

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

Regional Information	
<b>Select Region:</b> Region 5	<b>Date:</b> 5/24/2011
<b>SPoC:</b> Michele DiMuzio	
<b>Regional Manager:</b> Margaret MacLearie	
<b>Other Attendees:</b>	

### 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:

For OIP supports, 100% of districts identified through Differentiated Accountability received support funded through the SST.

For Special Education, the data reflects 38/39 identified districts received support from SST 5. After examining this data, we can confirm that the single district not served (LaBrae Local) had been Identified with Early Learning needs. The hours of support for that district are listed under EL. Additionally, 50% of non-identified districts were served.

54% of districts serving 10 or more PS/SE were served. This is the first time that our staff was aware of the data sorted this way. The 3 districts with the largest number of PS/SE received the largest number of hours of support from SST 5 in the area of Early Learning.

Regional Mgr Response:

STARS data not included in placeholder data. Time/funding analysis commensurate with their funding allocations.

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 level of support to our districts identified as high is deceiving since 9 of 12 of these LEAs are community schools. The hours spent with the 3 city districts was 1745 hours out of the 1820 total for high districts. When the hours are reported by 100 students, the percentages are aligned at High 11.1, Moderate 9.9, Low 8.9. The percent of total hours is deceiving again due to the large number of community schools rated as "high" as well as the total numbers of districts in each category- High 36.2% (3 districts and 8 community schools), Moderate 18.9% (6 districts) and Low 43.1% (13 districts).

In the area of Special Education, 85.3% of hours were allocated to districts directly related to SPP indicators or IDEA review. In addition to the hours spent directly with districts, much time is spent building the capacity of special education directors across the region. Monthly meetings are held in each county to provide ongoing support to leaders in special education.

In Early Learning, 127 hours were spent on districts with less than 10 PS/SE students while 1297 hours were spent on districts with more than 10 PS/SE students. 91% of the total EL hours were spent in districts that serve more young children with disabilities. Time is prioritized to support building leadership capacity across the 4 counties by meeting quarterly with the preschool supervisors. Ongoing TA is provided to support the early learning leaders.

Regional Mgr Response:

Experienced difficulty connecting with community school leadership teams. There was limited collaboration and cooperation. They are not engaged beyond compliance (ex special education).

Conduct regular bimonthly meetings by county/city across programs to integrate work. SST meets together monthly as a region. This has had a positive impact on Ashtabula County.

Direction for early learning (EL) comes directly from ODE without information shared with SPOC and SPEC. There is no priority given to EL/SR directives; regions are left to pick and choose from the "laundry list". It becomes global EL community and not targeted. This approach makes it challenging to integrate/support the EL work.

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

SPoC Response:

For OIP, the SST 5 regional plan for 2010-11 was to provide facilitation support to all high, moderate and low support districts. The baseline allocation of days was formulated on number of schools within a district (10 days for DLT work and an additional 10 days for each school for BLT/TBT supports). This plan differentiated support by size of district. In addition to the baseline, other factors were considered such as Youngstown City was provided more intensive support due to the Academic Distress Commission. Other districts days were reduced due to lack of commitment to the process. Additionally, SST 5 was committed to embedding special education and early learning supports into our districts implementing OIP. We had assigned a special education facilitator to work with each district as a consultant as needed. Our Early Learning staff continues to build the facilitator capacity in this area. EL is also called in as needed to support implementation of OIP.

For Special Education, SST 5 has 6 districts with 500 or more students with disabilities. These 6 districts of our 69, received 24.8% of our total hours of service. Of all 69 districts, only 15 have not received some type of direct service.

EL has spent 75% of their reported hours in our 4 largest urban districts (Youngstown, Warren, East Liverpool and Ashtabula). As part of Youngstown's OIP, our EL consultant joined a subcommittee focused on addressing the needs of young children. This has become an ongoing subcommittee to the Youngstown DLT.

Regional Mgr Response:

Subgroup data was used to prioritize and address needs.

Leveraged resources of ESCs with SST resources to provide subgroup services. Many external facilitators (EF) are ESC partner staff.

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

IDEA Funding Amount: \$1,324,986.00  
SPoC Response: As we examined the supports provided to the districts, we reported our data in OIP section, not based on funding source but rather on implementation of the process. In TRAC, the work is correctly entered by PPS, but that is not how we reported the data in this spreadsheet. 13 of 31 districts that we reported under OIP missed AYP solely for students with disabilities. Therefore, the 1897 hours under OIP supports should be listed under IDEA. The data submitted under IDEA reflects supports for compliance indicators not achievement. Moving the hours from OIP to IDEA where they should have been allocated would make the time more proportionate to funding.  
Regional Mgr Response: Used TRAC documentation to monitor progress. Ongoing monitoring process includes biweekly internal staff meetings to discuss district progress and share information (i.e. EL/SR).

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

SPoC Response: The misalignment could be corrected by moving the 1897 from OIP to IDEA. Additionally, SST 5 did not capture all of the information from STARS into our time allocations. When multiple districts were represented in training, we did not know of a way to accurately portray that information without becoming duplicative. All of the time reflected in our sheet is direct supports to specific districts. We have offered extensive professional development in each county and regionally, touching many individuals that is not represented in any format at this time. All of our PD was focused on inclusive practices and achievement for students with disabilities. Our IDEA hours of support, would have been much greater if the PD time had been reported.  
Regional Mgr Response: Not easy to pull TRAC data to do activity analysis. SST considered strengths and challenges of districts. SST examined resource limitations.

