



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 10
Number of LEAs in Region: 76
Date of Review Conference: 10/15/2012

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 10 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 10'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 10 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 10 Fiscal Agent

FY2012 Fiscal Agent 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: 10

Number of LEAs in Region: 76

Date of Review Conference: 10/15/2012

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:

As the SST gathered with our regional partners this year, we reviewed the Monthly Progress Rating Report categories for each of our districts. In January, we discussed where we believed our districts fell on the rating system provided and based on our belief of where the districts fell under each of the categories, we made the initial determinations.

During the subsequent months, many of our districts engaged with their ESCs in professional development opportunities to learn more about the Common Core Standards with many beginning implementation of the CCSS Literacy and Mathematics standards in Grades K-2 and 11-12. Additionally, many of the LEAs involved in Race to the Top attended informational sessions on Battelle's Formative Instructional Practices (FIP) and signed Memorandum of Understandings to participate in the trainings and to implement practices learned. Additionally, one of our urban districts sent all of their academic coaches to training on implementation of the 5-Step Process for TBTs as we began training and implementation of the data review process.

Our district leadership (DLT) and building leadership teams (BLT) in many of our LEAs has taken hold this year. Most of our districts and Community Schools have included special education staff on their leadership team. The DLTs and BLTs are stepping up to reviewing relevant student data on at least a quarterly basis (monthly at the BLT), looking at adult implementation indicators, and monitoring what they have identified as goals and strategies in their district and building plans through the action steps. While many are in the "developing" stage as identified through the rating scale, they are seeing the value in the 5-Step process to monitor teaching and learning and the impact on student learning.

It has been a year of significant change for many of the districts in Region 10 with the plethora of initiatives that have been introduced. Our SST believes that our districts and community schools are on a positive trajectory for the 2012-2013 school year and applaud their efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning for their children.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

During the 2011-12 school year the ratings on the Progress Report for LEAs within the region tended to become lower in many areas of the Progress Report. The Progress Reports were a new tool for SSTs this past year. The SPoC believes and the ONII reviewer agrees, that as SSTs worked with the tool and with their LEAs, more consistency and common understanding of the language used in the report evolved. In essence ratings evolved from somewhat inflated to a very realistic reflection of the work existing in the LEAs. As the Progress Report continues to be used, particularly in the beginning of the 2012-13 school year, it is recommended that SST staff working with particular LEAs also review the LEAs completed dashboard survey (self-assessment) as another resource to identify TA and support needs and utilize the OIP Implementation rubric as a benchmarking tool.

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:

SST 10 relies on feedback from our customers as indicators of our responsiveness to their needs as well as an opportunity to look internally at our own service model to improve the quality of support that we provide to our customers in the Region.

In review of the customer service surveys, we were disappointed by the low number of responses from our district and community schools. Less than half of our district (6/14 or 43%) provided us with data to review. It was unfortunate that the surveys were not sent out a second time being that it was sent at the end of the year during a very busy time period for our district teams.

What we have learned from the six districts and community schools is that we must address the needs of the community schools early and often. With that knowledge, we have assigned one of our consultants as a liaison to our community schools to address their needs through monthly meetings that include professional development opportunities as well as technical assistance throughout the year as identified collaboratively with the CSLT. We have also learned that it is physically impossible to expect that the funding directed to the support of the level of the expectation of implementation of the OIP work is definitely not enough. With funding for only 2.0 FTE to support the 4 high support districts (2 urban districts) and 11 Community Schools, the Region 10 consultants performed extraordinary work given limited resources as noted by some of the comments noted from the reporting districts.

Additionally, in spite of the lack of responses to this survey, our SST consultants have received numerous accolades from our districts sent to the SPoC and SPeC heralding the outstanding work and support that our consultants have provided for Special Education and general curriculum work. In addition, many of our consultants serve on state-wide committees and have been acknowledged for their contributions to the greater body of work including Early Learning, Special Education initiatives and foundational work in creating the framework and content with PBS and OIP.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

With a 29.8% response rate, Region 10 fell significantly below the statewide Customer Service Survey response rate of 42.9%. It is recommended that effort be devoted to increasing this rate to provide the SST with a more complete picture of customer satisfaction. This may increase through a combination of a more thoughtful participant selection process and/or pre-survey receipt reminders to those participating. The comments in returned surveys were all very positive toward this SST.

