---	--	---------------	---------------	---------------

1/2.g Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased percentage of students with disabilities within Cohort schools who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in writing.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

1/2.h Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased percentage of students with disabilities within Cohort schools who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in English/Language Arts.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

1/2.i Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased percentage of students with disabilities within Cohort schools who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in math.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		Baseline Year	Baseline Year	Baseline Year

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

1/2.a – Implementation of Scientifically Based Reading, Math, and/or Dropout Prevention Programs/Strategies

Action plans have been developed by each of the 33 participating middle and high schools for the selected Priority Improvement Areas, as summarized in the chart found in the Annual Report Attachment. The local Collaboration Coaches have supported the implementation of these action plans through on-site technical assistance and training within the Cohort schools. The National Dropout Prevention Center and the GaDOE staff also provided back-up assistance to the Collaboration Coaches and the school-level teams.

A Collaboration Coaches Website link (www.gaspedg.com) was established within the SPDG website for reporting ongoing action plan implemen-

tation log activities for each of the participating schools during Year 1 and 2. Also a Website link on Googledocs contains ongoing implementation fidelity data and information related to the action plans. Following are examples of fidelity data/information contained in that Collaboration Coaches Website:

- Baseline data for each of the SPDG data probes (graduation rates, dropout rates, discipline incidents, attendance rates, grade retention data, and academic achievement).
- Action Plans with detailed strategies, activities, person(s) responsible for carrying out the actions, timelines, status, and formative and summative evaluation strategies.
- Formative data for behavioral, psychological, and cognitive engagement (e.g., attendance).
- Formative data for academic engagement.
- Formative evaluations/student monitoring of academic progress.
- SWIS referral data for problem behavior.
- Fidelity of implementation indicators.
- Data regarding risk factors for students with disabilities.
- School team meeting minutes.
- Data collection instruments.
- PowerPoints and handouts from selected presentations.
- Meeting and presentation reflections.
- Middle School Pyramid of interventions/middle tier interventions.

As an additional measure of implementation fidelity, an electronic survey via SurveyMonkey was administered to all of the 34 participating middle and high school team members. This electronic survey was sent to 169 school team members in February 2009 and 83 responses were received (49.1% return rate). Following is information on the areas of their plan the teams were addressing during Year 2 of the SPDG:

Attendance – 74.4%

Academic Achievement – Math – 59.8%

Academic Achievement – Reading – 28.0%

Positive Behavior Support – 46.3%

Behavior – 42.7%

Family Engagement – 29.3%

Transition – 22.0%

When asked if there were positive outcomes during Year 2, 54.2% of those responding indicated yes and 45.8% indicated no.

1/2.b – Satisfaction with Support Received from Collaboration Coaches

As stated earlier, the Collaboration Coaches are a critical component in the Georgia SPDG improvement efforts. A Collaboration Coach has been assigned to each of the participating schools and provides ongoing assistance to the participating schools as they implement activities/initiatives related to their Improvement Priority Areas.

Electronic follow-up surveys were administered approximately 90 days following the November 2007, March 2008 and Summer 2008 PBS training, summer 2008 math Training and at the end of Year 2. As part of these surveys, feedback was requested regarding the type of support the Collaboration Coaches were providing to the Cohort School teams. Following is the feedback received during earlier follow-up surveys in Year 2 (average response return rate of 69.7%):

Type of Training Provided by the Collaboration Coaches:

Coaching – Average of 75.7%

Training – Average of 48.1%

Coaching – Average of 42.9%

Satisfaction with Assistance Received from the Collaboration Coaches:

Very Helpful – Average of 43.0%

Helpful – Average of 32.5%

Uncertain – Average of 15.5%

Not Helpful – Average of 3.5%

Definitely Not Helpful – Average of 1.3%

At the end of Year 2, 75.5% of the school team participants reported that there were positive outcomes in their school as a result of participation in the dropout prevention program and the assistance received. The following feedback was received regarding the impact of assistance from the Collaboration Coaches in Year 2 (response return of 49.1%):

Changed the way the data is used – 71.0%

Change in practice or procedures – 68.78%

Change in the way data is collected – 48.1%

Changed school policies – 23.4%

NOTE: Baseline data for each of the SPDG data probe areas is reported in the following Georgia SPDG performance measures 1/2c – 1/2m. Because of the limitations of the SPDS electronic filing process, there will be a discussion of 2007-2008 baseline data. Full data across all of the 34 participating middle and high schools for the years 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 is included in the Georgia Report Attachment. In future SPDG Annual Performance Reports, data will be reported for each data probe area comparing baseline data with current year data—thus, measuring the ongoing outcomes of the SPDG dropout prevention program. Data is incomplete for some schools as the data is currently being retrieved by the school—but not available in time for this reporting. In addition, the baseline data is being reviewed for accuracy.

