



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 1

Number of LEAs in Region: 110

Date of Review Conference: 10/5/2012

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) Office of the Ohio Network for Innovation and Improvement (ONII), Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) and Office of Early Learning/School Readiness (EL/SR), completes an annual review of the implementation of the Performance Agreement for Ohio's State Support Teams (SSTs) as required by Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) Section 3312.09.

The annual review is referred to as the Performance Agreement Review Process (PARP) and ensures that the SST has met the requirements for performance agreement scope of work in: a) supporting effective use of the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP); b) improving results for students with disabilities; and c) implementation of early learning and school readiness areas of focus work.

The focus of the FY2012 annual evaluation was on the work scope outlined in the FY2012 Performance Agreement. Data sources used in the evaluation include: the first and last FY2012 progress reports; the May 2012 Customer Service Survey; professional development evaluations; regional average scaled scores in reading and mathematics for students with disabilities; Special Education Performance Profile Indicators; IDEA compliance reviews; implementation indicators for OIP and EL/SRs; and interviews with staff.

SST Region 1 has been found substantially compliant with the work scope defined in the 2011-2012 Performance Agreement as evidenced in the attached report. The report also includes continuous improvement strategies that have been identified by the SST and the PARP team for additional focus this year.

ODE commends SST Region 1's continued efforts to provide high quality professional development and technical assistance to LEAs and parents in the region.

Sincerely,

Sue Zake
Office for Exceptional Children

Pam VanHorn
Ohio Network for
Innovation and Improvement

Stephanie Siddens
Office of Early Learning
and School Readiness

c: SST Region 1 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 1 Fiscal Agent

FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) Office of the Ohio Network for Innovation and Improvement (ONII), Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) and Office of Early Learning/School Readiness (EL/SR), completes an annual review of the implementation of the Performance Agreement for Ohio's State Support Teams (SSTs) as required by Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) Section 3312.09.

Region: 1 **Number of LEAs in Region: 110** **Date of Review Conference: 10/5/2012**

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

Following a review of the data generated for and derived from the first and last FY12 progress reports, please comment on regional status.

Data: First and last FY12 progress reports (sent via email and attached to final report).

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Region 1 has 38 LEA's in Differentiated Accountability. Of these, 20 are community schools and 18 are traditional LEAs. Out of the 20 community schools, one is a virtual academy and 3 are virtual or blended classroom credit recovery schools. 14/20 are considered to be High Support schools, 2/20 are medium support and 4/20 are in the low support category. Out of the 18 traditional schools, two require high support, four medium support and 12 required low support. One school is considered to be a large urban district, 9 are considered to be suburban and 8 are considered to be rural districts.

When looking at our comparative data from January to June 2012, several things are notable. First, out of the nine districts that demonstrated improvement, most did so in multiple areas (that is, they were truly focused on the process and were able to look at the global picture). Secondly, 4/9 LEAs made changes to their DLT and/or BLT composition, demonstrating the knowledge that special education needed to be part of the process to effect positive change.

The "negative" side to the data also has several notable elements. Primarily, only 9/38 LEA's demonstrated any positive changes in the reported areas. Out of those 9, zero changes were made in the category of TBT implementation, and only two increases were noted in the BLT implementation category. Areas where districts seem to need encouragement, resources, tools and support is in the areas of participating in the formative assessment process, rolling out the common core standards and changing instructional practices to better meet the needs of their students. While the majority of LEAs are beginning to show development in these areas, progress is slow.

All 38 districts have DLTs in place, though roughly 50% of these are not established in a way that facilitates improvement within the district. It is our hope that during the coming year we will be able to facilitate positive change in this area as we will be working more closely with all districts in DA (including low support).

With regard to the traditional schools in region 1, 6 have undergone significant change in district leadership. Out of these, 4 have hired central office personnel that are trained in the OIP process or have been hired to do only school improvement work. Along these lines one Community school changed leadership solely due to the desire to implement the OIP process in a more focused, intentional way.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

While Region 1 has many of their DA districts trained in Formative Assessment, only 8/38 are truly beginning to implement at least in several grade levels. Districts that once would have rated themselves as implementing formative assessment, would no longer do so, based upon their current knowledge of what it takes to implement this initiative (following extensive PD in the region).

