

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 622

EC 302 184

TITLE Quality Improvement Program Plan for Special Educators (QUIPP), 1991-92. OREA Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

PUB DATE Jul 92

NOTE 61p.; For the 1990-91 and 1988-89 reports, see ED 349 768 and ED 320 330.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Knowledge Level; *Program Evaluation; *Special Education Teachers; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Methods

IDENTIFIERS New York City Board of Education; *QUIPP NY

ABSTRACT

The goal of the Quality Improvement Program Plan (QUIPP) for Special Educators, developed by New York City Public Schools in New York, was to improve the quality of instruction for students with disabilities by expanding the knowledge and instructional abilities of special education professionals. The program, available in elementary and intermediate/junior high schools, was designed to meet local needs through district-based and participant-driven programs of activities. A program evaluation based on interviews with advisory committee members and special educators, a survey of participants, and review of documents revealed that: (1) over time, committees became more participatory, collaborative, consensus-seeking, efficient, and cohesive; (2) successes most frequently mentioned were increases in participation, high quality offerings, and activities based on participants' needs; and (3) participants reported that the activities prepared them to implement what they had learned and resulted in higher levels of student enthusiasm, motivation, and involvement in learning. Recommendations to the District Advisory Committee and the Central Advisory Committee conclude the report. Appendixes contain summaries of interviews and the participant survey. (JDD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
 This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

ED358622



OREA Report

1991-92
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATORS
(QUIPP)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 302184

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1991-92
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATORS
(QUIPP)



NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

H. Carl McCall
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Keysha Z. McNeil
Student Advisory Member

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Newfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

7/7/92

SUMMARY

The goal of the Quality Improvement Program Plan for Special Educators (QUIPP) is to improve the quality of instruction for students with disabilities by expanding the knowledge and instructional abilities of special education professionals. Designed to meet local needs through district-based and participant-driven programs of activities, QUIPP was available to special education professionals in the elementary and intermediate/junior high schools of the 32 community school districts and the Louis Armstrong Middle School (IS 227) during the 1991-92 school year. Through a District Advisory Committee (DAC), each district developed and implemented a program of professional development activities based on the expressed professional development interests of their staff.

OREA's evaluation of the 1991-92 QUIPP program included interviews in eight districts with both DAC members and special educators eligible to participate in the program. Follow-up surveys were sent to participants in three QUIPP activities. Evaluators also reviewed documentation of the plans developed by the eight districts.

Many of the committee members stated that their committee has become more participatory, collaborative, consensus-seeking, efficient, and cohesive since it was first formed. Furthermore, they reported that the active participation of DAC members, cooperation and collaboration among DAC members, and the cooperation of the District Administrator of Special Education, UFT, and/or school administration facilitated the committee's functioning. Budget problems, such as not knowing the size of the budget allocation at the time of QUIPP planning and the timing of the budget release, were cited as the main obstacles to the committee's operations. In all of the districts, individual members informally networked at monthly meetings with colleagues from their borough, thereby learning about alternative offerings, successful practices, and solutions to problems.

Each year, the districts have steadily increased the number of activities that are provided, and the majority of activities (if not all of them) are new each year. In addition, most of the districts have expanded the number of formats and time options that were available. Innovative programs provided by some districts included an integrated program combining both general education and QUIPP staff development, a school-based staff development program, and a program that allowed participants to attend any college course of their choosing. Information regarding the activities were clear, and in many districts, information regarding the overall QUIPP program and the QUIPP committees was also provided. Increases in participation, high quality offerings, and activities that are based on participants' needs were the most frequently mentioned successes of the QUIPP program.

Almost all of the staff felt that the activities that were offered were relevant to their education, experience, and students; that the schedule was convenient; that their needs were adequately addressed; and that they have had an impact in determining what kinds of training activities or schedules were offered.

Those who participated in QUIPP activities reported that the activities were well organized and that there were sufficient opportunities to ask questions. However, they gave slightly lower ratings to the question of whether there was enough time to cover the topic fully. The highest ratings were obtained for the instructor's knowledge of the subject. Almost all of the respondents claimed that the activities were practical and prepared them to implement what they had learned, and that as a result of applying what they had learned in the training, their students were more enthusiastic, motivated, and involved in learning; and their skills and behavior improved.

Based on these results, OREA recommended the following:

District Advisory Committee:

- continue to provide staff development that is based on the needs and interests of the district's eligible staff;
- provide two-session courses, when necessary, in order to cover a topic completely;
- investigate new ways of encouraging non-participating staff members to become involved in QUIPP activities, perhaps by offering in-school staff development (in-class residencies);
- consider including general educators in QUIPP activities, possibly by integrating QUIPP with general education staff development; and
- consider the possibility of moving QUIPP towards school-based staff development.

Central Advisory Committee:

- continue to advise the DACs regarding budget issues, including the budget allocation and the timing of the budget release;
- provide funds for a QUIPP administrator at the district level; and
- facilitate networking through a QUIPP newsletter or annual QUIPP conference.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report has been prepared by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment/Student Progress Evaluation Unit (OREA/S.P.E.U.) of the New York City Public Schools under the direction of Dr. Henry Solomon. Barbara Young served as project coordinator and prepared this report.

Without the effort and help of other unit staff and consultants, this report would not have been possible. We are grateful to the following people for their assistance: Maria Rosario Mora, Eddy Souffrant, Julia Nevarez de Jesus, and Pamela Polycarpe. We would also like to thank Pang Chu and William Hilton for the statistical analysis. Editorial assistance was provided by Carol Meyer.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Henry Solomon
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
110 Livingston Street, Room 734
Brooklyn, NY 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Summary	i
Acknowledgements	v
I. Introduction	1
II. District Advisory Committee Planning and Implementation	4
III. QUIPP Implementation and Results	13
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	20
 Appendix A: Summaries of DAC Interviews	
Table A-1 DAC Interviews: QUIPP Model	23
Table A-2 DAC Interviews: DAC Operations	24
Table A-3 DAC Interviews: QUIPP Activities	25
Table A-4 DAC Interviews: Success of Program	26
Table A-5 DAC Interviews: Participant-Driven vs. Mandated Staff Development	28
 Appendix B: Summaries of Staff Interviews	
Table B-1 Staff Interviews: Positive and Negative Changes in the QUIPP Program	31
Table B-2 Staff Interviews: Attitudes Towards Staff Development	32
 Appendix C: Results of Participant Survey	
Table C-1 Participants' Mean Ratings of the Quality of Activities, by District	34
Table C-2 Participants' Mean Ratings of the Quality of Activities, by Position	35
Table C-3 Participants' Application of Learning, By District	36
Table C-4 Participants' Application of Learning, by Position	37
Table C-5 Participant Responses: Impact of Training on Teachers and Students	38
Table C-6 Staff and Participant Responses: Comments and Suggestions	39