1/2.c – Graduation with a Regular Diploma Gap

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, 15 high schools reported the graduation rate gap between general and special education students graduating with a regular high school diploma. The graduation gap between general and special education students graduating with a regular diploma ranged from 22.2% in Lucey Laney High School to 64.9% in Bainbridge High School. The lower the percentage, the more the gap between general and special education students has closed.

High Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage Gap – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	49.3
Coffee High School	45.3
Cook High School	47.6
Murray County High School	30.5
Manchester High School	31.7
Rutland High School	49.4
Jordan High School	33.0
Bainbridge High School	64.9
Henry High School	35.1
Liberty County High School	44.8
Lafayette High School	39.3
Lucey Laney High School	22.2
Madison County High School	28.7
North Gwinnett High School	24.4
Douglas High School	63.8

1/2.d – Dropout Rate Gap

For 15 reporting high schools, the percentage gap between students in general and special education for dropping out was –1.7% in Lucey Laney High School and –1.9% in Madison County High School to 4.0% in Rutland High School. A negative percent indicates that the special education students had a lower dropout rate than general education students.

High Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage Gap – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	7
Coffee High School	1.5
Cook High School	0.4
Murray County High School	3.3
Manchester High School	-0.2
Rutland High School	4.0
Jordan High School	0.0
Bainbridge High School	3.8
Henry High School	1.4
Liberty County High School	2.6
Lafayette High School	3.5
Lucey Laney High School	-1.7
Madison County High School	-1.9
North Gwinnett High School	0.6
Douglas High School	6.6

1/2.e – Discipline Referrals

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, twelve middle schools reported using the number of students with discipline incidents or in school suspension. This would explain the wide variation in numbers reported by some schools (from a low of 49 in-school suspensions in East Augusta Middle School to a high of 5,168 discipline incidents in Rutland Middle School). For eleven reporting high schools, the number of discipline incidents or in-school suspensions ranged from a low of 46 in-school suspensions in Lucy Laney High School to a high of 9,593 discipline incidents in Rutland High School. Schools reported much difficulty in obtaining this data and therefore the baselines reflects different measures which will be corrected for Year 3. (* indicates data not available).

Middle Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Number – 2007-2008</u>
Bagley Middle School	*
Coffee Middle School	*
Cook Middle School	2,102
Double Churches Middle School	1,166
East Augusta Middle School	49
Gladden Middle School	*

Harper-Archer Middle School	*
Henry Middle School	848
Hutto Middle School	274
Lanier Middle School	907
Lafayette Middle School	1,346
Lewis Frazier Middle School	*
Madison County Middle School	67
Manchester Middle School	*
Midway Middle School	186
Oak Hills Middle School	1,038
Rutland Middle School	5,168
West Bainbridge Middle School	77

High Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Number – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	959
Coffee High School	287
Cook High School	*
Murray County High School	*
Manchester High School	108
Rutland High School	9,593
Jordan High School	4,250
Bainbridge High School	3,900
Henry High School	*
Liberty County High School	375
Lafayette High School	226
Lucey Laney High School	46
Madison County High School	2,405
North Gwinnett High School	890
Douglas High School	*

1/2.f – Attendance Rates – More Than 15 Days – Gap Between All and Students with Disabilities

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, eleven middle schools reported using the percentage gap between students in general and special education for absences greater than 10 days. Absentee gap percentage rates range from 2.9% in Hutto Middle School to 12.70% in Rutland Middle School. For 13 reporting high schools, the absentee rate gap ranged from 2.7% in Cook High School to 15.3% in Rutland High School. (* indicates data not available)

Middle Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage Gap – 2007-2008</u>
Bagley Middle School	*
Coffee Middle School	*
Cook Middle School	4.6
Double Churches Middle School	10.6
East Augusta Middle School	*
Gladden Middle School	*
Harper-Archer Middle School	6.4
Henry Middle School	3.4
Hutto Middle School	2.9
Lanier Middle School	3.3
Lafayette Middle School	*
Lewis Frazier Middle School	*
Madison County Middle School	3.9
Manchester Middle School	*
Midway Middle School	6.3
Oak Hills Middle School	4.6
Rutland Middle School	12.7
West Bainbridge Middle School	13.0

High Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage Gap – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	12.8
Coffee High School	*
Cook High School	2.7
Murray County High School	*
Manchester High School	8.7
Rutland High School	15.3
Jordan High School	5.5
Bainbridge High School	10.3
Henry High School	6.2
Liberty County High School	3.8
Lafayette High School	5.8
Lucey Laney High School	4.0

Madison County High School	12.0
North Gwinnett High School	7.3
Douglas High School	12.6

To measure statewide academic success and progress toward narrowing the achievement and graduation gaps, the achievement levels of students with disabilities are assessed by the percent of students with disabilities who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education). The performance measures 1/2.h-1/2.m report on baseline data using the percentage meeting or exceeded these standards during 2007-2008.

