

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

Regional Information	
Select Region: Region 15	Date: 5/31/2011
SPoC: Eric Humston	
Regional Manager: Forest Kuhn	
Other Attendees: N/A	

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:

LEAs are identified as needing support through the Differentiated Accountability System, SPP Profiles, OEC On-Site monitoring, findings from special education complaints, due process, and district requests for services and/or technical assistance. Other than one district in the DA ALL districts with identified needs have received support. There is a collaborative effort among the SST and three ESCs to ensure all districts needing and/or requesting support be provided that support. The one district in the DA that did not receive support declined assistance both from the SST and the ESC.

Regional Mgr Response:

The SST and the regional ESCs have worked cooperatively to meet the needs of all districts in the region. As stated above, the SST and ESCs have served all districts in the region on the OIP, Early Learning, and/or Special Education. The one district has been hesitant to allow the SST or ESC to provide direct OIP support. They are a Low support district with one of their schools in SI delay.

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: The number of hours dedicated to the work is commensurate with the needs of the districts and the capacity of the SST. The hours of reported service approximate the state average hours/dollars allocated to the work. All the districts could benefit from additional support if there were additional funding to provide additional support. We are responsive to district needs and are proactive. For example we had a team of two SST members and one ESC member (in most cases) visit every district in the region and review the SPP profile with the DLT. Every district received on-site training in secondary transition requirements. Every district received on-site training in standards-based IEP development.

Regional Mgr Response: The data as reported to the SST from the Baseline Survey does not reflect the time the region's ESC partners spent with districts in providing OIP services to the high-medium-low support districts. SSTs were required to report their time spent in technical assistance to districts, but ESCs were not required to report this time.

3. To what degree is the level of support consistent with the number and types of student population?

SPoC Response: Since every district in the region, except one, missed AYP benchmarks for students with disabilities, and since SWD was the only subgroup to miss AYP in the region, our support whether through the OIP or IDEA funded work focused on that population. Early Learning support to districts included all districts and focused on those services mandated through the Performance Agreement.

Regional Mgr Response: As stated above the focus of the work of the SST is with SWDs since this was the population that resulted in districts not meeting AYP. The other regional work was planned as per the required work as stated in the Performance Agreement.

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

IDEA Funding Amount: \$1,109,561

SPoC Response: The estimates of hours allocated to the work appear to be disproportionately small in comparison to their funding allocations. (see Analysis of Placeholder Data, page 2)

Regional Mgr Response: As stated in the chart: Percents of \$ Allocation and Total Hours by Region, Region #15 was noted as having hours by function that approximated the State average hours or the State average \$ (funding allocations).

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

SPoC Response: The hours reported are those hours that a consultant spent providing direct services to a specific district. There are many other hours of support that are not reflected in the collection of hours by districts. For example many hours of PD/TA in Early Learning support are provided in group settings with representatives of all districts and agencies attending. We have provided much support through regional or county level meetings and trainings including building autism training, parent meetings, OIP training, standards based IEP training, Special Education and Psychologist networks, secondary transition training, and superintendent meetings.

Regional Mgr Response: As previously stated, the hours reported on the Baseline Survey does not include the hours (TRAC) the region's ESC partners spent on regional work. In addition, the numerous hours of PD as reported in STARS is also not included.

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: There are districts with similar needs for professional development. The SST has identified these similar needs and has shared that information with the Regional Advisory Council and its special education and school improvement subcommittees as well as with our ESCs. The ESCs for the most part are the entities who deliver the PD that is part of the district improvement plans. The ESCs have become more focused and purposeful in their approach to professional development delivery.

Regional Mgr Response: The Single Point of Contact has initiated a Special Education Network to assist district special education leaders with joint PD as well as other special education concerns. Also, the SPoC has initiated a psychologist's Network to allow a forum for discussion of similar concerns and a speech therapist network is planned for 2011-12.

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: The data on the "dashboard" is not accurate. ALL districts in the DA have at least one assigned facilitator for the district. Many have assigned building facilitators. The district internal facilitators are generally prepared to facilitate the OIP: 5-6 are exceptional, 11-12 are adequate with external support, and 1 is not prepared. The limitations of internal facilitators are due to time available to do the work, limited authority to direct the work, and individual motivation.

Regional Mgr Response: The data in the Baseline Survey is not accurate. In actuality all districts as identified in DA do have a district assigned IF.

