Georgia State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

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

Executive Summary

The five-year Georgia 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 the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), other GaDOE Divisions and programs, other agencies, institutes of higher education (IHEs), 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 school team training and onsite assistance
- Implementation of dropout prevention strategies, transition enhancements, early literacy, and family engagement activities,
- Student achievement monitoring and fidelity of implementation/outcomes tracking.

Goals l and 2: During Year 3, Cohort l schools (18 middle schools, and 15 high schools) continued to implement scientifically- based interventions related to selected Priority Improvement Areas. These 33 Cohort 1 schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not be available until fall 2010. Many of the schools focused on ninth graders and the impact on graduation rates will not be evident until their graduation. The probes used to obtain baseline data in Year 1 were again measured to determine progress made against baseline. This analysis is included within performance measures 1/2h – 1/2k. Preliminary data indicates a decrease in school absences and course failures. During Years 1 and 2, a GLRS Collaboration Coach was assigned to each of the participating Cohort l schools to provide ongoing assistance as the schools implemented activities/initiatives related to their Action Plans. During Year 3 (for Cohort 2 schools), this support model shifted to local support being provided by School Team Leaders, with the Collaboration Coaches supporting the School Team Leaders. Monthly meetings were held between the Collaboration Coaches and School Team Leaders to monitor implementation progress toward the selected Priority Improvement Areas. To promote additional parent engagement, the Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉ) project, was piloted during Years 1-2 in two schools—Manchester High School in Meriwether county and Rutland High School in Bibb county. In Year 3, a third CAFÉ was implemented in Elbert County High School in Elbert county. All three CAFÉs have been promoting strategies to reduce dropouts and increase graduation rates. In Year 3, a liaison for Hispanic families continued to provide ongoing support to parents within both the Cohort l and Cohort 2 schools, as did local Parent Mentors. A total of 98 Goal 1 and 2 professional development trainings were held during Year 3 with 5,732 total participants. In addition to these trainings the SPDG collaboration coaches have been provided ongoing intensive professional learning in all National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) modules and delivered to team leaders in Cohort 2 schools. A website has been developed that is to be launched September 2010. It will contain all modules and products developed thus far as well as ongoing support for participants statewide.

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. A long-range goal is to have a total of 14 Regional Transition Councils in the GLRS regions. At the end of the Year 3 SPDG performance period, there were six operational Regional Transition Councils. Two Councils (i.e., SW Georgia - Albany and Middle Georgia- Macon) were formed in the first cadre. The second cadre included the following Regional Transition Councils: Three Rivers - Claxton, Georgia Mountains - Cleveland, Coastal Plains, - Lenox; and Coastal Georgia – Hinesville. The first (informational) meetings of these Councils were held in September and October 2009. Currently, there are three Regional Councils in the Work Group phase: Metro-South-Griffin, Southeast Georgia-Waycross, and West Central Georgia-Grantville. These groups will hold their first Regional Council meetings in fall 2010.

Goal 4: During Year 3, the SPDG staff have been collaborating with the National Personnel Center to identify issues in recruitment and retention of fully qualified/certified special education teachers. The National Personnel Center has also been assisting in providing training for three school districts in the development of recruitment/retention plans. The GaDOE worked with a task force during Year 3 to develop standards and a model of support for a pilot teacher induction program for special education teachers. Training will occur in August 2010. Mini grants will be issued to seven IHEs to provide technical assistance to school districts in the implementation of collaborative plans for increasing the number of certified special education teachers.

Goal 5: During Year 3, three trainings were provided on the *Get Ready to Read* early literacy program for 52 child care providers, Head Start, and regional child care providers. Pre and post-test data are being gathered and will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report.

In summary, 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 SPDG has increased the graduation rate for students with disabilities. During 2008-2009, 41.4% of students in special education graduated with a regular diploma. This compares to 32.9% during 2006-2007 and 37.7% in 2007-2008. Although academic success continues to be an area of concern for students with disabilities improvements are evident in SPDG schools. Over half of the Cohort l middle and high schools reported an increased Reading English/Language Arts achievement/RELA percentage change from baseline to 2008-2009. Twelve middle and six Cohort l schools reported an increased math achievement percentage change from baseline to 2008-2009. Prior to receiving technical assistance from the SPDG 20 of the 33 Cohort 1 schools were in needs improvement status based on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Already 5 schools have either met AYP or were eligible to come out of "Needs Improvement" status.

Helping students with disabilities stay in school and graduate requires well-qualified teachers. During 2008-2009, 91.4% of Georgia's special education teachers were highly qualified. Of the total special education teachers employed during 2010, an average of 89.0% were retained for a two-year period.

The Georgia SPDG has an overall goal of reducing dropouts and increasing the numbers of students who stay in school and receive a regular diploma. Implementation of action plans in selected Priority Improvement Areas in 33 Cohort 1 and 76 Cohort 2 middle and high schools will help meet that goal as well as the recruitment and retention of fully qualified/certified special education teachers.

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

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 Year 1 SPDG Annual Performance Report narrative. Within the GaDOE, the Divisions of Curriculum and Instructional Services (including Reading First), School Improvement, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Career, Technical, and Agricultural 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 Georgia SPDG workscope is also closely aligned with the Georgia State Performance Plan (SPP).

The SPDG activities are being carried out in coordination with the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS). The 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 in the following Priority Improvement Areas to 15 middle schools and 18 high schools in Cohort l, as well as to 20 middle schools and 56 high schools in Cohort 2, who began their work in Year 3.

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, 15 middle and 18 high schools (total of 33) within the GLRS regions were selected to participate in the SPDG improvement efforts in Cohort l. Table 1 in the Year 3 Annual Report Attachment provides a listing of these middle and high schools within 15 of the 17 GLRS regions of Georgia. Following training from the GaDOE and the NDPC-SD during Year 1, the school teams from each of the 33 middle and high schools in Cohort l engaged in significant baseline data analysis during both Years 1 and 2. Teams compiled baseline data in the following 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 Years 3-5 of the SPDG. The Year 3 SPDG Annual Report Attachment provided a summary of Priority Improvement Areas selected by the Cohort l participating middle and high schools.

