



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 15
Number of LEAs in Region: 30
Date of Review Conference: 10/10/2012

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 15 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 15'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 15 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 15 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: 15

Number of LEAs in Region: 30

Date of Review Conference: 10/10/2012

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:

Looking at the data from the January reporting to June reporting it appears there is some improvement in the overall scores of the districts. However it is questionable about what data and/or evidence within each district was examined to make the ratings on the Progress report.

Formative Assessment definitions, methods and data are not consistent across districts or across the facilitators who work in the districts. The 19 districts in DA in the region are served by either an SST or ESC facilitator. Sometimes SST/ESC facilitators are paired in a district. Some ratings were provided based on the extent of implementation of Quarterly Assessments only. Others based ratings on every day formative assessment and how those assessments guide instruction. Sometimes monitoring systems are not in place and the rating becomes more of a guessing process.

The same can be said about the "Standards". The implementation of the common core standards is limited (beginning with K-1) and the ratings were different based on how the facilitator perceived the implementation.

Instructional practices defined as differentiated instruction on the rating form was also open to varying interpretations which may give a distorted view of whether districts were progressing or not. Also, some districts did not choose differentiated instruction as a strategy so there was nothing to observe in this area. Our districts/TBTs are still not seeing differentiation as part of the 5-Step Process.

The inclusion of special education and early learning staff on OIP structures may also have given distorted pictures of progress. Sometimes a "4" was given when an intervention specialist was on the DLT list. There was no consideration given to the extent of involvement and a "4" would not initiate actions to increase involvement. The "4" then becomes a false rating because it does not represent the expectations for SE involvement.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- This SST understands the importance of working with within region ESC partners to provide services to LEAs in the region.
- Provide assistance and support to LEAs in the region on understanding the OIP Implementation Rubric. The rubric was a resource tool provided to LEAs to assist them with completion of the dashboard survey. Therefore, there should be alignment and common understanding of definitions by SST and LEA staff toward the completion of the dashboard survey and the repetitive completion of the progress reports.
- It is recommended that time be devoted to calibrating an understanding on the use, application of and common definitions for the Ohio Improvement Process Implementation rubric amongst SST staff working with LEAs. Utilize the OIP Implementation Rubric as a resource in conjunction with the completion of the Progress Report.

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:

State Support Team Region 15 is comprised of twenty-eight local, city and exempted village school districts and two community schools. Nineteen of the districts participate in the differentiated accountability process. Eighty names and email addresses from nineteen of the twenty eight school districts served by Region 15 were sent to ODE to receive the on line “Customer Service Survey.” Thirty-five, of the eighty district representatives who received the survey, responded, for a response percentage of 42.5%, less than the number hoped for.

Results;

Special Education Compliance 3.67 out possible 4
 Special Education Instructional Practices 3.52 out of possible 4
 Early Learning 3.08 out of possible 4
 Building Teams 3.26 out of possible 4
 Teacher Based Teams 3.27 out of possible 4
 Short Cycle Formative Assessment 3.21 out of possible 4
 District Leadership Teams 3.35 out of possible 4
 OIP Stage 0 3.70 out of possible 4
 OIP Stage 1 3.68 out of possible 4
 OIP Stage 2 3.48 out of possible 4
 OIP Stage 3 3.40 out of possible 4
 OIP Stage 4 3.48 out of possible 4
 Overall Satisfaction 3.73
 State SST overall satisfaction 3.46

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

SPOC/SPEC Comments Continued:

The ratings reflected very positively on the level of satisfaction with SST services. The Overall Satisfaction rating for the region was the highest rating in the state. Consultants from the SST need to be commended for their relationships with and services to the districts. Though few in numbers the SST consultants make frequent district contacts, are approachable, and provide timely responses to the needs of school districts they serve. The ratings seem to support our shift from regional sessions to personal contacts with district personnel. The relatively low ratings of TBT, BLT, and formative assessment services are consistent with other data sources in that we have recognized we need to do more with TBTs. “Early Learning School Readiness” received the lowest rating in Region 15. If the item would have been listed as “Pre-School Services” the responses may have been different. Also respondents who may have little or no knowledge of “Early Learning School Readiness” services and how they are provided in the district may have given lower ratings.

