



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 13
Number of LEAs in Region: 39
Date of Review Conference: 9/25/2012

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 13 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 13'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 13 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 13 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: 13

Number of LEAs in Region: 39

Date of Review Conference: 9/25/2012

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. [January, 2012 – June, 2012]

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

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

This report is based on the review of the data provided in FY12 Progress Reports from January, 2012, to June, 2012, for twenty-four [24] traditional school districts and fifteen [15] community schools served by the State Support Team Region 13 and regional partners.

Early Childhood Programs exist in the LEA and may be supported by SST:

In January, 2012, it was reported that Early Childhood Programs existed in 20 of the 24 traditional school district settings. In June, 2012, after more intense involvement with the traditional school districts, it was reported that Early Childhood Programs existed within the district in only 16 of the 24 traditional school district settings but students in the other school districts were being served with either Head Start or private preschool settings or both within the community setting.

In January, 2012, it was reported that Early Childhood Programs existed in 14 of the 15 community school settings. The Greater Ohio Virtual School did not have an Early Learning Program due to the type of school. In June, 2012, after more intense involvement with the community schools, it was reported that Early Childhood Programs existed in only 8 of the 15 community schools. However, many of the students were being served through Head Start or private preschool settings or both within the community school setting. It should also be noted that community schools have some programming for younger students that may or may not fall within the traditional definition of early learning programs.

In reflection, criteria for denoting whether an Early Childhood program exists in the LEA and whether it may/should be supported by the SST needs to be clearer with the SST staff in terms of the types of preschool available in the community whether it is a school-based, district-based, private, Head Start, community based, etc. Economic and financial considerations have had great implications for the offering of early learning programs both within traditional and community schools. Enrollment in programs such as Head Start is also suffering. With the increased emphasis on the Third Grade Guarantee, early learning programs must play a greater prevention role in preparing all children for success.

Early Childhood Impact Data:

While data indicates that the SST's impact on the effectiveness of Early Childhood Programs changed from **.90 to 1.36** across all 39 LEAs served, the majority of the impact made was with traditional school districts and not community schools. This indicates a need for more intense efforts toward reaching out to community schools. We have increased personnel in this area and feel that we can improve effectiveness and impact with three people serving in this capacity.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Formative Assessments:

While data indicates that the status of implementation of formative assessments had improved from an average of 1.9 to 2.07 from January to June, 2012, progressive movement in individual categories changed in traditional districts from Level 2: 16 to 14; Level 3: 6 to 6; Level 4: 2 to 4; In community schools from Level 0: 2 to 1; Level 1: 6 to 5; Level 2: 5-7; Level 3: 2-2; This will be an area of increased focus this year.

Formative Assessment Modifications: Extent to which modifications have been made to formative assessments for Students with Disabilities: Data indicates a change in average status from 1.4 to 1.5 which indicates a great need for more direct services in this area. While positive progress was made, more is needed in all service areas. There is a discrepancy between traditional and community schools. **Overall, formative assessments must be a critical area of service for FY13.**

Standards: District/Community Schools are using the common core/revised state curriculum:

Average score improved from 1.38 to 1.76 with improvements being seen across the board. Community schools are still lagging in implementation of the common core but are making progress. Intense services need to be coordinated with other regional service providers to link the common core/revised standards to formative assessment and changes in instructional practices for all students.

Instructional Practices: Districts/Community Schools are using differentiated instructional practices:

Average score improved from 1.71 to 1.95 which is probably relatively accurate if you believe that instructional practices change as a result of implementation of new standards and new assessments and increased emphasis on accountability for all children. Interesting to note is the movement from 2 to 4 on **Level 4** for traditional schools and 0 for community schools and 20 to 28 for **Level 2** for traditional schools and 5-7 for community schools. Implication is that priority must be given to assisting districts/schools in realizing the necessity for change in instructional practice in order to improve results for all children and close the achievement gap.

Teacher Based Teams Implementation:

Average score improved from 1.88 to 1.93 on status of Implementation of TBTs and 1.76 to 1.86 with **involvement of special education personnel on TBTs**. The community school data impacts the overall picture with several just at the beginning stage. While most traditional districts are considered "developing" or "accomplished", there is still considerable work to be done around Stage 3 and Stage 4 implementation.

Building Based Teams Implementation:

Average score increased from 1.62 to 1.76 on status of implementation of BLTs and 1.45 to 1.55 with **involvement of special education personnel on BLTs**. There is significant difference in traditional school district data and community school data in this category because community schools are considered CSLTs and not BLTs. Without community school data, the change would be 2.58 to 2.75. Continued effort is needed in moving the BLT from "developing" to "accomplished" so that it is part of their everyday work and can be sustained over time.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

District/Community School Based Team Implementation:

Average score on DLT/CSLT implementation changed from 2.05 to 2.14 and with the involvement of special education personnel from 1.93 to 2.07. Once again, the majority of the traditional districts were at the “accomplished” stage whereas the community schools were at the “developing to accomplished” stage. Involvement of special education personnel and representatives across all levels is improving. The SST needs to continue the work in this area.

Overall:

In reviewing the changes in individual **LEA** data across all twelve [12] categories progressive changes were seen in all but one [1] of the LEAs whose change was a -0.05. The overall average rate of change was from 1.69 to 1.86 or a change of 0.17. The range was from 0.00 to 0.73. The High priority districts who received the most assistance improved an average of 0.2725 and the Medium Priority District improved an average of 0.192. Improvements had a wide variance in both categories which need to be examined as to the causes and implications for services.

Summary:

School improvement is a “system of change” and, therefore, all parts of the system must work together and strive for continual improvement. The context may change but the functions do not. The system must change in order to adjust to the context. The SST must begin this year where it left off last year and continue its efforts in a more concentrated plan of action in the areas of Early Learning, Formative Assessments, Standards, Instructional Practices, DLTs, CSLTs, BLTs and TBTs, systems change [Rtl, PBS, etc.] and the integration of general education and special education so that we close the achievement gap and meet the needs of all learners. What we are currently doing is showing results, but, unfortunately, it is just not enough to cause the changes in practices that must be done in order to close the achievement gap. We must design a different system to assist districts in moving student achievement for all subgroups forward at a rapid pace while at the same time closing the gap.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

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:

In initially reviewing the **Average Response by Region**, the red and green denotation caused considerable alarm as did the rate of return for the Customer Service survey. However, in reviewing the average response by category, all categories except Short Cycle Formative Assessments were 3.0 or above on a 4.0 scale. We will review these areas and make necessary changes to the services. In the area of Short Cycle Formative Assessments, considerable work has been done in collaboration with the Formative Instructional Program Specialists but this work is really just beginning to be a major focus as districts are feeling more comfortable with alignment of the common core and revised standards. With the introduction of the Common Core and subsequent changes in assessments, the need is growing considerably in this area but districts are not ready for the changes in practice that needs to take place to align curriculum, instruction and assessment. This year will be instrumental in creating the need for change especially with the release of the PARCC items.

We will also encourage more districts to respond to the surveys. While SST 13 was below the state average in several categories, responses that were submitted by the High and Medium priority districts were reassuring in that they were satisfied with the services being provided.

We have also strived to leverage and integrate the work of the State Support Team with regional providers such as Hamilton County ESC, Clermont County ESC, Butler County ESC and Warren County ESC. Frequently, districts do not associate the personnel with the State Support Team exclusively. In the case of the large urban school districts, it is often better not to make direct association and results tend to differ if it is felt to be "compliance" with the state.

In reviewing the Customer Services Responses by Individual Districts, even though there were few of them, the overall satisfaction rate was a majority of 4 [17 of 27]; 3 [6 of 27]; 2 [4 of 27]. It is interesting to note that customer satisfaction was higher in Stage 3 and Stage 4 of the OIP. Is this because those stages are not yet being fully implemented? I do know from my years in school improvement that when people are asked to change their practices that you do not always want the customer to be totally happy. If they are, then change is not taking place at the rate that you desire. Having said that, I do think that there is room for improvement in terms of customer satisfaction.