1/2.g – Standards in Writing

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, fourteen middle schools reported using the percentage of students in special education meeting or exceeding the writing standards in writing, ranging from a low of 0.0% in West Bainbridge Middle School to 59.0% in Hutto Middle School. For twelve high schools, the percentage of special education students meeting or exceeding the writing standards ranged from a low of 11.0% in Madison County High School to a high of 51.0% in Douglas High School.

Middle Schools:

Writing – 8th Grade

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage – 2007-2008</u>
Bagley Middle School	*
Coffee Middle School	*
Cook Middle School	48.0
Double Churches Middle School	31.0
East Augusta Middle School	10.6
Gladden Middle School	*
Harper-Archer Middle School	25.0
Henry Middle School	57.0
Hutto Middle School	59.0
Lanier Middle School	36.0
Lafayette Middle School	*

Lewis Frazier Middle School	40.0
Madison County Middle School	30.0
Manchester Middle School	49.0
Midway Middle School	40.0
Oak Hills Middle School	49.0
Rutland Middle School	46.0
West Bainbridge Middle School	0.0

High Schools:

Writing – 11th Grade Writing Gap

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	43.0
Coffee High School	*
Cook High School	40.0
Murray County High School	*
Manchester High School	46.0
Rutland High School	44.0
Jordan High School	36.0
Bainbridge High School	41.0
Henry High School	50.0
Liberty County High School	39.0
Lafayette High School	30.0
Lucey Laney High School	*
Madison County High School	11.0
North Gwinnett High School	34.0
Douglas High School	51.0

1/2.h – Standards in Reading/English/Language Arts

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, 17 middle schools reported the percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding the Reading/English/Language Arts Georgia Standards (CRCT Scores), ranging from a low of 41.2% in East Augusta Middle School to a high of 77.2% in Lanier Middle School. For the 15 reporting high schools, the percentage of students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding the Reading/English/Language Arts Georgia Standards (GHSGT) for R/ELA ranged from a low of 25. 0% in Lucey Laney High School and Henry High School to a high of 63.2% in North Gwinnett High School.

Middle Schools:

Name of School **Percentage – 2007-2008**

Bagley Middle School	62.1
Coffee Middle School	50.6
Cook Middle School	67.7
Double Churches Middle School	60.6
East Augusta Middle School	41.2
Gladden Middle School	65.1
Harper-Archer Middle School	48.0
Henry Middle School	51.8
Hutto Middle School	44.8
Lanier Middle School	77.2
Lafayette Middle School	74.2
Lewis Frazier Middle School	71.4
Madison County Middle School	69.4
Manchester Middle School	62.2
Midway Middle School	59.4
Oak Hills Middle School	68.6
Rutland Middle School	63.2
West Bainbridge Middle School	43.8

High Schools:

Name of School **Percentage – 2007-2008**

Baldwin High School	53.1
Coffee High School	42.9
Cook High School	56.2
Murray County High School	39.4
Manchester High School	52.0
Rutland High School	42.9
Jordan High School	26.1
Bainbridge High School	51.7
Henry High School	25.0
Liberty County High School	37.8
Lafayette High School	47.4
Lucey Laney High School	25.0
Madison County High School	54.8
North Gwinnett High School	63.2

Douglas High School 38.7

1/2.i – Standards in Math

As can be seen by the 2007-2008 baseline information below, eighteen middle schools reported using the percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding the Georgia Math Standards (CRCT scores), ranging from a low of 19.3% in Harper-Archer Middle School to a high of 53.0% in Lanier Middle School. For 15 reporting high schools, the percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding the Georgia Math Standards (GHSGT scores) ranged from a low of 7.1% in Jordan High School to a high of 41.0% in North Gwinnett High School.

Middle Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage – 2007-2008</u>
Bagley Middle School	34.4
Coffee Middle School	34.5
Cook Middle School	39.2
Double Churches Middle School	31.8
East Augusta Middle School	22.0
Gladden Middle School	33.3
Harper-Archer Middle School	19.3
Henry Middle School	24.6
Hutto Middle School	32.8
Lanier Middle School	53.0
Lafayette Middle School	51.6
Lewis Frazier Middle School	51.5
Madison County Middle School	47.0
Manchester Middle School	47.6
Midway Middle School	32.4
Oak Hills Middle School	43.8
Rutland Middle School	43.5
West Bainbridge Middle School	26.8

High Schools:

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Percentage – 2007-2008</u>
Baldwin High School	28.1
Coffee High School	19.0
Cook High School	37.5
Murray County High School	18.2

Manchester High School	28.0
Rutland High School	7.1
Jordan High School	16.7
Bainbridge High School	37.9
Henry High School	25.0
Liberty County High School	32.4
Lafayette High School	10.5
Lucey Laney High School	25.0
Madison Co. High School	45.2
North Gwinnett High School	41.0
Douglas High School	12.5



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

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

PR/Award # H323A070012

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.

Goal 1: Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.

Objective 1.4: Parent/family engagement will increase within all Cohort schools to enhance positive student outcomes for all students with disabilities.

1.4.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of Cohort schools forming a Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (C.A.F.E) and having at least two C.A.F.E. dialogue meetings.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		2	/	100%	2	2 / 2	100%

1.4.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data
---------------------------	--------------	-------------------

Number or percent of the C.A.F.E. teams within Cohort schools reporting changed school practices as a result of receiving training received.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2	/	NA for Year 2

1.4.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of districts whose middle and high schools are participating in Cohort 1 of the SPDG reporting parent mentors providing support to parents.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		15	15/15	100%	15	12/15	80%

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

1.4.a – Formation of Circles of Adults Focusing on Education (C.A.F.E.s)

A C.A.F.E (Circle of Adults Focusing on Education) is a method or a process of collaborative team problem solving on the local level to improve student achievement. C.A.F.E.s are a family/educator/community team that integrates educator know-how, parent/family real experiences, and community experience and resources. The C.A.F.E. team typically includes at least three family members and several building-level decision makers. The team focuses on identifying and launching sustainable initiatives/activities to impact student success. C.A.F.E. dialogue meetings are typically two hours.

The SPDG implemented pilot C.A.F.E.s in two schools/counties—Manchester High School, Meriwether County and Rutland High School, Bibb County. During Year 1, Georgia C.A.F.E. DIALOGUES were created utilizing the IDEA Partnership’s Dialogue Guide Facilitator’s Handbook, published by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education to be used in facilitating pilot C.A.F.E. meetings. Ms. Patti Solomon, Family Engagement Specialist, GaDOE, facilitated the pilot dialogue meetings in both of the pilot sites. The first session of the C.A.F.E. Dialogue SPDG Pilots was held in both Meriwether and Bibb counties in January/February 2009. The goal of these two Pilots is to create short-term and long-term solutions to engage families in ensuring that students graduate with a general education diploma. Both of the Pilot C.A.F.E.s had a subsequent dialogue meeting in March 2009—another dialogue is planned for the spring following the end of the Year 2 performance period. Participants in the C.A.F.E. discussions included parents, school personnel, and community members and have included presentation/discussions regarding research articles/materials prepared by the National Dropout Prevention Center as well as a review/discussion of baseline data gathered by the school in the data probes discussed earlier.

Pre- and post- surveys were administered in both of the two sites to the parents on the C.A.F.E. to assess perceptions from the parents regarding the C.A.F.E process and their present knowledge and experience with school and community resources impacting their child and family. All

(100%) of the parents surveyed were either satisfied or very satisfied with the communications with their teachers and the school. All (100%) of the parents were neutral or did not agree with the questions regarding awareness of community resources and use of community resources. Most parents surveyed did not know if the school offered information on resources. Ninety percent of the parents wrote in the survey that they wanted to make sure their child did not dropout or "fall through the cracks."

Ms. Solomon interviewed parents on the school SPDG school-based teams during the first round of trainings and found that parents did not know how to negotiate the school to get support, nor did they know how to network in the school or community to get the help their children needed. The pre-C.A.F.E. survey found that parents were frustrated about issues related to community resources for their children.

The next steps in the C.A.F.E. process at the two pilot sites will be to develop a strategic plan to reduce the numbers of students with disabilities dropping out and graduating with a regular diploma. Targets and draft improvement activities have been developed in the Manchester High School to increase student and family engagement.

1.4.b – Changed Practices Resulting from C.A.F.E. Work

This measure will be reported on in Year 3. The two pilot C.A.F.E.s have begun their work, but it is too early to measure impact of the C.A.F.E. implementation.

1.4.c – Parent Mentor Support for Families

The Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership is now celebrating its fifth anniversary of working to increase parental involvement in special education. The partnership that started as a small group of parents and administrators, now collaborates with more than 60 local school systems and over 140,000 families raising children with learning and/or physical challenges.

Created and partially funded by the Georgia Department of Education's Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports, Parent mentors are moms and/or dads hired by local school systems to work with special education directors, parents, school teams, teachers and the community. Their goal is to build a bridge of communication between home and school. Together, they collaborate to increase parent involvement in solving concerns and gaining ground on targeted goals to improve all children's achievement. The Partnership, which meets 2-3 times a year statewide and four times a year regionally, is locally driven, therefore meeting the needs of each local area.

Mentors build connections for families in the community, concentrate on transition needs of high school students and young children, lead task forces, organize training sessions, collaborate with teachers and increase parent involvement activities in schools.