Community schools remain more of a challenge to work with, due to the nature of their structure and the fact that many of the ones in DA in region 1 have management companies out of the region or even out of the state. The structure of school and sponsor and management company also makes collaboration and support more convoluted and the SST is frequently left “out of the loop” in school improvement discussions.

One area that poses a concern with regard to the validity of the data presented is the reported scores for low support LEA’s. While contact was made with these districts throughout the year, it was not always a situation that provided direct knowledge/observation of what the low support districts were implementing. Several of these scores were rated low, as SST region 1 did not feel it had data to support a higher ranking.

In looking at the data, it is not only important to look at the changes LEAs made in the last half of the year, but to look at overall scores in general. This will help focus our support, PD and general resources for the upcoming year.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

Data: First and last FY12 progress reports (sent via email and attached to final report).

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

This year SST 1 has additionally hired four part-time consultants to help with the implementation of OIP with fidelity in the high/medium support LEAs. The foundation of OIP has to be in place this year. Community Schools will be given support through group work as well as utilizing separate contacts. From January- June, 2012 the Formative Assessments column increased by .08% while the Instructional Practices by .05% on the Progress Report. To increase these numbers, SST 1 is utilizing teams in “Align-Access-Achieve” from North Carolina. High support districts have used this professional development and this year community schools will be asked to join. A connection with the Formative Instructional Practice (FIP) consultant will be established. Literacy and math professional development will be offered including balanced literacy/balanced math (Learn and Learn) to model instructional practices. Bridging the literacy gap between preschool and early learning is also being offered by consultants. During monthly OIP Facilitators’ Meetings (face-to-face or webinar) pieces of evidence will be shared that align with formative assessments and instructional practices.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

Following a review of the data derived from the May 2012 Customer Service Survey, please comment on regional status.

Data: Regional May Customer Service Survey (sent via email and attached to final report).

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

The deeper I probed into the data from Region 1, the more confusing it became, and the more questions the data generated. It was necessary to coordinate all of the documents provided to get a true sense of what the data was saying.

When looking at the list of potential responders, only 46% of the 76 names actually took the time to answer the questions, and many that participated in the survey did not elaborate on their responses (which is much more helpful in informing our future planning than the simple number scale). Approximately 30% of those listed chose to not actively participate with the SST in trainings or in onsite meetings during the past year. Therefore it is confusing to our staff how to interpret their responses, as we are unclear what information they used to rate the SST.

When analyzing the specific responses to Questions 5 and 6 of the Survey, one thing was evident; the districts are desirous of having more contact with the SST consultants. Not only would they like the consultants to be more readily available to their districts and buildings, but they would like the external facilitators to come to the districts and engage in more personal dialogue regarding specific school improvement/OIP issues the district may be encountering. Last year due to budget constraints it was necessary to be more creative in our approach to providing support for our districts on our DA list. It is apparent that the districts did not feel supported with these options and this is something we will need to re-examine for the upcoming year. I also feel that our low support schools were confused by the indirect support we provided last year. While their internal facilitators were invited to participate in training sessions, discussions and formal PD opportunities, I question whether or not they had the foundational skills necessary to facilitate a DLT through the OIP process.

Community schools also weighed in that they would like training that better meets the needs of Community schools in general. As was stated in the previous question, the very nature of many community schools infrastructure (school, sponsor, management company) may need to result in a more differentiated approach to support.

I have concern regarding the validity of some of the responses found on the Customer Service Individual Detail Report. While overall SST1 received many 3's and 4's, I fear they cannot all be trusted to be accurate. For example, one district in medium support worked with the SST for only two meetings in the summer of 2011 to complete their DF and write their plan. They participated in no TBT training, no formative assessment training, no special education training and did not respond to our attempts to meet with them throughout the year, yet they rated the SST with all 3's and 4's. This scenario is repeated several times in this report.