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:

In our region there are two community schools that are under the leadership of the same superintendent. The schools operate much as a K-12 district. It is unique to community schools in this respect and does not require a different approach for support/services from the SST. There are some challenges in finding some PD as the schools are not directly associated with an ESC (although will be next year).

Regional Mgr Response:

The SPoC/SST has done an excellent job in involving the CSs in the Region relative to OIP support and any relevant PD that may be available to them. The CSs have also been involved in the Special Education Network, the SST has assisted them with their On-Site Review, provided IEP support, and the SPP presentations. Basically, the CSs received the same services as those available to the public school 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:

OIP facilitation: The level of GRF funding will determine to what extent we can provide OIP facilitation services and support. We have worked collaboratively and closely with our ESCs in providing OIP support to districts. In most districts we have paired an SST and ESC facilitator. We have had quarterly meetings with SST-ESC facilitators to provide PD, share best practices and problem-solve specific facilitator issues. Through the close collaboration we have a solid base of facilitators from the ESCs. If there is no GRF funding to the SST, the region would have to rely solely on ESC facilitators. A minimum amount of funding may permit us to serve 2-3 high need districts, provide support to the ESC facilitators, or provide supports to groups of districts rather than individual district facilitation. We should have sufficient funding to provide HQPD/TA through the IDEA funded work. Until we receive the new Performance Agreement and review any additions we cannot make specific plans. However, we anticipate that we will not have a major shift to additional monitoring responsibilities. If there are additional responsibilities, we will have to provide fewer other direct services (such as our planned IEP-Specialized Instruction services).

Regional Mgr Response:

With limited SST funding for 2011-12, the SST will assume more of a support/TA role, especially with the districts identified in DA.

In reference to the 2011-12 funding formula, it needs to be taken into account these factors in making the final allocation to regions:

- The numerous districts with small enrollment numbers.
- The number of districts with small number of SWDs that do not show up on the DA list as needing services.
- The Grade Band Rule eliminates many of the region's districts from being identified as DI.

The region's ESC have been extremely supportive of the process and willing to provide this assistance, but with increased work on the ESCs and less funding, their priorities may need to shift. The assistance and involvement of the Regional Training Team (RTT) is extremely important to the ESCs as well as the SST.

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: A review of regional data from multiple sources indicates the following needs. The needs are prioritized in reference to the structures for the OIP. Other work that will be required through the Performance Agreement is not included in this list of priorities.

1. TBT Level

OIP:

“RTI”: TBT 5-Step Process:

- Assessments
- Instructional Strategies
- Interventions

IDEA:

“RTI”:

- Assessments (screening, diagnostics, formative)
- Instructional Strategies
- Interventions
- Progress Monitoring & Reporting

Specially Designed Instruction

Early Learning:

- Strategies for Teaching Language
- Teacher Leader Initiative
- Second Step Training
- ECO, GGG, ASQSE

Planning Secondary Transition Services

Accommodations

2. BLT Level

OIP:

Monitoring:

- Connecting adult actions with student achievement
- Continued use of monitoring protocols
- Refinement of walkthrough tools , processes, and look-fors to align with strategies

Building Administrator Training

- Changing role of the principal
- Balance of pressure and support

IDEA:

Building Autism Training

Roles of Gen Ed. Teachers/Intervention Specialists

ELSR: Ready Schools Training

Principals as Instructional Leaders

Paraprofessional Training

3. DLT Level

OIP:

Maintaining Momentum &

Focus:

- Support persons to keep the focus on improvement, lessen the chance of reverting to old less effective behaviors
- Moving the process forward in middle and high schools
- Finding time for OIP meetings
- Aligning initiatives (OIP, RttT), maintaining ONE focused plan
- Using current DF data in Stage 4: Evaluation

Training for New Staff

- Internal facilitators – leading the OIP
- Teachers – OIP overview

IDEA:

Integrating Early Learning into DLT discussions

- (Data Package)
- ECE Companion Guide

4. Regional Level

OIP:

Training in IMM

OIP/OLAC Tools Training

Training for New Staff

IDEA:

Parent Advisory Council:

- Expand network
- Increase membership

Regional Mgr Response:

The priorities as set by the Region are in line with the priorities as set by the Performance Agreement. The Region has identified their needs with data from numerous sources and have prioritized their work with the TBTs as their top priority. It is with change occurring at the TBT level is where we will see change at the classroom level and in turn increased student achievement.

The next level of regional work that will occur is setting up action steps and tasking out the work after final regional allocations are made.

SPoC Signature: [Redacted]	Date: 5/31/11
Regional Manager Signature: [Redacted]	Date: 5/31/11