



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 2
Number of LEAs in Region: 37
Date of Review Conference: 9/17/2012

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 2 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 2'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 2 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 2 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: 2 **Number of LEAs in Region: 37** **Date of Review Conference: 9/17/2012**

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:

This report is based on our perceptions of the work with districts. I believe that our perceptions were somewhat valid and demonstrated what we believed to be progress that was viewed from our vantage point.

Some of the information was beyond our ability to know so we attempted to answer to the best of our ability. For example, the extent to which modifications have been made to formative assessments for students with disabilities was a supposition on our part. Also the extent to which districts were using the common core/revised state curriculum again was a supposition. Without being in the buildings and classrooms we were making a broadly educated guess.

In the area of TBT's, BLT's and DLT'S we were better able to give more accurate feedback that reflected the work that was done with the districts and we feel that the data reflects that progress.

Our staff found this report an exercise that did not provide the kinds of information that shared the work they did at a district level and expected a judgment of issues they were not able to substantiate. I would suggest input from regional consultants before this data is requested to assure that it aligns with the work and that evidence can be provided that supports the request.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

From January to June, 2012, Formative Assessments on the Progress Report increased by .77% while the Instructional Practices rose by .94%. These were large increases due to SST 2 technical assistance being focused on improving instruction and Step 3 in the Ohio Improvement Process. Pieces of evidence will be asked to be produced at monthly OIP internal/external facilitators' meeting as rating scores appear on the Progress Report. This school year these meetings will be a new addition to the work at SST 2.

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:

We reviewed the Customer Services Response by individual detail and by region. In some cases we are not sure about the data based on such a small sampling and missing data.

Given that we have areas for improvement. OEC Comp and OEC IP are two areas. We also need to keep working with Stage 2 and Stage 3 of the OIP process.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

On the Customer Service Survey, five LEAs gave SST 2 an overall satisfaction of 4; three LEAs issued a rating of 3; and two LEAs gave a rating of 2. SST 2 had a response rate of 42.9%. This coming year a link to the Customer Service Survey will appear on the SST 2 website. Also the link could be emailed by SST 2 consultants to the respective respondents in order to increase the response rate.

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:

This data should all be at the level of 100% but we are proud of the numbers, even with a low response rate and we are particularly happy with the data related to the OIP process. With a low response rate for ELSR we are not particularly concerned about the low Job embedded number. The same can be said for the SPED Compliance. We are happy to have one individual that is happy but it doesn't speak to the breath of the work that went into the support we provided.

The language in the comments were all positive. We just need to do a better job of capturing the evaluations as they are happening. After a recent training we had folks log on about 2:30 to put in their feedback for a non-ODE related training and that worked very well. We are considering that strategy for other workshops as well.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

SST 2 was below the state totals in averages based on professional development responses (3.13% compared to 3.44); job embedded professional development (90.1% compared to 89.1%); and job impacted professional development (96.2% compared to 91.3%). To increase these percentages a link to the professional development survey is on the websites (Education Service Center and SST 2). An orange hard copy of the survey is also available for PD recipients. Consultants will explain how important it is for the professional development recipients to fill out the survey for it reflects on the work of the SST. Also this year consultants at the time of professional development will explain the difference between the terms job embedded and job impacted. Professional development at SST 2 tends to also be tailored to individual districts such as study groups, reviewing IEPs, and sharing breathe and depth of conversations.

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:

Out of the 34 districts/charter schools reported when looking at the data regarding the change in Reading Gap 2007 -2011 seventeen reported a widening of the achievement gap in the area of reading rather than closing the achievement gap. Three of these schools were charter schools and fourteen were school districts.

Out of the 34 districts/charter schools reported when looking at the data regarding the change in Reading Gap 2009-2011 thirteen reported a widening of the achievement gap in the area of reading rather than closing the achievement gap. Six of these schools were charter schools and 7 were school districts. The data raises grave concerns for the SST staff, especially the data reported for the charter schools as not only did the gap become wider, in some cases the gap was in the double digits (i.e., 25.98, 14.48, 22.24, 18.06).

Out of the 34 districts/charter schools reported when looking at the data regarding the change in Math Gap 2007-2011 eighteen reported a widening of the achievement gap in the area of mathematics rather than closing the achievement gap. Fourteen of these districts were public school districts and four were charter schools.

Out of the 34 districts/charter schools reported when looking at the data regarding the change in Math Gap 2009-2011 ten reported a widening of the achievement gap in the area of mathematics rather than closing the achievement gap. All ten of these districts were public school districts and met the LRE target which leads one to wonder exactly what curriculum those public schools are using for mathematics and what their instructional practices in the area of mathematics are.

While the number of districts/schools reporting achievement gaps in both areas were reduced concerns are still raised as to the instructional practices for students with disabilities in both areas; reading and mathematics. Seven districts demonstrated increasing gaps in the area of reading in both sets of data (2007-2011 & 2009-2011).

