



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 3
Number of LEAs in Region: 73
Date of Review Conference: 9/24/2012

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 3 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 3'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 3 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 3 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: 3 Number of LEAs in Region: 73 Date of Review Conference: 9/24/2012

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:

Strengths	Weaknesses	Clarification of Data or Questions
<p>Scores increased from January to May</p> <p>Special Education involvement with DLTs/CSLTs and BLTs</p>	<p>The column of Formative Assessment Modifications is a weakness</p> <p>Need a common interpretation of the rubric at the state, regional and local level</p> <p>Missing and incomplete data</p>	<p>The number of LEAs (73) is based on the gap spreadsheet provided for this review. However, this number does not align with other numbers that we have.</p> <p>How consistent are our ratings across our organization? Both consistency with ratings and common understanding of each column header may be an internal issue</p>

PARP Reviewer Comments:

<p>ONII Response:</p> <p>SST 3 had a slight increase in averages within the Formative Assessments and Instructional Practices columns in the Progress Report. From January-June, 2012, both columns increased .07%. To obtain larger gains in these percentages, the infrastructure of Teacher Based Teams (TBTs) and Building Level Teams (BLTs) need to be strengthened. The 5 Step Process also needs to be followed with fidelity. Current LEAs instructional practices need to be analyzed and strengthened when adult indicators need to be more in alignment with best practices.</p> <p>Quarterly internal/external OIP facilitators’ meetings are held. Pieces of evidence are brought to these meetings to verify LEAs participation in OIP. Best practices aligned with the specific OIP discussion are shared as well at these meetings.</p>

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:

Strengths	Weaknesses	Clarification of Data or Questions
<p>Highest relative areas for our region - Stage 0, Stage 1, and TBTs</p> <p>We were all green (above the state average) for OIP work</p> <p>From the comments section parents provided positive feedback</p> <p>Districts rated us positively with addressing TBTs, DLTs and formative assessment</p>	<p>Did not have a good response rate (2nd lowest in state)</p> <p>Lowest relative areas for our region are Stage 4, special ed instructional practice and early learning (9 respondents)</p>	<p>Question - Do we have a low response rate because the surveys went into people's junk mail?</p> <p>Because of the low response rate it is difficult to interpret the survey results</p>

PARP Reviewer Comments:

ONII Responses:
 SST 3 had twelve LEAs give a rating of 4 for overall satisfaction in the Customer Services Responses; three districts issued a 3; one LEA gave a rating a 2; and one LEA issued a 1. To increase the response rate, the Single Point of Contact (SPoC) will send out an email to districts as a reminder when the survey is released by ODE. This should eliminate the possibility of surveys not being delivered to emails or sent to spam. As SST 3 consultants are in the LEAs a personal contact will also be made as a reminder.

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:

Strengths	Weaknesses	Clarification of Data or Questions
<p>Averaged over 3.36 on all of the areas of PD</p> <p>Job impacted all 91.7% or above</p> <p>Early Learning has very strong positive responses</p>	<p>We have weaker scores than state as far as job embedded PD and job impacted</p> <p>We have very few responses to our PD evaluation at this point</p> <p>OIP was perceived as the least job embedded</p>	<p>How are other regions sending it out?</p> <p>Is it going into people’s junk mail when it gets sent out?</p> <p>Overall comments – not enough data to make good observations</p> <p>How can we use this data to inform our work? Can we access this data throughout the year? (send quarterly updates?)</p>

PARP Reviewer Comments:

ONII Response:

SST 3 was below the state averages and percentages in professional development. The state average was 3.44 while SST 3 was 3.36; job embedded was 65.5% compared to 90.1%; and job impacted was 93.5% compared to 96.2%. To increase these percentages, SST 3 will conduct a “huddle meeting” to develop a consistent message from all consultants. Once the definitions of job embedded and job impacted have been established, these will be shared with the professional development audiences.