Consistent with the rest of the state's regions, one of the lowest rated areas was short cycle formative assessments. Areas suggested for further analysis should include the interface between ratings for BLTs, TBTs and Stage 2 of the OIP. In this region all three areas deviated at higher levels negatively from the statewide averages in the same areas. When considered with short cycle formative assessments, the four areas converge to create very important foundational work regarding OIP implementation.

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:

During the past year, Region 10 held a variety of professional development sessions based on regional data. Our initial needs assessment reflected from the district and Community School report cards, review of district and building plans, and priorities indicated from data in the district Special Ed profile, indicated that the following were high need areas: Strategies for Closing the Achievement Gap; Formative Assessment Practices (using data to make instructional decisions); RTI and Differentiated Instruction; Compliance Trainings: ETR, IEP, Alternate Assessment, Legal Issues, Transition Planning; PBIS; Effective Use of Instructional Time; Instructional Strategies for All Learners; Co-Teaching; Creating and Facilitating Effective Building and Teacher-Based-Teams; Support to SPDG districts; Parent and Family PD (Note: parents and families are encouraged to attend our compliance trainings. Additional PD is offered to parents on reading and math strategies)

Participant feedback from the professional development services provided by the Region 10 SST has by and large been very positive. Our team created a system in which all participant certificates are tied to completion of the PD survey. Once the event is over, our secretary sends the link to the survey to the participant. When the participant completes the survey, their certificate is then generated and sent via email. Using this strategy, we have realized a significant increase in the quality of feedback as well as an increase in responses. With the implementation of ODE's new Survey Monkey link, we missed a beat in transitioning from our survey to ODE's survey thus reason for the limited data that was provided to our region for this review. We have corrected this and all participants at our PD events have been directed to ODE's Survey Monkey link. During our onsite meeting, reviewers will be provided with aggregate data from all of the PD sessions that we offered during the 2011-2012 school year.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

During the 2011-12 school year the ratings on the Progress Report for LEAs within the region tended to become lower in many areas of the Progress Report. The Progress Reports were a new tool for SSTs this past year. The SPoC believes and the ONII reviewer agrees, that as SSTs worked with the tool and with their LEAs, more consistency and common understanding of the language used in the report evolved. In essence ratings evolved from somewhat inflated to a very realistic reflection of the work existing in the LEAs. As the Progress Report continues to be used, particularly in the beginning of the 2012-13 school year, it is recommended that SST staff working with particular LEAs also review the LEAs completed dashboard survey (self-assessment) as another resource to identify TA and support needs and utilize the OIP Implementation rubric as a benchmarking tool. It is recommended this SST continue working on the mechanics to reinforce and ensure that PD evaluations are completed by participants.

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:

Review of the data provided reveals that while collectively the subgroup of SWD in Region 10 appear to be improving their performance over a four year period (See charts below), so do their typical peers. In fact on the Reading assessment, students in the SWD subgroup equal the growth over time as their typical peers (+4.9) Thus the achievement gap does not effectively narrow despite the improvement of SWD but the gap between this group and their typical peers remains relatively significant (29.5 points in Reading and 36.6 points in Mathematics).

TYPICAL Group Reading Scale Scores over Time

	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Rdg	423.4	424	426.5	427.8
<i>Change</i>		+0.7	+2.5	+1.3
<i>Increase/Decrease</i>	+4.9			

SWD Group Math Scale Scores over Time

	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Math	389.9	389.9	391.7	393.6
<i>Change</i>		0	+1.8	+2.0
<i>Increase/Decrease</i>	+3.8			

TYPICAL Group Math Scale Scores over Time

	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Math	423.5	425.1	428.8	430.1
<i>Change</i>		-0.4	+3.7	+1.3
<i>Increase/Decrease</i>	+4.6			

While SST 10 consultants have spent a significant amount of time encouraging our districts to review LRE and adopt inclusive practices, the operational sides of these two processes have not yet taken hold. Many of our districts have adopted co-teaching as a practice simply assigning two teachers to work together. There has been little PD and technical assistance to some of the teams in the various co-teaching strategies.