Over all students with disabilities are increasing their scores on the OAA & OGT, however, the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their typical peers is not decreasing in all districts. This data will help to drive the focus of the work for the region and the levels/type of assistance being provided to districts/schools within the region. Being new to the region (start date 8/1/2012) I cannot speak to past practices in the region; however I do not believe that Region 2 is greatly different that other regions when one compares the data. I believe that the new rating/identification of districts/schools based upon the achievement gap is going to assist the SSTs in helping the districts to focus on their instructional practices, especially for students with disabilities.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 2 recently hired a new SPEC and this school year, the SPoC and SPEC have been attending face-to-face meetings with each district in their region so that the superintendent, assistant superintendent, special education director and curriculum director in order to establish a positive rapport and so district leadership can become familiar with the SST staff.

SST 2 is working diligently with the districts and community schools in their region to address the achievement gap for all students. In regards to the reading gap, SST 2 has provided professional development for the school psychologists on multi-sensory approaches and dysgraphia. The professional development was presented by Dr. Rebecca Tolson. SST 2 is also doing extensive work with districts on the extended content standards. Currently, they are hosting three separate two-day trainings on the extended standards. The training provides an overview of the standards, how the districts can access the standards with technology, and finally, working with teams on curriculum planning.

SST 2 shared a hypothesis on why certain districts are struggling academically. One school of thought is that some districts have a limited budget and have chosen to share their services with other districts which have in turn limited their access to a curriculum director. The curriculum director may only be in their district one day a week and this presents a challenge in getting curriculum directors to available training and/or facilitator meetings because the training and/or meeting may fall on a day when they are serving in another district so they are not available. SST 2 is conscious of the challenges their stakeholders face so to better accommodate them the SST staff travels to the districts and provides training and technical assistance onsite.

SST 2 is earnestly looking at instructional practices and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) with the districts in their region. The SPoC and SPEC have been meeting with the curriculum directors in their region to review student data. Special Education Directors have also been invited to these meetings. SST 2 shared that the SIDR also provided valuable information about how some of the districts are not using their data to drive their instructional practices. Currently, SST 2 is assisting the districts on using their data to align their curriculum which is being used in their teacher based teams (TBTs).

SST 2 reported that their postsecondary transition coordinator and early childhood coordinator are both extremely active in field. The postsecondary transition coordinator has been working intensely with the middle school staff on the new transition rules and helping them develop plans for fourteen year-olds.

SST 2 reported that they are exploring professional development topics on differentiation and co-teaching and are also working with districts on implementing PBIS in their districts. SST 2 has two districts scheduled for an IDEA onsite monitoring visit this school year and is looking forward to working with this district. Professional development opportunities are also being provided to community schools who serve students with low incidence disabilities and autism. The training is provided by ODE through OCALI and some of the SST teams are taking advantage of this valuable training.

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:

Being new to the region I am able to look at the data with fresh eyes, while this has an advantage it also has a disadvantage in that I do not have a historical relationship built with the districts. That being said, review of the data has led me to form questions as to some of the districts' practices in the area of special education and how I can effectively assist districts in making systemic changes to correct /revise current practices. Compliance will continue to be addressed via professional development and technical assistance to districts, with certain areas being targeted as identified by SPP Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Indicator 5 – Numerous questions came to mind when reviewing the data for Indicator 5, such as are the districts correctly calculating the percentage of time that students with disabilities are removed from their typical peers, do teachers have knowledge and skills on differentiating instruction, and are districts embracing the co-teaching model to provide grade level academic instruction? I am optimistic that of the districts that did not meet the target, all but four districts did make forward movement on this indicator. The data clearly indicates that this is one area for the SST staff to provide additional professional development and technical assistance on to districts. Of all the indicators, I believe that this is the most difficult one to see forward progress on as one is not just providing technical assistance and professional development, but is actually changing the mindset of the individuals involved.

Indicator 11 – The district data raises concerns as to why districts are unable to meet required special education timelines as this is not a new requirement. I am optimistic that all but 3 districts received ratings in the 90% for the 2011 fiscal year. Further review of the data is required and will be completed in order to offer targeted support and technical assistance to the districts'.

Indicator 12 – The data appears to indicate that districts' have an understanding of the requirements surrounding early childhood transition and are appropriately engaging in those practices. I commend Betty Lord, the Early Learning and School Readiness Coordinator, on her work with the districts in the region on this indicator.