Professional development recipients email addresses will be verified at meetings. If needed the professional development survey link will be sent a second time with the workshop title, date and whether the PD was job embedded or job impacted. SST 3 will look at a quarterly analysis of professional development data.

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:

Strengths	Weaknesses	Clarification of Data or Questions
Districts in our region on average are making gains at closing the reading gap In general, even those districts that are in the red, the gaps are getting smaller	Community schools have wider gaps (on average) and more variability than districts Region 3 has the largest math gap in the state	Why is our regions' math gap so large compared to other regions? What's region 14 doing? How can we learn from our peers?

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

PARP Reviewer comments:

SST Region 3 is looking at integrated comprehensive services by assisting individual districts in analyzing their equity and social justice practices and how this impacts student achievement. SST 3 is also encouraging districts to investigate their achievement gap by conducting a gap analysis of their formative assessments on a shorter time cycle rather than waiting until the end of the school year. Using formative assessments to transform instructional practices is a learning process for many districts because many of the districts participating in the OIP process are still at the awareness stage. Districts are learning how to use their student performance data to make decisions about instruction and the delivery of services. SST 3 has found that many general education and special education teachers are weak in the area of instructional practice, and adult belief systems often impact the location of where students with disabilities receive services and supports. With the assistance from SST 3, mindsets are beginning to change in the region; however, much work still needs to be done in order to affect change. SST 3 shared that the OIP process is helping districts better understand an integrated team is necessary and that special education staff must be involved in the district level team meetings (DLT) and building level team (BLT) meetings. Through SST 3's work with districts on OIP the staff determined that they also needed to re-evaluate their own infrastructure so they can better align their services and supports to their stakeholders' needs. SST 3 is modeling true collaboration by ensuring that they do not have any silos within their own organization and districts can witness successful collaborative practices.

SST 3 shared that they are also using special education as an opportunity to work with teacher based teams (TBTs) in their individual buildings. This will help general education teachers in the discussions pertaining to educating students with disabilities. By using DLTs, BLTs, and TBTs, SST 3 is demonstrating to districts how the many initiatives they are working on are integrated and connected to one another. Some of the districts currently do an effective job of making these connections while others still need assistance in this area. For those districts that struggle, SST 3 is working with them by having frequent discussions and by providing professional development and technical assistance when necessary.

SST 3 has a large number of community schools within their region and they have recently hired a consultant to work exclusively with community schools because this area has been lacking in the past. SST 3 shared that emails were sent to the community schools last year to inform them of the services the SST provides. Very little response was received from the community schools. Some of this could be due to the frequent leadership and staff changes within the community schools; internal conflicts within the community schools; and little to no response and/or support from their management companies/sponsors. With the hiring of a new consultant, this area has improving immensely. The consultant has been visiting each community school face to face in order to build rapport between the schools and the state support team. SST 3 has also differentiated their professional development to better meet the community school's needs so their infrastructure is vastly different from the traditional public schools.

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:

Strengths	Weaknesses	Clarification of Data or Questions
<p>Indicator 3B Participation rate of SWD</p> <p>Indicator 13 Secondary Transition</p> <p>Indicator 12 Preschool Transition</p> <p>Indicator 11 Child Find - (relative strength) some increase in number of districts meeting timelines from 09-11 (26 red in 09; 16 in 2011)</p>	<p>Indicator 3C Reading & Math Proficiency (seems to be slight increase from 09-11 but scores still very low)</p> <p>Indicator 5 LRE declined from 09-11</p> <p>Indicator 1 Graduation Rate is not improving; Urban districts showing very low graduation rates</p> <p>Indicator 3A AYP for SWD - mixed results, not improving overall</p> <p>14 LEA's need a survey and 34 LEA's have action required</p>	

PARP Reviewer comments:

SST 3 shared that at the district level there is still some confusion about graduation rates and how they are calculated. Due to the confusion, SST 3 is concerned that the districts may not be reporting their data into EMIS correctly. However, no matter the reason for not meeting the graduation rate, districts need to own their operational practices.

