



## FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

**Region: 16**

**Number of LEAs in Region: 25**

**Date of Review Conference: 10/12/2012**

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 16 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 16'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 16 Single Point of Contact  
SST Region 16 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: 16**      **Number of LEAs in Region: 25**      **Date of Review Conference: 10/12/2012**

### I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

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

#### SPoC/SPEC Comments:

As we evaluate the areas of the PARP for the period from January through June we can determine that a small amount of progress was made. However, we feel there is much work to be done. Many of our districts are participating in several initiatives that will serve to enhance their progress in meeting a few of these areas. We feel as if greater sustained progress will be made through this school year especially in the areas of formative assessments, standards implementation and instructional practices. The districts growing awareness of these areas and the presence of additional professional development and support to districts will help us validate our confidence.

OIP Teaming at the teacher and building levels saw a slight increase during the review period while the focus on district teams saw a slight decrease. The positive part of this is that the place where the work needs to be focused, teacher and building teams, is gaining momentum.

An additional piece of our evaluation of our process is that we did not do a very good job of communicating with the districts relative to their self-assessment on the PARP items. We entrusted our team to provide most of the assessment and this year we will seek more district input as a means of raising awareness of their own stated progress.

As a support system our team has gone through some changes in personnel for the upcoming year in anticipation of the changes of districts' needs. We felt as if a change that would cause us to focus more on the time we spend in the buildings and districts was in order. We anticipate having additional staffing, using a different approach, who will focus on developing and fostering the relationships that will strengthen our processes and meet the growing needs of our LEAs. Relationships built on trust and value will make us better suited to assist our region. It is of significant importance that our districts value the individuals we send to them and that these individuals are partners in this work not compliance monitors, a role for someone else.

## I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

### PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- Strengthen the process used to complete the Progress Reports by first increasing the common understanding of the OIP Implementation rubric across SST and LEA staff.
- Reinforce with LEAs their ongoing use of the rubric to self-assess and identify achievable benchmarks toward more effective levels of OIP implementation.

## 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:

When we first evaluated our performance on the Survey results we were troubled. Our performance was below the state average in all 12 of the respondent areas as well on the overall ranking our region was last in overall satisfaction.

Upon further evaluation and some consultation with several of the responding districts we gleaned some valuable insights. First, the respondents came from a variety of administrative and district personnel from most of our LEAs that makes the information valuable but lacks consistency. Second, nearly all of the district respondents indicated on comments to questions 5 & 6 that the SST was doing well and many offered suggestions that would be beneficial to their progress and the responses varied from supportive to critical based upon the individuals position within the district/building.

Throughout the comments there were signs of concern relative to our approach to providing support. We have got to get better at providing support and guidance rather than compliance and advice. Many of our districts are small and many of the folks wear many hats when it comes to being involved in their districts initiatives. We have to be seen as a valuable resource and we have got to work with our districts in a manner that demonstrates that all of the initiatives can align and correlate through OIP.

We will be focusing on providing more localized trainings as opposed to regionalized which we hope will make the information and focus more on the district and building level needs. Our OIP team will have additional expertise in the areas of curriculum and assessment that we have been lacking.

## II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

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

### PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- For this region overall satisfaction was rated at 2.87, significantly less than the statewide average of 3.46 and the lowest overall satisfaction rating of all Regions. This has provided valuable information to the SST regarding service delivery. As a result, alternative means of delivery have been identified in the SST's plans moving forward.
- All sub-areas of the Customer Service Survey related to the Ohio Improvement Process (i.e. BLTs, TBT, SCFA, DLT and Stages 0 thru 4) were rated below the average ratings across all SSTs.
- Apply the 5 step process to internal workings of SST organization to improve communication, efficiency, and effectiveness. Refer to Region 5 webinar for more information.

## 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:

We found this to be quite informative and were a big part of our recognition for change in our staff and our support approach. The most compelling part of this information was the low percentages associated with providing PD that is Job Embedded. This information supports many of the comments made in the Customer Satisfaction Survey that alluded to the need to provide assistance and make the work meaningful and helpful at the classroom level.

An overall review of the comment report indicated that most of the respondents were pleased with the PD and found valuable resources that would benefit their work.

Based upon respondent feedback we will need to strengthen our trainings around Special Education Compliance and Early Learning/School Readiness to ensure we are not just providing valuable information and resources but also how the PD relates to the everyday work. The assessment of our OIP PD also must be improved as the overall average of the trainings indicate lower customer satisfaction.

### III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

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

#### PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- Operating out of a different facility in the future, the SST will be much more able to provide HQPD in an environment conducive to doing so.
- Hiring additional staff with content expertise and changing focus from regional level PD to local level PD and coaching will allow the SST to better meet the needs of the LEAs and should improve customer satisfaction.