In the “Customer Service Comments” section several respondents provided positive comments on the training of building based autism teams, the monthly Special Education Network meetings, regularly scheduled regional psychologists meetings and timely communication filtered from ODE/OEC to the local districts.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- The response rate for the Customer Service Survey, at 42.5% for this region, was very close to the statewide average of 42.9%
- At a rating of 3.73 this region was the highest rated, statewide, for overall satisfaction.
- The lowest rated sub-area was Early Learning/School Readiness. The highest rated sub-areas included: Stage 0 OIP at 3.70; Stage 1 OIP at 3.68; and, OEC Compliance at 3.67. All three of the region’s highest rated areas are significantly above the statewide averages for those areas.
- Continue to invest time into increasing response rate from identified customers.

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:

Professional development in Region 15 was delivered throughout the entire year. The PD evaluations were not implemented until after March 1 and it took some training and coaching to get consultants and administrative assistants to use the new PD Evaluation form in place of whatever form they had been using so the results are limited. The regional summary indicates four areas of PD. The SE compliance and instruction topics were mostly evaluations provided by intervention specialists after IEP training. The OIP topic was rated by only three participants. Early Learning received the lowest ratings although there were only seven respondents but the rating is consistent with the customer service survey ratings.

Frequent comments from IEP training were:

- Writing compliant IEP's and choosing specially designed instruction that meets the specific needs of students with disabilities was helpful to me as I do my work.
- It helped me improve my IEP writing, write correct IEP's, and write IEP's that will be more effective in meeting student learning goals to help students.
- Information from the presentation will be used to create more compliant IEP's which in turn can lead to more thought being placed on valid instructional methods we can use to improve outcomes for students with special needs.
-

These comments reinforce the ultimate goal of compliance training: improving services delivered to SWD and the improved achievement of SWD as a result of those services.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

The low response "N" for OIP related PD was a result of the date on which the evaluation process started (March 1). The SST is working toward doing more job-embedded PD. SPoC/SPEC will likely ask for PD evaluations from LEAs receiving job-embedded PD on a periodic rather than singular event evaluation. Since much PD on OIP is job-embedded this may increase the response for this area.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

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

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

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Regionally there is a slight decrease in the reading gap over four years. The math gap, however, has increased by 2.17 points in the same four years. The differences in scaled scores between typical students and SWD from 2008-2011 have been only slight changes. From 2007-2011 the scaled scores in reading and math for both typical students and SWD exhibited only a small range of points (only ranges of 3-6 points). It is difficult to interpret the data with no key or explanation of the data in the spreadsheets and how the calculations were made; e.g, how average scaled scores across grades were calculated. However the data seems to show little change in the gap, some slight increase in scaled scores for SWD and a decrease in scaled scores for typical students.

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:

For the first time, all the districts in the region have met the target for participation of students with disabilities in mathematics and reading assessments. However, the region continues to have issues meeting results indicators for students with disabilities (SWD). Only 8 of the 30 LEAs in the region met the AYP indicator for FY 11. In addition, ten districts did not meet the target for graduation rates of SWD.

Regionally, there has been a slight decrease in the reading gap between students with disabilities and students without disabilities over the past four years. The math gap has increased over the same four years. No LEAs were able to meet either the Mathematics or Reading Proficiency rate targets for FY 11. Region 15 continues to address closing the achievement gap for SWDs by embedding data-based goals and strategies through the OIP. This year, in collaboration with the ESCs, the SST will provide more targeted, job-embedded professional development at the TBT level and focus on strategies to improve the achievement of SWD. The LEAs will also be provided additional TA/PD in behavioral issues. To address the lack of progress in Mathematics proficiency, the SST has targeted funds to hire a new consultant with expertise in differentiating math instruction to meet the needs of all students.

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 a review of the indicators used to make District Determinations in Region 15:

- 4-B Suspension Discrepancy Rate by Race: Only two districts did not reach the targeted risk ration of 3.5% of less for FY 11. Both districts have few students in special education programs that are from a minority race. Thus, the suspension of one or a few of these students could easily put them above the target.
- 4-B Expulsion Discrepancy Rate by Race: No problems reported.
- 5 LRE: Most districts are doing well in reaching the target. The target for SWD participation in the regular education classroom took a significant increase for the FY 11 year. It was increased by 10.4 % from the FY 10 target. Only one district continues to not meet the target for the last three years. Two districts were very close to meeting the target percentage.
- 9 Disproportionality in Special Education: All districts are meeting the target
- 10 Disproportionality in Specific Disabilities: No problem noted.
- 11 Child Find: This indicator continues to be a problem for a few districts. However, there are only four districts missing the target in FY 11 which is the lowest number over the past three years. It would be helpful to know how many students are actually involved in not reaching an indicator because only seeing a percentage figure doesn't provide how often a district is not in compliance.
- 12 Early Childhood Transition: All districts have met the 100% target.
- 13 Secondary Transition: Most districts have met the target. Of the two districts who missed the target in FY 11, each had only one student IEP not developed with a transition plan as required by age 16 or older.
- 15 Uncorrected Noncompliance: No problems noted.
- 20 Timely and Accurate Data: Only two districts involved and both are there due to secondary transition reporting errors.
- A review of the Indicators not included in the SPP District Determinations:
 - 6A - Regular Preschool Setting: No Target level established. Percentages range from 0% to 100%
 - 6B - Separate Preschool Setting: No Target level established. Percentages range from 0% to 100%.
 - 7A - Preschool Social-Emotional Skills: It is not clear nor understood why most districts are reported as "NR". Of the three districts reporting data, all met 65% target for Increased Growth Rate, but all three below the target of 48% for Age-level Skills at Exit.
 - 7B - Preschool Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: Again, there are a limited number of districts reporting data.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

- 7C - Preschool Use of Appropriate Behaviors: Again, there are a limited number of districts reporting data.
- 3A - AYP for Students with Disabilities: Only eight districts met this indicator for FY 11. There appears to be no real progress in the region.
- 3B - Mathematics and Reading Participation Rate: All the districts are meeting the target of 97.4%. This is the first year that all of the districts have met the target. Why was the lowered in FY11 for both mathematics and reading participation?
- 3C - Mathematics and Reading Proficiency Rate: No districts were able to meet either of the targets for FY 11. This indicator is the one districts are most often not meeting every year.
- 4A - Suspension and Expulsion Discrepancy Rate: "NR" reported by all districts.
- 1 - Graduation Rate: Ten districts did not meet the target. Percentages range from 100% to 73.3%.
- 2 - Dropout Rate: Ten districts missed the dropout target rate. The highest dropout rate was 26.7% and lowest rate was 0%.
- 14 - Post School Outcomes Survey: Ten of our districts are involved in the survey for the FY 2011-12.
- 8 - Parent Involvement Survey: Only four districts are involved for FY11.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST consultants visit each district DLT to review the Special Education Performance Profiles that are produced in the fall and develop plans to address any deficiencies. The SST also contacts each district who has received a determination of “Needs Assistance” and provides appropriate PD/TA on an individual district basis.

On a regional level, the SST incorporate the areas of deficiencies from both the SPP indicators as well as common findings from regional and state on-site reviews into IEP/ETR training sessions. Through a Special Education Network for SE supervisors, the SST disseminates information, provides professional development, discusses best practices, and problem solves common issues.

It was noted that customer service survey respondents provided positive comments on the training of building based autism teams, the monthly Special Education Network meetings, regularly scheduled regional psychologists meetings and timely communication filtered from ODE/OEC to the local districts.

Region 15 assigns two consultants to each LEA receiving an IDEA onsite review. The consultants are deeply embedded in onsite monitoring as evidenced by attendance at all scheduled onsite review meetings and monitoring of Corrective Action Plans (CAP). The SST has provided training designed specifically for related service personnel employed by the districts as well as recruited from placement agencies to address compliant goal development.

Indicator 11 continues to be an issue for some LEAs. The SST will engage in intentional discussions with LEA administrators, including the superintendent, to create a sense of urgency in meeting 100% compliance on Indicator 11 (Child Find), to investigate root causes for non-compliance, and to discuss the potential impact of continued non-compliance.

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
2	2	Provided and maintained an SST website adhering to the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE
3	3	Collaborated within and across regions as well as with other regional resource providers (e.g. higher educ., other ESCs, etc.)
<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS
2	2	Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
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
3	3	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
2	3	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
2	2	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
2	2	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
2	2	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
2	2	Organized and conducted monthly meetings with SST staff and ESC/District OIP practitioners to identify and discuss OIP implementation strategies to meet the needs of the region
3	3	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Part A:

The SST is meeting the PA requirements in most areas although there is always room for improvement in any area. Our PD is based on regional needs but not ALL PD is HQPD (including on-the-job coaching, support). One strength of collaboration is the monthly Quad meetings for SPoCs and SPECS. The SST website does need to be improved to meet the expected standards in the PA.