The Detail report also revealed that the support we provide to Credit Recovery Schools needs to better fit the unique needs of those schools. Schools of this nature do not serve "typical" students and do not generate the same kind of data that regular schools/community schools generate. Their needs are different, yet we do not differentiate our services to meet their needs.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Lastly the Individual Detail Report revealed that as a region we were weakest in our support, training and technical assistance for DLTs. While I think this was partially addressed in a previous paragraph, I also think it was a result of focusing on moving districts to begin TBT work and continue with the BLT process. I feel we erroneously felt DLTs should be self-sufficient and able to coordinate their own activities without an accountability system or a safety net in place. I also question whether we have informed the districts that there exists the expectation to internally manage their DLT without as much assistance from the SST. Without frequent “nudging” from the external facilitators some districts would not have met as a DLT on a consistent basis.

In analyzing the Average Response by Region data, several questions need to be asked. Why do 50% of all regions fall below the cut score for instructional practices for students with disabilities and for Early Learning and School Readiness? When analyzing this data in conjunction to the PD and TA activities we offered in the region last year, two things come to mind. Many of the survey participants would not have participated in these regional activities and therefore would not have known about or understood them. More importantly many of our responders are looking for a “cookbook” of answers as to how to increase achievement for students with disabilities. They have yet to grasp the idea that decreasing the achievement gap is ultimately about data driven decision making and choosing research based strategies that are implemented with fidelity. I feel the same may be the reason for the lower score in ELSR. It has also been difficult to engage our DA districts in the discussion of strengthening instructional practices in preschool as a starting point for their school improvement process. This will need to be addressed in a more focused way in the upcoming year.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

Data: Regional May 2012 Customer Service Survey (sent via email and attached to final report).

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

On the Customer Services Responses, sixteen (16) LEAs gave an overall satisfaction rating of 4, ten (10) issued a rating of 3, one LEA gave a 2 and one LEA rated customer service with a 1. The overall response rate was 46.1%. A root cause of the low numbers could be that an LEA felt that it needed more services than it was able to receive. SST 1 will also need to figure out how to work better with Community Schools. Utilizing survey monkey, SST 1 would like to do a quarterly check on a Customer Service Survey. Accuracy and clarification can be monitored and technical assistance will be tailored for each LEA. SST 1 would like to better align their services to insure linkages so they will know what they are doing well and what not so well.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

Following a review of the data derived from professional development evaluations, please comment on regional status.

Data: Regional March-June 2012 professional development evaluations (sent via email and attached to final report).

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

The analysis of the Professional Development data (comment report and training report) revealed that during the reporting period for March-June 2012, 341 participants responded to the online PD evaluation form. This was out of a total of over 3000 people participating in PD during this time frame. This completion rate of 11% is far less than the completion rate of 90+% our staff was accustomed to receiving when we used a paper/pencil format and the participants completed their evaluations prior to leaving the session. While we attempted many different options and avenues for participants to respond to the online survey, it was very difficult to have PD attendees actually participate in this new format.

The staff depends on the responses to the evaluation forms to help with follow up activities and to inform changes that need to be made to future presentations. The online survey did not provide them with the immediate feedback they have come to depend on and this was frustrating to staff. Region 1's evaluation form asked participants to self-reflect about what they had learned, how they would apply their new knowledge, how they would connect their information to student achievement and to define the support they would need in the future to assist with implementation of their new information. While we were able to add several of these questions to the ODE form the decreased number of responses did not allow the staff to set new learning targets and make instructional changes.

The analysis of the data in the training report revealed the following: Special Education Compliance: It was interesting that almost 99% of those that responded felt the information would impact their job, but only 76% felt the PD was job embedded. This led our staff to believe that while the participants knew the information was important they did not feel it was pertinent to the everyday instruction or leadership they were to provide in their district. This aligns with information found in section V of this report, which looks as the IDEA monitoring information.

Special Education Instruction: This data indicates that not only did the participants feel this information would impact their job, they also saw the embedded nature of the information. This is a bright spot in the data in that this is the area of PD that will greatly impact our ability to decrease the achievement gap. Our focus in this area has been to address instruction in district teams, combine general ed, special ed and leadership together and to approach as many topics as possible from multiple views (leadership teams, teacher teams, blended teams etc.).