### 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 analyzing the data provided by ONII in which calculations were made to measure the gap between the achievement of typical students and those with disabilities from 2009 to 2011, the following observations were made:

From 2007 to 2011, 62.5% of our districts have been closing the reading gap with a range of .49 to 17.55. Four of the districts that did not close the gap in that group over four years did make gains between 2009 and 2011 ranging between .81 and 3.97. Also between 2009 and 2011, 67% of districts were closing the gap for reading.

From 2007 to 2011, 29% of our districts have been closing the math gap with a range of .25 to 12.25. Twelve of the districts that were in the red over four years made gains in the last two years (50% of our districts), showing 67% of the 24 making gains in math the past two years.

We looked at those districts where we were putting the most emphasis on the general OIP process and those where more special education consultants were embedded to see where we were having the most success. What we found was it appears to take four or more years to make systemic change.

An example would be a district, where the first two years were almost all making a plan and working at the district and building levels. However, once plans were at the teacher level and more special education was embedded with literacy instruction and differentiation was emphasized, the reading gap changed for 1.18 to -3.97. The same was true in another district where two years were spent developing the OIP plan, but once it was in place, the teacher level training was able to use the structure in place and begin to better work with all students in reading to change the first two years of the gap from 3.39 to the last two years to -1.54.

**SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):**

We have attempted to work with all districts, but have spent more time in those that were at a higher risk. A good example is a district in school improvement and every building was doing its own thing. After starting the OIP process, they adopted a plan and began to look at how they were serving their students with disabilities. They had very little inclusion. In 2007 they had 58.37% of students who spent more than 80% of their time in the general education setting, and by 2010, they had 62.25%. They are now working on making significant changes to their programming. Our special education consultants have worked with them at many levels, including co-teaching, IEP and ETR development, RTI, and DIBELS. Administrators, teachers, Paraprofessionals and parents have all been involved. They moved from a 9.39 math gap in 2007 – 2011 to -4.37 math gap from 2009 to 2011. Again, it takes four years to make the systemic change.

We have a lot of work ahead of us, but we are pleased with the gains we have made. When compared to fifteen regions, we believe we compare favorably. Using the gap change chart provided by ONII, Region 16 has made the second highest reading gap change 2.8 with the highest region being 3.2 and the lowest region being 1.3. In math, only one region in 16 made a positive move in gap change (1.65), but Region 16 had the smallest deficit of .18 with the greatest deficit being 5.26.

In regard to the average scores for SWD in reading, for 2010-2011, they range from 396.2 to 405.1, which are close to, or within proficient. For math the score for 2010-2011 range from 392.3 to 401.3 which are close to or within proficient. This is compare to typical student for the same year in reading (426.6 to 432.9) and math (426.3 to 435.1), which are all proficient. While this is not an acceptable gap, it is encouraging to note that that in 2007-2008, only 4% of our districts (1 in 24) had SWD average scores that were in the proficient range. Now 38% (9 in 24) are proficient with many more coming very near. Math has not met such success yet, but with time and training, there is every reason to believe there will be success in this area as well.

#### 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:

Region 16 has made steady gains in improving results and closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities in reading. However, they recognize the need to continue escalating their efforts. The progress in math has been much slower, as it has been throughout the state. Region 16 addresses closing the achievement gap for SWDs by embedding data-based goals and strategies through the OIP and they have made several changes internally to address these issues. They have also contracted with a university math specialist to work specifically with LEAs regarding math instruction for all learners.

Region 16 has recently gone through a huge transformation, both in staff and philosophy. To change the focus from IDEA compliance to a more balanced approach of compliance and results for students with disabilities, more hires have been brought in with strong school improvement and coaching skills, as well as content knowledge. They have also shifted from regional level PD/TA to more targeted, job-embedded local PD/TA. Region 16 is in the process of filling additional positions.

Region 16 has begun to move coaching emphasis to the TBT level, while recognizing that the BLT and DLT structures established need to continue to be supported. They are working towards achieving a balanced approach to school improvement coaching. Their goal is to have local coaching available to every LEA in the region.

SST consultants have provided targeted, job-embedded professional development and technical assistance around differentiated instruction, universal design for learning, extended standards, co-teaching, Multi-tiered Systems of Support/Response to Intervention, serving students in least restrictive environment, and IEP development of specially designed instruction. The impact of these efforts was noted in the improved average scaled scores in the participating LEAs.

Going forward, Region 16 will analyze LEA average scaled score gap data and provide structured and targeted support for LEAs demonstrating the most significant gaps. As well as, continuing efforts to support LEAs in making least restrictive environment decisions based on student need and providing effective classroom based supports and services.

## 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:

Indicator 5 finds 72% (18 in 25) districts or community schools meeting the 59.8% target. Five districts have consistently missed the target for three years. Two districts missed the target for the first time in three years.

We continue to work with RTI, co-teaching and differentiation in this region. Districts are just now starting to see the need for these initiatives as well as UDL and other tools that make inclusion work. Some schools have tried throwing SWD into the classrooms without the appropriate supports and are now turning to us for those supports.