The expectation was that schools participating in the selected areas of focus would show progress that would ultimately improve their graduation rate; e.g., reducing number of students with disabilities (SWD) who were absent more than 15 days, reducing suspension/discipline referrals and improving academic performance. Based on the data after a year of implementation of change strategies, 81.8% (27 out of 33 Cohort l schools) reported a decrease in the number of students absent more than 15 days. Prior to receiving technical assistance from the SPDG, 20 of the 33 schools were in needs improvement status based on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Out of the 20 schools, 25% (5 of the 20 Cohort l schools) either met AYP or were eligible to come out of "Needs Improvement" status pending another year of meeting AYP. Out of the 15 Cohort l high schools that participated in the SPDG, no school met the revised ESEA target (75%) for SWD who graduate with a general education diploma, and 13% (2 of the 15 Cohort 1 high schools) met the State's previous target of 38%.

The Cohort l schools continued their implementation efforts during Year 3. In addition, replication has occurred during Year 3 with the addition of Cohort 2, consisting of 41 school districts, 20 middle schools and 56 high schools. In order to establish a sustainable technical assistance capacity, all of the participating schools have identified a dropout prevention team with a School Team Leader. Table 3 in the Year 3 Annual Report Attachment provides a listing of Cohort 2 schools, and Table 4 contains a summary of the Priority Improvement Areas that have been chosen for implementation by the Cohort 2 schools. A total of 23 schools have selected affective as their Focus area; nine have selected behavior, one has selected academic, 32 have selected math, three have selected attendance, and three have selected student engagement.

During Years 1 and 2 of the SPDG, the SPDG Collaboration Coaches provided direct support to the participating Cohort l middle and high schools in their regions. Collaboration Coaches received NDPC-SD and SPDG staff training during Years 1 and 2 as a member of the school's teams. During the current Year 3, the GLRS Collaboration Coaches work more directly with the School Team Leaders, with the expectation that the School Team Leaders provide support to their schools in the implementation of improvement activities related to dropout prevention. Monthly meetings are held with the School Team Leaders to discuss progress being made toward the selected Priority Improvement Areas.

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.

Objective 1.1: The GaDOE will enhance its infrastructure providing coordinated resources for Cohort schools, thereby facilitating planning and implementation in all 33 Cohort 1 and all 71 Cohort 2 schools.

Objective 1.2: The math, reading specialists and other staff within the Cohort schools will increase their awareness and skills in providing scientifically- based researched (SBR) math and reading strategies for students with disabilities in the GPI by attending 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 strategies, monitoring of student achievement and use of increasingly more intense interventions within the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions**.**

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

1/2.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices (Federal Measure 1.1).	PROGRAM PROJECT			100		5,421/5,732	94.6

1/2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (Federal Performance Measure 2.1).	PROGRAM PROJECT		/	80		88/98	89.8

1/2.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of SPDG projects that have implemented personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (Federal Performance Measure 1.2).	PROGRAM PROJECT		/	80		98/98	100

½.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices; e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc. (Federal Performance Measure 2.2).	PROGRAM PROJECT		/	75		82/98	83.7

1/2.e Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percentage 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		/			33/33 – Cohort 1 76/76 – Cohort 2	100%

1/2.f Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 teachers reporting that the Struggling Reader Course training was very helpful in im-	PROJECT						

plementing interventions in their classrooms.			/				**NA for Year 3**

½.g Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of Cohort participants receiving LRE/Co-Teaching Training who reported that the ongoing support received following training was very helpful in implementing school and classroom interventions.	**PROJECT**		/				**NA for Year 3**

1/2.h Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
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 and/or School Team Leader 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**		/	**80**		/	**91.7 – Cohort l 95.8 – Cohort 2**

1/2.i Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of Cohort 1 schools reporting an increased rate of graduation with regular diplomas for students with disabilities.	**PROJECT**		/	**60**		**13/15 – All 8/15 - SWD**	**86.7 53.3**

See narrative below for ranges.

1/2.j Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of Cohort 1 high schools reporting a reduced rate (increased retention) of students with disabilities dropping out of school.	**PROJECT**		/	**60**		**7/15**	**46.7%**

See narrative below for ranges.

1/2.k Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of Cohort 1 schools reporting reduced absences of more than 15 days (increased attendance) by students with disabilities.	**PROJECT**		/	**80**		**8/15 - High 13/18 - Middle**	**63.6**

See narrative below for middle and high school breakdown and ranges.

1/2.l Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of Cohort schools reporting an increased percentage of students within Cohort schools who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in English/Language Arts.	**PROJECT**		/	**60**		**6/15 – High 12/18 - Middle**	**40.0 66.7**

1/2.m Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of Cohort 1 schools reporting an increased percentage of students who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in math.	**PROJECT**		/	**80**		**8/15 – High 11/18 - Middle**	**53.3 61.1**

See narrative below for middle and high school breakdown and ranges.

1/2.n Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools with no in-school and no out-of school suspensions.	**PROGRAM PROJECT**		/		**894* 1,133****	**894/1,382 1,133/1,382**	**64.7 82.0**

* - In-school suspensions; ** - Out-of-school suspensions

1/2.o Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	Average Days
Average number of days absent by students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools.	**PROGRAM PROJECT**		/			**8,942/1,382**	**6.5**

1/2.p Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools with no course failures.	**PROGRAM PROJECT**		/			**516/1,382**	**37.3**

1/2.q Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data

		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools. (Long-Term) (Federal Performance Measure 4.1).	**PROGRAM PROJECT**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**
			/		**NA for Year 3**		**NA for Year 3**

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

1/2.a Personnel Receiving Scientific- or Evidence-Based Professional Development
1/2.b Scientific or Evidence-Based Professional Development

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).

The Georgia training in math has incorporated research-based practices in effective math interventions. Four national advisory panels have been appointed since 1999 to provide advice and assistance on how best to teach mathematics: The National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century, National Research Council, the RAND Mathematics Study Panel, and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel. The reports emerging from each of the advisory panels explain what each expert panel concluded schools must teach and students learn in math. What these reports make clear is that mathematics teaching and learning are complex. The National Research Council refers to "mathematical proficiency" as five intertwined strands (Kilpatrick, Swafford, and Findell, 2001). Learning each of these strands is an ongoing process that builds on itself. As new concepts and skills are learned, new terms and symbols must also be learned and older skills remembered and applied.

The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel (2008) speaks clearly to the need for math curricula that fosters student success in algebra (and beyond) and experienced math teachers who use researched-based instructional strategies. The report also stresses the "mutually reinforcing benefits of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and automatic recall of facts" (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008, p. xiv). The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel Report (2008) further investigates successful mathematical teaching strategies and provides additional support for the research results.