Early Learning and School Readiness: This data was strong and showed that the connection between job embedded information and job impact has been made by the presenters and the participants. Topics presented during this time frame were concrete and linked directly to implementation strategies and daily classroom activities. This resulted in educators leaving the sessions knowing what to do to help their students, how to do it and what should happen if they implement correctly. This model will need to be replicated for future PD opportunities.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Ohio Improvement Process: (80% job embedded and 89% job impact ratings). This data tells me two things: First, systems change is difficult and participants need significant support and repetition of information to understand the content, how to implement this in their districts, and how it impacts their life in the classroom. Secondly, OIP is not “black and white” information. As presenters, facilitators and coaches we need to do a better job of helping participants link information and align processes with what they do on a daily basis in their districts.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Responses:
SST 1 was below state totals in average responses (3.33% compared to 3.44), job embedded (87.4% compared to 90.1%) and job impacted (95.6% compared to 96.2%) The breaking down of silos (school improvement, special education, and early learning/school readiness) will help participants in understanding the terms job embedded and job impacted. SST 1 will start with the end in mind. Surveys will be entered by paper and pencil to capture all participants to complete their evaluations prior to leaving the session. Recovery/Community Schools will be marketed professional development that meets their direct needs. Participants partaking in professional development will comprehend that they will need to monitor and collect data once they are back in their LEAs. SST 1 staff is available to coach throughout the school year so there is not “one-shot” professional development. Sign assurances for multiple day professional development are being tightened in order for LEAs to be reimbursed.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Following a review of this data, please comment on *both the changes in the average scaled score for students with disabilities and changes in the gap within the region.*

Data: Regional average scaled scores in reading and mathematics for students with disabilities and students without disabilities (sent via email and attached to final report).

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Regionally in the past two years, the achievement gap between typical students and students with disabilities in the area of reading has decreased by 2.2 percent, with the range being -43.97 to +28.89. The gap in math between these two groups of students has increased by 1.40 (with a range of -22.09 to +22.83.) Forty LEAs' demonstrated a decrease in the achievement gap in both math and reading, while 24 LEAs demonstrated an increase in gap in both content areas. These changes align with the regional PD that has been provided over the past several years which has focused on literacy.

In the area of reading, 66 LEAs reduced their gap over the past two years, while 40 demonstrated an increase in the gap size. With regard to math 56 LEAs narrowed the gap and 50 had a larger gap than 2 years ago. When comparing the change in gap over the last two years with the change in gap over the last four years it was noted that the gap has been getting steadily smaller over time for about half of the LEA's while it has slowed or become larger for the other half of the LEAs.

For every positive data point there is a negative data point which leads me to the following summary comments:

1. Regionally the achievement gap in reading is decreasing (for about 68% of the LEAs), but at a slow rate for the majority of districts.
2. The trend in reading gap data reveals that the reduction in gap has been occurring over the past 5 years for about ½ of the LEAs. Again, the gap reduction is slow.
3. Regionally the achievement gap in math is decreasing for approximately 57% of the LEAs, and appears to be reducing at a slower rate than reading.
4. This aligns with our past practice of focusing PD in the area of reading as opposed to math. PD has also not been focused in targeting tier two and tier three interventions which would address the achievement gap issue.
5. We have yet to find the answer to increasing skills for SWD in an accelerated manner, as we have been focused on tier 1 work as well as compliance issues for SWD.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Data: Regional average scaled scores in reading and mathematics for students with disabilities and students without disabilities (sent via email and attached to final report).

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST Region 1 shared that they would like more information on how to interpret the scaled score data before sharing this information with the districts in their region. This information, once analyzed would be useful in helping districts assess and improve their instructional practices.

To assist districts in improving their instructional practices, SST 1 has created professional development opportunities and book studies based upon the work of Don Deschler, Elise Frattura and John Hattie. The book studies have primarily been offered to the local special education directors during their quarterly meetings with plans to provide this opportunity to the curriculum directors in the future. Much work is being done to build collaborative relationships within the districts served by SST Region 1.

SST 1 is working diligently with their stakeholders on how to increase the skills of students with disabilities in an accelerated manner. Professional development on Balanced Math from Lead and Learn has been added to their training calendar. They will also focus on professional development for RtI by targeting the training on tier two and tier three interventions since most of their work has focused on tier 1 interventions as well as IDEA compliance.