SST 3 shared that the AYP rate fluctuates among many districts and the assumption is that this is due to the educators within the district who are still using antiquated teaching strategies and are resistant to change. Some of these individuals do not take the opportunities presented to them for improvement.

SST 3 shared that the IDEA monitoring process basically is satisfactory. SST 3 reported that they had a few schools fall through the cracks within their region but those issues have been appropriately addressed. SST 3 shared that the IDEA monitoring process is a good way for their staff to introduce themselves to the districts and inform them about what SST 3 has to offer in regards to professional development and technical assistance. SST 3 contact the district when they learn that a particular district is going to be reviewed by the Office for Exceptional Children. SST 3 offers to assist the district in preparation for the IDEA review and then assists the district with the development of the corrective action plan (CAP), and provides professional development and technical assistance, as necessary. The level of support the SST provides is based upon each district's specific needs.

SST 3 shared that they recently incorporated the Office for Exceptional Children's (OEC) Monitoring Tool/Rubric into their IEP and ETR professional development seminars so that the districts know prior to an onsite review the areas that OEC will be examining for compliance. By adding the tool, this has provided opportunities for districts to conduct their own internal audits of special education records prior to an IDEA onsite review.

SST 3 shared that they have also designated a consultant at region 3 to be their internal reviewer of all CAPs developed by SST 3 with LEAs in their region. SST 3 shared that this is just one example of how they are working on improving their internal inter-rater reliability so that they deliver a consistent message to their districts and communicate OEC's message effectively as well.

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.

For these specific ratings pull up the spreadsheet that we completed as a group: <http://goo.gl/pfX7n>

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	A: GENERAL INDICATORS
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 <i>(travel requests/vouchers, STARS registrations)</i>
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.) <i>PD across SST regions, autism series, preschool technology, para-educator, curriculum people, transition in collaboration with Cleveland State, Early childhood advisory group for Tri-C, Sit on the Regional Autism Collaborative, Early childhood collaboration with Starting Point and Help Me Grow, workshop flyers, college credit offered</i>
<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
2	2	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) <i>This will be assigned using a variety of SST consultants whose expertise align with the identified needs of CMSD.</i>
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 <i>STARS registration, sign in sheets, PD evaluation summary</i>
2	2	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
3	3	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP <i>Designated external facilitators for medium and high districts, SPOC's role/responsibility</i>

PARP Reviewer Comments:

ONII Responses:
 In January, 2012, SST 3 hired a full-time Community School liaison. Through phone calls and personal contact there has been increased participation of Community Schools with the Ohio Improvement Process. This consultant has been responsive to their needs such as how to operate a Community School Leadership Team (CSLT) and work with the Decision Framework within the CCIP.

SST 3 currently cannot modify its website. The new website will be operational fairly soon. Its website is found within the Educational Service Center's (ESC) site.

Consultants will increase their knowledge skills of the DF and IMM so a consistency level will exist as technical assistance is given to the LEAs. This will also help districts to further break down their data to help in closing the performance gaps in all subgroups.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments: These are this year’s Performance Agreement Indicators, not last year’s

<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 Consultants’ requests/vouchers
2		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
2		Participated in district IDEA monitoring visits, particularly at exit meetings and 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 Sign in sheets, STARS registration
3		Received instruction on topics, including train-the-trainer models STARS registrations and sign in sheets, travel requests/vouchers
2		Delivered training and/or technical assistance to districts, ESCs, boards of 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 STARS registrations and sign in sheets, report turned in to Early Learning at ODE
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 Completed quarterly reports submitted to Early Learning at ODE
3		Participated in systems building by participating in the Teacher/Leader Initiative They have their own tracking system, sign in sheets
2		Promoted improved outcomes for English language learners based on regional needs
2		Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
3		Participated in building a statewide professional development system STARS registrations and sign in sheets, travel requests/vouchers
2		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 STARS registrations and sign in sheets

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Progress Reports:

- Rate districts using the OIP Implementation rubric to improve inter-rater reliability and build common vocabulary.