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Quality Improvement Program Plan for Special Educators (QUIPP) is a supplemental, professional development program. Since its inception in 1987, the goal of QUIPP has been to improve the quality of instruction for students with disabilities by expanding the knowledge and instructional abilities of special education professionals. QUIPP was designed to meet the individual needs of each district through district-based, participant-driven programs of activities. Each district established its own QUIPP District Advisory Committee (DAC), consisting of district, school-, and classroom-based members. Each DAC formulated and implemented a program of QUIPP professional development activities based on the responses to a survey (Interest Inventory) of its staff's professional development interests.

Some direction and guidance was provided to the DACs by a Central Advisory Committee (CAC) comprised of representatives from the UFT, the C.S.A., District Administrators of Special Education (DASE), and the Division of Instruction and Professional Development of the New York City Public Schools. The CAC assured district compliance with the guidelines of the program and provided technical assistance as needed.

POPULATION SERVED

*For a more detailed description of the program and its guidelines please refer to the 1990-91 OREA evaluation report.

The 1991-92 QUIPP program served special education self-contained classroom teachers, resource room teachers, crisis intervention teachers, speech teachers, and paraprofessionals who deliver services to special education students in the elementary and intermediate/junior high schools of the 32 community school districts and the Louis Armstrong Middle School (IS 227). In addition, since QUIPP's inception, eligibility has been expanded yearly and now includes special education teacher trainers, language coordinators, health coordinators, and those who provide instruction and classroom coverage to special education and mainstreamed students (Module 5B).

EVALUATION SCOPE AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the 1991-92 evaluation was twofold: 1) to assess how the district-organized, participant-driven process has evolved in individual districts since the program's inception; and 2) to determine whether the activities that were offered addressed the participants' needs and interests. The quality of the resultant activities and their impact on participating special educators and their students was also assessed. Evaluation instruments were developed by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) in consultation with the QUIPP program director. OREA conducted interviews with both DAC members and special educators eligible in a sample of eight districts. Follow-up surveys were sent to participants in three activities in each district. Evaluators also reviewed documents,

spanning the five years since QUIPP began, of the plans developed by these eight districts.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report presents OREA's evaluation of the QUIPP program for the 1991-92 school year. Chapter II discusses the process district committees have followed in planning and implementing the QUIPP program. Chapter III provides the findings of OREA's interviews and surveys of the eligible staff regarding:

1) whether the program addressed the staff's professional development interests, 2) the quality of program activities in terms of relevance and usefulness, 3) implementation of the skills learned, and 4) the impact of those activities on the QUIPP participants and their students. Chapter IV presents OREA's conclusions and provides recommendations based on this year's evaluation.

II. DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

INTERVIEWS OF DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS (DACs)

A total of 43 DAC members were interviewed, including administrators (N=19), school-based members (N=12) and classroom-based members (N=12). In order to understand how the process of district-organized, participant-driven staff development has evolved in the districts since the program began, interviews were primarily conducted with DAC members who had served on the committee since its formation (91 percent). In one district, there was no longer a functioning committee; instead participants' needs were assessed and activities were provided by one person who is now responsible for developing and implementing the QUIPP program."

Roles and Responsibilities of DAC Members

The majority of interviewees (88 percent) stated that their roles had not changed since the committee began, and those whose roles had changed indicated that they were more involved in the program as a result of becoming either a chair of the committee or a QUIPP coordinator. Almost all of the DAC members (91 percent) stated that their responsibilities included: participating in discussions and decisions, promoting QUIPP in the schools, providing the committee with feedback from participants, and planning and implementing the QUIPP program.

"Responses from interviews with former committee members in this district are included in this report whenever relevant.

Sixty-five percent of the DAC members stated that they were involved in administrative tasks. As in previous years, although some classroom-based members have become involved in these tasks, many classroom-based members are not involved in these tasks due to time constraints. In addition, one district has begun to integrate QUIPP with the district's general education staff development program, and this has, therefore, become an additional responsibility of some DAC members in this district.

DAC members stated that they gained many skills from participating in the committee process, among which were:

- interpersonal skills (N=24)
- administrative skills involved in developing and implementing the program (N=18)
- assessment skills (N=10)
- decision-making skills (N=3)

The QUIPP Model and Committee Operations

The role of QUIPP. In previous years, evaluation results indicated that not all of the members of the DAC were aware of QUIPP's role. This year, however, as can be seen in the summary statements in Table A-1, DAC members were aware of many aspects of QUIPP, such as its participant-driven nature and the goal of improving the staff's skills in order to improve the students' education.

The role of the committees (DACs). DAC members typically described the committee's role (see Table A-1) as assessing the staff's professional development needs, developing and

implementing a program of QUIPP activities based on these needs, and evaluating the activities.

Committee operations. Many of the committee members stated that their committee had become more participatory, collaborative, consensus-seeking, efficient, and cohesive over the years (see Table A-2). DAC members from seven of the eight districts stated that further training or support in administrative or programming skills was not necessary. Interestingly, in District "B"-the district without a committee-two former DAC members wanted to receive training in order to re-establish the committee, whereas the other two former members said that the training they had received in the past had not been helpful. Rather, according to one of these members, the role of the committee (advisory or working committee) should be clarified, because as an advisory committee they had no one to implement the program.

A summary of the factors that DAC members identified as facilitating or impeding the committee's functioning is also provided in Table A-2. Some of the most frequently mentioned facilitating factors included the active participation of DAC members, cooperation and collaboration among DAC members, and the cooperation of the DASE, UFT, and/or administration. The most commonly mentioned impeding factors focused on budget problems, including not knowing the size of the budget allocation at the time of QUIPP planning and the timing of the budget release.

Selection of members. Five of the districts replaced committee members who had either been promoted or had not attended meetings. In addition, although none of the districts formally changed the length of members' terms, two districts replaced members for rotating purposes, to include schools or people who had not served before. While all of the districts followed the Board of Education guidelines for member selection (teachers and paraprofessionals are selected by the district's UFT), two interviewees suggested that the DACs should play a role in the selection process.

"Ownership" of the program. All of the district's DAC members stated that their committee has been encouraged to take "ownership" (control) of the program. Yet, none of the districts have formally developed their own bylaws or procedures for selection of committee members; instead, they have followed the original Board of Education guidelines. Ownership of the program, however, is reflected in the innovative and creative programs that are being developed by individual districts, as will be discussed later in this report.

Networking among DACs. In all of the districts, individual members, such as teacher trainers, informally network with colleagues at monthly boroughwide meetings. Many DAC members felt that it is more beneficial for some, but not all, of the members to network with other districts. Interviewees claimed that through informal sharing of information they have learned about alternative offerings, successful practices, and solutions

to problems. In addition, one district was able to offer a weekend retreat with another district as a result of networking. As in previous years, respondents (N = 15) frequently requested more formal opportunities to network, such as an annual conference or a QUIPP newsletter organized by the Central Advisory Committee.

QUIPP Activities and Successes

QUIPP activities. Each DAC assessed the professional development interests of its eligible staff through an Interest Inventory (I.I.) survey, and developed its own plan of activities based on an analysis of this survey. As a result, each district provided a unique menu of activities and attempted to offer them at times that were the most convenient for their staff.

A review of the QUIPP plans, spanning the last five years, indicated that six of the districts have now begun to provide activities at various times (in-school, after-school, and weekends), whereas only two districts limited their activities to after-school. Each year, all of the districts have steadily increased the number of activities that are provided, and the number of activities (the majority, if not all) that are new. All of the districts have also expanded the number of formats that are provided (such as workshops, college courses, in-school residencies, retreats, and class trips).

All of the districts now provide courses for varying levels of participant education (graduate and undergraduate courses), and position (such as courses for paraprofessionals). In all but

one district, courses are provided that are geared to various student levels (preschool, elementary, and junior high school). Furthermore, each school in one district had the opportunity to choose its own activity based on its student population and staff needs.

Innovative programs. Many districts have developed their individual QUIPP programs in innovative ways, including the following:

- District A has an integrated program combining both general education and QUIPP staff development. With QUIPP funds, special education professionals are able to attend general education staff development offerings.
- District C allowed participants to attend any course that was offered at the City University of New York campuses.
- District D offered a joint weekend retreat with another district.
- District F offered school-based staff development. The special education staff in each school created a plan of activities based on their school's staff development needs. The QUIPP committee approved the plans, provided some general activities district-wide, and allocated the funds.

Expectations of participation. As the summary provided in Table A-3 shows, the majority of DAC members expected QUIPP activities to increase the staff's knowledge and improve their teaching skills, raise their morale and self-esteem, and improve their ability to educate and communicate with students. Table A-3 also lists how each district's staff needs have changed and shows how the DACs have typically met these changing needs by

providing a selection of new activities based on the analysis of the Interest Inventory surveys.

Registration. All of the districts reported that registration and participation has increased among some or all of the following eligible groups: teachers, paraprofessionals, general education (Mod 5) teachers, crisis intervention teachers (CITs), and speech teachers. Due to problems in securing substitute teachers, four districts did not provide activities during school hours. In contrast, the other four districts provided in-school residencies in which both teachers and students participate, thus eliminating the need for substitute teachers. Furthermore, one district reported that the residencies were included in order to get non-participating staff members, such as more experienced teachers, involved, and as a result of participating in these residencies, many experienced teachers later registered for other QUIPP activities.

Success of the program. Increases in participation, high quality offerings, and activities based on participants' needs were the most frequently mentioned successes of the QUIPP program, as can be seen in Table A-4. The following comments were representative of comments made by DAC members:

- "Because teachers decide what they want, are listened to, and have a choice in topics, they feel a sense of control."
- "QUIPP makes participants feel professional."
- "Doing it on a district level makes it more effective."
- "QUIPP is a wonderful and essential component of special education."

The most frequently cited factors increasing QUIPP's success, as can be seen in Table A-4, included the popularity of the QUIPP program, the increased and/or high level of participation, the efforts of the committee, and the quality of the activities that were offered. Most DAC members stated that more funding would further increase QUIPP's success. Integrating the program with general education staff development, having a QUIPP coordinator, and networking with other DACs were other commonly mentioned suggestions (see Table 4).

Participant vs. Mandated Staff Development Programs

The majority of interviewees (67 percent) preferred participant-driven models of staff development because they felt that allowing the staff to decide what is provided increases their motivation to participate. The remaining 33 percent stated that both participant-driven and mandated programs are necessary. Table A-5 gives a summary of the statements respondents gave favoring either one or both of the models.

III. QUIPP IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

INTERVIEWS OF STAFF MEMBERS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN QUIPP

OREA interviewed 82 staff members who were eligible to participate in QUIPP, including special education teachers (63 percent), paraprofessionals (22 percent), and general education (Mod 5) teachers (15 percent). Interviews addressed the participant-driven aspects of QUIPP, how the program and the staff's involvement has changed, and the staff's feelings about staff development.

Information About the QUIPP Program

All of the interviewees were familiar with the QUIPP program and stated that they had received program information in the form of Interest Inventories, registration materials, and flyers. In order to assess the usefulness of this information, OREA evaluators reviewed the brochures and flyers distributed to the staff. Six districts, for example, sent out a complete brochure with the year's full schedule of offerings, while two districts simply distributed flyers as courses were arranged. OREA determined that course descriptions were clear and informative, such that when a course had prerequisites or was limited to a particular population (teachers, paraprofessionals, etc), this was listed. All but one district listed the exact time and date of the courses. Information from four of the districts clearly listed the names and phone numbers of people to contact for more information.

Four districts provided brief descriptions of the QUIPP program with the course listings, including a clear delineation of who was eligible to participate and an explanation that it was a participant-driven, district-organized, staff development program for special educators. In addition, two of these districts provided the names and positions of DAC members.