SST 13 will review the information across the board and make adjustments to services as necessary. Relationship, distance of services and communication are keys to success. Several of the districts have requested more services but those districts are not on the priority list for service and are being served by other regional providers. This is the issue when the priority list changes from year to year based on the accountability measures.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying the central portion of the page. It is intended for the reviewer's comments on the survey data.

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:

SST Region 13 is above the state average and most regional averages in the three categories of Overall Average, Job Embedded Professional Development, and Job Impacted with an average of 3.57, 95.8% for Job Embedded PD and 98.1% for Job Impacted. The 98.1% means much more than the other areas but the data shows that job embedded professional development leads to more job impacted evidence. If you review the data for all four categories of Special Education Compliance, Early Learning/School Readiness, Ohio Improvement Process and General Education, you notice that results are shown primarily by the amount of resources being provided to the service area due to the funding being \$258,675 for GRF, \$2,184,277 for IDEA and \$70,000 additional for the Early Learning Specialist. More professional development and technical assistance services are provided in the areas of special education compliance. With the two Early Learning Specialists there is considerable training taking place in the region. The OIP process is more district job embedded and involves more regional partners in the delivery of the services. The general education area was just a catch-all for those areas of regional need that did not nicely fit into other areas. SST 13 is pleased with the data in this area but feel that we need to increase in our efforts to provide leadership toward a more integrated approach to closing the achievement gap. The concentration must be on student results and putting instructional practices and interventions in place throughout the system in order to be successful.

The comments from the professional development were all very positive and reflected plans for implementation of skills and knowledge learned. SST 13 needs to move forward in not only providing the professional development but establishing expectations for implementation with fidelity and monitoring the implementation so that the same professional development does not need to be provided repeatedly. We need to increase monitoring of implementation and providing direct technical assistance when districts are struggling following the professional development. Providing more and more professional development on the same topic without in-depth technical assistance is not the answer to systemic change in struggling districts.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The SST has recently hired consultants that can train within the areas that they have most recently worked: general education specially designed instruction, co-teaching, differentiated instruction and etcetera. The SST is constantly evaluating and making adjustments to the training in order to provide professional development that not only addresses compliance but moves toward best practice and improving results for all students.

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:

In light of the new Ohio ESEA Waiver, this data is overwhelming and calls for drastic changes in how we view the system of education and opportunities that we are providing students with disabilities and all other subgroups. All students must have access to the curriculum and quality instructional practices to meet their specific needs to assure their academic success. The integration of special education and general education practices to meet the needs of all learners can no longer be hearsay but must become part of the transformation of our educational system. We go by day-to-day being “compliant” and responding to the “compliance functions” of special education and often forget why those regulations are in place. We do countless professional development trainings on how to properly complete the forms and yet don’t always take advantage of communicating why these types of things are being done. Progress is being made but not at a rapid enough pace to overcome the failures of the past and the system that we created to protect and assist children which is now limiting their access to opportunities for academic success. We place blame and say “you just don’t understand special education or general education” but fail to take the opportunity to design a better system. Enough of my ranting for now but if we do not as a state come to the realization that we must create a better **system of education** to meet the needs of all children in the future then we are doing a great disservice to our state and communities. The SSTs are a valuable vehicle for change but we must drive the change and have a vision for what we are designing and supporting in transforming the educational system.

The data reveals that the average scaled scores for Students with Disabilities and typical students have gradually increased each year in reading and math. The progression of scores for reading and math from 2007 to 2012 is as follows:

SUBJECT	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	CHANGE
Reading						
Special Ed	396.9	397.7	400.8	402.5	403.8	6.9
Typical	427.0	427.7	429.8	431.1	432.5	5.5
GAP	30.1	30.0	28.9	28.6	28.7	+1.4
Math						
Special Ed	393.7	395.0	397.3	398.9	400.9	7.2
Typical	428.9	430.0	433.7	435.1	437.6	8.7
GAP	35.2	35.0	36.4	36.2	36.7	-1.5

You can see from this data that the scale scores have gradually increased each year in both content areas. However, when the data for Students with Disabilities begins 30.1 points lower in Reading and 35.2 lower in math than the “typical” populations then the rate of progress must be higher for SWD. In the math content area, this has not happened and progress in the reading content area is just not enough to meet increased demand for knowledge and skills for the 21st century. We must do something radical and different to cause change.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

In SST 13, the rate of progress for students with disabilities in Reading is higher than “typical” students by 1.4 points but in Math the rate of progress is -1.5 or has not kept up with the progress of the “typical” student population. Achievement is increasing across both content areas but the progress of students with disabilities must be at a higher rate in order to close the achievement gap. Understanding the new ESEA Waiver and implications for all the districts served not only in Region 13 but across the state is critical. A greater sense of urgency for all including the SSTs and the districts is critical but this change won’t and can’t happen overnight. Systems must be changed and accountability cannot be the only driver.

If you analyze all the data across the sixteen regions, you will find that the issue is systemic. Closing the Achievement Gap in Reading is on a more positive upward spiral than Closing the Achievement Gap in Math. The good news is that only 3 regions of the 16 “widened” the gap rather than narrowed the gap in reading meaning that 13 regions actually narrowed the gap. However, in Math only 2 regions narrowed the gap rather than widened the gap and 14 actually “widened” the gap. This is certainly not a surprise and not intentional but shows the efforts being provided in changing instructional practices for reading and the complex change in instructional practices for math. The Common Core/Revised Standards, the new PARCC assessment and new accountability system will certainly be critical factors for consideration in the SST work this year.

Data reveals that SST 13 is in the top third of the SST regions in Closing the Achievement Gap in Reading with a +1.5 [Sixth] and in Math with only a -1.02 [Fifth]. While this sounds better than it looks on the chart, it is not good because we need to be closing the achievement gap at a faster rate than we are currently doing. We need to analyze what other regions in the top third of the group are doing to close the achievement gap and learn from them. We need to look at demographics and see what they tell us. We need to press forward with the state on systemic changes that need to take place and be part of the design of the new system rather than just a compliant partner.

We must take this data to all the meetings with districts and make it very clear what the data says and develop plans for change. However, this is just not good enough. We need to continue the work with “Why Johnny Can’t Read” or “Janie Can’t Do Math” or how to Close the Achievement Gap but we need help in integrating the work to design a new system with greater urgency for change.

The data also revealed differences and significant gaps between the community schools and traditional schools. This is also a statewide systemic issue due to the changes in focus on the work of community schools and oversight of community schools. SST 13 has made a concerted effort to develop services for community schools but is finding that it takes a great deal of time to establish relationships, trust, continuity and direction with community school changes in leadership and direction. By nature, community schools are not bound by the same regulations that traditional schools are; yet, is school improvement and better results really prevalent in the community school settings across the state? I think it would be helpful to separate the community school data from the traditional school data as we have done with Students with Disabilities. We would also like to analyze the data by demographics.

In summary, SST 13 and the state have a great deal of work to do to really substantially close the achievement gap. Can we do it? Not unless we change our current practices and focus of our work. This is our challenge and why I continue working with SST 13, the state of Ohio and HCESC. The challenge is worth it

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:

The SST discussed the scaled scores for students with disabilities (SWD) at length. The SST recognizes that both typical students and SWD are improving; however, the typical students are making more progress than the SWD. A concern shared by the SST was how small the gains were between typical students and SWD. It is clear that the education gap is quite large and that SWD will have to make huge gains to “catch up” with their nondisabled peers.

A concern raised by the SST was the use of technology in the classroom and how many students, not just SWD, do not have daily access to technology in the classroom. This could pose some challenges for both typical students and SWD in transitioning from an OAA in written form to the PARCC which will be computerized. The SST recognizes that instructional practices need to change and adapt with technology and are constantly evaluating their services and supports that they provide to districts.

One area the SST is starting to address is the gap in math scores. Currently, the SST is working to deconstruct the math standards so that they can determine the essential skills and mathematical processes that students need to learn so that training can be developed for teachers. The SST wants to provide different instructional strategies for educators so that they can differentiate their instruction for all students. The SST shared that if the same emphasis is placed on math as there has been on reading, then student will make growth in their performance and the gap will decrease over time.

There was much discussion about the quality professional development that is provided for educators by the SST. A concern was raised, however, about the fact that the Performance Agreement does not currently address the SST providing training on “closing the achievement gap.” This may be an area the Department of Education may want to review for future performance agreements.

In regards to PD, the SST and ESC is starting to see the need of flexibility of scheduling training after schools hours during the week and on weekends. The SST is constantly evaluating the training and technical assistance needs of their customers.

The SST shared that they will be discussing the data regarding the scaled scores for SWD with their districts. The SST recognizes that all resources, superintendents, PPDs, treasurers and ESCs need to be familiar with this data and be a part of the discussion in helping to move SWD forward on their math and reading scores.

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:

In reviewing the State Performance Plan Annual Performance Report [SPP/APR] data, the regional status is as follows:

Indicator 5: Least Restrictive Environment [LRE] – 80% or more time

From FY09 to FY11, the "Target" has increased from 49% to 49.4% to 59.8% for the respective years which is an overall increase of 10.8%. In FY09 and FY10, 4 schools did not achieve the established target. In FY11, 9 districts or 11.5% of the districts did not achieve the increased target of 10.4% or 59.8%. While it is certainly the desire of SST 13 for all districts to meet and exceed these expectations, 4 schools fell within the range of 58.00 to 59.1%, 2 schools fell within the range of 52.1 to 54.1, 2 schools fell within range of 43.3-46.3 and only 1 school fell at 15.9% which shows that focus has been placed on least restrictive environments and change in practice resulting in improvements in LRE in the region. Consultants assigned to the districts not meeting the target will work collaborative with the district in addressing a plan for improvement.

Indicator 11: Child Find

With the Target being 100% over the past three fiscal years, progress has been seen in the number of districts not reaching the target. In FY09, there were 34 of 78 districts who did not meet the target; In FY10, there were 20 of 78 that did not meet the target; and FY11, there were 19 who did not meet target with 6 additional districts in caution. Child Find continues to present a problem for the region but efforts are being made to assist those districts who are striving to move forward but need additional assistance. In many cases, districts have met the target for the first time this year but other districts due to specific circumstances have not been able to reach the target. Technical assistance will be provided to those districts not reaching the target.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

So close but not yet there. SST 13 had only two districts that did not meet the target of 100% for Early Childhood Transition. Cincinnati Public Schools was at 99% but not the 100% target and Lakota Local was at 81.8%, a decrease from 100% to 92.9% to 81.8%. There are many changes in both of these districts especially as it relates to change in the leadership of programs. SST 13 will continue working with both of these districts to provide technical assistance and support. SST 13 has changed staff and replaced the ELLS position with two people, providing a collaborative team of three people carrying out the function of Early Learning.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Improvement has been seen in the area of Secondary Transition with an increase of districts meeting the 100% target improving from 60 of 78 districts or 77% in FY09 to 69 of 78 or 88% in FY10 to 73 of 78 districts or 94% in FY11. Considerable work has been done in this area by the SST Consultant. Districts not reaching the 100% were within the 97.2 to 99.2 range. SST 13 will continue working with the districts to reach the 100% target.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

The regional status of LEAs selected for IDEA on-site monitoring or selective review during the 2011-2012 school years is as follows:

Cincinnati Public Schools: Completed onsite review during 2011-2012 school year, submitted CAP in February 2012 and it was approved April 2012. CPS with the assistance of SST 13 established a cadre of Peer Compliance Reviewers (PCR) who are training special education teachers and support personnel on the "new" IEP and MFE. The PCRs will begin rounds of IEP reviews this fall once their training is completed.

Franklin: Completed all individual corrections.

Hamilton City: Completed their CAP and all activities last year and were cleared. They completed Prong 1 &2

Lockland: Completed their SST training on measurable goals, SDI, LRE, age range of classes, and PR-01 on Sept 10 (**BASED on complaint**)

Mount Auburn International Academy: Completed their SST training on LRE, interventions and continuum of services, in early August.

Middletown: District has been cleared of all individual corrections and is currently completing their SST compliance trainings as part of their CAP. There have been two and will be a third one next week.

Norwood: Norwood went through the on-site review in 2010-2011. SST worked with them all last year, mostly on Prong 2. All is completed on Norwood.

Oak Hills: Cancelled due to ODE resources

Phoenix Community Learning Center: Completed CAP in 2011-2012 and were passed/cleared/completed in March, 2012.

Richard Allen Academy: Completed all activities last year and have been cleared. They completed Prong 1&2

Southwest: Completed their CAP and have been cleared as of the end of last school year.

Sycamore: Onsite review occurred in January, 2012 and CAP developed and submitted by the deadline in the Spring. They are meeting with SST support in next week for assistance in writing measurable goals.

Assistance will be provided to these districts on a follow-up and continuous improvement basis.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

In terms of Child Find, the SST recognizes that some of the issues regarding this compliance indicator are EMIS reporting issues and some are that the district or community school is simply not meeting the 60 day timeline for initial evaluations after receiving parental consent. Districts sometimes do not do a good job of tracking their timelines and sometimes the data is skewed when there are twin siblings. Note: My notes differ somewhat in terms of root causes identified for missed timelines. I did not make any reference to EMIS reporting for this indicator but rather the inability to secure parent participation and lack of urgency on part of some ESC hired psychologists working with LEAs. I also made note that compliance indicators lacked a sense of urgency with SST staff as their focus is on improving results. Some discussion ensued regarding the relationship of the two and the need to make the connections for LEAs.

The SST shared that addressing the compliance indicators (Child Find, LRE, EC and Postsecondary Transition) within a traditional public school district is much different than addressing them in a community school. For instance, the traditional public schools often want very individualized training and technical assistance and want these services to be provided within their district. This is frequently seen in larger urban school districts. Conversely, the community schools vary in size and typically have a different leadership structure than their traditional public school colleagues. Community schools often experience frequent changes in staff and it is not uncommon for their school leadership to be from out of state/out of the country and unfamiliar with IDEA and Ohio Law. To address these challenges the SST has involved the community school management companies in their PD. This has helped in building positive relationships within the community school environment and has helped strengthen their compliance with IDEA.

The SST reported that LRE compliance is much like Child Find, I have no reference to this in my notes. However, I did note the concern over EMIS reporting specific to LRE. Often it is tracking and/or reporting errors in EMIS. One concern raised by the SST in terms of LRE data was that community schools typically have big jumps one way or the other in their LRE percentages because they are typically much smaller than their traditional public school counterparts. It was suggested that maybe the community school data and the traditional public school data be separated and disaggregated differently. The SST did indicate that when they look at the data, whether it is a traditional public school or a community school they always look at the big picture when meeting with individual LEAs.

The SST reported in terms of secondary transition they are narrowing the work in area of professional development and are developing training to address the recent change of requiring fourteen year-olds to have a postsecondary transition plan within their IEP.

The SST reported that in EC that have added additional staff members in the ESC to assist districts in compliance. Several districts have lost their expertise in this area due to retirements and the SST/ESC is trying to bridge any gaps in this area.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments Continued:

In regards to OEC Monitoring, the SST is in continuous contact with the LEAs who have a current Corrective Action Plan (CAP) as a result from 2011-2012 School Age Onsite Review. The SST staff is cognizant to the needs of each LEA and what has to be done for them to be compliant with IDEA within one year. The consultants track their progress and report to OEC regularly. Training and technical assistance is tailored to meet the needs of the individual district and its staff.