Customer Service Survey:

- Improve communication with districts/community schools about upcoming and changes in professional development using suggested ideas. (e.g., Facebook and Twitter with new website, create a mailing list within Constant Contact, keep a consistent look to our OIP flyers so districts start to recognize).
- Improve coordination with other initiatives going on in the districts/community schools, (i.e., FIP, SIG, etc.) via discussion at our Huddles and SST meetings and attendance at in-district events.
- Focus our efforts on the areas that are rated low, specifically Stage 4, Special Education Instructional Practice, OEC Compliance and Early Learning. (We already have trainings scheduled to address some of these areas).
- **SPOC** - To increase our response rate, SPOC will send an email to all of the people that we recommended for the survey letting them know that ODE will be sending them a link to a survey that will help us further support them. Encourage them to tell their people to fill out the survey when they get it.
- **Suggestion to ODE** – Make sure that the subject line is very clear so people will respond, something like “State Support Team 2012-13 Customer Satisfaction Survey” and flag it urgent.

PD Evaluations:

- Consider ways to get this email survey out to people at the end of a meeting/PD session. Email during the session.
- Develop a protocol that has each of us as presenters discuss the concepts of embedded professional development and relationship of this presentation to your day to day functioning, (this could be on the agenda as a standard piece) the evaluation at the end of our sessions, including the importance, the actual process of filling out the survey right now through our electronic mailing to attendees.
- We have already incorporated the topic area and whether it is job-embedded into our PD planning form to make it easier for support staff to send out the survey as soon as a session is over.
- Support staff are now sending an email link to survey out as soon as PD is concluded.
- **Suggestion to ODE** – Send SSTs the quarterly reports of the PD evaluations to allow us to make changes if our new system is not giving us the feedback results anticipated.

Scaled Scores:

- Have a small subgroup of SST explore this data further and how the gap will be reported on the new report card.
- All professional development (especially to general education) has to be intentional about good core instruction for ALL students (SWD, 504, ELL, etc.).

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments Continued:

SPP Indicators:

Focus on **LRE** – service delivery models/Equity work

- Continue to provide PD and TA for teachers and administrators on the basics of SPED – SDI; meaningful, measurable goals; LRE; quality IEPs; quality evaluations that directly inform IEP development.

Provide PD and TA for **Reading/Graduation Rates** especially for Cleveland, Life Skills and credit recovery schools that focuses on:

- Teaching students how to read,
- Content literacy
- Strategies for teaching adolescents how to read
- Strategies for increasing graduation rates such as Check and Connect; Early Warning Systems
- PBIS – see below (school climate contributes to graduation rates)
- RtI to support tier 1 at reducing over identification and increasing quality instruction

Provide PD and TA for **Math** instruction/ has to be team approach with math content teachers

Provide PD and TA because **Discipline** is an issue that’s underreported –

- PBIS support (Tier 1)
- Targeted and intensive behavioral supports

Performance Indicators:

- Develop a common definition and understanding of HQPD and Job Embedded.
- Finalize website to meet requirements.
- Expand system (leadership group) to develop regional OIP process.
- Develop a system to communicate early childhood information to internal SST teams.
- Participate in IDEA monitoring visits – especially early childhood.

Develop a plan for increasing knowledge of ELL within our work and regional understanding.

PARP Reviewer Comments:

ONII Responses:

Through core team and huddle meetings, SST 3 practices a team approach in organizing and implementing the Scope of Work through the Performance Agreement. The following goals will be followed in order to increase the implementation with fidelity of the Ohio Improvement Process:

1. Increase the fidelity of implementation of OIP by monitoring and instructing the 5 Step Process within TBTs, BLTs, and DLTs.
2. Use equity information to help districts’ analysis and dig deeper into their data.

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