Relevance of QUIPP Activities

Ninety-eight percent of those interviewed felt that the QUIPP activities were relevant to their education, experience, and students. Almost all of the staff (95 percent) found the schedule convenient. Seventy-two percent of the staff believed that they had had an impact in determining what kinds of training activities or schedules were offered, and almost all of the staff (96 percent) stated that their needs were adequately addressed.

Expectations of QUIPP

The most common expectations held by the staff about participating in QUIPP activities were that they would:

- gain information, knowledge, and strategies that could be implemented in the classroom (N=82);
- gain experience (N=6);
- gain understanding about different areas and situations (N=5);
- obtain materials to bring back to the classroom (N=5); and
- learn more about helping students (N=3)

Eighty-six percent of the staff maintained that their expectations had been met, and an additional eight percent claimed that some of their expectations had been met.

Changes in the QUIPP Program

Seventy-three percent of those interviewed reported that they have become more involved in QUIPP, while 10 percent said that they have always been actively involved in the QUIPP activities. Sixty-six percent of the staff stated that QUIPP has changed over the years. Table B-1 lists both the positive and negative changes that the staff described.

Attitudes Toward Staff Development

Eighty percent of those interviewed favored a participant-driven model of staff development. As can be seen in Table B-2, their preference was based on the participant-driven aspect and on the quality of the activities provided by the QUIPP program. The remaining 20 percent of the respondents stated that both participant-driven and mandated staff development models are necessary.

SURVEY OF ACTIVITY PARTICIPANTS

OREA evaluators also distributed follow-up surveys to participants in three QUIPP activities in the same eight districts in which the interviews had been conducted. Responses were received from 193 participants, a 48 percent return rate. Because QUIPP activities were limited to no more than 25 participants, in some cases the total number of responses for a given an activity or a district were small. The majority of the responses were from special education teachers (40 percent), followed by paraprofessionals (21 percent), resource room teachers (12 percent), general education (Mod 5) teachers (11

percent), speech teachers (4 percent), teacher trainers (3 percent), language coordinators (2 percent), and other special education staff (8 percent).

In order to obtain feedback from a diverse sample of activities, surveys were sent to participants in activities held at different times (in-school, after-school, and weekend), and with different formats (retreat, college course, and workshop). These surveys focused on the quality of the activities, including: the organization of the activity, its appropriateness to the participants' daily experiences and professional interests, and the usefulness of the training materials.

Quality of Activities

Respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the training using a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very good). As shown in Table C-1, the activities were rated very positively overall (a rating of 4 or above). Only one district ("C") consistently gave low ratings on every measure.

The results indicate that participants felt that the activities were well organized and that there were sufficient opportunities to ask questions. However, most respondents agreed that there was not enough time allotted to cover topics fully. The highest ratings were obtained for the instructor's knowledge of the subject. In most districts, the activities were rated slightly more relevant to the participants' professional interests than to their daily activities. Participants from all districts considered the training materials very useful.

Overall, respondents indicated that their expectations were met, and reported that their knowledge increased as a result of the training (from an overall mean rating of 2.98 before training to 4.27 after training).

When the data were analyzed by position, (see Table C-2), it was found that special education and resource room teachers gave slightly lower mean ratings than the respondents from other personnel categories on most measures. This may be due, in part, to their higher expectations of the activities.

Application of Learning

Almost all of the respondents (96 percent) claimed that the courses were practical and prepared them to implement what they had learned. As shown in Table C-3, in all but one district, over 70 percent of the respondents applied what they had learned during the training in their classroom activities. Of the four classroom-based professionals, more Mod 5 teachers and resource room teachers reported applying what they had learned (see Table C-4). Some aspects of the training that were frequently applied were behavior modification, the use of literature in social studies lessons, reading strategies, and Spanish. The most common reason for not applying what they had learned was that they had either just finished the course or that it was not applicable.

As shown in Table C-3, in three districts none of the participants encountered obstacles in applying what they had learned. In four districts, however, more than 25 percent of the

respondents reported that they had encountered problems. This may be due, in part, to the type of activities attended. For example, in District A, which had provided a Poloroid course, the most frequently reported obstacle was the expense of the materials, and, in District F, participants in a Spanish course stated that they needed additional training in order to communicate effectively. When analyzed by personnel category (see Table C-4), it was found that more general education and special education teachers encountered obstacles than did resource room teachers or paraprofessionals.

Impact on Participants and their Students

As can be seen in Table C-5, the reported positive effects of the training on the participants were broadened knowledge, improved skills, and the acquisition of new ideas, resources, and strategies.

In most cases, the respondents reported positive experiences as a result of applying what they had learned in the training. Table C-5 also shows the impact of the participants' training on their students. Respondents reported that students were more enthusiastic, motivated and involved in learning; improved their skills and behavior; were more cooperative and better able to relate to others; and improved communication with their teachers. The three negative responses stated that what was implemented was not appropriate to the students' abilities.

Comments and Suggestions

Some participants volunteered additional comments about the course they had attended, as shown in Table C-6. Most of these comments either praised the courses, instructors, and topics or offered suggestions for future QUIPP activities. The most common suggestions were that more sessions or two-part courses be available in order to cover the topic completely, more materials be supplied to properly implement the activity, and more courses be offered for the JHS level. The few negative comments were from participants of one activity, who said that the workshop was not appropriate to their students' level.

Most of the positive comments were similar to the following:

- Continue having QUIPP, it helps the students,
- Informative, enjoyable course. I really benefitted from the course,
- Excellent training. A wonderful way to teach,
- Interesting and well presented activities, and
- Students loved the activities."

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall goal of the QUIPP program--to provide high quality, district-organized, participant-driven staff development to special educators--was once again achieved during the program year. Furthermore, as the program has been implemented over the years, the DACs have become more collaborative, cooperative, and participatory, and are becoming increasingly more creative and innovative in the design of their programs.

Satisfaction among the participants of QUIPP activities in 1991-92 was very high. Distribution and the clarity of information about the QUIPP program was found to be adequate and informative. Program recipients felt that their needs were adequately addressed, and that the activities were relevant to their education and experience, and appropriate for their students' levels. Most districts have increased the number of courses, schedule choices, and types of formats that are available to participants. Scheduling the activities at times convenient for the staff was a problem in the early years of QUIPP, but now, in many districts, changes such as the addition of weekend retreats and in-class residencies have resulted in activities that are available at convenient times.