Part B:

Based upon other data sources improvements are needed in several areas of OIP process and implementation. We have discussed these issues as we reviewed data, feedback from districts, and observations of facilitators. Major areas include TA/PD with DLTs (focused plan, and quarterly review), BLTs (monitoring), and TBTs (5-step process, learning targets, frequent – at least weekly – formative assessments, study of data and development of instruction).

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

Reviewer concurs with SST self-rating on indicators. Evidence exists and was provided to support a rating by this reviewer of 3 for “Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP”.

<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
0	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
0	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
1	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:

These are comments provided by our Early Learning Supervisor:

1. Attended Monthly OEL&SR Meetings: My planner and travel forms. *See attached schedule.*
2. Assisted Districts, ESC's and DD, in meeting IDEA requirements-
 PD: Second Step – 8/25, 26/ 2011
 TA- My Quarterly Meetings 9/23/2011, 1/6/2012, 3/23/2112
 PD: ECO Summary Training, October 28, 2011.
 PD: Preschool IEP – 1/20/2012
 Hosted Preschool Special Education Webinar 2/29/2012.
3. Participated in IDEA Monitoring – Needs improvement
4. Provided PD : GGG, ASQ-SE ---9/30/2011
 Presented with a panel at Fabulous Friday OIP PreK Partnership Panel
 TA: Attended, IMPACT Leadership Meetings
5. Received instruction on topics:
 Facility Orientation -- 8/9-10, 2011;
 5th Annual SpEd Conference -- 9/19-20, 2011
 OAEYC Annual Conference -- 4/19-21/2012
6. Hosted Model Curriculum Development -- 5/6/2011
7. Facilitated LRE Study Groups – 12/9/2011, 1/27/2012, 2/17/2012, 3/2/2012, 3/16/2012
8. Conducted Data Verification Visits – 11/10/2011, 11/15/2011, 2/8/2011, 6/7/2012
9. Participated in Teacher Leader Systems Building – 10/12/2011, 11/16/2011, 3/14/2012, 4/17/2012, 5/16/2012
10. Promoted improved outcomes for ELL – Not applicable
11. Promoted use of Interagency Agreement -- Attended Ross/Pike (5/21/2012) and Scioto (8/22/2012)
12. Participated in building state-wide PD: *Could not* attend Ohio Professional Development Network, OPDN
13. Developed Parent Engagement activities – Facilitated, Parenting with Purpose, Pike County - 4/27/2012
14. Provided 1 delivery of Intentional Teaching: Language and Literacy Development for All Young Children ----Marin – 9/30/2011, 10/28/2011, 1/20/2012, 1/27/2012

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

SPoC Comments: It seems that the Early Learning work is focused on compliance and the delivery of training around mandated testing, meetings, and agreements. These components of the PA have been fulfilled very well.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Progress Reports: We need to focus on the work that is to be reflected in the Progress Reports. We need to assist districts in implementing the OIP which means focusing DLTs, BLTs, and TBT on the 5-step process. Resources 21A, 21B, and 21C provide the templates for meeting agendas based on the 5-step process. These resources need to become familiar documents with every SST/ESC/Internal Facilitator. We need to help DLTs define adult behaviors they expect of all teachers, coach the BLTs to monitor these behaviors, and work with TBTs to implement these behaviors and then collect data on their impact on student achievement. Working on the 5-step process will incorporate the implementation of new standards (defining learning targets), developing pre-and post-assessments, reviewing the results in TBTs, and planning for differentiation both before and after initial instruction. The columns on the Progress Report should not be viewed as separate pieces of work. The expanded OIP Implementation Criteria and Rubric will be helpful in making the Progress Reports more meaningful. This rubric needs to be shared with SST/ESC/Internal Facilitators and reviewed together to “calibrate” its use.