Professional development opportunities are also being provided to districts who have adopted inclusion classroom models. Some of the districts have struggled with effectively implementing this teaching strategy due to adult behavior indicators and cultural attitudes that students with disabilities should not be included in the regular education classroom. SST 1 has developed an intensive professional development series to assist districts in changing this particular paradigm. Districts that participate in this training are asked to invite their special education teachers to the District Leadership Team (DLT) meetings and Building Leadership Team (BLT) meetings so that they are a part of the improvement process and working collaboratively with their regular education colleagues.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Following a review of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) data for Indicators 5, 11, 12, and 13, please comment on regional status. In addition, please comment on regional status of LEAs selected for IDEA on-site monitoring or selective review during the 2011-2012 school years.

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Monitored Districts: Region 1 had four new LEAs participate in on site monitoring during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition Region 1 had three districts from the previous year's monitoring group which required ongoing technical assistance and training to ensure clearance from the monitoring process. Lastly, an urban 8 school which was part of the 2009-2010 onsite monitoring has yet to be cleared and requires ongoing TA and PD in various areas. Therefore Region 1 has eight LEAs in various stages of the onsite monitoring process.

It has become increasingly evident that LEA's that have a strong infrastructure to support and internally monitor their special education programs with regard to compliance are quick to be "cleared" by the state. An internal monitoring system (which has been written into their CAPs) has proven easier to implement for districts that maintain their own special education programs, as they seem to feel a sense of ownership and responsibility to their programs, teachers and students. This has not been the case for those districts that purchase special education services (supervisory and teaching staff) from an ESC. There seems to be a sense of confusion as to who is ultimately responsible for the district's special education programming and the teachers are somewhat uncertain as to who they are accountable to for being cleared from monitoring, their own district or the ESC. Some rather heated discussions have occurred between ESC personnel and district personnel regarding the accountability of the monitoring process.

Having stated the above, work in region 1 has already begun to strengthen the knowledge our 9 ESCs have regarding the monitoring process, roles and responsibilities of those involved in monitoring and the sharing of PD tools and resources. In the future discussions will occur with ESCs regarding how a compliant IEP should be viewed as an important part of decreasing the achievement gap (if compliance is combined with best practice).

A second issue that has been identified is the difficulty that Community schools have with the follow up to the onsite review. There has not been a shortage of people participating in the discussions, or the PD regarding writing compliant documents. However the confusion as to who is responsible, the management company or the sponsor, for ultimate authority to make decisions regarding changing policy, establishing an infrastructure and holding schools accountable for their results, remains cloudy at best.

Two of our community schools participating in onsite monitoring are virtual schools and one of these is a credit recovery school as well. The very nature of the services they provide makes it difficult to help them become compliant. Their LRE, method of delivering services and their opportunities to provide specially designed instruction if they receive the same PD and are expected to write IEPs with the same specially designed instruction, or the same LRE requirements as their traditional school counterparts.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Lastly, concern has been raised by districts participating in the monitoring process that focusing so much time and effort on writing compliant IEPs and ETRs takes away from instructional time and focuses a teacher's attention on a product and not the special education process and results in the classroom for students with disabilities. Unfortunately at this time, in Region 1, product and process are not aligned as strongly as they could or should be. LEAs do not have a strong infrastructure in place to ensure that a compliant IEP is the first step in decreasing the achievement gap.

When analyzing SPP I-5 (LRE) results it was noted that the number of LEAs not meeting the target increased by 17% and 18% respectively over the past two years. It is true that the target jumped by slightly more than 10 percentage points, but additional information indicates that there is a downward trend in the data. Regionally, 38% of all LEA's showed an increase in the amount of time children with disabilities spent instructionally with typical peers. (This includes LEAs that fell below the target, but still showed an increase in their scores). However it was also noted that 44% of the LEAs demonstrated a downward turn in the amount of time SWD spent in the general education classroom. There were also felt to be several validity errors, in that several LEAs reported that they have 100% of their students with typical peers 80% or more of the time, when in fact they have at least one self-contained classroom. Thirteen different Community Schools purport to have met this indicator with 100% accuracy. One concern that is repeatedly voiced by special education leadership is that intervention specialists do not know their role or how to provide instruction in the general education classroom. They also feel that general education staff does not know how to provide instruction for SWD. Region 1 has decided to offer PD in the area of various instructional strategies, by requiring at least one special education teacher and one general education teacher to team up for the PD event as well as the building based follow-up activities.