Indicator 13 – Again I would question the data as to whether or not the districts are appropriately inputting the data into EMIS. Further review of the data is required and will be completed to determine if the data is being correctly entered or if additional technical assistance/professional development is needed to support the districts on Indicator 13.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

LEAs selected for IDEA on-site monitoring – Elyria City Schools & Sandusky City Schools

- Elyria continues to work on conducting internal audits around the compliance indicators identified in the district’s corrective action plan. District-wide training for special educators, building administrators, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists and special education supervisors was conducted on August 23, 2012 around the IEP and ETR. Speech Language Pathologists were able to attend the morning IEP training on that day but were unable to attend the afternoon training on ETRs.

Professional development regarding the ETRs is being conducted for the Speech Language Pathologists on October 3, 2012. An on-site review is scheduled for November of 2012 and I anticipate that the district will be found to be in compliance and will be released from their corrective action plan (cap).

Sandusky City Schools was found to be in compliance and released from their corrective action plan in all areas except for fiscal. SST staff members have been in contact with Sandusky City Schools to offer support and technical assistance in assisting the district in becoming fiscally compliant. A meeting is currently in the process of being scheduled to discuss ODE’s concerns and supports available to the district from the SST.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 2 is addressing noncompliance with least restrictive environment (LRE) by educating the districts in their region about what LRE means and that SWD should be considered general education students first. The SST is helping teachers realize that they currently have the resources available to not just educate SWD but all students in the general education classroom. To change the mindset of educators who think SWD should be placed in a more restrictive environment first, and then move toward the least restrictive environment, SST 2 has incorporated Dr. Elise Frattura's work on social justice into their professional development.

SST 2 has noticed that some districts in the region as well as community schools have declined in student achievement and SPP/APR Indicator compliance due to budget cuts, and frequent changes in leadership. Some of the districts also do not have a strong acceptance of the OIP process and have refused assistance from the SST. On the contrary, the districts that do have a strong acceptance of the OIP process and a strong leadership team are doing well and showing improvement in their achievement gaps and compliance indicators. SST 2 continues to educate the districts and community schools about how the OIP process can aide in strengthening their districts' strategic plans ultimately leading to greater student achievement.

SST 2 has been working to develop a common language among the districts so that they understand how the different educational initiatives (OIP, OTES, OPES) work together in order to improve student outcomes. SST 2 reported that districts often see an initiative as just one more thing to do and often need assistance on seeing how the initiatives work together to positively affect student growth. Many districts have adopted the Marzano framework to enhance the OIP process.

SST 2 reported that have collaborative relationships with the districts and districts do contact SST staff for training and technical assistance. New information about educational initiatives, such as the Third Grade Reading Guarantee is shared with districts and community schools through the Special Education Director and Curriculum Director Talk Network. Through communication and collaboration educators' stereotypical mindset about special education is starting to change. Regular education and special education staff are attending meetings and training opportunities in SST 2 and SST 3 thus becoming a learning community.

SST 2 reported that they will continue to assist the districts in evaluating their special education practices so that they can continue to make systemic correction and improve their educational practices. Professional development will then be tailored to meet the district's needs.

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
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: 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)
3	3	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	2	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
2	2	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
3	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:

One of our concerns is consistency with our districts and community schools. Although the OLAC models are available to districts there is a need to support the work on the ground level. The facilitators that provide the support are an important part of the implementation and when the support goes away the process has a great deal of “slippage”, from our point of view.

Additionally, there is some concern and frustration regarding where OIP fits with all of the other initiatives. Because OIP was not written as an overarching structure in RttT, OTEs and other initiatives it is up to the consultant to show the district how the pieces fit together. So, for example, how is the OTEs SLO related to the TBT process and can we show how a TBT could create a SLO that would meet the rigorous standard needed?

Alignment and working smarter is a goal that we hope to achieve with our work with districts.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

The SST 2 website is now linked through a word press site. Medium support districts are being encouraged to use the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) training modules. Throughout the year connections will be made between OIP and other ODE initiatives so that districts can see how their Scope of Work aligns. These connections will also help to increase the monitoring and evaluation of the OIP implementation process.

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

Throughout the year the EC team has shared the information related to the Early Learning Challenge Grant to groups as well as individuals. The future will change. We feel strongly that it is our responsibility to share how that change is occurring. Teachers and administrators want to plan for the future while they are extremely busy serving the present.

The two member ELSR team participated in trainings throughout the year and provided relevant trainings for those in the region. Participants in our trainings represented the LEAs, many Community Preschool programs, Community Groups addressing readiness, Head Starts and DD programs. PD has been offered at the SST site as well as throughout the 3 county area. Technical Assistance occurs on a daily basis through email, phone calls and personal contact. New to the TA provided last year was a focus on providing assistance to programs requesting ELL support for PS teachers.. Often those required on site observations and individual conferences. Onsite IDEA monitoring was conducted by OEC. Early Childhood participated in the opening visit, support to the EC data verifier, the closing meeting and several follow up meetings with the district leadership. All PS files used by OEC were ultimately reviewed. IDEA data verification monitoring was completed with 1 district in the fall and 2 districts in June. As a result of issues identified during IDEA monitoring additional support was given to districts based on data provided by OELSR. In one county this necessitated a review of practice as children transitioned from HMG to the LEA at age 3.