There are 12 of the 15 school districts participating in Cohort 1 (34 middle and high schools) who have parent mentors working with school-based teams to increase parent engagement as a critical component of dropout prevention and student achievement. The parent mentors are also participating on the pilot C.A.F.E.s in the two high schools described above.



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

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

.5

PR/Award # H323A070012

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.

Goal 1: The Georgia IHEs will increase their capacity to train and support special education and general education teacher candidates in the area of SBR reading interventions (Secondary Struggling Readers and the Strategic Instruction Model or SIM) as well as identified effective math interventions for students with disabilities by including these interventions in their coursework.

Goal 2: The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of school will be reduced by 50% through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavior interventions.

Objective 1.5: The Georgia IHEs will increase their capacity to train and support special education and general education teacher candidates in the area of SBR reading interventions (Secondary Struggling Readers and the Strategic Instruction Model or SIM) as well as identified effective math interventions for students with disabilities by including these interventions in their coursework.

Objective 2.2: The IHEs will increase their capacity to train and support special education teacher graduates in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies for students with disabilities by including information in their courses about research implementation and impact.

1/3 a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of IHE staff reporting increased knowledge of SBR reading and math interventions and/or effective dropout prevention strategies for students with disabilities as a result of receiving training satisfaction through bi-annual university forums.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	100%	NA	/	NA

1/2..b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of IHEs that report infusion of SBR reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention programs/strategies for students with disabilities into their teacher and administrator pre-service training.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	100%	NA	/	NA

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

L/2.1.a – IHE Satisfaction with Training In SBR Reading, Math, and Dropout Prevention Programs/Strategies

The 2008 Georgia Teacher of the year was hired as a co-funded recruitment, retention staff person at the GaDOE, between the SPDG and the Division of Teacher Quality. A steering committee met four times during Year 2 to assist Ms. Jennette in the planning of the first University Forum to be held in fall 2009. The University Forum will involve participants from both public and private Georgia universities that offer special education teacher degrees, along with school district personnel such as special education directors, and human relations staff. Forum discussions will include the formation of IHE/school district partnerships and opportunities to improve access for those wishing to enter the field of special education.

Formal training was not offered for IHE staff during Year 2 due to reduced federal SPDG funding; however, the Elluminate sessions were available for IHE staff utilization. In addition, the IRIS Center conducted a two-day seminar for the IHEs focusing on infusing scientifically based interventions into their preservice training classes. Six of the Georgia IHEs were represented at this seminar. This Performance Measure will be reported in the Year 3 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

L/2.1.b – Infusion of SBR Reading, Math, and Dropout Prevention Strategies/Programs

This performance measure will be reported on in Year 3—following training and other activities to be carried out with increased federal SPDG funding.



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

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

PR/Award # H323A070012

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.

Goal 3: Through the implementation of effective transition strategies, there will be an increase in the number of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals.

Objective 3.1 Local Transition Specialists and district or regional Interagency Transition Councils working with Cohort schools will be trained to implement effective transition assessments; develop measurable IEP transition goals, including self determination; and implement interagency service planning for post-high school programs and services.

3.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of district-based Transition Specialists reporting increased knowledge of SBR transition training, as a result of training received.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			NA	/

3.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of IEP team members within the Cohort 1, and 2 schools, reporting satisfaction with the technical assistance and training received by Transition Specialists and Local Interagency Transition Councils.	Program Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		100%	NA	/

3.1.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of regional groups holding an informational session on the concept of a regional transition council who moved to the second phase of forming a Regional Transition Council by establishing work group and holding at least one meeting.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		7	7/7	100	4	4 / 7	57.1

3.1.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of regional transition councils that were formed and at least one meeting held.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		2	/	

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

3.1.a – Training for Local Transition Specialists

At the end of the Year 1 reporting period, a “Lunch and Learn” was held during Cohort team training aimed at providing training and support for one or two persons within each of the 17 GLRS regions designated as Transition Specialists. Because of reduced federal SPDG funding, no additional training was provided for Transition Specialists regarding scientifically based/effective transition strategies. Training will occur in Year 3 for Transition Specialists given additional SPDG federal funding.

3.1.b – Transition Technical Assistance Provided for IEP Teams

SPDG activities related to this Performance Measure were not carried out during Year 2 due to reduced federal SPDG funding, but will be implemented during Years 3-5.

Although not related directly to this Performance Measure, the Parent to Parent of Georgia provided training for parents in IEP development and writing measurable IEP goals.

3.1.c – Formation of Regional Transition Councils

During Year 2, seven information sessions were held in five areas of the state. These meetings included: Cordele (Albany Area), Macon (2 meetings), Cleveland, Lenox (2 meetings), and Claxton, and Hinesville. The focus of these Transition Council Information Sessions was to discuss the concept of a regional transition council. Individuals attending the information sessions were considered decision makers including special education directors, teachers, agency representatives, parents, and individuals with disabilities. If the decision makers/session participants agreed to endorse the concept of a regional transition council, individuals were nominated to form a work group.