According to these studies, four methods of instruction show the most promise. These are:

- **Systematic and explicit instruction-**a detailed instructional approach in which teachers guide students through a defined instructional sequence. Within systematic and explicit instruction students learn to regularly apply strategies that effective learners use as a fundamental part of mastering concepts.
- **Self-instruction-** through which students learn to manage their own learning with specific prompting or solution-oriented questions.
- **Peer tutoring-** an approach that involves pairing students together to learn or practice an academic task.
- **Visual representation**-uses manipulatives, pictures, number lines, and graphs of functions and relationships to teach mathematical concepts.

There is a growing body of knowledge regarding effective math instruction for students with disabilities, especially students who have been identified with a learning disability(LD). There have been five meta-analyses on the subject, reviewing a total of 183 research studies (Adams & Carnine, 2003; Baker, Gersten, and Lee, 2002; Browder, Spooner, Ahlgrim-Delzell, Harris, and Wakeman, 2008; Kroesbergen and Van Luit, 2003; Xin and Jitendra, 1999). The studies combined in these meta-analyses involved students with a variety of disabilities—most notably, LD, but other disabilities as well, including mild mental retardation, attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD), behavioral disorders, and students with significant cognitive disabilities. The meta-analyses found strong evidence of instructional approaches that appear to help students with disabilities improve their math achievement.

These and other promising directions for effective math instruction are identified by Grouws and Ceulla (2000) and 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.

The Georgia professional development in math is incorporating these and other evidence-based practices supported by research including careful progress monitoring and reinforcement of programs, the use of technology, curriculum-based interventions, and differentiated instruction.

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. 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 professional development 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.

Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE) – **http://www.bestevidence.org**

Browder, D. M., Spooner, F., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Harris, A., & Wakeman, S. Y., (2008). A meta-analysis on teaching mathematics to students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 74(4)*, 407-432.

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.

Center on Instruction – http://wwwcenteroninstruciton.org/index.cfm.

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 l: 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.

Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (Eds.). (2001). Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the National Academies Press Web site: http://www.nap.edu/catalog. php?record_id=9822

Kroesbergen, E. H., & Van Luit, J. E. H. (2003). Mathematics interventions for children with special educational needs. *Remedial and Special Education, 24(2)*, 97–114.

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 Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century. (2000). *Before it's too late: A report to the nation from the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/inits/Math/ glenn/index.html

National Mathematics Advisory Panel. (2008). *Foundations for success: The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/ mathpanel/report/final-report.pdf

National Research Council—*Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics.* http://www.nap.edu/catalog

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.

RAND Mathematics Study Panel. (2003). *Mathematical proficiency for all students: Toward a strategic research and development program in mathematics education*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the Rand Web site: http://rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/ MR1643/

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.
What Works Clearinghouse - http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/
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. & Tandrew, S. (2006). Use of a program monitoring system to enable teachers to differentiate math instruction. Manuscript in Progress.
Xin, Y. P., & Jitendra, A. K. (1999). The effect of instruction in solving mathematical word problems for students with learning problems: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Special Education, 32(4),* 207–225.

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 and 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 the 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.

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, Jou*rnal 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.

Number of Total Persons Trained (Goals l and 2): 5,732
Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instructional Practices: 5,421– 94.6%

During Year 3, the following Goal 1 and Goal 2 trainings/professional development sessions were carried out:

1. Four scientifically based math content trainings – 118 Participants
2. Eleven Math in the Fast Lane trainings – 297 Participants
3. Twenty-one LRE and Co-Teaching trainings – 945 Participants

4. Three Co-Teaching for Secondary Schools trainings – 146 Participants
5. Six Slants/Lincs Reading Strategy Trainings – 180 Participants
6. Six Behavior Consortia Trainings –77 Participants
7. Six follow-up RTI for Behavior: Using Data Based Decision Making Sessions - 177 Participants
8. One Graduate First SPDG Teams Conference – 300 Participants
9. Three School Engagement/Affective Trainings – 312 Participants
10. Twenty-eight Parent Engagement Sessions/Trainings – 3,001 Participants
11. Nine Struggling Readers Training – 179 Participants

Total Goal 1 and Goal 2 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 98
Number and Percentage of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence-Based Practices: 98– 89.8 Percent

1/2.c Alignment of Professional Development with State Performance Plan (SPP)and Annual Performance Report (APR)

Alignment is as follows: SPDG Goals 1 and 2 align with: Goals 1, and 3 of the DOE Strategic Plan Goals which are 1. Increase high school graduation rate, decrease dropout rate, and increase postsecondary enrollment rate and Goal 3. Improve workforce readiness skills. These align with SPP Indicator 2 (Decrease the percent of students with disabilities who dropout of school); SPP Indicator 1 (Increase the percent of students with disabilities who earn a regular high school diploma); SPP Indicator 14 (Increase the percent of students with disabilities who transition to employment or post-secondary education); and SPP Indicator 13 (Increase the percent of transition aged students with disabilities who have measurable IEP goals and transition services that will lead to attainment of post-secondary goals). SPDG Goal 5 will impact DOE Strategic Plan Goal 5 which is to improve the SAT, ACT, and the achievement scores of Georgia students.

SPP Indicators	SPDG Goal 1	SPDG Goal 2	Comments:
1	**X**	**X**	The APR reports on the development and implementation of Transition Plans to help students with disabilities achieve post-secondary goals. SPDG Goals l, 2, and 3 activities will assist in the implementation of effective transition, reduction of dropout rates, and increase the number of 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 collaboration 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. 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.