With regard to Indicator 11 (Child Find), 15 LEAs (14%) were found to fall below the target of 100%. This was down from 29 districts in 2009 and 20 districts in 2010. A positive trend is being established. Bright spots in the data included the 5 LEA's that have never made the target, have shown steady increases in compliance over the past three years. Six out of the 15 have scores of 95% or higher, most likely indicating that these errors were isolated incidences and not systemic issues. A noted concern is that there were 17 schools that did not report any data in this category. While it is believed that several of these LEAs would not complete initial evaluations, it is felt that data verification may be appropriate for these districts to determine why an NR occurred.

Indicator 12 data reveal 100% compliance.

With regard to Indicator 13, only 7/110 districts did not meet the 100% target. All 7 had scores of 96.7% or higher, again indicating isolated incidences of noncompliance within the districts and not systemic concerns. The focus of regional training has been in developing transition plans that meet the NSTTAC requirements. It is felt that this is an appropriate focus of the SST, based upon the data analysis (including Indicator 20) and the changes that are occurring due to SB 316.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 1 is educating the districts on how IDEA compliance needs to be linked with instruction so that the districts can analyze their student performance data and evaluate whether or not their instructional practices are helping students succeed in the regular education classroom. Currently, SST 1 uses the district's profile, data from the Decision Framework, Measure Up and determination reports and the Local Report Cards to discuss the areas of noncompliance so decisions can be made about how to improve results for all students. SST 1 has found during these discussions that there are some educators who believe students with disabilities cannot learn as their typical peers do and expectations for their performance are lower. The district's initial approach is often to place the student into a resource room because special education is viewed as a location and not a service. SST 1 is working diligently to change these beliefs through professional development and training.

SST 1 shared that there has been some confusion among the local districts and the Educational Service Centers (ESCs) on who is responsible for IDEA compliance and special education practices. The confusion is primarily in regards to the onsite monitoring process and any follow-up or corrective action activities that were required of the district due to noncompliance identified by the Office for Exceptional Children. SST 1 has addressed this issue by providing education to the nine ESCs in their region about the IDEA onsite monitoring process as well explaining the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the process. Professional development, tools and resources have been provided both the districts and the ESCs so they can see the value in combining compliance with best practices in order to improve student performance and decrease the achievement gap. SST 1 is also working with the community schools in their region to ensure that they fully understand the IDEA onsite monitoring process; including their roles and responsibilities and what may be required to address any identified IDEA noncompliance.

The community schools like the traditional school districts in the region struggle with determining the Least Restrictive Environment for their students with disabilities. Part of the challenge is that some of the community schools are online schools and their continuum of services are drastically different due to the structure of their school. It is sometimes difficult to determine the placement changes because the primary setting is the student's home. It is also often difficult to determine the amount and frequency of the supports and services being provided due to the nature of the online curriculum. Overall, SST 1 needs more longitudinal data on LRE in order to determine whether LRE is positively or negatively affecting student performance.

Overall, SST 1 reported that the districts are doing a better job in their Child Find responsibilities except for an occasional missed report or an incorrect EMIS code.

VI. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Implementation indicators extracted from the performance agreement for the areas of: (A) General Indicators; (B) OIP Implementation; and (C) EL/SR are listed below. SPoCs/SPECs shall complete a self-rating for each of the areas denoting implementation status for the entire Region on each indicator using the following scale.

0 = Not Applicable or Addressed Elsewhere

1 = No

2 = Needs Improvement

3 = Yes*

*When a self-rating of “3” is indicated, the SPoC/SPEC should be prepared to provide evidence supporting that rating.