In the next phase, work groups were formed in Claxton (9 counties and 10 school systems) with 13 members; Cleveland (11 counties, 11 school systems) with 13 members; Lenox (10 counties, 11 school systems) with 10 members; and Hinesville (8 counties, 8 school systems) with 18 members.

Three of the GLRS regions already had pre-existing Regional Transition councils prior to the beginning of Year 2 of the SPDG. Two Regional Transition Councils were formed by the end of the Year 2 reporting period and are functioning independently. The Southwest Georgia work group accepted the applications of 34 individuals to become members of the Southwest Georgia Regional Transition Council. The Council members represent: individuals with disabilities, families of individuals with disabilities, employers, agency representatives and educators geographically distributed across the 14 county (16 school systems) southwest Georgia region. The new Council held its first meeting on Tuesday, February 24, 2009 at Southwest GLRS in Albany Georgia. Officers were elected and future meeting dates were set.

The Middle Georgia work group accepted the applications of 32 individuals to become members of the Middle Georgia Regional Transition Council. The Council members represent: individuals with disabilities, families of individuals with disabilities, employers, agency representatives and educators geographically distributed across the 11 county Middle Georgia region. The Council held its first meeting on March 4, 2009 at Macon State College. Officers will be elected at the second meeting of this group. Future meeting dates were set. An interim goal is to have these four Regional Transition Councils in place by fall 2009. The long-range goal is to have Regional Transition Councils in all GLRS regions where there is an interest—conceivably eight additional councils for a total of 17 councils.

The members of the middle Georgia and southwest Georgia work groups were offered the opportunity to evaluate their process at the last meeting of their respective work groups. Seven members of the middle Georgia work group returned completed evaluations. Overall, the process was rated at 4.46 on a 5-point scale. Nine members of the southwest Georgia work group completed and returned evaluations. Overall, the process was rated at 4.99 on a 5-point scale.



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

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

PR/Award #H323A070012

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.

Goal 3: Through the implementation of effective transition strategies, there will be an increase in the number of students with disabilities achieving their IEP transition goals.

Objective 3.2: Ninety percent of the Cohort schools will use effective transition assessments; develop transition plans with measurable goals, including self-determination, aligned with the student's course of study in math and English/language arts, and implement student transition goals using proven strategies

3.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of the Cohort high schools and their feeder middle schools identified as having model transition practices.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		No Target Set	1	/

3.2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
When followed up, number or percent of special education graduates who report that their postsecondary goals have been dropped, met, or are in the process of being met.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			NA in Year 2	/

3.2.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased rate of graduation with regular diplomas for students with	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

disabilities—Measure 2.1.c.			/		Baseline Year	/	Baseline Year
-----------------------------	--	--	---	--	---------------	---	---------------

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

3.2.a – Model Transition Practices

The best practices disseminated and training sessions provided at the Touch the Future and National Dropout Prevention Conferences were primarily based on one school, known as school number twelve, which was determined to be a model because it had the lowest drop-out rate, and second highest positive placement rate. It was also one of the leaders in the percentage of students earning a regular education diploma. This school shared some practices with the three other comparatively high performing schools, while having some unique practices. Practices from this school reported included the following:

Curricular Materials: Curricular materials include Life Centered Career Education (LCCE); Succeeding in the World of Work (AGS); Career Planning; Pace Maker (Fearon) for basic math; Creative Living (Glenco) for money management; and SRA for reading.

Instructional tools and strategies: Instructional tools and strategies include: Teaching to Georgia Performance Standards and Georgia Alternative Assessment objectives, co-teaching in general education classes, remediation for the Georgia High School Graduation Test, offerings of elective courses at an area technical college, offering driver’s education, use of business tours of potential employment sites, job fairs, post-secondary campus tours, Career Technology Instruction (CTI) classes with a CTI program, and State CTI skills competition.

Community Network: In addition to the area technical college that provided elective courses, the network includes a second technical college, juvenile justice, a client assistance program, the mental health agency, vocational rehabilitation to include Roosevelt Warm Springs Institute for Rehabilitation, and Georgia School for the Deaf.

Community Strategies: Vocational evaluations are provided through vocational rehabilitation, Work Keys Assessment that involves school system partnership with local businesses and technical colleges, enclaves which involve local businesses providing paid employment targeted to skills acquisition, vocational rehabilitation sponsored community worksites, participation in the High School High Tech program, and a Youth Leadership Forum for students interested in post-secondary education.

Follow-Up: The transition specialist continues to maintain contact with students who have transitioned for the purpose of facilitating communication with special needs coordinators at the post-secondary education campuses, with vocational rehabilitation, with the Department of Labor, and with potential employers.