We know that in order to close the achievement gap, simply including SWD in a typical classroom is not going to bring about expected results unless teaching and learning is transformed. Our greater region team needs to take deeper dive into the data and begin discussions with our districts that have made significant progress over time in closing the achievement gap. We need to then identify strategies that these teams have adopted and ask these teams to serve as models inviting others to visit or contact the leadership to identify lessons learned. We also know that the work of Elise Frattura and other experts in the field supports closing the achievement gap. We look forward to incorporating the strategies suggested by Elise and others in our work this coming year.

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 10 is differentiating their training to meet the districts' needs and is challenging districts to closely review and evaluate their instructional practices. SST 10 has used the work of Elise Frattura, and Mike Schmoker's book, "Focus" as the framework of their training. SST 10 has also provided training on co-teaching utilizing the six models of collaboration. The district's needs and structure of their system determine which model SST 10 provides to them in their training.

During the 2011-2012 school year, SST 10 conducted a limited trial of training for Closing the Achievement Gap seminars with both elementary and high school teachers on reading and math instructional strategies. SST 10 along with the training participants performed their own diagnostic prior to the training sessions in order to collect data on: what the teachers knew or did not know; what was currently being taught in the classroom around the content standards; how the students were performing in regards to the content standards; and what the students needed to learn. SST 10 reviewed this data with the teachers and their districts so that the SST could tailor their training and provide different strategies for instructional practices and interventions to be used in assisting struggling students. Following the training, SST 10 consultants then observed the teachers in their classrooms to determine whether they were implementing the strategies and interventions with fidelity.

SST 10 has also held special education data retreats so that performance data could be broken down by district and building. SST 10 along with the district personnel identified the percent of students in each category who were or were not successful on the state achievement assessments. The teams drilled down to the student level identifying students who were not proficient and then looked further at the subscale scores. LRE was a major component of discussion for all disability category levels. In some cases, the IEP team reconvened and changed the LRE of particular students. When districts studied this data and used it to make instructional changes, they successfully closed their achievement gap.

SST 10 SST 10 plans to replicate this activity with the teacher based teams (TBTs) in their region so that they can track their students' performance with the content standards using formative instructional practices. They will also review special education data with the medium and low support schools within the region. Districts who have been successful in closing their achievement gap will share their processes, structures and data with other districts in the region so that they can replicate the process in their respective districts.

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:

Reviewing the 2012 Determinations, 23 LEAs are identified as Needs Assistance. Ten of these 23 LEAs are community schools. The following data has been mined from the report:

- Indicator 5 – LRE: 10 LEAs (3 community schools)
- Indicator 11 – Child Find: 15 LEAs
- Indicator 12 – Early Childhood Transition: 0 LEAs
- Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition: 2 LEAs

It is evident that the focus of efforts needs to be with LRE and Child Find, although our ELSR team works diligently with our LEAs on this topic. We have reassigned one of our outstanding consultants to the role of Secondary Transition and she has stepped up and reinvented our Transition training and established a viable Regional Transition Council with solid membership and representation from various agencies. Her goal this year is to increase membership of agencies as well as to take the transition training to the middle schools. In fact, she has scheduled 9 different trainings offerings with many of the sessions already closed.

As noted in another section of this report, LRE is clearly a focus for this State Support Team. We are committed to addressing this issue not only with the LEAs identified through the data as “Needs Assistance” but with all of the districts within our region.

During the 2011-2012 school year, Region 10 had eight (8) LEAs identified for on-site monitoring. The two urban districts’ on-site monitoring overlapped this year as well. With a limited staff dedicated to supporting the LEAs through this intensive process, our stellar team managed to successfully guide almost all teams through the process (one community school closed before the CAP was implemented). Of the eight, 7 CAPs have been submitted and approved. 3 LEAs have been cleared for Prong 1.

Through our work with the eight LEAs found that the process has provided clearer guidance on our general scope of work with all of our districts.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 10 recognizes that the areas of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and Child Find need to be addressed with both traditional districts and community schools within their region. The issues with LRE are often that the districts' scheduling system, particularly at some high schools may need to be reevaluated. This type of scheduling system often misses opportunities to include all students to the best of their ability in general education content areas. In regards to Child Find, districts with preschool education often struggle with the transition of students from Part C to Part B because they do not have a process in place to track these students. SST 10 is addressing these areas through training and technical assistance.