All 3 counties completed an intensive revision of the Interagency Agreement between the LEA, Head Start, DD, and HMG. This was the first major revision in several years and involved representatives from each of the systems. We worked closely with our family engagement coordinator to provide opportunities for families either independent of others or as participants in PD as attendees. Parents of PS children were included as intended participants on flyers that were distributed throughout the region. The Special Quest team which represented the 3 counties embarked on a new process for the 2011-12 year. Because the participants in SQ were often the same people participating in county HMG groups, we contacted each county Family and Children First Council to meet with the Early Childhood Coordinating Committee. At that meeting we shared SQ's vision, materials, and local history. In each county SQ is now a subcommittee of the ECCC and is a visible participant in the local planning to support inclusive practices for all children and families. One team member became a CLASS trainer during the 2011-12 year in anticipation of providing trainings during the following years. LEA interest supports this training.

Early Childhood representatives are participants in several SST sponsored network meetings/workshops. Monthly the SST holds a Network Meeting for all Special Education and Curriculum contact people. Early Childhood Supervisors participate. A follow-up network table for PS issues is often scheduled. This is often a time when those who hold a variety of district titles access the EC team for specific information. The Early Childhood Task Force met 4 times during the year climaxing in a day long retreat in June. These meetings provide TA, trainings, new information, and opportunities for networking. They provide us with an opportunity to address needs and plan for future opportunities.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments Continued:

An LRE study group was held with staff from a Head Start that provides a site for itinerant services for many children. This Study Group was so successful that the teachers asked for a second year. The EC team has distributed an extensive list of possible Study Groups along with a facilitator and books. Included in the list are opportunities for study related to social emotional development, managing challenging behaviors, PBIS for preschool as well as a willingness to address other areas as requested. The Teacher Leader process was successfully completed. Because there was no teacher leader for our region, the ELS provided that intensive support to three teachers in the area. Intentional Teaching – Literacy was offered during the fall APPLE cycle once and throughout the year as a yearlong cohort for a community Preschool. Literacy has been the ongoing focus of several community groups which we have supported through team membership. The statewide professional development system has two prongs. We are heavily vested in the STARS system, our attendees are comfortable with it and it has served us well as our secretaries offer individual support to those who do not have a SAFE account. We support the OPDN system verbally and have entered PD into the system with less success. During the 11-12 year we were unable to attend the statewide OPDN meetings as they conflicted with local needs.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

Intentional Teaching – Literacy was offered during the fall APPLE cycle once and throughout the year as a yearlong cohort for a community Preschool. Literacy has been the ongoing focus of several community groups which we have supported through team membership.

The statewide professional development system has two prongs. We are heavily vested in the STARS system, our attendees are comfortable with it and it has served us well as our secretaries offer individual support to those who do not have a SAFE account. We support the OPDN system verbally and have entered PD into the system with less success. During the 11-12 year we were unable to attend the statewide OPDN meetings as they conflicted with local needs.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Our plan of action is focused on three goals:

- 1) Feedback: We will be doing a better job getting response from our constituents' related to feedback.

We did not have enough data to provide a picture of the quality we believe is being delivered by our organization. If the reflection of our organization is based on the data collection then we need to be more thoughtful in how, when and where the data is being collected.

- 2) Leadership: The SPEC has had three changes in the past three years, the superintendent is new to our ESC and the SPOC will be leaving at the end of December.

There is room for improvement and new leadership will provide the energy and enthusiasm needed to move the work forward. We have had a number of changes that have not allowed us to move forward and it is our hope that the new direction taken by the new leadership will improve our processes and increase our productivity.

- 3) Training: Many new initiatives are coming forward and many of the past trainings have not been replicated for staff new to their positions. We need to make sure all of our staff knows the programs, know the content and can deliver the messages effectively. Those that have done the work need to share their expertise and those that are new need to be caught up and many of the pieces that are now in OLAC and other places so they have the most current information.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

SST 2 will see a change in leadership in December, 2012. Although that occurrence will happen, the agreed upon goals that will be worked on during SY 2012-13 are the following:

1. Feedback will be increased by doing a better job of getting responses from district personnel by looking at data and asking questions such as "are you recording this correctly?"
2. Training of staff in all programs/initiatives will allow staff to share their expertise and to know the content and deliver the messages effectively and efficiently.

SIGNATURES:

SST - Single Point of Contact: ____ Sharon Rybak Ph.D. _____ Date: 9/18/2012

SST - Special Education Contact: _ Tracy Lichtenfels _____ Date: 9/18/2012

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