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	A: GENERAL INDICATORS
3	3	Provided high quality professional development based on regional needs
2	2	Submitted in a timely and accurate manner required and/or requested data and reports, including but not limited to subcontracted work and services provided by persons funded by the performance agreement
3	3	Attended ODE required and sponsored meetings and trainings
0	0	Corrective action plan completed by fiscal agent if work within the scope of the performance agreement is deemed unsatisfactory
3	3	Provided and maintained an SST website adhering to the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE
3	3	Collaborated within and across regions as well as with other regional resource providers (e.g. higher educ., other ESCs, etc.)
<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS
2	2	Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
2	2	Used GRF allocated funds to provide Ohio 8 districts one FTE* for each district to assure implementation with fidelity and an “Accomplished” level of implementation as per the OIP Implementation Rubric. (*One FTE = 180 school days per school year)
3	3	Provided technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM
3	3	Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
2	2	Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
2	2	Provided assistance and support to non-fiscal agent, within region, ESCs to build the capacity of personnel to provide support and technical assistance to DLTs/CSLTs/BLTs/TBTs
2	2	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
2	2	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
2	2	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3	3	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
2	2	Organized and conducted monthly meetings with SST staff and ESC/District OIP practitioners to identify and discuss OIP implementation strategies to meet the needs of the region
3	3	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

VI. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

The SST region 1 has been focused in their provision of regional PD activities as it relates to the needs of the region, using multiple forms of school improvement and special education data. During the past fiscal year, SST1 has provided PD opportunities in Formative Assessment, Rigorous Curriculum Design, unpacking the ELA Common Core and various other special education and school improvement arenas as outlined in the Performance Agreement.

Several of the above tasks were rated as “needing improvement” simply so we do not lose sight of their importance to implementing OIP globally and with fidelity. We do not want to become complacent with what we have done in the past nor do we want to stop pushing ourselves to find new ways of presenting the work to our stakeholders in ways that increase their engagement and sense of urgency.

Areas in which we need to focus and truly need to show improvement include the following: provide more intense TBT support for all assigned districts, but most importantly Toledo Public Schools, increase the number of ESC partners trained and ready to implement the OIP in the region, (as many who were trained have retired or have yet to work with a district in the OIP process and therefore need updates and current information), increase the use of OLAC modules both internally and externally and better engage Community Schools in the implementation of the OIP, as it has been challenging to encourage several of them to participate in the process. This will be the first year we have dedicated staff to focus 180 days of time to Toledo. We will primarily do this through one consultant, and supplement with several other consultants (within the 15% IDEA fund limits) which will bring multiple skill sets and areas of expertise for the district to access.

Collaboration with other SSTs and community agencies has been on the steady increase over the past few years. This will continue in 2012-13 through sharing costs for PD with nearby regions, engaging in multi-region expos and participating in Early Warning System/dropout prevention research through AIR (American Institute of Research).

While Value Added is not specifically addressed in the performance agreement, it is a goal to have a consultant become better versed in Value Added to assist districts in multiple upcoming initiatives (OTES, data analysis etc.)

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

This will be the first year that SST 1 will have a dedicated consultant in its high support urban district for 180 days. It is essential that this district implement OIP with fidelity by adhering to the standards of a monthly District Level Team Meeting (DLT), monthly Building Level Team Meetings (BLT), and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs) meeting weekly for 40 minutes. This large urban district and Community Schools in differentiated accountability that do not follow the standard of CSLT meeting monthly will receive additional help through the ODE Office of Ohio Network for Innovation and Improvement. Webinars and Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) modules will increase the opportunity and exposure of OIP training in LEAs and Educational Service Centers (ESC). The adherence to monthly OIP Facilitators’ Meetings, quarterly Special Educator/Early Learning/Career Technology/Recovery School administrators meetings will allow for the merging of the previous mentioned silos.

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS
3		Attended monthly OEL&SR meetings and took advantage of information and capacity building professional development
3		Assisted districts, ESCs and boards of DDs as they attempted to meet federal IDEA requirements and indicators through the provision of professional development and technical assistance
2		Participated in district IDEA monitoring visits, particularly at exit meetings an assisted districts in the completion of corrective action plans
3		Provided professional development and TA to districts, ESCs, boards of DD and the early learning community at large on topics
3		Received instruction on topics, including train-the-trainer models
		Delivered training and/or technical assistance to districts, ESCs, boards of
3		DD and the early learning community at large related to standards, curriculum, assessments and other goals related to RTT ELC grant
3		Provided professional development, study groups and resources to the field regarding enhancing the social and emotional development of preschool children with disabilities and their typical peers in district and community-based settings
3		Conducted data verification visits related to the assignment of statewide student identifier numbers (SSIDs) to children exiting Part C and entering Part B to promote and monitor timely and effective transitions
3		Participated in systems building by participating in the Teacher/Leader Initiative
2		Promoted improved outcomes for English language learners based on regional needs
3		Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
2		Participated in building a statewide professional development system
3		Developed parent engagement activities based on regional needs
3		Provided 1 or 2 deliveries of <i>Intentional Teaching: Language and Literacy Development for All Young Children</i> to build capacity of early childhood programs to meet the needs of developmentally appropriate and effective instruction