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:

As a region, we have responded to the variety of district needs. Our 2010-11 regional needs assessment included a snapshot of all of the district, focused plans, goals, strategies and action steps. Monthly, we meet with the curriculum directors in each county. With our regional partners, we examined the needs and determined which needs were covered by ESC services and which are specific to the SST performance agreement. At that time, we have planned regionally training related to improving the outcomes for students with disabilities. Many of our districts have missed AYP for the students with disabilities subgroup. Our PD plan has focused on both inclusive practices and improving instruction. In addition to our regional training, we have partnered with each of our 4 ESCs to provide specific supports related to their districts in the area of special education. We meet with each county (including the city districts located there) to provide ongoing support in school improvement, special education and early learning,

Regional Mgr Response:

Evidence of regional professional development based on prioritized needs of targeted districts.  
Linked instructional PD with leadership PD.  
ESC partners participate in PD planning and attend PD with district to support/monitor the follow-up activities.  
SST has expectations for each facilitator with specific "look fors" in each environment in an effort to hold participants accountable (implementation and monitoring).

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 schools have been a challenge. It is difficult to navigate the right person to communicate with between the management company, sponsor, and building administrator. Often, they are resistant to external supports. Communication from ODE may encourage more cooperation and collaboration from community schools.

Urban 21 and Ohio 8 are in the greatest need of support in our region. It takes much more time to support the large urban centers. These districts need supports that can be contextualized given their unique needs. Given the variety of initiatives and mandates being implemented by our neediest districts, measuring impact can be a challenge.

For both community schools and the large urban districts, having an agreement upfront would be helpful. If the expectations and responsibilities are agreed upon before services are initiated, that may give more clarity and ownership to the district and/or community school.

Regional Mgr Response:

Internal structures of urban and community schools make the school improvement work challenging.

## 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:

SST 5 has begun planning for the 2011-12 school year. Our plan is to use a tiered support for professional development and technical assistance. (see attached). Reviewing this data has helped us see gaps in our service across all functions of the SST.

For OIP, the biggest learning that we had is to differentiate support between high, moderate and low support districts. Moving into next year, our focus will need to prioritize based on level of need. Also, a more concerted effort is needed to build the capacity of Internal Facilitators. Additionally, we need to plan a way to effectively support our high need community schools. To sustain movement of our medium and low support districts, we may be able to offer universal support by partnering with our ESCs and have potential PD and TA through the use of technology.

For special education, we are planning to continue to provide supports in a tiered approach. Having universal information PD and TA with more intentional use of technology to bring people and ideas together. We will offer both regional, county and district supports. The data helped us see where the bulk of our special education students reside and may add additional support to the 6 districts with the largest numbers of students with disabilities. This may become a quarterly onsite meeting with each of the districts in addition to the other supports provided.

For Early Learning, we are anticipating a more clearly defined and focused performance agreement, so that the time and resources are allocated to best serve our youngest students. Help in prioritizing the work of early learning would be most appreciated.

Regional Mgr Response:

Have begun to develop an integrated planning and communication system for FY12. This is being designed to increase SST implementation and accountability.

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:

Global Priorities-

- Create/utilize a better system to measure impact including costumer satisfaction
- Use data on an ongoing basis to progress monitor our supports and impact
- Examine ways to support districts resistant to external help (working with those in most need as opposed to those requesting service)
- Use multiple indicators (AYP, SPP, DA, etc.) to tier the level of support given to districts
- Communicate with partners and districts our coherent and comprehensive plan of support aligned to the performance agreement.
- Use 2011-12 data to ensure gaps of service are addressed.
- Use professional development standards and Gusky model of evaluating PD in planning and implementing all PD and TA

Priorities of OIP-

- Support to Districts identified as "high" need
- Build capacity of Internal Facilitators
- Implement a system to support community school
- Continue relationships with ESCs to support moderate and low districts (without funding)
- Connect districts with other resources/supports like RTTT, SIG, etc.
- Continue to support the academic distress commission in Youngstown City

Special Education-

- Youngstown and Warren follow-up from onsite review scheduled for next year
- Offered tiered supports based on SPP data
- Provide PD/TA on compliance indicators
- Focus PD/TA on achievement indicators (LRE and reading/math achievement)
- Use the DAC model to assist districts in delving deeper into special education data

Early Learning-

- Prioritize work based on PA
- Ensure a focus on SPP data related to young children
- Clearer connections to LEAs through OIP, SPP, etc.
- Maintain regional and county meetings to support and build capacity of leaders in EL
- Clearer focus on supporting PS/SE
- Align the work more closely to the other functions of the SST.

Regional Mgr Response: Have considered new ideas and tools with the potential of statewide generalization. Guidance from ODE to measure impact of PD, TA and facilitation. Some general tools applicable to all regions. Knowing upfront what data will be collected and use it for mid-course corrections. ODE may want to consider continue the restricting of the SPOC/SPEC meetings into work sessions like the former SLDT. A comprehensive communication loop for SPEC/SPOC that supports all work outlined in the performance agreement (especially EL/SR and OCALI) is needed including a common calendar for the year.

11.

<b>SPoC Signature:</b> 	Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>
<b>Regional Manager Signature:</b> 	Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>