SST 10 is doing outstanding work in the area of postsecondary transition planning. The region has reinvented its Transition training and has established a viable Regional Transition Council with solid membership and representation from various local agencies. The goal this year is to increase membership of agencies as well as to take the transition training to the middle schools as part of the requirements within the newly promulgated Senate Bill 316.

SST 10 has partnered with its regional ESCs to assist with the IDEA onsite monitoring process when necessary. Due to the intensive nature of the onsite monitoring, the high volume of districts being reviewed Region 10's limited staff, SST 10 sought assistance from Darke County ESC last school year so that the district being reviewed in their county would be provided high quality services and supports. SST 10 expressed one concern about the IDEA onsite monitoring process. It appeared that there may have been some inconsistencies among the OEC monitoring teams and how they were calibrated. SST 10 shared this concern because they want to ensure that they give a consistent message to all of the districts within their region.

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		Provided high quality professional development based on regional needs
3		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		Attended ODE required and sponsored meetings and trainings
0		Corrective action plan completed by fiscal agent if work within the scope of the performance agreement is deemed unsatisfactory
3		Provided and maintained an SST website adhering to the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE
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		Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
3		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		Provided technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM
3		Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
2		Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
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		Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
		Continued next page

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS
2		Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
2		Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3		Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
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		Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

A: General Indicators

The State Support Team believes that our region exemplifies a true spirit of collaboration. We work closely with our six ESCs to identify regional needs and provide quality services and supports to our districts utilizing the talents and skills of our respective staff members. This year, during our combined ESC/SST meetings, we included RttT representative, FIP Specialists, and extended invitations to our Transformation Specialists.

Each request for data made by ODE/OEC was met in a timely fashion with data and information as accurate and reliable as available to our team members. We attended all required meetings and professional development opportunities. Many of our consultants have been honored to serve on a variety of state-wide committees and learning teams.

B. Ohio Improvement Process Implementation Indicators

During this third year of implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process statewide, our Region has experienced success in moving the initiative forward with many of our LEAs. Original reluctance to an ‘imposed’ process for many of our districts and community schools has evolved into a way of doing business. District Leadership Teams (DLT) involved in RttT realized the natural progressions to merging the two teams. Building Leadership Teams (BLT) began using the 5-Step Process more effectively learning how to hold the Teacher-Based-Teams (TBT) accountable for student performance.

Noting the need for capacity building in our districts, we gathered together ESC teams, BLTs, and other staff for a series of TBT trainings embedding the 5-Step process. We utilized the outstanding services of our Quad Lead, Becky Rees, to deliver these sessions so that our SST staff could participate with our district/building leaders. Our goal was to be able to engage in discussion in order to move the process from one owned by the SST to the one that the district teams embraced and institutionalized. We still have much work to do in this area and look forward to the opportunity to continue in our role as facilitator of learning moving ownership of the process to the LEA.

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

One of the foci for our team this year was to bring to the attention of our district and building teams the achievement gaps that exist for their subgroups, especially those for the SWD. Offering a series called *Strategies for Closing the Achievement Gap* for elementary and high school teams, the SST staff introduced high leverage instructional strategies, formative assessment options, etc. In addition, the SST facilitators made on-site visits to observe teachers engaged in their newly learned strategies. Using a commonly designed observation tool, teachers received valuable feedback on classroom implantation from these on-site visits.

Overall, Region 10 has made inroads with many of our districts yet has far to go. As a support to districts, we work to encourage districts to examine their practices, present alternate perspectives, and build their capacity to take on the initiatives we are charged with through our Performance Agreement. Often met with resistance, our team has the expertise and training to build the relationships to gain the trust of our districts and to promote change. It has been a rewarding yet challenging year!

ONII PARP REVIEWER COMMENTS:

The ONII PARP Reviewer agrees with the self-rating provided by the SST for these areas. Following discussion regarding work with within region ESCs and other partners, the reviewer upgraded the rating in that area from a 2 to a 3.