Respondents rated the quality of QUIPP activities and instructors very positively. Most indicated that their expectations of QUIPP activities were met, and that they gained knowledge and developed new skills and strategies as a result of their participation. Respondents reported that the activities

prepared them to implement what they had learned, and those who have had the opportunity to do so reported that their students' interest, motivation, and involvement in learning has increased.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the results and conclusions of this evaluation, as well as the suggestions of DAC members and QUIPP participants.

District Advisory Committee:

- continue to provide staff development that is based on the needs and interests of the district's eligible staff;
- provide two-session courses, when necessary, in order to cover a topic completely;
- investigate new ways of encouraging non-participating staff members to become involved in QUIPP activities, perhaps by offering in-school staff development (in-class residencies);
- consider including general educators in QUIPP activities, possibly by integrating QUIPP with general education staff development; and
- consider the possibility of moving QUIPP towards school-based staff development.

Central Advisory Committee:

- continue to advise the DACs regarding budget issues, including the budget allocation and the timing of the budget release;
- provide funds for a QUIPP administrator at the district level; and
- facilitate networking through a QUIPP newsletter or annual QUIPP conference.

Appendix A

Table A-1
DAC Interviews: QUIPP Model*

District†	Role of QUIPP	Role of Committee
A (N=5)	Improve professionals' skills to improve students' education by providing staff development based on the staff's needs (N=5)* Provide resources and professional development (N=2)	Assess professional needs and develop plan based on teachers' input (N=4) Liaison between special and general education staff development (N=1)
B (N=4)	Additional staff development for special educators (N=3) Provide training to teachers to increase student performance (N=2) Offer topics that the staff has requested (N=2)	Provide staff development based on the needs of district staff (N=3) Evaluate the courses (N=1)
C (N=5)	Staff development for special education teachers (N=3) A participant-driven model for staff development (N=3)	Planning and implementing the program (N=3) Assess needs (N=2)
D (N=7)	Supplemental staff development program based on the needs that participants express (N=7)	Evaluate activities (N=4) Plan and provide activities (N=4) Assess needs (N=2) Insure that everyone is represented fairly and equally (N=1)
E (N=5)	Improve teachers' instruction and education to affect student performance (N=5) Provide special education staff development (N=2)	Assess staff needs (N=3) Organize, plan, and implement activities (N=2) Provide new activities (N=2)
F (N=4)	Staff-driven staff development (N=4) Encourage mainstreaming (N=1)	Design a program that meets staff's needs (N=2) Foster staff development (N=2) Broaden staff skills and knowledge (N=1) Represent the staff (N=1)
G (N=6)	Supplemental self-selected staff development based on participants' interests (N=4) Treat the staff more professionally (N=2)	Provide a program that is based on needs of the staff (N=6)
H (N=7)	Provide participant-driven staff development to special educators to enhance skills in order to benefit students (N=5) Provide a way for administration, staff & students to work together (N=2)	Provide options to help the staff help the students (N=4) Assess needs (N=2) Ensure that activities are based on needs of teachers (N=2)

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table.

† District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report.

* Participants were able to make more than one comment.

Table A-2
DAC Interviews: DAC Operations*

District*	Changes in DAC Operations	Factors That Facilitated DAC Operations	Factors That Impeded DAC Operations
A (N = 5)	More participatory (N = 5) ^b More collaborative (N = 4) More consensus seeking (N = 3) Expanded program (N = 3) Committee works as a team (N = 1)	Integration of QUIPP into a larger professional development program (N = 2) Experiences gained through the years (N = 1) Cooperation (N = 1) Teacher's input (N = 1)	Bureaucracy and paper work (N = 1)
B (N = 4)	DAC doesn't function	N/A	Not having a committee (N = 4)
C (N = 5)	More collaborative (N = 3) More participatory (N = 3) More consensus seeking (N = 1) More cohesive committee (N = 1)	Commitment of district administration (N = 3) Staff participation (N = 2) Union appointment of good members (N = 1) Committee (N = 1)	Program should be planned earlier (N = 1) Committee meeting schedule (N = 1) Decrease in budget (N = 1)
D (N = 7)	More cohesive & collaborative (N = 2) More consensus seeking (N = 2) Learned from past experience and the participants (N = 2) More efficient (N = 2) More of the members became active in the work (N = 1)	UFT Rep who is very supportive (N = 2) Cooperation/collaboration (N = 2) DASE's cooperation (N = 1) People familiar in budget/planning (N = 1)	The time & location of options (N = 3) Not knowing if the money will be there at the time of planning (N = 2) Less funds (N = 1) Timing of budget release (N = 1)
E (N = 5)	More participatory (N = 3) More collaborative (N = 3) New areas represented on the DAC (N = 3) Added a school liaison (N = 1)	Good planning and implementation (N = 3) Good working committee (N = 2) Good representation of the different staff areas (N = 1)	Time constraints (N = 2)
F (N = 4)	More participatory (N = 2) More consensus seeking (N = 2) More collaborative (N = 2)	Cooperation among members (N = 2) Helpfulness of DASE (N = 1) People's dedication to work for a good program (N = 1)	Space constraints/locations for workshops (N = 1) Time constraints (N = 3) Release of funds (N = 2)
G (N = 6)	More consensus seeking (N = 3) More collaborative (N = 1) More participatory (N = 1)	Feedback from participants (N = 1) Good committee (N = 1) Support from DASE and UFT (N = 1)	Lack of funds for some programs (e.g., CPR) (N = 1) Regulations and rules regarding budget could be made easier (N = 1)
H (N = 7)	More participatory (N = 2) More collaborative (N = 2) As the members have changed, it became better (N = 1) More efficient (N = 1) UFT agreed to a more collaborative effort (N = 1)	Active participation of committee members (N = 6) Having time set aside for meeting and planning (N = 2) Collegial atmosphere (N = 2) Good response to needs assessment (N = 1) UFT and district support (N = 1) Skills of supervisor and teacher trainers (N = 1)	Budget constraints (N = 4) Other commitments/time constraints (N = 2)

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table
 * District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report
 * Participants were able to make more than one comment