The SST reported that they appreciate the strong relationship they have with OEC and that the resources provided by OEC such as, EdResources.com is amazing. They also appreciate the quickness of OEC's responses to the SST's inquiries; however, they do think that there is room for improvement on obtaining consistent information from OEC. The SST reported that have strategically aligned their leadership with ODE's agency leadership so that that can build positive working relationships and establish collaborative

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	PARP	Provided high quality professional development based on regional needs
3	PARP	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	PARP	Attended ODE required and sponsored meetings and trainings
0	PARP	Corrective action plan completed by fiscal agent if work within the scope of the performance agreement is deemed unsatisfactory
2	PARP	Provided and maintained an SST website adhering to the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE
3	PARP	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
3	PARP	Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
3	PARP	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	PARP	Provided technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM
3	PARP	Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
3	PARP	Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
3	PARP	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
3	PARP	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS
2	PARP	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
3	PARP	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3	PARP	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
3	PARP	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	PARP	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

SST 13 closely adheres to all indicators and items in the Performance Agreement. The Performance Agreement is thoroughly reviewed by the fiscal agent, the Single Point of Contact, the Special Education Contact, the SST Coordinators and all State Support Team consultants each year. The scope of work is defined and outlined to assure fulfillment of all expectations.

General Indicators: SST 13 has provided high quality professional development based on a regional needs assessment utilizing the most current data sources, input from stakeholders and regional partners. We strive to submit timely and accurate information and data at all times and attend ODE required meetings and trainings. Areas of improvement would be a more robust SST website. While we do adhere to guidelines, it is felt that our website could be more informative and customer friendly. Improvements will be made this year. In the past, Region 13 has always been a very collaborative region with regional design, delivery, communication and leveraging of resources. In the past few years with changes in leadership of our regional partners, collaboration and participation is not nearly as effective as it has been in the past and is presenting a challenge to the work of the SST in meeting the needs of districts utilizing regional partners. As an organization, we are working on a resolution to this issue.

Ohio Improvement Process:

SST 13 has always been very involved with the design and delivery of the Ohio Improvement Process and works diligently to not only facilitate the work in districts and build district capacity to sustain the work but to also continue the critical areas of training in Stage 3 and Stage 4. SST 13 has two FTE staff working in the Cincinnati Public Schools and also has considerable resources supporting Middletown City Schools which is part of the Urban 21. Professional Development and technical support has been provided for the DLT, BLT, TBT, CSLT work including the decision framework and IMM. We have encouraged the use of the OLAC modules and have worked with regional partners to meet the needs of the region. We have served as a liaison between ODE and the LEAs in support of the OIP and related services. We will continue to encourage and market the OLAC modules.

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

Self-Rating	PARP Rating	C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS
3	PARP	Attended monthly OEL&SR meetings and took advantage of information and capacity building professional development
3	PARP	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
3	PARP	Participated in district IDEA monitoring visits, particularly at exit meetings an assisted districts in the completion of corrective action plans
3	PARP	Provided professional development and TA to districts, ESCs, boards of DD and the early learning community at large on topics
3	PARP	Received instruction on topics, including train-the-trainer models
3	PARP	Delivered training and/or technical assistance to districts, ESCs, boards of
3	PARP	DD and the early learning community at large related to standards, curriculum, assessments and other goals related to RTT ELC grant
3	PARP	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	PARP	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	PARP	Participated in systems building by participating in the Teacher/Leader Initiative
3	PARP	Promoted improved outcomes for English language learners based on regional needs
3	PARP	Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
3	PARP	Participated in building a statewide professional development system
3	PARP	Developed parent engagement activities based on regional needs
3	PARP	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:

SST 13 has fulfilled all the expectations for the Early Learning/School Readiness Indicators. Through the leadership of Gretchen Estreicher and our ELLS, Early Learning services have been recognized throughout the region. I would like to mention the work of the Southwest Early Learner Leaders [SWELL] as one positive result of the work of the Early Learning Consultants. SST 13 is in the process of improving upon services in this area by adding the expertise of two new State Support Team consultants who will be fulfilling the functions in the Performance Agreement and integrating the services of Early Learning into PreK-12. They will be providing the training and assisting with the Teacher/Leader Initiative and the Intentional Teaching: Language and Literacy Development of All Young Children. They will also be coordinating their work with the HCESC on developing services to support the Third Grade Guarantee. We are very excited to have the three person team working collaboratively to improve the spectrum and quality of services being provided to support Early Learning and School Readiness in our region. I realize that there may be some concern over the change in personnel but I assure you, it will be beneficial to the services provided in the future and that all areas of the Performance Agreement will be effectively implemented with the highest quality.

As the SPC, Special Education Contact and SST Coordinators, we will strive to better understand the Early Learning and School Readiness function and provide the support and leadership to the SST and the state.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

HCESC made a strategic decision at the end of the 2011-2012 school year to change the service delivery model that was being utilized across the region for State Support Team Region 13. This was partially due to opportunities presented to the organization as a result of the loss of personnel due to retirements and/or changes in employment, increasing needs of school districts for technical assistance, leveraging of regional resources, system demands, need for change and the changing context at the state, regional and local level. This decision resulted in the employment of 9 new SST staff members who bring fresh, new perspectives to the resolution of the issues facing us with "Closing the Achievement Gap". We searched for individuals with experience in both general education and special education and who had some English Language Learner backgrounds and experience. This has resulted in a cadre of highly qualified State Support Team members with varied backgrounds and recent experience in the classroom in meeting the needs of all learners who can actually assist districts and schools in integrating the work of general education and special education in an effective school improvement model.

The major focus of SST 13 will be on transforming the educational system so that all children can learn more, do more and be more. We will design services and products within the Performance Agreement indicators to break down the barriers that currently exist and integrate the work in the schools so that all children have access to the curriculum and opportunities to learn so that they meet the expectations set out for them in the Common Core/Revised Standards, the Extended Standards, the Alternate Assessment, and state and national accountability including the ESEA Waiver. We will develop services around Co-teaching, Universal Design for Learning, Differentiated Instruction, Formative Assessments, Third Grade Reading Guarantee and many more to meet the needs of our districts. We will continue our work on the Common Core/Revised Standards and meeting the needs of all learners. We will also focus more heavily on the work of the community schools as a target.

We will focus more heavily on utilizing data to drive resolution toward "Closing the Achievement Gap". We will develop a better understanding of the deliverables under "Supporting the Effective Use of the Ohio Improvement Process" and know and communicate why that process is so important to the success of districts in meeting the needs of all children. We will help districts understand the new ESEA waiver and implications for their districts. We will work with regional partners to leverage resources and integrate the work.

We will provide all the training and services under the deliverables in "Improving Results for Students with Disabilities" but will focus on the outcomes for children as a result of these services. We will have a better understanding of the end results and why we are asking districts to be compliant with the regulations. We will challenge the regulations that do not enable children to have full access and opportunities to learn and will monitor the fidelity of implementation of the services provided so that we can provide more technical assistance to districts in need to assure success.

VI. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments Continued:

The SST is clearly strong in using data to drive their decision making and in developing services for the LEAs that they serve. The SST is constantly looking for ways to move all student subgroups forward in math and reading and not just SWD. They recognize a need for instructional practice to change and adapt and have engaged districts in this conversation as districts implement the Common Core and prepare for PARCC.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

We will search for and find other ways to “Close the Achievement Gap” because what we are currently doing is simply not getting the job done at a rapid enough pace for our children.

We will strive to not only provide the deliverables under Early Learning and School Readiness but will integrate the work more thoroughly across the board. We want to break down the silos and help each other and the districts understand all the parts of the system and why they must work together differently and more efficiently and effectively.

Data & Closing the Achievement Gap will be our focus! Transforming Education! We must design a different system to assist districts in moving student achievement for all subgroups forward at a rapid pace while at the same time closing the gap.

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