			SPDG Cohort l and Cohort 2 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. 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. The Georgia APR reports the services of the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) in 17 regions throughout Georgia to lead and support school systems in the above areas. The GLRS is an integral support system for the SPDG in supporting Cohort participating schools.These schools have been receiving training during Years 1, 2, and 3 from the NDPC-SD and GaDOE staff, have selected priority areas for improvement and are implementing scientifically based strategies in those areas. As reported in the Georgia APR, the expectation was that schools participating in the selected focus areas (e.g., reducing number of SWD who were absent more than 15 days, reducing suspension/discipline referrals and improving academic performance) would show progress that would ultimately improve their graduation rate. Based on the project's data, 63.6% (21 out of 33 schools) reported a decrease in the number of students absent more than 15 days. Prior to receiving technical assistance from the SPDG, 20 of the 33 schools were in needs improvement status based on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Out of the 20 schools, 25% (5 of the 20 schools) either met AYP or were eligible to come out of "Needs Improvement" status pending another year of meeting AYP. Out of the 15 high schools that participated in the SPDG, no school met the revised ESEA target (75%) for SWD who graduate with a general education diploma, and 13% (2 of the 15 high schools) met the State's previous target of 38%. The Georgia APR reported that 20% (3 of the 15 Cohort 1 high schools) met the target, and 33% of the schools showed a decrease in their dropout rate. During Year 3, the GLRS Collaboration Coaches have been working with the School Team Leaders to provide support to the schools. All Cohort 2 schools have selected their Improvement Focus areas and are implementing scientifically based interventions, with the support of the SDDG and GLRS staff as well as School Team Leaders.
2	**X**	**X**	" " " " "
3	**X**	**X**	" " " " "

4	**X**	**X**	" " " " "
5	**X**	**X**	" " " " "
8	**X**	**X**	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). The PLC has developed training, and supported Navigation teams in local communities to increase the availability of information on supports and services to families. The Georgia APR supports the use of a "CAFÉ." (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 CAFÉs surrounding local issues to encourage collaboration between educators, community members and parents. The SPDG has implemented CAFÉs in 3 high schools as of the end of Year 3 and is encouraging increased family support and engagement within the SPDG participating Cohort schools. 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 1-3, this liaison continued to provide invaluable 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.
12			During Year 2, the SPDG Parent Engagement Coordinator worked with the SPDG Cohort 1 schools in the implementation of parent engagement strategies. During Year 3 of the SPDG, The Parent Engagement Coordinator has also worked with the Cohort 2 schools, as has the SPDG Hispanic Liaison.

Total Goal 1 and Goal 2 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 98
Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8: 98– 100%

1/2.d Professional Development Sustained by On-Going and Comprehensive Practices

Follow-up for Sustainability:

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

- During Year 3, each of the 15 middle school and 18 high schools in Cohort 1 had a trained Collaboration Coach to provide limited ongoing support and assistance. These Collaboration Coaches provided planned, systematic follow-up support for the middle and high school teams with limited contacts and webinars via Elluminate trainings. During Year 3, all of the 33 Cohort l schools and the 76 Cohort 2 schools (20 middle schools and 56 high schools) have designated a School Team Leader to provide assistance within the schools. The Collaboration Coaches have met at least monthly with the team leaders to discuss progress being made with their dropout prevention improvement activities related to selected Improvement Focus Areas. Other on-going follow-up training and technical assistance have been provided by the Collaboration Coaches for the School Team Leaders, based on need and request.
- Quarterly Coaches' Trainings were held with support from the coach trainer between meetings with informal email follow-up or visits as needed. In addition regular Coaches newsletters are provided. The SPDG Design team meets monthly to review the feedback and reports received from coaches and makes adjustments in the project on an ongoing basis.
- Support and assistance to Cohort l and Cohort 2 middle and high schools has continued to be provided by the SPDG Latino Outreach Specialist and the Parent Enhancement Coordinator.
- Elluminate sessions were held during Year 3 that were 'next session-sequenced"; that is, each session had a follow-up support session.
- CAFÉ follow-up included developing resource materials, reviewing materials and plans, on-going meetings, ongoing technical assistance and/or consulting, and follow-up reports.
- During Year 3, six meetings were in the Cohort l and Cohort 2 schools that have behavior consortia for the purpose of following up training on RTI and behavior to support the implementation of effective strategies. A total of 153 team members from Cohort l and Cohort 2 participated in these meetings. The behavior consortia meetings will continue to be held regionally on a quarterly basis in Year 4 of the SPDG.
- Although not a formal, comprehensive follow-up strategy, sixteen presentations/trainings were made at regional, state and/or national conferences during Year 3 that had informal email/telephone follow-up, upon request.

Total Goal 1 and Goal 2 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 98
Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: 82– 83.7%

1/2.e – 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 in Cohort l for the selected Priority Improvement Areas, as summarized in Table 3 found in the Year 3 Annual Report Attachment. Table 4 in the Year 3 Annual Report Attachment provides a summary of selected Priority Improvement Areas for the 76 participating middle and high schools in Cohort 2. GLRS Collaboration Coaches supported the implementation of these action plans through on-site technical assistance and training within the Cohort schools during Years 1 and 2. The National Dropout Prevention Center and the GaDOE staff also provided back-up assistance to the Collaboration Coaches and the school-level teams. During Year 3, the School Dropout Prevention Team Leaders have provided support to their school teams, as well as backup support from the Collaboration Coaches.

A Collaboration Coaches' Website link was established within the SPDG website for reporting ongoing action plan implementation and to log activities for each of the participating schools during Year 1 and 2. For Year 3 a new coaches' log website at pioneeresa.org was utilized to more

quickly note the work being done. The Collaboration Coaches Website documents the progress being made and shares strategies being used across GLRS regions.

The Collaboration Coaches met monthly with the School Leadership Team Leader during Year 3 to discuss the status of the school's implementation of plans related to selected Priority Improvement Areas aimed at reducing dropout and increasing graduation of students with disabilities and other special needs. These monthly meetings covered discussions and training in many content areas including data gathering for SPDG probes, data analysis, follow-up technical assistance to previous trainings such as school and student engagement, math strategies, archived Elluminate sessions, GraduateFIRST Progress Assessment Tool, action plan implementation/progress with challenges and successes, affective engagement, sharing Action Plans with school faculty, individual action plan conferences, and behavior incentives.

Fidelity of plan implementation and implementation impact being made by the Cohort 1 schools continues to be measured through probe data—see performance measure 1/2g to 1/2k. During Year 3, a GraduateFIRST Progress Assessment Tool was developed and utilized to gather ongoing performance/fidelity data for targeted students on three variables in the Cohort 2 schools: discipline actions, attendance, and course failures. These are reported in performance measures 1/2.n, 1/2.o, and 1/2.p below.

In an end-of year survey, (described in performance measure 1/2h below), 91.7% of the Cohort 1 school team respondents and 82.6% of the Cohort 2 school respondents 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 from Cohort l survey respondents regarding the impact of the dropout prevention strategies/programs implemented during the school year: fewer repeat absences, improved grades/student achievement, less absenteeism, decreased discipline problems, more focused dropout prevention strategies, increased numbers passing state assessments, and improved school culture. Given that the Cohort 2 schools were just beginning their implementation stage, positive outcomes were more limited, but included improved benchmark scores, improved student achievement, and more understanding of effective reading and math interventions.