Table A-3
DAC Interviews: QUIPP Activities*

District*	Expected Impact on Participants	How Have The Staff's Needs Changed?	How Did The DAC Attempt To Meet These Needs?
A (N=5)	Learn skills and educational techniques to improve teaching methods and ways of learning (N=4) Acquire materials for classroom implementation (N=1) Able to interact more effectively with students (N=1)	Requested new activities They want to learn new ways of teaching	Provided more options and schedule choices, changed offerings
B (N=4)	Improve teaching skills and knowledge (N=3) Able to work with students better (N=1) Communicate better with parents (N=1)	An increase of new teachers led to a need for more activities for increasing skills	Used the needs assessment to provide appropriate activities
C (N=5)	Gain new skills and knowledge (N=5) Professional growth (N=2) Feel supported (N=1)	Requested new topics	Provided new options
D (N=7)	Improve skills/knowledge in an area that the participant chooses (N=6) Students' education will be improved (N=2) Raise staff morale (N=1) Meet others & bring teachers together (N=1) Increase in confidence (N=1)	Staff turnover, changes in the population and the requirements, led to requests for different training	Provided new and different offerings based on changing needs and interest inventory
E (N=5)	New knowledge implemented in classroom (N=3) Meet new people (N=1) Enhance staff interest (N=1)	Training in new areas	Provided more options, schedule choices and site choices
F (N=4)	Learn new techniques (N=2) More job effectiveness (N=1)	Requested new types of training and more in-depth training in methodology and teaching techniques	Provided more options, more schedule choices, and more in-school training Provided grants to school for the designing of school-based programs
G (N=6)	Network with colleagues (N=3) Improve professional skills (N=2) Increase self-esteem (N=2) Feel like professionals (N=1) Paras working more effectively with teachers (N=1)	Interest in CPR Student needs have changed Staff turnover	Designed new program based on needs assessment (I.I)
H (N=7)	Growth of both skills and knowledge (N=6) Able to try new approaches (N=2) Increased self-esteem from having a voice in their professional development (N=1) Able to implement creative ideas (N=1) Increase students participation (N=1)	Need to be more involved with parents Different life issues (child abuse, AIDS)	Provided activities based on needs assessment Provided different time options (e.g., Saturday) Provided new topics

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table

* District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report

* Participants were able to make more than one comment

Table A-4
DAC Interviews: Success of Program*

District ^b	Successes	What Factors Influenced QUIPP's Success	What Would Help Your Committee Make QUIPP More Successful?
A (N=5)	Combined funds to allow general and special education to take courses and work together (N=2) ^c Provided high quality offerings (N=2) Offerings represented participants' interests (N=1) High participation (N=1)	High level of participation (N=3) The quality of instruction (N=2) Integrated different professional areas (N=2) Popularity of program (N=2) Provided more offerings (N=1)	More funding (N=3) Networking (N=3) Continuing to integrated QUIPP with general staff development (N=1) Extend QUIPP into the summer (N=1)
B (N=4)	High participation (N=2) Provided valuable and interesting staff development (N=1) Offered the staff an opportunity to better itself (N=1) General education participated (N=1)	Provided what is needed (N=2) Increased participation (N=1) The voluntary selection of courses (N=1) The committee became better at meeting the needs of teachers (N=1)	Need a functioning committee (N=3) Need more collaboration on the part of the members (N=1) Should have committee member rotation (N=1) Offer more activities (N=1)
C (N=5)	Increase in participation (N=2) Provided the opportunity to choose from a wide variety of options (N=2) Teacher's satisfaction with QUIPP (N=1)	Program popularity (N=2) Feedback from participants (N=2) Assessing the staff's needs (N=1)	Meeting the needs of teachers (N=3) A full-time coordinator (N=1) Budget increase (N=1)
D (N=7)	Acceptance from participants (N=2) It brought the staff together (N=2) Increased feeling of professionalism (N=2) Provided workshops of interest to participants (N=1)	Teachers decide what they want, are listened to, and have a choice in topics (N=4) Useful, practical, quality activities (N=2) Participants' enthusiasm (N=2) The committee (N=1) The voluntary aspect (N=1)	Integrate QUIPP with general education (N=3) Having school-based staff development (N=1) Having an annual conference (N=1) Seeing other programs (N=1)
E (N=5)	High participation (N=5) Training implemented in classroom (N=1) Program popularity (N=1)	Program popularity (N=3) Incentives for the participants (N=2) Participatory model (N=1)	More funding (N=3) Flexibility in using the funds (N=1)
F (N=4)	Increased participation (N=4) Training was based on needs assessment (N=1) Participants learned new techniques (N=1)	Ability to adapt program to changing needs (N=4) Increased participation (N=1) Program popularity (N=1)	More funding (N=1) Allocate funds earlier in the year (N=1)
G (N=6)	Courses provided new techniques for teaching (N=3) Provided what participants wanted (N=2) High participation (N=1)	Involved committee that works together (N=4) Excellent coordinator (N=3) DAC provided what the people want (N=2) Excellent cooperation from UFT (N=1) It's voluntary (N=1)	Need a full-time staff (N=2)

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table
^b District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report
^c Participants were able to make more than one comment

Table A-4 (cont'd)
Success of Program*

District*	Successes	What Factors Influenced QUIPP's Success	What Would Help Your Committee Make QUIPP More Successful?
H (N = 7)	<p>Provided quality staff development (N = 4)^b</p> <p>Staff suggested ideas knowing that they would be implemented (N = 3)</p> <p>Provided practical offerings (N = 2)</p> <p>Participation increased (N = 1)</p> <p>Training implemented in classrooms (N = 2)</p> <p>Students share teachers' enthusiasm (N = 1)</p>	<p>The combined effort of the committee (N = 3)</p> <p>Quality & variety of offerings (N = 2)</p> <p>Increased participation/interest (N = 3)</p> <p>Principals support the program (N = 1)</p> <p>Popularity of QUIPP (N = 1)</p> <p>DAC has a better understanding of needs (N = 1)</p>	<p>More funding (N = 3)</p> <p>Having a coordinator (N = 1)</p> <p>More flexibility in funding (N = 1)</p> <p>Seeing other programs (N = 1)</p> <p>Allocate money sooner (N = 1)</p> <p>Have an annual conference (N = 1)</p>

- * Only the most relevant comments are included in this table.
- * District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report.
- * Participants were able to make more than one comment.

