

**SY2010-11 PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT PLACEHOLDER DATA
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

Regional Information

Select Region: Region 11	Date: 5/25/2011
SPoC: Choose an item.	
Regional Manager: Margaret MacLearie	
Other Attendees: Tom Reed (SPOC), Bart Anderson, Rick Fenton, Greg Paulmann	

Region Data Provided – Condensed from SSOS Baseline Survey

District Name	Student Population	Reason Working with LEA	Number of Years Provided OIP Support	Hours of SST Support
Column B	Columns C-F	Column G and H	Column I	Columns J, K, L

Analysis of SY2010-11 Placeholder Data

1. What percent of LEAs identified as needing support receive OIP, Early Learning and/or Special Education support?

SPoC Response: 100%

Regional Mgr Response: Used placeholder spread sheet to determine response. Recognize that 2 community schools went unserved. Understand that the quality of service may differ.
2. To what degree is the allocation of hours reflective of/commensurate with the identified: a) LEA DA status, b) LEA IDEA profile, c) number of preschool children?

SPoC Response: Moderately reflective. TRAC data shows different proportion of activity and is likely more accurate for IDEA work.

Regional Mgr Response: TRAC entries were determined to be more accurate than placeholder chart. IDEA TRAC data was found to be more accurate. OIP entries less accurate; OIP facilitator interpretations of the PPSs.
3. To what degree is the level of support consistent with the number and types of student population?

SPoC Response: Level of support falls below what is needed given the student population

Regional Mgr Response: LEAs determine level of support; however the student population is disproportionate.

4. To what degree is the allocation of hours generally proportionate to the funding allocations (source)?

IDEA Funding Amount: 2.7 million
SPoC Response: Estimates for IDEA are too low

Regional Mgr Response: Have done more SWD work than the data fields show. As a year-end activity, the SST has begun to cross-walk activities with the needs assessments and prioritizing the data to influence FY12 planning.

5. What information or evidence helps explain any misalignment seen in questions 2-4?

SPoC Response:

1. Funding formula for SSTs determined at the LEA level, not the student level. SST11 has between 1 -2 percent of the LEAs statewide but accounts for about 20 percent of the student enrollment.
2. Estimates were made hastily and late in the year, well after most of the services had been provided.
3. TRAC is an inefficient and inferior software system for accurately logging level of effort to complete the work.

Regional Mgr Response: Need a more user friendly, readily available system data collection system.

6. Are there a significant number of districts with similar professional development in the district plan (Columns AE-AN)? How has the region responded?

SPoC Response: Yes. The region has responded by leveraging resources to build capacity of districts with similar needs at multi-district events and also by attempting to partner districts to share ideas and support each other.

Regional Mgr Response: Prioritized by the number of LEAs requesting a need. Recognize the need to engage in a deeper conversation about "what is the right work". Need to engage in a more systematic approach that is need driven through data analysis, rather than want driven through facilitator preference and/or interest.

7. What percent of high-medium need districts in differentiated accountability (OIP) have an assigned internal facilitator (Column AA)? To what degree are internal facilitators prepared to facilitate the OIP?

SPoC Response: 13%. Generally, IFs are sufficiently skilled to facilitate the OIP, however many are over-utilized throughout the district meaning they lack the resources of time and funding to adequately support building level training and capacity building.

Regional Mgr Response: 60% of the region's LEAs are community schools and 40% traditional. There is a lack of understanding among district leadership as to the amount of effort necessary to facilitate OIP with a high degree of fidelity.

8. Given your experiences working with a) community schools and b) the urban "21"/ Ohio "8", what special considerations should be taken into account when establishing the performance agreements with fiscal agent to work in these settings?

SPoC Response: Community School and Urban 21/Ohio 8 districts are exceptionally complex and at times less responsive to technical assistance, therefore requiring an "effort" factor to be added to any funding formula and any performance agreement deliverables. Generally, community school structures are much more diffused, requiring EFs to establish meaningful working relationships with individuals who frequently are not employed on site and at times are in other states. In the case of Urban 21/Ohio 8, the districts represent very complex, hierarchical organizations that are labor-intensive to navigate and extremely difficult to coordinate and move.

Regional Mgr Response: Attempts to group community schools to facilitate the OIP have not been successful. Region recognizes the value in studying other Ohio models of high performing urban districts.

Interpretation of SY2010-11 Placeholder Data

(Givens: Reduced funding in GRF, level IDEA funding with additional responsibilities and requirements for some districts, required accountability and progress monitoring of fiscal and performance.)

9. Based on responses to the above, how will the region redistribute and/or creatively provide services in SY2011-12 in order for all districts to receive adequate support commensurate with their needs?

SPoC Response: More intentional planning and leveraging of resources against like needs. Greater reliance on regional partners (ESCs) to assist in localized efforts. More strategic allocation of human capital, ie. by special area of expertise rather than LEA dedicated.

Regional Mgr Response: Design a more strategic allocation of human capital that aligns to a master plan for the delivery of services outlined in the Performance Agreement. This would include a system of progress monitoring and accountability based on data and evidence. The SST will develop a preliminary master plan by June 30 for review by the RMs, with a final version by Aug 1.

10. What can be learned from the additional and/or other comments provided by the region? Please also prioritize your needs for the upcoming year.

SPoC Response: One priority for the upcoming year is building capacity at the school level to implement and effectively use teacher-based team structures to support school-wide improvement initiatives such as RTI, formative assessment, formative instruction, and the implementation of the common core standards and the revised curriculum in science and social studies. Other priorities include establishing and fostering productive relationships with community schools, their sponsors, and their management companies in helping them plan, implement, and monitor instruction that is aligned to state standards and assessments. Additionally, it is imperative that regional work focus more intently on vertically aligning early childhood activities in both public and private pre-schools to expectations and outcomes in Kindergarten, first, and second grades.

Regional Mgr Response: Need to focus on building the knowledge, skills, capacity, reporting structure, and focus for the SST to be successful in the implementation and monitoring of the work outlined in the Performance Agreement.

SPoC Signature: 	Date: 5/25/2011
Regional Manager Signature: 	Date: