



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 14
Number of LEAs in Region: 18
Date of Review Conference: 11/8/2012

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 14 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 14'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 14 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 14 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: 14 **Number of LEAs in Region:** 18 **Date of Review Conference:** 11/8/2012

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:

Ratings data suggests that *Involvement of Special Education Personnel in DLT, BLT and TBT* are the strongest of the practices listed on the Progress Report, although in most cases this involvement is a developing practice at best. *Formative Assessment* and *Modification of Formative Assessment for Students with Disabilities* are the least strong and beginning or developing in almost all districts.

From January to June we believe there has been some slight strengthening of the practices of *Formative Assessment*, and *Modification of Formative Assessment, Standards, TBT's, BLTs and Early Childhood Practices*. The strongest growth was shown in *Standards* and we anticipate a "jump up" in this rating for almost all districts due to district participation in professional development in the area of Standards, Extended Standards and Early Learning School Readiness Standards.

From the first to the last reporting period all averages increased except *Instructional Practices, DLT and Special Education Involvement in DLT*. We are especially concerned with the lack of change in instructional practices and will need to focus our efforts more at the TBT level to better gauge and report implementation of instructional practices and to assist TBT's, BLTs and DLT's in improving instructional practices.

Overall there appeared to be slight improvement in five districts and slight fallback for three districts on areas contained within the Progress Report Form—although this may reflect greater familiarity with the reporting tool or increasing knowledge regarding the practices and better identification of "what we don't know," than actual decline or improvement in practices.

Across the region, areas of greatest need appear to be in *Formative Assessment and Modification of Formative Assessment and Implementation of TBT's and Standards, as well as Instructional Practices*. Data suggests that in all districts there is a great deal of work to be done before practices reach accomplished or exemplary.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The region has a very active Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) and a Regional State Support Team (RSST) which helps nurture/strengthen relationships across the region focusing on needs identification and service delivery. SPoC comments regarding the ratings on the Progress Reports appear to be on-target. Formative Assessment was the lowest rated OIP-related area across the region. Working with LEAs by providing TA and support to develop and implement formative assessments will increase the quality and fidelity of several other areas, including but not limited to: Instructional Practices, TBTs, BLTs and DLTs. By enabling LEAs to bring formative assessment data to the table during TBT, BLT and DLT discussions, Stages 2 and 3 of the five stage process will be better able to function as designed. The OIP Implementation rubric is an excellent resource. It is recommended that all SST staff be well versed in its contents. Further, working with LEAs to develop the same understanding of the content of the OIP rubric and its use as a benchmarking tool will go a long way toward creating a common language and understanding of high fidelity OIP implementation within the region.

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:

Review of Customer Service Survey Results reveals a low return rate (42 of 97=43.3%), which while slightly above the state average is of significant concern.

In discussion with members of our RAC School Improvement Subcommittee on September 11, they indicated that there is some "survey fatigue" in districts since survey tools are now used so frequently and that this contributed to the lower than desired response last spring.

That said, we will still need to endeavor to increase our customer returns in the spring, 2013 so that we can be more confident in the results. We plan to do this through increased communication with customers regarding how the data is used and the potential district benefit in returning the survey. We would also like to suggest that the survey be available in April and for a larger window and that a paper version of the survey be an option for parents who are surveyed. If an online format is the only format available, Region 14 will offer facilities, equipment and personnel to assist parents and others in completing the survey.

Based upon survey responses that are available, average satisfaction with Region 14 of respondents was 3.54 on a 4.00 scale. There were twenty two ratings of "4" in the area of overall satisfaction, fifteen ratings of "3" and one rating of "2." Although this level of satisfaction (3.54) is slightly higher than the state average, if it is reflective of regional attitudes we do not feel that this is acceptable. Of particular concern are the results for *Formative Assessment*. Several other areas were below state average: *OEC Compliance, OEC Improvement, Early Learning School Readiness, TBT support, DLT Support and Stage 4 Support*. We did note that we received a rating of "1" on seven of the items; three of these 1's were received from the same individual.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

SPoC/SPEC Comments Continued:

While the majority of Customer Service Comments were positive (examples: “They convey the message from ODE accurately,” “Our district has a great working relationship with them.” “They work extremely hard on getting input from the member schools.” “The SST responds to our requests quickly and thoroughly.” “Their commitment to quality and great service is exceptional.” “Being visible at building and teacher based team meetings. Providing training and opportunities to share; assisting with district leadership/OIP process”) the Survey provided us with areas for improvement that include: “Need embedded PD not having to take people out of the buildings.” “offer Webinar/taped version of the session missed so that teachers/administrators in the district would view at another time.” “Some of their meetings are long because they tend to incorporate too many fluff activities.” “Meeting schedules should consider all districts’ breaks, etc. not just a few: “Create work sessions that allow districts to focus on the framework, IMM and other CCIP connected items.” “Take the info across the board from Pre-K to grade levels so the grade levels understand what is going on in Pre-K.” “Pre-assess where districts are before requiring attendance at internal facilitator meetings.” “Perhaps more work directly with our teachers and less with administrative staff?” “The SST came to one BLT meeting, I wish they could’ve come to more.”

Feedback from the Pre-K Community also identified a continued need for professional development offered in inclusive, multiagency settings so that networking and resource sharing is promoted between schools districts, private and public child care, DD and Head Starts.

We plan to use these results (along with other informal feedback from customers and direction from ODE) to insure that more of our training is job embedded, that it is directed at building district and school capacity and we plan to make connections with OTES and OPES, as well as FIP, more explicit. Professional development for early childhood will be designed to support community building, as well.

We will also assist our districts, centers and agencies in accessing webinars and other on-line resources for professional development.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

This region had an overall customer service rating that placed it in the top third of all regions. In addition, comments offered by respondents were very positive. The response rate for returned surveys was at the state-wide average, and the SST has identified steps it will take to increase that rate. Consistent with statewide ratings, the lowest rated area by customers was service received regarding short cycle formative assessments. The region rating in this area was below the statewide average for this area. There is correlation for this area between ratings provided by SST staff for LEAs in this area on the Progress Reports, and how the LEAs rated this service delivery by the SST. It is recommended that delivery of TA and support in this area be strengthened, which will, as indicated in comments provided under Progress Reports, positively impact other OIP functions.

As indicated in comments above, efforts to help LEAs understand the connections across initiatives will better enable them to create focus around increasing student achievement.

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:

Regional data showed an average rating of 3.50% (based upon 325 responses), which is slightly above the state average of 3.44%. While 97.8% of respondents indicated that their job was impacted by the Professional Development, only 90.8% indicated that it was job embedded, Both are slightly higher than state averages, but below desired percentages.

The highest average rated area was *Early Learning School Readiness* with an average score of 4.00% rating, 100% job embedded and 100% job impacted. (However, only 7 respondents were included in these results.) Next strongly rated was *Special Education Instruction and Special Education Compliance*, followed by ratings for the *Ohio Improvement Process and General Education* professional development.

Suggestions for improvement included timing of professional development, expanding job embedded training, along with follow-up coaching as resources allow and assisting participants in seeing connections between OTES/OPES, FIP, RttT work, as well as standards, extended standards and effective instruction.

The window for these professional development evaluation results was relatively short. We will have significantly more data to analyze during the 12-13 school year, including more from early learning school readiness professional development. We also revised our "additional questions" for the PD evaluation to include some elements that we believe will yield useful information for future planning and have endeavored to insure that personnel understand the requirement for 100% compliance and consistency in administration and collection of professional development evaluations.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The ONII and OEC PARP reviewers agree with the comments provided by the SPOC.

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:

Scaled score data reveals several districts making some progress in closing the achievement gap in reading 09-11.

In math, fewer districts have made progress 09 to 11, but some have seen very positive gap closing.

Change in average scaled score data shows overall growth in seventeen of eighteen districts, for students with disabilities over the last 5 years.

Compared to other regions we have seen progress in both 4 year reading (3.2) and math (1.65) gap change. However, to better analyze and use this data we need technical assistance from ODE in order to insure that we are interpreting the data correctly. I have requested that technical assistance and am confident that the assistance I receive from OEC will help us better use the data.

Even without the technical assistance it is clear that there continues to be a great deal of work needed to see both improvement of subgroup performance and reduction in the achievement gap and as districts continue to see improvement in their non disabled student performance, as well as that for students with disabilities we will need to assist districts in accelerating the performance improvements for students with disabilities.

PARP Reviewer Comments

Region 14 has spoken with the OEC data manager and attended overview training of average scaled scores to gain a better understanding of this data. They are looking forward to further technical assistance from OEC in how to utilize the data to inform decision making within the region. In comparison with other regions, Region 14 has made the largest gains in closing average scaled score gap for reading and math. The SST attributes this gain to the work of district personnel and parents, and collaborative efforts with the Educational Service Centers (ESCs) in their region to support the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) among LEAs. In addition to monthly SST meetings, the SST is involved in a bi-monthly RSST (Regional Support Team) meeting that includes ESC personnel and an active Regional Advisory Council (RAC). The RAC meets 5 times a year and is well attended by LEA superintendents. The regional teams have focused on ensuring participation of special education on DLTs, BLTs, and TBTs and the inclusion of subgroup performance in overall OIP discussions and planning. They have also focused their work with TBTs on differentiating instructional practices to meet the needs of all students. All but two of the LEAs in the region are OIP participants. Several professional development opportunities have been provided addressing standards and extended standards. The region is beginning work towards embedding extended standards and early childhood standards training into overall standards training.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments Continued:

Region 14 SST, along with their ESC partners, recognizes that there is still work to be done to ensure all students are achieving at high levels and plan to ramp up efforts to support LEAs to close the achievement gap for students with disabilities. The School Improvement RAC Subcommittee will review regional and district level data in order to determine regional and district needs. SST and ESC facilitators will continue to support LEAs in maintaining high expectations for all learners, to serve SWD in least restrictive environments, and to change instructional practices to meet the needs of all students including students with disabilities.

Although the SST noted the need to continue efforts to have more SWD served within the general education classroom, it was noted that students with high incidence disabilities are less likely to be pulled from core instruction for specially designed instruction in several districts than in the past. Additionally, the region has continued to show improvement including students with disabilities in a *Least Restrictive Environment*, which has translated to some extent into steady improvement in the attainment of AYP for the districts of Region 14.

The region has also focused resources on scheduling to allow for instructional planning and TBT work with assistance from Dr. Canady, as well as professional development regarding differentiation and co-teaching.

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:

The 2012 SPP Determinations data released for Region 14 school districts indicates 14 of the 18 districts to have earned the “Meets Requirements” designation. Of the districts that missed this designation, all 4 received the designation of “Needs Assistance.” Region 14 has two school districts that earned their “Needs Assistance” designation because of noncompliance with Indicator 13 (*Post-Secondary Transition*) and associated Indicator 20 (*Data Verification*) findings from their Onsite Monitoring visits during the 2011-2012 school years. Both districts agreed to receive technical assistance from Region 14 SST to support the writing and implementation of their Corrective Action Plans. The remaining two districts in “Needs Assistance” earned this designation for noncompliance on Indicator 11 (*Child Find*); however, one of these districts has already completed the necessary corrective action and will therefore have no required actions. Nonetheless, technical assistance and professional development will be offered to both districts to address the Indicator 11 noncompliance.

An in-depth examination of performance of Region 14’s school districts on the SPP Indicators finds both areas of celebration as well as areas of continued need for support, professional development, and technical assistance. These needs pertain not only to compliance with IDEA requirements, but also the achievement and outcomes for students with disabilities. An area of celebration is the continued improved inclusion of student with disabilities in a *Least Restrictive Environment*, which has translated to some extent into steady improvement in the attainment of AYP for the districts of Region 14. Additionally, districts of Region 14 consistently meet the compliance indicators for *Early Childhood Transition* (Indicator 12) and *Post-Secondary Transition* (Indicator 13). Furthermore, much improvement has been seen in the districts’ compliance with *Child Find* timelines (Indicator 11), although continued need for assistance in this area is indicated. The area of most significant concern in Region 14 is the school districts’ performance in Indicator 3c, the *Reading and Math Proficiency* rates for students with disabilities. This is an area for which some of our districts have made steady growth as shown in the following example for Reading Proficiency in one district: FY09 51.0%, FY10 75%, and FY11 78.7%. While still below the target, this district demonstrates steady, positive growth in the reading proficiency rate for its students with disabilities. However, results such as this are not seen in the majority of our districts with some showing perplexing “backtracking” of the achievement of their student with disabilities (i.e., one district showing reading proficiency as follows FY09 49.0%, FY10 62.0%, and FY11 55.2%). Another area of need for Region 14 school districts is the improvement of the *graduation and dropout rates* among students with disabilities. Approximately one-third of the school districts in Region 14 have missed the *graduation/dropout targets* for the preceding three years of available data.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Summary of 2011-2012 Onsite Monitoring

During the school year 2011-2012, Region 14 SST supported four LEAs through different stages of the PACTS Onsite Monitoring process. Two LEAs were in the corrective stage in which Region 14 SST supported the implementation of their Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) and verification of compliance. Specifically, Region 14 SST supported both districts by providing technical assistance in the writing of the CAP and correction of noncompliance with individual student records, comprehensive professional development, and follow-up support including reviewing draft Evaluation Team Reports (ETRs) and Individual Education Programs (IEPs) to verify correction in areas of noncompliance. Two LEAs within Region 14 began the Onsite Monitoring process during the 2011-2012 school year. Region 14 SST supported these two LEAs in the beginning stages of the Onsite Monitoring by providing individually-scheduled meetings to provide an overview of what to expect from the process, including a review of the LEA Guidelines (provided on the ODE website) and the available “record review” tools used by the monitoring consultants. Additionally, one LEA opted to schedule a professional development on the writing of measurable annual goals prior to their monitoring visit; Region 14 SSTs provided this PD. Both districts were provided with technical assistance upon receiving their summary reports, and one district received technical assistance in the writing of the CAP prior to the close of the 2011-2012 school year. The main areas of noncompliance for all school districts receiving an Onsite Monitoring visit in Region 14 are in the areas of *Delivery of Services and Least Restrictive Environment*, including problems with *writing measurable annual goals, addressing how the child’s disability affects his/her involvement and progress in the general education curriculum, writing descriptive statements of specially designed instruction, providing justification/explanation of the extent to which a child would not be educated with nondisabled peers in the regular education classroom, and writing of compliant post-secondary transition plans.*

In addition to assisting the districts in monitoring and the districts needing assistance with SPP, our Special Education Consultants are using results of the On Site Monitoring and to inform all of our districts (through meetings and in written correspondence) of important compliance and improvement information.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

Region 14 Special Education Consultants review Special Education Profile data with LEAs when it is released from OEC. All LEAs have either met or made progress toward meeting all SPP compliance indicators. The SST will continue to keep LEAs focused on ensuring that students suspected of a disability receive a timely evaluation. The SPOC and ESC Superintendent indicated that timelines are most often missed due to unavailability of school psychology personnel and related services in the region. Resources are available and many efforts have been made to hire personnel but some positions have been difficult to fill. The region continues efforts to “grow their own” people for hard to fill positions and are exploring the use of professional assistants and shared services.

Region 14 Special Education Consultants are deeply embedded in all phases of the monitoring process and all LEAs monitored have been able to demonstrate correction of non-compliance within the one year timeline. During FY 12 early childhood consultants were consulted regarding monitoring and received monitoring reports, but did not actively participate in the on-site process. Region 14 Early Childhood Consultants will have complete involvement in the monitoring process this year.

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
3	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	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
3	3	Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
0	0	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)
2	2	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
0	0	Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
3	3	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	3	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
2	2	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
3	3	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3	3	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
3	3	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

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Region 14 has endeavored to meet all of the Performance Indicators in the FY 12 Performance Agreement. In collaboration with our ESC partners we developed a workscope for the Agreement and reviewed progress periodically throughout the year at our RSST Meetings. We will continue that effort in FY 13.

We have evidence to support self-ratings of three on all items so marked. We believe that we need to improve in the areas of: providing technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM and in the area of reinforcing awareness and utilization of the OLAC modules, although we have done both to some extent during the project year.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII PARP reviewer agrees with the self-ratings by the SPoC/SST.

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	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
1	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
	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
2	PARP	Promoted improved outcomes for English language learners based on regional needs
2	PARP	Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
2	PARP	Participated in building a statewide professional development system
2	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:

Region 14 has also endeavored to meet all of the Early Learning/School Readiness Performance Indicators in the FY 12 Performance Agreement. In collaboration with our ESC partners our workscope included these Indicators and our progress reviews included the Early Childhood work.

We will continue that effort in FY 13.

We have evidence to support self ratings of three on all items so marked. We believe that we need to improve in the areas of: *ELSR participating in district IDEA monitoring visits* (and this involvement has already been planned for FY13), *promoting improved outcomes for English Language Learners*, *promoting the use of interagency agreements*, *participating in building a statewide professional development system* and *developing parent engagement activities based on regional needs*. The FY 13 workscope includes actions to address all of these areas.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

As indicated above, our SST, working with our ESC partners will implement our workscope for FY 13 Performance Agreement and will meet the deliverables identified in the Performance Agreement.

We will work to

1. Increase District use of OLAC, as well as other ODE developed/supported online training (OCALI, etc) and ensure participation in relevant webinars, such as those supporting OIP.
2. Increase implementation fidelity of OIP structures and processes, including the use of tools including the DF/IMM, within our DA districts and Focus Buildings (if any).
3. Connect improvement work (OIP, RttT, FIP, OTES/OPES) regionally and at district and building levels
4. Keep the focus on instructional practices, content, early learning and extended standards and formative assessment for all students
5. Incorporate early childhood data messages, as well as subgroup performance data messages (Pre K-16) into all work

We plan to continue to collaborate with our Regional Advisory Council to insure that our work is tailored to meet regional needs. Their feedback, along with the Customer Service and PD evaluation data is driving us to increase our use of technologies (webinars, etc) and to insure that our PD is job embedded and respectful of district downsizing and capacity issues and we plan to provide follow up whenever it is needed and possible within resource limitations.

We will analyze and identify actions and practices in districts that are resulting in closing the achievement gap in Region 14 and elsewhere and share that information with our districts in an effective manner.

We will also collaborate with our quad and the SSOS to learn from the successes of others, so that we can support our districts in their efforts to improve and we will incorporate recommendations from the PARP review in order for Region 14 to improve.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The region's plan moving forward is on target. In addition, there needs to be a strong emphasis on providing TA and support to LEAs in the area of developing and implementing formative assessments. As that occurs, assistance should be provided to help LEAs understand and properly use the data derived to conduct data-driven TBT, BLT and DLT meetings. Identifying high leverage adult implementation behaviors within a building/district, monitoring implementation through walkthroughs and other means, and making necessary adjustments to instructional practice is the essence of the 5 Stage process and will, over time, lead to increases in student achievement for all students.

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