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

SSTR 1 has a very active Early Childhood Coordinator and EL, both of whom participate in activities at the local and state level. Our early childhood program is very integrated into the overall functions of the SST and sit on multiple work teams that integrate both preschool and school age activities.

Our EC Coordinator focuses on compliance, but has been very attentive to the growing needs of the region through the SPP indicators 6 and 7 (preschool outcomes). Our ELL is heavily invested in the Teacher Leader initiative, Project Approach as well as other preschool instructional activities. Their work within the region through such activities as interagency agreement meetings (collaborative meetings), statewide urban 8 development meetings, attending Parent Advisory Council meetings, work with preschool special ed administrators and work with higher education in various capacities all help to strengthen their work in the community.

To better meet the needs of the Performance Agreement, it will be necessary to focus additional resources to English Language Learners as well as actively participate in the IDEA monitoring process (Bowling Green City and Toledo Public, (LEAs to be monitored this year) both have large preschool programs.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

SST Region 1 will promote many of our PD activities as team trainings, with teams consisting of both general and special educators together. In addition we will continue to have teams sign “assurances” which indicates their ability to participate in training activities as well as follow up activities. District leadership must sign these assurances as well, indicating their willingness to supply teacher subs, and professional release time for their staff.

Based upon the data reviewed, focus areas will include

1. Literacy instruction (pre k-12)
 - a. Reciprocal Teaching
 - b. Literacy for students with Complex needs
 - c. Literacy training for students with cognitive disabilities
 - d. How to build a strong literacy classroom
 - e. Content Literacy Curriculum (7-12)
2. Balanced Math instruction
3. Instructional strategies that allow all students to access the curriculum
 - a. Universal Design for Learning
 - b. Instructional Technology
4. Autism/Low incidence training
 - a. District level teams
 - b. Ziggurat training
 - c. Training for teams serving adolescent students
5. Curriculum Design
6. Assessment
 - a. Formative Assessment
 - b. Alternative Assessment
7. Parent Learning Opportunities
8. Secondary Transition
 - a. Dropout Prevention through use of Early Warning System

Goals for the 2012-2013 school year include

1. Strengthen our partnership with ESCs
2. Increase our contact and support with districts found to be in the DA category of low support
3. Focus on TBT training and implementation in all districts
4. Re-focus district DLT work
5. Strengthen our contact and support of Community schools
6. Continue to work with Credit Recovery Schools in the OIP process
7. Change the way SSTR1 gathers data regarding PD opportunities
8. Develop a stronger communication system to interoffice communication regarding status of all assigned districts
9. Implementation of all activities on the ELSR plan

VIII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response: The current work in SST 1 that is occurring in the areas of school improvement, special education and early learning/school readiness has met and at times exceeded the requirements in the Performance Agreement. To strengthen the school improvement requirements, the following goals will be a focus:

1. Teacher Based Team meetings will be monitored in the high/medium support LEAs as well as the Focus Schools/Community Schools to determine what additional help is required to fully implement the 5 Step Process.
2. Through communication and linkages the silos of school improvement, special education and early learning/school readiness will be broken down.

SIGNATURES:

SST - Single Point of Contact: _____ Date: _____

SST - Special Education Contact: _____ Date: _____

ODE - OEC Representative: _____ Date: _____

ODE - EL/SR Representative: _____ Date: _____

ODE - ONII State Consultant: _____ Date: _____

Attachments:

- 1 Regional Progress Reports
- 2 Customer Satisfaction Survey
- 3 Professional Development Evaluations
- 4 Scaled Scores for Students with Disabilities
- 5 OEC SPP/APR Indicators