3.2.b – Survey of Special Education Graduates

A survey of special education graduates was not carried out during Year 2 because of SPDG budget constraints and is not planned at this time due to lack of funding last year. It is known that parents have concerns. For example, the state's PTI (Parent to Parent of Georgia) reported that parents are concerned about students with disabilities not passing the High School Graduation Test for several reasons including peer pressure and the students' embarrassment in asking questions. Their many local activities proved successful such as one school's establishment of "The Graduation Kitchen Table" with six juniors, one senior, and one freshman to simulate test taking in a comfortable environment. Every one of these students who attended passed the graduation test and the students now look forward to post school experiences.

3.2.c – Graduation with a Regular Diploma

See Performance Measure 1/2.c – Baseline data was gathered during the Year 2 SPDG performance period. Data gathered at the end of 2009 will be reported on in the Year 3 SPDG Annual Performance Report.



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

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

PR/Award # H323A070012

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.

Goal 4: Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

Objective 4.1: Special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate will be reduced from 38% to 10%.

4.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of special education teachers, holding a non-regular special education certificate statewide.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				/		3,564	3,564 / 17,820

4.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of Cohort schools that report reductions in special education teachers with non-regular certificates as a result of strategies implemented to increase the numbers of fully certified special education teachers (e.g., coursework offered by the RESAs closer to home, tuition and professional learning stipends, and/or alternative routes to certification).	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				/		NA for Year 2	/

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

4.1.a – Special Education Teachers Holding a Non-Regular Special Education Certificate - Statewide

Of the total number of special education teachers during 2008-2009, 20% (3,564) hold a non-regular certificate.

4.1.b – Reductions of Non-Regular Certificates in Cohort Schools

This Performance Measure will be reported in the Year 3 SPDG Annual Performance Report as it is too early to determine impact.



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

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

PR/Award #H323A070012

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.

Goal 4: Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

Objective 4.2: Aggressive recruitment efforts will be implemented to place fully certified special education teachers within Georgia schools meeting Objective 4.1 targets.

4.2.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of special education teachers in Georgia who are highly qualified.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		17,169.9	17,169.9/17,169.8	100%	16,150.3	16,150.3/17,169.8	94.1

4.2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of special education teachers, receiving SPDG stipends, achieving full certification.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2	/	NA for Year 2

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

4.2.a –Highly Qualified Special Education Teachers

Following is a summary of highly qualified/not highly qualified special education teachers in Georgia during 2007-2008 (data for Year 2 will be available for the Year 3 Annual Performance Report):

Special Education Teachers – Preschool and School Age:

	Highly Qualified	Not Highly Qualified	Total
Teachers – 3-6:	758.6	22.9	781.5
Teachers – 7-21	15,391.7	996.6	16,388.3
Total Teachers	16,150.3	1,019.5	17,169.8
Percent	94.1%	5.9%	100.0%

4.2.b – Status of Special Education Teachers Receiving SPDG Stipends

This activity was cancelled during Year 2 due to reduced federal funding and is not going to be utilized for the SPDG due to availability of Title IIA funding.



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

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

PR/Award #H323A070012

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.

Goal 4: Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

Objective 4.3: The special education teacher retention rate will continue to be monitored for maintaining a 65 percent rate over five years for first-time teachers

4.3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number and percent of special education teachers, who remain teaching after the first three years of employment statewide. Note: See OSEP Measure 1.3 within Section I of this Report.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		100%		/

4.3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of schools, with high rates of non-highly qualified/non-certified special education teachers, reporting satisfaction with on-going technical assistance received.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			NA for Year 2	/

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

4.3.a –Special Education Retention

Of the total special education teachers who began teaching in 2005-2007, 17.5% left after one year (compared to 11.3% for general education); and 34.4% left after three years (compared to 25.3% for general education). Thus, 66.6% of special education teachers remained teaching in special education for 3 years. See OSEP Measure 1.3 in Section I of this Report for further analyses.

4.3.b – Technical Assistance to Schools with High Attrition Rates

At the end of the Year 1/beginning of Year 2, a jointly funded position by the GaDOE and the Division of Teacher Quality, GaDOE was filled by the 2008 Georgia Teacher of the Year, Ms. Emily Jennette. During Year 2, Ms Jennette has worked with the National Personnel Center to identify areas of the state with the largest percentage of non-highly qualified/non-certified special education teachers. In collaboration with the National Personnel Center, a meeting was held on March 22 regarding special education teacher staffing issues/recruitment and retention. All of the GLRS directors, special education directors from the three southern RESAs, the Professional Standards Commission, other agency staff, and GaDOE staff attended (60 in attendance). A number of issues were identified that prevent recruitment and retention of sufficient numbers of highly qualified special education teachers, and a number of solutions were proposed. A follow-up meeting will be held in June 2009 for the human resource directors of these districts.