Table A-5
DAC Interviews: Participant-Driven vs. Mandated Staff Development

District	What Is Your Opinion Of Participant-driven Vs. Mandated Models Of Staff Development
A (N=5)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation of members increases motivation. <p>Both are necessary (N=2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandated programs should integrate participant-driven model (include opinion of participants). - Participant-driven model is very effective, but mandated is necessary to get some of the staff involved. <p>Prefer participant-driven model (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participant-driven is much more beneficial because people choose to participate and choose their activities. - Staff development models must be participant driven. <p>Both are necessary (N=1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sometimes there is a need to impose staff development.
B (N=4)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N=4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in the selection of training creates a more positive attitude to learn. <p>Both are necessary (N=1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandated is necessary for the staff that does not want to participate, but the participant driven model is far superior because the staff is motivated
C (N=5)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N=4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important to hear what the teachers have to say about the type of staff development they need. - There is no substitute for a program that people are involved in developing. There has been increased success and participation with this model. - Participant-driven is the way to go <p>Both are necessary (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should be made to keep abreast of current issues in their field, so there is still a need for mandatory staff development. - The training needs to be both mandated and participant driven. QUJPP lends itself to participant driven because it is a supplementary program and allows flexibility.
D (N=7)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-motivation is stronger than mandatory attendance. - There is more incentive with participant-driven models, because participants needs are taken into consideration. <p>Both are necessary (N=2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any type of staff development is useful. - Mandated programs are necessary, but should be more open to suggestions.
E (N=5)	<p>Prefer participant-driven (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participant-driven is more effective. - Participant-driven reflects what the participants are interested in. - Mandated programs should incorporate participant-driven models. <p>Both are necessary (N=1)</p>
F (N=4)	<p>Both are necessary (N=1)</p>

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table

* District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report

Table A-5 (cont'd)
Participant-Driven vs. Mandated Staff Development*

District*	What is Your Opinion Of Participant-driven Vs. Mandated Models Of Staff Development
G (N = 6)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N = 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The participant-driven model works extremely well, it's the only way to go. - It is the only model that can work. <p>Both are necessary (N = 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They both have their place, but participant-driven gives more respect to professionals.
H (N = 7)	<p>Prefer participant-driven model (N = 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When it is staff driven, everyone identifies with the fact that you are meeting their needs. - Mandated is never successful. The content areas within the mandates should be participant-driven. - Participant-driven is an excellent model. <p>Both are necessary (N = 2)</p>

* Only the most relevant comments are included in this table.

* District identifications have been changed for the purposes of this report.

Appendix B

Table B-1
Staff Interviews: Positive and Negative Changes in the QUIPP Program

Positive Changes	Negative Changes
<p>More offerings (N=24) More variety (N=23) More exciting and better offerings (N=10) New activities were offered (N=6) Each school chooses its own activities (N=4) Better time schedules (N=2) Teachers' input is taken into consideration more (N=2) As needs changed, QUIPP has changed (N=2) QUIPP evolved into a very professional staff development program (N=1) More information is provided (N=1) More emphasis on hands-on activities which are easier to adapt to classroom (N=1) offerings provide more insight into the special education child's needs (N=1)</p>	<p>Less offerings are provided (N=2) No new offerings are provided (N=1)</p>

Table B-2
Staff Interviews: Attitudes Towards Staff Development

<p>How do you feel about QUIPP in relation to other staff development programs?</p>	<p>Both are necessary (N=17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - QUIPP complements mandated staff development - Sometimes the mandated programs are interesting <p>Prefer participant-driven (N=56)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - QUIPP has a more professional approach - QUIPP is better because you can choose what is most beneficial to you - With QUIPP, teachers are asked what they want and are provided it - QUIPP is geared to special education - QUIPP has a more hands-on approach - The quality of QUIPP has set a standard for other programs - QUIPP is more relevant to the students - QUIPP provides knowledge that can be applied in the classroom - QUIPP's offerings are more interesting than mandated courses - QUIPP brings teachers and paras together to learn more about helping students - paras are not involved in mandated staff development
<p>Has your attitude towards staff development changed as a result of participating in QUIPP?</p>	<p>No (1)</p> <p>Yes (28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - QUIPP addresses participants' needs - Developed a positive attitude - More supportive of staff development - Enjoy staff development more - Found staff development can be helpful, if you have the power to choose what you want you are more receptive to it - What is learned in QUIPP can be implemented - Mandated programs are not geared towards paras' needs

Appendix C

Table C-1
 Participants' Mean Ratings* of the Quality of Activities, by District
 (N=164)

Question	District ^b								Total (189)
	A (N=34)	B (N=20)	C (N=16)	D (N=7)	E (N=12)	F (N=29)	G (N=50)	H (N=21)	
How well was the activity organized?	4.53	4.20	3.81	4.43	4.92	4.52	4.62	4.19	4.44
Were there sufficient opportunities to ask questions?	4.59	4.35	3.75	4.71	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.05	4.44
Was there enough time to cover the topic fully?	4.24	3.85	2.53	3.86	4.58	4.24	4.06	3.67	3.96
How knowledgeable was the instructor about the subject?	4.74	4.40	4.13	4.57	5.00	4.76	4.78	4.48	4.65
How appropriate was the content of the activity to your daily activities?	4.18	4.25	3.63	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.47	3.90	4.20
Did the content of the activity meet your professional interests?	4.26	4.20	3.81	4.43	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.29	4.33
How helpful were the materials used in the training?	4.55	4.25	3.81	4.14	4.58	4.36	4.42	4.33	4.35
Were your expectations of the activity met?	4.44	4.11	3.67	4.14	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.29	4.32
Before receiving this training, what was the extent of your knowledge of the topic?	2.97	3.35	2.44	2.86	2.09	3.31	3.00	3.05	2.98
As a result of this training, what is the extent of your knowledge of the topic?	4.59	4.30	3.38	4.57	4.17	4.38	4.20	4.33	4.27

* Respondents rated different aspects of the activity they attended using a rating scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
 • Due to the fact that QUIPP activities are limited to, at most, 25 participants, the total number of respondents in each district may be small.

- The quality of activities were rated very positively. Despite indicating less satisfaction with the amount of time to cover the topic, the activities were rated as a 4 or above by all but one district.
- The respondents' knowledge of the topic increased as a result of the training.