<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
3		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
3		Participated in building a statewide professional development system
2		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:

The Region 10 Early Learning and School Readiness team has had a very busy year. Our team of two consultants, one being an Early Language and Literacy Specialist, has provided high quality services and support to the preschools in our community and districts. The following is a summary of their activities:

- Attended ELSR meetings and shared information as appropriate at ESC/SST meetings and with districts and preschools.
- Provided the opportunity to meet at a region and onsite with district staff to help with attaining federal and state requirements for Early Learning.
- Provided quarterly Preschool Task Force trainings to address Regional needed.
- When invited, the ELSR team participated with districts on development of the preschool portion of their CAP.
- Attended trainer-of-trainer sessions as offered by ODE.
- Provided technical assistance on compliance issues (ETR and IEP) within and outside of Region 10.
- Offered all trainings as identified in the Performance Agreement and others as identified from data collect through the 2011-12 regional survey results.
- Provided regional updates on the Early Learning Challenge Grant.
- Offered Study Group session as well as technical assistance addressing social and emotional components using the book *Little Kids Big Worries* to guide the learning.
- Offered a technology series: using flip cameras, interactive white boards, and Boardmaker.
- Completed all of the data visits (except 4th quarter – did not get to the Part C Quarterly Report as planned – rescheduled visits but were cancelled due to staff illness).
- Ran a PELL session targeting English Language Learners.
- Participated in an Inter-Agency Agreement for the six county region.
- Provided coordination and training with Parent Advisory Council group ages 3-21 services including math, reading, and disability issues.
- Offered two opportunities for Intentional Teaching and supported all aspects of the ECQNET Apple Research Project.
- Other study group events were available and offered as ongoing PD for Itinerant Teachers and others in our region.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Any change, even a change for the better, is always accompanied by drawbacks and discomforts. Arnold Bennett

Charged as agents of change, the Region 10 State Support Team has experienced drawbacks and discomforts as noted in Arnold Bennett's quote above. The consultants on this team bring a wealth of background and experience...experts in their respective fields who are admired and respected by district, building, and community school staff. Their dedication to this work goes beyond the traditional work day, the number of days in their contract, and even the number of days in the school year. Their passion for this work and desire to help districts move forward in their school improvement efforts yet often yields less than optimum results. As the age-old adage "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make them drink!" goes, so does our work as SST consultants.

Some of the data presented by the ODE team may not reflect the efforts of this skilled team. However, what our team identifies is that many of our LEAs are beginning to buy into the process...whatever they choose to call it...OIP, strategic planning, Baldrige, etc. and effectively changing the way they conduct business in their LEA. We credit that change, not to our work but to their dedication to improving teaching and learning for students they serve.

What have we learned from last year and where are we going in FY13? Here are our thoughts:

- Onsite reviews require more time than expected, thus we've hired three additional Special Ed staff members to provide support to our LEAs to build their capacity to continue the work that's identified in their CAP.
- The additional Special Ed Consultants will be instrumental in creating PD and working intensively with LEAs on closing the achievement gap.
- New trainings for ETR, IEP and Extended Standards are in the works. We're going back to our strategy of assigning SST Consultants to each of our counties to build capacity of staff within our six ESCs to offer all of above noted trainings.
- We have barely scratched the surface to build capacity of our BLTs to support the 5-Step process in their buildings with TBTs. We will increase support for development and building capacity of BTLs and TBTs.
- OLAC modules – while we used the videos in many of our trainings, we could have been more intentional in the promotion of these great resources with our DLT, BLT and TBTs. We will do so this year.
- OIP modules – provide onsite support for LEAs internal facilitators and new OIP facilitators to our team to participate in these outstanding training resources.
- Compartmentalization vs. Integration- although we believe that we were thoughtful as we worked collaboratively within our own team, we realized that we often worked in isolation, especially where Early Learning and School Readiness was concerned. Already this year, we've made a conscious effort to be inclusive discussing how to support our districts with the responsibility of instituting the Third Grade Guarantee and the transition to college and career readiness at the other end of the spectrum.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The ONII PARP Reviewer agrees with the Region's identification of plans moving forward related particularly to:

- Continuing to build capacity for LEA BLTs and TBTs to engage in the 5 Step process.
- Greater utilization of the OLAC and OIP modules.

In addition and as indicated earlier in this document, working to provide TA and Support to LEAs on the development and use of formative assessments will reinforce the need to identify high yield adult implementation strategies from that data and monitor ongoing implementation. Making adjustments when needed will strengthen the critically important Stages 2 & 3 of the OIP – and as a result, focus the work of the TBTs and BLTs.

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