

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

Regional Information	
Select Region: Region 8	Date: 6/2/2011
SPoC: Linda Fuline	
Regional Manager: Margaret MacLearie	
Other Attendees: Karen Majeski	

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: 91.8%

Regional Mgr Response: The region used data evidence to inform the response.

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?

3/SPoC Response:

High Support

- a) 11 high support districts= 1,552 hours
Note: 1 large urban, 2 locals, 8 academies/community/charter schools
- b) 5/11 LEAs are in "Needs Assistance" status
6/11 LEAs are in Meets Requirements
- c) 458 preschool children
Note: 1 large urban, 2 locals, 8 academies/community/charter schools

Medium Support

- a) 1 medium support city district = 181 hours
- b) 1 medium support district in "Meets Requirements" status
- c) 23 preschool children

Low Support

- a) 16 low support districts= 3,554 hours
- b) 3/16 low support districts are in "Needs Assistance" status
- c) 585 preschool children

Note: 7 cities, 8 locals, 2

academies/charters/community schools

Note: 2 districts in "Needs Assistance" are not in differentiated accountability at all.

Note: 20% (10/50 LEAs identified in "Needs Assistance")

Regional Mgr Response:

Consideration was given to the number of districts and hours, the SPP indicators, and numbers of preschool children. There was evidence of integration of planning for OIP and the specialized work - given to the priority level of the served districts.

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

SPoC Response:

- a) 11 districts/high support
 - a. 3/11 have preschool children
 - b. %SWD=19%
 - c. %ED=81%
 - d. %PC=1.43%
- b) 1 district medium support-city
 - a. % SWD=16%
 - b. % ED= 59%
 - c. % PC= 2.4%
- c) 16 districts/low support
 - a. % SWD= 13.3%
 - b. % ED= 27.8%
 - c. % PC= 1.1%

Regional Mgr Response:

Data was used to determine the level of support as much as district would allow. In some cases larger districts used internal facilitators with additional TA support from the SST.

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

IDEA Funding Amount:

\$ 1,708,132.62 which includes the carryover.

SPoC Response:

Based upon data in #2, the allocation of hours is relatively well distributed based upon high, medium and low support areas when the following factors are noted:

- a) 5 high supports are community schools not working with SST in any OIP capacity and little contact in any other area
- b) Medium support district is allocated appropriately
- c) The majority of districts in region are low support thus accounting for larger number of hours
- d) Traditionally, low support districts fall into this category because they are more likely to engage in activities within the region to continue to improve

Regional Mgr Response:

The SST attempted to cross-walk the hours served with the funding source. The lower support districts tended to seek additional assistance in all the activities outlined in the Performance Agreement. The placeholder data also indicated that the hour estimate was commensurate with the funding allocation.

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

SPoC Response: Not a significant misalignment based upon data. Potential information to explain what might exist is:

- a) Lack of willingness by certain LEAs to work with SST
- b) Perhaps an “over” of support in districts who have truly focused on school improvements for SWD and requested frequent support
- c) Confusion over how to enter some data (i.e., Boards of DD, vocational schools
- d) Lack of accurate way to represent support in large group events, incidental supports

Regional Mgr Response: The region has a good level of understanding of the expectations. Consideration was given to resource allocation limitations as well as local district leadership capacity and the ability to implement.

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: Two PD areas of note are RtI and Inclusive practices/co-teaching. The region's response was to provide RtI support in collaboration with two professors from Kent State University and to offer the “PEP” initiative for ongoing systemic support on inclusive practices and also allowing school teams to identify RtI or co-teaching as two options for on-going SST support.

Regional Mgr Response: The PD needs were prioritized and based on the local district OIP plans and supported local identified needs for SWD. The PD was aligned to the spending plans. In some of the specialized work areas (ECT) the region joined with other regions (3,9); in EL/SR (regions 3,4,9).

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:

- a) 11 high support districts of which 4 have an identified internal facilitator; only one (Akron) that is well-prepared and does facilitate OIP. 5 are community schools who do not collaborate at all so no information is available
- b) One medium district who has an internal facilitator who is prepared to facilitate but has not been supported by higher level administration to proceed as expected

Note: all internal facilitators are invited to all trainings and encouraged to come. Also, several have been included on the distribution list and receive all SST/OIP updates and announcements.

Regional Mgr Response:

In making assignments the region considered district capacity. Serving community schools continues to be a challenge for the region. They are not always responsive to offers of assistance.

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:

For our large urban, they have taken complete ownership of OIP but am not sure how effective TBTs are. Being so large and often experience staff changes, it is difficult to gauge their quality and skill set. Community schools that are attached to large management companies blatantly ignore any SST offers for OIP support. There must be some way to enforce the differentiated accountability with them. Small individual community schools in our region have been highly receptive to assistance and are trying to follow through.

Regional Mgr Response:

The region has worked to integrate OIP into existing strategic plans and/or related initiatives. The larger community schools continue to be a challenge. ODE may want to consider additional support and/or direction for these entities.

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:

Planning for next year, the team came to some conclusions to make the work more efficient including:

- a) Eliminating "duplicated" work within SST
- b) Elimination of external facilitation will free-up time which will be redirected to new responsibilities
- c) Continue contracts with high quality part-time staff
- d) New staff have gained skills that will allow them to be even more productive next year

Regional Mgr Response:

There is evidence of a clear understanding of ODE expectations. The region is working to integrate the various ODE initiatives present in each district, such as RTTT; CAP; SPP indicators; etc).

As a cost saving measure base salaries have been frozen for FY12.

The region is continuing to plan with regional partners the online PD support for FY12. The use of SST staff to support rather than provide direct facilitation. The region is expanding its use of technology to support the expectations outlined in the Performance Agreement.

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) Monthly regional meetings and distribution list for e-mails promoted positive networking and consistent information to those who engaged
- b) Preschool emphasis was more evident this year with facilitators' understanding and district responses
- c) Implementation of OIP plans still in early stages in several districts/buildings
- d) IDEA support carefully aligned to SPP indicators in compliance but also other indicators to focus regional work
- e) There were some inconsistencies regarding services/supports provided by certain ESC facilitators that was difficult to monitor

Regional Mgr Response:

The region is looking forward to the increased consistency being provided by OEC and SSOS Offices. The region recognizes the need to document work; however, has found the TRAC process to be cumbersome.

SPoC Signature:		Date: 6/3/2011
Regional Manager Signature:		Date:6/3/2011