Indicator 11 finds 10 districts or community schools at 100%, with 7 districts in the yellow, leaving 8 districts in the red. One district had a 58.82% but now has a new director of special education and school psychologist. We have worked with them directly and they are coming up to meet requirements. The next lowest district, has hired a contact school psychologist who has gotten them back in the appropriate time lines. One of our districts, at 85.29%, could use a closer look. They have not been receptive to this point.

Indicator 12 finds 100% compliance or an NR.

Indicator 13 had 23 of 25 (92%) compliance. Again one district has made corrections, and the other is being addressed.

We had no schools with IDEA on-site monitoring.

**V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING**

**Data:** Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

**PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:**

SST consultants call every LEA to review the Special Education Performance Profiles that are produced in the fall and go on-site to develop plans to address systemic change with LEAs demonstrating highest levels of noncompliance. They also train new special education directors each year in how to read and utilize Profile data.

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.

Region 16 did not have any IDEA onsite reviews in their region last year. They have already started preparing for this year's monitoring with pre-review preparation meetings with administrators and teachers. SST consultants will attend all scheduled onsite review meetings and monitor any corrective actions resulting from the review. All noncompliance identified through past OEC monitoring processes, including SPP indicators, has been corrected within the required one year timeline.

Indicator 11 continues to be an issue for some LEAs in the region. The SST identified lack of psychologist services as a root cause for noncompliance in some LEAs and has worked with them to procure these services. Region 16 will continue to engage in intentional discussions with the LEAs 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>	<b>A: GENERAL INDICATORS</b>
2	2	Provided high quality professional development based on regional needs
2	2	Submitted in a timely and accurate manner required and/or requested data and reports, including but not limited to subcontracted work and services provided by persons funded by the performance agreement
3	3	Attended ODE required and sponsored meetings and trainings
0	0	Corrective action plan completed by fiscal agent if work within the scope of the performance agreement is deemed unsatisfactory
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>B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS</b>
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
2	2	Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
2	0	Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
2	2	Provided assistance and support to non-fiscal agent, within region, ESCs to build the capacity of personnel to provide support and technical assistance to DLTs/CSLTs/BLTs/TBTs
2	2	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
2	2	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
2	2	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
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
2	3	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

**VI. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

**A: GENERAL INDICATORS**

**B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS**

**SPoC/SPEC Comments:**

As a team we feel confident that we attend all of the required and pertinent meetings provided and that we are well connected with our partner ESCs, IHEs and regional agencies. Our regional connections are probably one of our strengths.

Overall, our assessment is that we have some improvements to make and we shall work to make changes with the intent to better provide support and meet the needs of our districts. We will need to be able to make our work more meaningful at the classroom level and demonstrate the usefulness of our information and resources as an integral part of a teachers and buildings daily work and planning. Our special education consultants will need to connect more with our curriculum specialists to correlate the information to student learning and usefulness in the classroom there by enhancing the learning opportunities for SWD and reducing the performance gap.

We will be utilizing a new website this year which should be easier for our team to post information and the visitors to the site should be able to more easily use it as a resource rather than a location to find contact information.

**PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:**

ONII reviewer is in agreement with Region's self-assessment on general and OIP indicators.

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

Our ELSR staff is very limited in its capacity to do much outside the required work. However, this coming year we have gained some additional staff that has experience with ELSR that can provide some much needed assistance to the team.

## VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

### SPoC/SPEC Comments:

We are excited for the changes that we are planning for the year. We anticipate the work we will be doing with districts, focusing more on the building and district level, to be of great benefit to our district and provide greater insight for our consultants into the work that truly needs done.

Our team will need additional supports from the department as much of our OIP knowledge base has gone. We have a very capable team of individuals who will be able to pick up on this support but it may take some time. It would be beneficial for our team to be able to get monthly support training from a recognized and valued lead. It is one thing to read the guide but another to have a practitioner to guide them through essentials of the work.

We will more frequently communicate with our districts on the items of PARP and will review PD and Customer Satisfaction Survey as a team to assess our practices.

### PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

- PARP reviewers are in agreement with the Region's plans on moving forward. Shifting the delivery paradigm to one that is more "in-district" and relationship driven should realize positive outcomes.
- More effective use of the OIP Implementation rubric (as noted in Section I. Progress Reports) coupled with providing LEAs with TA and support regarding the development/identification and proper use of data from formative assessments will strengthen the implementation of the OIP, particularly at Stages 2 and 3 (two of the lower rated sub-areas on the Customer Service Survey).
- It is suggested that SST facilitators to the extent possible sit in as process observers during LEA DLT, BLT and TBT meetings. This may assist with relationship building and move the TA and support provided as a result of observations to being more job-embedded.
- As SSTs such as this region, shift to contractor-based assistance for LEAs there will be a need for increasing the professional development provided to facilitators so they can remain knowledgeable and consistent with supporting LEAs with implementation of the OIP.

**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