Customer Service Survey: The SST needs to continue to make personal, timely contacts with districts and be responsive in a timely manner to districts requests. The focus of SST work this year (enhancing the work of TBTs) is consistent with the apparent needs as reflected in the survey. Early Learning needs to become more a part of DLT meetings through the introduction of early learning data so that district personnel become more aware of Early Learning work in the district and the importance of this work. We need to increase the services that will enhance the skills of early learning teachers in addition to providing the compliance training and training in the administration of required assessments. It would be helpful to have the survey sent to ALL LEAs in the region as we provide many services to them through our IDEA funded work. The survey could be pre-populated with a field indicating whether or not the district was in DA so that results could be disaggregated based on that field. To increase survey participation the SST could make calls/contacts with potential respondents closer to the time the survey is to be sent to the districts. The email with the survey could contain the subject: SST Customer Satisfaction Survey” to make it stand out from other email. Providing brief descriptors or definitions of the services may help clarify what services the respondents are asked to evaluate.

Professional Development Evaluations: RTI coaches are eliminated for this year. The RTI work will be integrated into the TBT training. The high marks given to the SE topics are consistent with the factors behind customer satisfaction in that personal attention was provided to intervention specialists. The training was delivered to small groups (2-5) of intervention specialists at the building level and occurred in two separate sessions that were follow-up sessions to large group regional training conducted earlier in the year. Our plan is to continue the building level training with even more attention to the needs of individual intervention specialists and principals. We intend to review PD evaluations (by topic and by individual sessions) monthly at SST meetings. We need to ask for PD evaluations after a series of individual or small group coaching/TA sessions.

In the past these sessions were not considered PD as the large group regional sessions were. As we move from large group to more focused individual/TBT work, we need to think of those sessions as PD.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments (Continued):

Scaled Scores for Students with Disabilities: We need a session with the people who developed the spreadsheets to explain how the calculations were made so that we can interpret the data better.

OEC SPP/APR Indicators and monitoring: One of the most beneficial and productive activities we perform is to visit each district to review the special education Profiles that are produced in the fall. We ask to meet with the DLT or, at a minimum, representatives of the DLT. We note the areas of strengths and needs and develop plans with the district to address any deficiencies. We also make contact with each district who has received a determination of “Needs Assistance” and provide appropriate PD/TA on an individual district basis. On a regional level we incorporate the areas of deficiencies from both the SPP indicators as well as common findings from regional and state on-site reviews into our IEP/ETR training sessions. Through a Special Education Network for SE supervisors we disseminate information, provide professional development, discuss best practices, and problem solve common issues. This year we are providing targeted PD at the building level and focus on strategies to improve the achievement of SWD. We collaborate with our ESCs to provide this targeted assistance. We need to plan for additional TA/PD in behavioral issues.

Performance Indicators:

Part A:

The SST website needs to conform to guidelines in the PA and be updated monthly. An Administrative assistant will be assigned these duties. We need to contact OU-Chillicothe to encourage them to have a representative at RAC meetings.

Part B:

We plan to focus our efforts, as required through the ESEA Waiver, on those priority and focus buildings and the H-M support districts. We have identified resources to help support the work and have assigned all SST OIP Facilitators to review and become familiar with those resources. We have shared the focus of our work and the resources with our ESC OIP Facilitators. Our work is to be more involved with DLTs in the H-M Support districts, monitoring and coaching them in the application of the 5-step process to guide their meetings. A major focus will be to assist them to identify specific adult behaviors they expect to see across the district. The same focus will be provided to BLTs with emphasis on monitoring the adult behaviors. In At the building level we plan to develop and/or enhance focused TBTs. Having monthly meetings with ESC and district practitioners may be a challenges. We invite SEC representatives to attend our twice-monthly meetings and usually have one ESC attend once a month. We do conduct quarterly meetings of SST/ESC OIP Facilitators and these meetings are well-attended. This year we also include our regional FIP specialist in the quarterly meetings and will invite district Internal Facilitators. Regional training will make more use of webinars, including the OLAC series of webinars, the delivery of which is in collaboration with our three ESCs, and the OIP training modules. We also are defining the work in each area of the PA and will monitor this work monthly.

Part C:

There needs to be more involvement of the Early Childhood Coordinator in the OEC monitoring process and in DLT/OIP processes. There needs to be a development of data regarding Early Learning to present to DLTs.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- There is agreement with the Region’s plans moving forward.
- In addition it is recommended there be a continuing a focus on TA and support to LEAs with the implementation of formative assessments (short cycle classroom and periodic). The data from these assessments can then be utilized to strengthen the OIP Stages 2 – 4 within supported LEAs.

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