1/2.f – Participant Feedback from Struggling Reader Training

The Struggling Readers Course is a scientifically- based reading researched program that has identified four essential components of effective reading instruction for secondary students. Training was provided during Year 3 for 23 participants in Cleveland in the north region, 33 in Macon in the middle region, and eight participants in Albany in the south region. Participants learned how to systematically and explicitly implement instructional lessons that reflect best teaching practices and that target student learning needs in the four essential components of effective reading instruction. Participants also learned how to monitor and assess student progress.

1/2.g – Satisfaction on On-going Support in LRE/Co-Teaching

During Year 3, support in LRE was provided by the SPDG to Cohort 1 (Henry County and Gwinnett County) and Cohort 2 systems (Marietta City and Elbert County). LRE coaches worked with school leadership teams to assist them in enhancing their school's use of co-teaching as a strategy to promote appropriate LRE services to students with disabilities. Leadership teams used two researched-based strategies, coaching and

professional learning communities, to promote effective use of co-teaching as a strategy to support students with disabilities in the general classroom.

1/2.h – Satisfaction with Support Received from School Team Leaders and Collaboration Coaches

The Collaboration Coaches continue to be a critical component in the Georgia SPDG improvement efforts. A Collaboration Coach has been assigned to each of the Cohort l participating schools and provides ongoing assistance to these participating schools as they implement activities/initiatives related to their Improvement Priority Areas. In the replication phase to Cohort 2, the Collaboration Coaches began to work closely with the School Team Leaders meeting with them monthly and providing ongoing support, training, and technical assistance.

An end-of the year electronic survey was administered to all of the Cohort l school team members as well as to all of the Cohort 2 school team members. Electronic surveys were sent to 51 school team members in Cohort l and 134 school team members in Cohort 2. Response rates were 27.5% in Cohort 1 and 20.9% in Cohort 2. Following is the feedback received for Cohort l and Cohort 2 team respondents. This data needs to be considered in light of a low response rate, despite three waves/attempts to obtain feedback.

Cohort 1:

Type of Training Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:
Coaching – Average of 83.3%
Training – Average of 33.3%
Observation – Average of 50.0%

An additional five respondents (16.7%) reported other types of assistance including data analysis, assistance with interpreting data gathered, and email/telephone advice.

Cohort 2:

Type of Training Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:
Coaching – Average of 87.5%
Training – Average of 79.2%
Observation – Average of 20.8%

An additional four respondents (16.7%) reported other types of assistance including on-site meeting/technical assistance and telephone/email support.

Following is a summary of the satisfaction feedback received by Cohort l and Cohort 2 respondents regarding the assistance and support received by the Dropout Prevention Team Leaders and/or the Collaboration Coach:

Cohort l:

Satisfaction with Assistance Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:
Very Helpful – Average of 41.7%
Helpful – Average of 50.0%
Uncertain – Average of 8.3%
Not Helpful –Average of 0%
Definitely Not Helpful – Average of 0%

Cohort 2:

Satisfaction with Assistance Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:
Very Helpful – Average of 70.8%
Helpful – Average of 25.0%
Uncertain – Average of 0.%
Not Helpful –Average of 4.2%
Definitely Not Helpful – Average of 0%

1/2.i – Graduation with a Regular Diploma by Students with and without Disabilities in Cohort l Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09

Table 4 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of changes in graduation rates for all students from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 15 Cohort l participating high schools. As can be seen by this data, 13 Cohort l high schools reported an increased graduation percent change from baseline to 2008-2009 for all students, ranging from +.71% change at North Gwinett High School to +48.95% change in Lucey Laney High School. Of the total Cohort l high schools, two reported a decreased graduation rate percent change for all students from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from –2.63% change in Douglass High School to –3.61% in Bainbridge High School.

For students with disabilities, eight Cohort l high schools reported an increased graduation percent change for students with disabilities from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +7.59% change in Liberty County High School to +105.43% change in LaFayette High School. It should be noted, that the participating Cohort l high schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (essentially Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not available until fall 2010 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

1/2.j – Decreased Dropout Rate in Cohort l High Schools for Students with Disabilities – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09

Table 5 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of dropout rate changes for students with disabilities from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 15 Cohort l participating high schools. As can be seen by this

data, seven Cohort 1 high schools reported an increased retention rate change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +.20% change in Liberty County High School to +45.93% change in Cook High School. Of the total Cohort l high schools, eight reported a decreased retention rate from baseline to 2008-2009. It should be noted, that the participating Cohort l high schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (essentially Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not available until fall 2010 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

1/2.k – Attendance Rates (More Than 15 Days absent) by Students with Disabilities in Cohort l Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2008-09

Table 6 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of attendance rate changes for students with disabilities from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 15 Cohort l participating high schools. As can be seen by this data, eight Cohort l high schools reported an increased attendance rate (fewer absentees for more than 15 days) change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +12.12% change in Rutland High School to +87.90% change in Murray County High School. Of the total Cohort l high schools, seven reported a decreased attendance rate change from baseline to 2008-2009.

Table 6 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of attendance rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 18 Cohort l participating middle schools. As can be seen by this data, 13 Cohort l middle schools reported an increased attendance rate (fewer absentees for more than 15 days) change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +13.79% change in Double Churches Middle School to 70.19% change in LaFayette Middle School. Of the total Cohort l middle schools, five reported a decreased attendance rate change from baseline to 2008-2009.

It should be noted, that both participating Cohort l middle and high schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (essentially Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not be available until fall 2010 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

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 j and 1/1k report on the percentage gain of students with disabilities meeting or exceeded these standards from baseline to 2008-2009. Baseline is reported as the average score during 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08.

1/2.l – Standards in Reading/English/Language Arts in Cohort l Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09

Table 7 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement percent changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 15 Cohort l participating high schools. As can be seen by this data, six Cohort l high schools reported an increased English/Language Arts achievement/RELA change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +3.31% change in Jordan High School to +40.24% change in Baldwin High School. Of the total Cohort l high schools, eight reported a decreased English/Language Arts achievement – R/ELA change from baseline to 2008-2009.

Table 7 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 18 Cohort l participating middle schools. As can be seen by this data, 12 Cohort l middle schools reported an increased English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +2.68% change in Rutland Middle School to +33.70% change in West Brainbridge Middle School. Of the total Cohort l middle schools, six reported a decreased English/Language Arts achievement rate change from baseline to 2008-2009.