Given increased SPDG federal funding, activities will be implemented in Year 3 and Year 4 to assist school districts in these areas to link or partner with IHEs offering programs/classes to achieve highly qualified status and to attain full certification in special education. These Year 3 efforts will be carried out in coordination with a Georgia Transition to Teaching grant that, if funded, will be working in three regions of the state having high poverty rates and uncertified teachers. Reporting of this Performance Measure will be included in the Year 3 or Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report.



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

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

PR/Award #H323A070012

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.

.Goal 5: Parents of preschool children within the targeted schools in Cohorts 1 and 2 will increase participation to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.

Objective 5.1 – To enhance preschool children's abilities, parents in participating schools will receive training on SBR strategies for home use to produce an effective transition to preschool. Ninety percent of the parents trained will employ their skills for one year. Fifty percent of entering preschool students will have peer level skills.

5.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of providers and technical assistance staff from early childhood partner agencies who report increased knowledge in scientifically based SBR early reading, math, and PBS strategies for families to use at home. (Aligned with OSEP 2.1)	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2		NA for Year 2

5.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of Cohort schools successfully implementing increased parent engagement, as measured by fidelity data.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2		NA for Year 2

5.1.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of young children impacted by parent involvement within Cohort schools showing knowledge and skills at entry to special education preschools programs (long-term).	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		NA for Year 2		NA for Year 2

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

5.1.a – Technical Assistance to Early Childhood Interagency Partners

The GaDOE preschool consultant continued to meet with the preschool agency partners during Year 2. The training anticipated within Objective 5.1 for early childhood providers was delayed during Year 2 because of reduced federal SPDG funding. Planning for this training was carried out during Year 2 and will be provided on early literacy for Head Start, Day Care providers, preschool teachers, and parent trainers in August, 2009.

The SPDG Parent Engagement Coordinator and Latino Outreach Coordinator provided on-going assistance to the 34 Cohort middle and high schools to encourage the implementation of scientifically based parent engagement activities.

Currently, there are parent mentors in 70 school districts. These parent mentors also provided ongoing assistance to the participating middle and high schools.

The Parent to Parent of Georgia reported on SPDG preschool activities during Year 2:

- Created a video (P2P and Me) that encourages families to reach out for support while their child is young.
- Encouraged Pilot Person Centered Planning as a tool for three-year old transitions in one community.
- Located and trained seven facilitators to conduct Communities of Practice for parents of children ages 0-5.
- Provided Hughes Spalding Transition training for low-income families having young children with autism.
- Provided a two hour session focusing on the transition process and program options for three-year-olds—*Moving Up: Transition at Three*.
- Provided two two-hour sessions focusing on school discipline process and how it relates to the IEP development.
- Provided a four-hour interactive workshop for parents of young children on writing measurable IEP goals—*Making it Count!*

5.1.b – Increased Parent Engagement

It is too early to report on this Performance Measure. It will be measured in the Year 3 SPDG Performance Reports.

5.1.c – Knowledge and Skills at Entry to Special Education Preschools

It is too early to report on this long-range Performance Measure.



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

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

PR/Award #H323A070012

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

During Year 2, due to uncertainty of future grant funding and because the SPDG received only half of the grant award, several projects had to be put on hold or were not implemented. These projects included: the early literacy activities in preschool, tuition stipends for teachers to become certified and funding for university partnership initiatives. Also during year two we were able to hire the teacher recruitment, retention specialist we had budgeted for originally in the grant and were able to share funding with another Division in GaDOE for that position as well as the Latino outreach specialist.

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

It was determined that the tuition stipends for teachers were not the best use of funding due to the limited impact of \$1000 stipends and availability of other sources for tuition. Those funds (\$17,000) will be move and used to provide stipends for IHE partnerships for participation in University forums and to facilitate integration of math and PBS interventions into coursework. Funds set aside for the GLRS region who did not participate in the Dropout Prevention Project (\$40,000) will be moved to support technology and media support as we begin in year 3 to post modules and trainings for access by schools not participating as a cohort school. The entire amount set aside for the National Dropout Prevention Center in Year 3 (105,000) is reduced to \$60,000 for year 3 as we provide more targeted assistance to cohort schools as indicated by school action plans that involve closer work with the National PBS center in south Florida, and more specific math assistance and other intervention strategies related to content. Part of those funds will be moved to continue the work of the state school completion facilitator who is based at one of the northern GLRS centers and directs the work of the Dropout Project, resources for school teams and training. Funds budgeted for struggling readers and carryover from shared positions will be used to provide \$1500 in travel funds for each collaboration coach who will need to visit more schools and cross regions to conduct trainings in Year 3.

All partnerships will continue in Year 3 with the exception of the GaDOE joint funded recruiter position. For year 3 it will not be jointly funded with the Division of Teacher Quality due to time required for SPDG position responsibilities.