Table C-2
 Participants' Mean Ratings* of the Quality of Activities, by Position
 (N=164)

Question	Position ^b					Total (N=164)
	Spec. Ed. Teachers (N=73)	Res. Rm. Teachers (N=24)	Paras (N=38)	Gen. Ed. Teachers (N=22)	Other (N=16)	
How well was the activity organized?	4.22	4.58	4.68	4.50	4.44	4.44
Were there sufficient opportunities to ask questions?	4.27	4.38	4.67	4.68	4.50	4.44
Was there enough time to cover the topic fully?	4.07	3.71	3.84	4.18	3.63	3.96
How knowledgeable was the instructor about the subject?	4.43	4.58	4.95	4.77	4.63	4.65
How appropriate was the content of the activity to your daily activities?	4.04	3.79	4.43	4.36	4.56	4.20
Did the content of the activity meet your professional interests?	4.15	4.17	4.68	4.27	4.31	4.33
How helpful were the materials used in the training?	4.25	4.08	4.71	4.33	4.19	4.35
Were your expectations of the activity met?	4.23	4.00	4.74	4.36	4.00	4.32
Before the training, what was the extent of your knowledge of the topic?	2.98	2.80	2.89	3.41	3.13	2.98
As a result of this training, what is the extent of your knowledge of the topic?	4.19	4.04	4.42	4.55	4.19	4.27

* Respondents rated different aspects of the activity they attended using a rating scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
 * Results from speech teachers, teacher trainers, and language coordinators were not included because the N for these groups fell below 10. They are, however, included in the total.

- The activities were rated very positively (a rating of 4 or above) by the classroom-based personnel.
- The slightly lower ratings for one measure indicate that many of the classroom-based personnel would like more time to cover the topic.



Table C-3
 Participants' Application of Learning, By District

Application of Learning	Percent of Respondents by District*								
	A (N=34)	B (N=18)	C (N=14)	D (N=7)	E (N=11)	F (N=28)	G (N=50)	H (N=21)	Total
Did you apply what you learned in your classroom (N=183)	91.2	77.8	50.0	85.7	72.7	92.9	86.0	71.4	82.0
Did you encounter obstacles in applying what you had learned (N=164)	48.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	26.9	26.1	0.0	24.4

* Due to the fact that QUIPP activities are limited to, at most, 25 participants, the total number of respondents in some districts may be small.

- Over 70 percent of respondents in all but one district reported applying what they had learned into their classroom.
- The percent of respondents who reported encountering obstacles in applying what they learned ranged from 0 percent in three districts to 49 percent in one district. Less than one-quarter of the participants overall reported encountering obstacles in applying what they learned.

Table C-4
Participants' Application of Learning, by Position

Application of Learning	Percent of Respondents by Position ^a		
	Spec. Ed. Teachers (N=70)	Gen. Ed. Teachers (N=22)	Paras (N=36) Res. Room Teachers (N=24) Total
Did you apply what you learned in your classroom (N=183)	77.1	95.5	72.2 83.3 82.0
Did you encounter obstacles in applying what you had learned (N=164)	24.6	35.0	16.1 22.7 26.9

^a Only the classroom-based personnel are included individually in this table. However, all groups were included in the total column.

- Over 72 percent of classroom-based personnel applied what they had learned into their classroom.
- More general education teachers and resource room reported applying what they had learned.
- Slightly more general education and special education teachers encountered obstacles in applying what they had learned.

Table C-5
Participant Interviews: Impact of Training on Teachers and Students

Effect on Teachers	Effect on Students
<p>Positive Effects</p> <p>Broadened knowledge (N=16) Improved skills (N=16) Learned new ideas, resources and strategies (N=10) Practical application of knowledge learned (N=8) Enjoyed what was learned (N=4) Shared ideas with other professionals (N=3) Helped develop more patience and work better with special education students (N=3) Increased self-confidence in teaching (N=2) More awareness and understanding of students emotional needs (N=1) More motivated (N=1) More effective methodologies and concrete goals (N=1) Gained materials to work in the classroom (N=1) Greater awareness of the remedial courses and programs that are available (N=1)</p> <p>Negative Effects</p> <p>The activity had no effect on my skills (N=1)</p>	<p>Positive Effects</p> <p>More interested and enthusiastic (N=29) More motivated (N=17) More involved in learning (N=15) Improved students' skills (N=10) Improved students' behavior/more cooperative (N=12) More receptive (N=8) More participation (N=6) Better able to relate to people from other countries (N=6) Students enjoyed the course (N=6) Better understanding of the subjects taught (N=6) Gained new information and new ideas (N=4) Improvements in writing and reading (N=4) Enjoyed the hands-on activities (N=3) Better communication between teacher and students (N=6) Students' attention improved (N=2) Knowledge and skills allowed students to work independently (N=2)</p> <p>Negative Effects</p> <p>No effect, students were too young (N=1) Beyond students' abilities (N=2)</p>

Table C-6
Staff and Participant Interviews: Comments and Suggestions¹

Comments	Suggestions
<p>Positive Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue having QUIPP, it helps the students. (N=15) - Had good instructors who were informative and engaging. (N=4) - Informative, enjoyable course. I really benefitted from the course. (N=2) - Excellent training. A wonderful way to teach. (N=1) - Interesting and well presented activities. (N=1) - Students loved the activities (N=1) - Weekend retreats are very informative (N=1) - It was wonderful to have this training and bring it back to the classroom (N=1) - QUIPP fosters camaraderie among people in the district (N=1) - QUIPP is very good in content and offerings (N=1) <p>Negative Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The course was not appropriate for the students and they did not benefit (N=8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide more sessions or two-part courses in order to cover the topic (N=12) - Provide more materials to properly implement the activity (N=6) - Provide more courses for the JHS level (N=4) - QUIPP should provide more offerings throughout the year (3) - Provide more courses for paras in special education (N=3) - Offer more time options (N=1) - Need a wider course selection (N=1) - Increase QUIPP funding for more sophisticated courses (N=1) - Provide professional guidance - follow-up in classroom (1) - QUIPP should be offered to other professionals to help them understand special education (N=1) - Offer more in-school residencies and lunch-time activities (N=1)

Only the most relevant comments are included in this table.