It should be noted, that both participating Cohort l middle and high schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (essentially Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not available until fall 2010 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

1/2.m – Standards in Math in Cohort l Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09

Table 8 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 15 Cohort l participating high schools. As can be seen by this data, eight Cohort l high schools reported an increased math achievement percent change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +6.54% change in North Gwinnett High School to +143.43% change in Baldwin High School. Of the total Cohort l high schools, six reported a decreased math achievement rate percent change from baseline to 2008-2009.

Table 8 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment also provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 18 Cohort l participating middle schools. As can be seen by this data, 11 Cohort l middle schools reported an increased math achievement percent change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +4.44 in Liberty Middle School to +232.20% change in Harper-Archer Middle School. Of the 18 total Cohort l middle schools, seven reported a decreased math achievement rate percent change from baseline to 2008-2009.

It should be noted, that both participating Cohort l middle and high schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 school year (essentially Year 2 of the SPDG). The 2009-2010 data that will reflect the impact during Year 3 will not available until fall 2010 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

1/2.n – Discipline Actions in Cohort 2 Schools

During Year 3, a Progress Assessment Tool was developed and utilized to gather ongoing performance data on discipline actions in the Cohort 2 schools. Data is available for this Report for the first 18 weeks of school, 2009-2010. During this period, 894 or 64.7% of the students in grades 5-12 (888 of the total 1,382 students were those with disabilities) had no in-school suspensions. Of the total students, 1,133 or 82.0% had no out-of school suspensions.

This compares to 480 or 71.0% of the total 676 students in Cohort 1 (504 of the total students had disabilities) who had no in-school suspensions and 582 or 83.3% who had no out-of-school suspensions. Cohort l is in the second year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies.

1/2.o – Attendance Rate for Cohort 2 Schools

During Year 3, a Progress Assessment Tool was developed and utilized to gather ongoing performance data on attendance rate in the Cohort 2 schools. Data is available for this Report for the first 18 weeks of school, 2009-2010. During this period, the students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools had an average of 6.5 days of school absence. This compares to 5.8 for Cohort 1 schools who are in the second year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies.

1/2.p – Course Failures in Cohort 2 Schools

During Year 3, a Progress Assessment Tool was developed and utilized to gather ongoing performance data on course failures in the Cohort 2 schools. Data is available for this Report for the first 18 weeks of school, 2009-2010. During this period, 37.3% (516/1,382) of the students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools had no course failures. This compares to 61.5% for Cohort 1 schools who are in the second year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies.

1/2.q Replication of Scientific- or Evidence-Based Practices

The Georgia SPDG has replicated implementation of dropout prevention/school improvement activities into 41 additional school districts, 56 high schools, and 20 middle schools; however, it is too early to report long-term replication. Replication data will be included in later SPDG Annual Performance Reports.

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 Cohort schools to enhance positive student outcomes for all students with disabilities.

1.4.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of Cohort schools forming a Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉ) and having at least two CAFÉ. dialogue meetings.	**PROJECT**	**2**	**/**	**100%**	**3**	**3/3**	**100%**

1.4.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of the CAFÉ teams within Cohort schools reporting changed school practices as a result of CAFÉ work.	**PROJECT**		**/**		**See Narrative**	**/**	**See Narrative**

1.4.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of school systems whose middle and high schools are participating in Cohort 1 of the SPDG reporting parent mentors providing support to parents.	**PROJECT**					**12/15 – Cohort l** **22/40 – Cohort 2**	**80.9- Cohort l** **55.5% - Cohort 2**

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

1.4.a – Formation of Circles of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉs)
1.4.b – Changed Practices Resulting from CAFÉ work

A CAFÉ (Circle of Adults Focusing on Education) is a method or a process of collaborative team problem solving on the local/community level to improve student achievement. A CAFÉ is a family/educator/community team that integrates educator know-how, parent/family real experiences, and community experience and resources. The CAFÉ 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. CAFÉ dialogue meetings are typically two hours.

During Year 2, SPDG staff supported the implementation of pilot CAFÉs in two schools/counties—Manchester High School (Meriwether County) and Rutland High School (Bibb County). The goal of these two CAFÉ's is to create short-term and long-term solutions to engage families in ensuring that students graduate with a general education diploma. These two CAFÉ continued their work during Year 3.

A new CAFÉ was initiated during Year 3 in Elbert High School, Elbert County Schools. All three CAFÉs continued to use the DIALOGUES that were created utilizing the IDEA Partnership's Dialogue Guide Facilitator's Handbook, published by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education to facilitate CAFÉ meetings. Participants in the new CAFÉ included parents, school personnel, and community members. Meetings included presentation/discussions regarding research articles/materials prepared by the National Dropout Prevention Center, as well as a review/discussion of baseline data from Performance Assessment data gathered by the Cohort 2 schools.

The goal of the CAFÉs in Manchester and Rutland was to create short-term and long-term solutions to engage families in ensuring that students graduate with a general education diploma. As a result of CAFÉ work in Manchester a new PTA chapter was formed in the high school with 125 who signed up to participate. In addition 42 church members, who have passed background checks, now go into the high school every Friday to work with students in the 9th grade advisories on self determination and other issues. A new PTA was also established in the Rutland High School as a result of CAFÉ work. For strategic CAFÉ work, the school counselor and ninth grade academy coach worked on creating a large computer generated map of the Rutland High School neighborhoods/feeder zones. A student survey was conducted with school approval to help the CAFÉ

understand the main issues facing Rutland students. This data is being tabulated and will help structure some of the CAFÉ work in the future. The CAFÉ looked into other issues including tutoring opportunities for the students and needed transportation to allow the students to participate. The Macedonia Church now allows the high school students to utilize space and computers in their new Challenge Center facility. They are also looking into strategies to eliminate transportation roadblocks for the students and additional tutoring opportunities. A Title l Parent Involvement Coordinator was hired as a home/school facilitator due to the CAFÉ work.

A Collaboration Coach has been assigned to assist the new CAFÉ in Elbert High School. The first CAFÉ meeting was held on March 29, 2010—at the end of the Year 3 reporting period. As with the other CAFÉs, the overall goal of the new CAFÉ in Elbert High School is to implement community/home/school strategies that will increase graduation of the students and reduce dropout rates. Additional information regarding the planning, work, and impact of the CAFÉ work in Elbert High School will be included in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report.

The CAFEs in all three sites are collaborating with the local Parent Involvement Coordinators from Title l and Resource Coordinators in PreK to create consistent data and planning from early intervention through graduation.

1.4.c – Parent Mentor Support for Families

The Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership is now celebrating its seventh 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 80 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 Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership meets 2-3 times a year statewide and four times regionally.

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.

As of Year 3, there are 12 of the 15 school districts (80.9%) with parent mentors participating in Cohort 1 and 22 of the 40 school districts (55.5%) participating in Cohort 2 with parent mentors working with school-based teams to increase parent engagement as a critical component of dropout prevention and student achievement.

The SPDG supported Hispanic liaison participated in a number of activities designed to provide mentoring and training support for parents. These activities included training/information presentations, participating in ESOL and special education state monitoring, phone calls, on-site meetings, as well as development and dissemination of videos and other information. During the period March 2009 to March 2010, over 1,625 parents participated in these activities (individuals may have participated in more than one activity).

Georgia's Parent to Parent of Georgia (P2P) also carried out a number of activities during Year 3 to support parent mentoring and support. These activities included collaboration with state and local Parent Mentors and training at the Parent Mentor Conference in October 2009. The P2P organization has also developed an ENCORE! Program, which is a module-based training series for youth in middle and high school aimed at developing self-advocacy skills for high school survival. Transition to Adulthood Training was also provided during the Year 3 performance period. Facilitated Dialogue sessions on the Transition to Adulthood were also provided for Navigator Teams.

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: Students with disabilities and other students at risk for school failure will have effective transition in school and from school to post school outcomes.

Objective 3.1 Regional Interagency Transition Councils will work with Cohort schools to implement effective transition for students with disabilities and other students who are at risk for school failure.

3.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Increased number of operational Regional Interagency Transition Councils.	PROJECT	14			6	6/14	42.9

3.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of Regional Interagency Transition Councils that report positive transition outcomes in the schools that they serve as a result of their work.	PROJECT		/		6	/	Data not Available until Spring 2010

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

3.1.a – Formation of Regional Transition Councils

A long-range goal is to have a total of 14 Regional Transition Councils in the GLRS regions. At the end of the Year 3 SPDG performance period there were six operational Regional Transition Councils. Two Councils (i.e., SW Georgia - Albany and Middle Georgia- Macon) were formed in

the first cadre. The first (informational) meetings of these Councils were held in January and February of 2009. The second cadre included the formation of the following Regional Transition Councils: Three Rivers - Claxton, Georgia Mountains - Cleveland, Coastal Plains - Lenox; and Coastal Georgia – Hinesville. The first (informational) meetings of these Councils were held in September and October 2009. Currently, there are three Regional Councils in the Work Group phase: Metro-South-Griffin, Southeast Georgia-Waycross, and West Central Georgia-Grantville. These groups are likely to hold their first Regional Transition Council meetings in fall 2010. The average number of participants at each of the information and work group meetings was ten. An average of 60 participants attended each of the Regional Transition Council meetings.

The SPDG coordinator of Goal 3 participated in 51 meetings during the Year 3 performance period (April 2009 – April 2010) to provide assistance and support in the formation and operation of Regional Council meetings and Work Groups.

3.1.b – Positive transition outcomes as a Result of the Work of Regional Transition Councils

The six operational Regional Transition Councils are newly formed. Site visits for the purpose of gathering information regarding positive outcomes as a result of work carried out by the Regional Transition Councils will be conducted as councils reach the one-year anniversary of their formation. Site visits to two Regional Transition Councils will be conducted in spring 2010, and site visits to four Councils will be conducted in fall, 2010. Since this information will be available after the end of the Year 3 SPDG performance period, positive impacts/outcomes will be included in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report.

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					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percent of special education teachers, holding a non-regular special education certificate statewide.	**PROJECT**		/		**3,564**	**3,564 /17,820**	**20%**

.

4.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
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.	**PROJECT**		/		**NA for Year 3**	/	**NA for Year 3**

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) held a non-regular certificate.

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

This Performance Measure will be reported in the Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report as it is too early to determine impact of decreasing the numbers of special education teachers with non-regular certificates.

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					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number or percent of special education teachers in Georgia who are highly qualified.	**PROJECT**					**16,073.90/17,586.10**	**91.4**

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

4.2.a –Highly Qualified Special Education Teachers

During 2007-08, 94.1% of the special education teachers were highly qualified. This compares to 91.4% for 2008-09—see below.

2008-09 Special Education Teachers – Preschool and School Age:

	Highly Qualified	Not Highly Qualified	Total
Teachers – 3-6:	800.1	10.6	810.7
Teachers – 7-21	15,273.8	1,501.6	16,775.4
Total Teachers	16,073.90	1,512.2	17,586.1
Percent	**91.4%**	**8.6%**	**100.0%**

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					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Statewide for 2009, the percent of all highly qualified novice special education teachers, who remain teaching two years beyond their initial employment (Federal Performance Measure 3.1).	PROGRAM PROJECT		/	100		/	89.02

4.3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of school districts developing and implementing recruitment/retention plans by five participating school districts, including a pilot induction program.	PROJECT		/		5 See Narrative Below for Progress	/	

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

4.3.a – Special Education Retention

In 2010, 12.0% of all special education teachers turned over from the previous school year, compared to 8.2% for general education. Figure 1 in the Annual Report attachment shows the special education and general education teacher attrition trend over the past seven years. Georgia follows the percentage of special and general education teachers who have been retained for one, three, and five years (see Figure 2). The federal perfor-

mance measure has changed during the current year to that of the percentage of special education teachers retained two years beyond their initial employment and who are also highly qualified in the area in which they teach.

As displayed in Figure 3 of the Annual Report Attachment, following is a summary of two-year retention rates for the last four time periods:

Ending in 2009, there was a retention rate of 89.02%
Ending in 2008, there was a retention rate of 95.56%
Ending in 2007, there was a retention rate of 92.10%
Ending in 2006, there was a retention rate of 78.54%

As can be seen by this information, the retention rate has increased for 2006 until the present time. The small downward fluctuation in 2009 may be in part attributed to the economic stress that LEAs were under, requiring them to reduce staff to meet budgetary requirements.

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

In collaboration with the NASDSE's National Personnel Center, a meeting was held on March 22, 2009 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 were preventing recruitment and retention of sufficient numbers of highly qualified special education teachers. As a result, a number of solutions were proposed. A follow-up meeting was held with the Human Resource Directors of three southern RESA/GLRS districts in June 2009 regarding teacher recruitment retention issues in their school districts.

To assist in meeting the needs of local school districts, SPDG staff collaborated with the National Personnel Center to support three school districts in developing recruitment/retention plans. The three school districts attended training provided by the National Personnel Center on September 3-October 1, 2010. They also received follow-up technical assistance from the National Personnel Center, including a Teacher Induction Academy conducted by the New Teacher Center (NTC) Santa Cruz on March 15-17, 2010.

The GaDOE is developing a pilot teacher induction program for new special education teachers to be implemented in the 2010-2011 school year (Year 4 of the SPDG). During Year 3, a task force composed of Georgia educators and other stakeholders has been meeting to review other states' (as well as international) teacher induction models. Draft standards were created and a model of support was created. It is anticipated that training will begin in August 2010 (Year 4 of the SPDG) for selected school mentors, administrators, GLRS staff and university partners in three regions of the state. Additional support and training will continue throughout the school year.

A Special Education University Forum was held on September 30-October 1, 2009 at Jekyll Island, Georgia. This was a partnership effort between GaDOE's Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) and the Georgia Board of Regents. Universities were invited to send teams to include their special education chair, dean, local special education directors of school districts in their catchment area, and the Georgia Learning Resource System Director in their Region. At the Forum, teams had an opportunity to

work together and develop regional and local plans for implementation that are aimed at increasing the number of certified special education teachers.

As a follow-up to and to continue the work of the Forum, those teams who developed plans could then apply for small mini-grants to provide support to the school teams in the implementation of their recruitment and retention plans. Of the 12 universities (70 participants) who attended, seven submitted applications. These mini-grants are in the process of being awarded. Initial activities will begin in May 2010 and will be reported as a part of the Year 4 SPDG performance period.

The Divisions of Special Education Services and Supports at DOE is collaborating with Board of Regents to work with these universities. It is anticipated that another Collaborative University Forum will be held in the Fall 2010 to review the progress being made in this collaborative effort between universities and school districts.

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 – Preschoolers who are at risk and/or have a disability will increase their literacy skills as a result of participation in the Get Ready to Read Program.

5.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Percentage of Head Start, day care, and other early intervention programs participants reporting a four on a four-point rating scale that the *Get Ready to Read* training met their needs regarding ways to use the screening and learning activities.	**PROJECT**		/		**9/9**		**100%**

5.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Increased literacy skills of young children served by GA child care providers, Head Start, and regional providers, as measured by pre/post data within the *Get Ready to Read* Program.	**PROJECT**		/		**NA for Year 3**		**NA for Year 3**

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

5.1.a – Participant Satisfaction with the Get Ready to Read Training

On March 15, 2010, nine Head Start, day care, and other early intervention program staff attended a training on implementation of the *Get Ready to Read (GRTR)* early literacy program. All (100%) reported that the training met their needs regarding ways to use the screening and learning activities. This training was well received. All (100%) of the participants rated the skills of the trainer as excellent and felt that the workshop had a

very good level of engagement. They also reported that they had a very good understanding of the material and the ability to use the material. All (100%) expressed very good commitment for GRTR screening and a very good overall satisfaction with the training.

5.1.b –Increased Literacy Skills of Preschool Children

During Year 3, the SPDG staff focused on initiating the *Get Ready to Read* collaborative efforts with Bright from the Start/GA Division for Early Care and Learning. Trainings were held on November 17, 2009, December 10, 2009, and March 15, 2010. A total of 52 child care providers, Head Start and regional providers attended these trainings aimed at gaining knowledge and skills in using the *Get Ready to Read* screening tool and materials. This initiative is focusing on three geographic areas of Georgia for implementation of *Get Ready to Read* (i.e., areas with the highest poverty and at risk indicators). In addition to the *Get Ready to Read* training, participants are being provided screening tools and activity kits to implement strategies to assist children based on their area of need from the screenings. Pre and post-test data are being gathered, as well as ongoing fidelity checks. Since pre-post test data will not be available until after the Year 3 SPDG performance period, this data will be reported in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report.

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

During Year 3 of the grant, several projects were able to begin implementation that had been delayed during Year 2: Get Ready to Read, University Forum and University stakeholder/school district partnership grants. Also during Year 3 our Teacher Recruitment/Retention Specialist resigned. Her replacement has been hired and starts May 3, 2010. Our Latino Outreach specialist continues to be supported halftime by another Division within DOE.

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

The changes made in Year 2 to help us better address IHE partnerships, technology and media for tool development, travel for collaboration coaches, and funding for the state school completion facilitator were very effective and will be continued in Year 4.

In addition, as we planned for and conducted SPDG activities in Year 3, the following changes were needed in the SPDG goals and objectives:.

1. Objective 1.5 and its performance measure that focused on working with GA IHEs in reading and math content were deleted. Through our University Partnership Forum, it became evident that we needed to assist universities in building partnerships with school districts in their areas to better impact teacher preparation. Thus, we have focused on IHE minigrants and a teacher induction pilot.
2. Performance Measures for Objective 3.1 were changed. We found it necessary to place more emphasis on the work of the Regional Interagency Councils than the local transition specialists since many school districts are not able to designate a transition specialist due to budget issues at their local district.

3. We have deleted Objective 3.2 and its performance measures as transition (assessment and plans) is being separately addressed by the GaDOE and is not really needed to be separately addressed by this SPDG objective. This change has provided more time to focus on an area of transition need (i.e., the further development of Regional Interagency Transition councils).

4. Performance Measure 4.2.b has been deleted because it was determined in Year 2 of the SPDG that SPDG stipends for certification were not that helpful as Georgia has the HOPE Scholarship Program. Rather, what is needed is a way to support new special education teachers to enhance their retention. We have, instead, developed a pilot special education teacher induction program.

5. Old performance measures were replaced with new ones for Objective 5.1. The emphasis for the measure is now on increased literacy skills for preschoolers, rather than training for their parents. This revision was necessary because training for parents was being addressed through other venues; and with our partner agencies, we found that we needed to shift our focus to training for the providers.

6. New performance measures 1/2.f and 1./2.g have been added for Struggling Readers and LRE/Co-Teaching trainings so that we could assist our Cohort schools to better address their needs. We found that many of the action plans developed by Cohort schools as a response to their data probe analysis indicated training needs in these areas that impact student achievement.