



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 6
Number of LEAs in Region: 49
Date of Review Conference: 10/2/2012

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 6 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 6'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 6 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 6 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: 6 **Number of LEAs in Region: 49** **Date of Review Conference: 10/2/2012**

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:

Celebrations:

- All 23 LEAs identified through differentiated accountability were rated as beginning, developing or accomplished.
- A rating of "0 - does not exist" did not apply in any category to any district by the end of the final reporting period.
- The rating of districts/community schools using the common core/revised state curriculum had the greatest increase (1.04) in their rating. Only 1 LEA is in the beginning stages of implementation, 18 are developing and 4 are accomplished. Of the 23 identified LEAs, 14 are Race to the Top (RttT) districts. Working collaboratively with the RttT consultant has contributed to the successful transition to the new standards. The RttT consultant has also been invited to attend a SST 6 staff meeting to increase the understanding of each other's work.
- The area with the second highest increase in rating (1.43 to 1.87) was in the implementation of teacher-based-teams. Two districts with exemplary teacher-based-teams, went from being identified through differentiated accountability, to delay, and then out of school improvement status. Districts that implement TBTs with fidelity have increased student achievement and are closing the achievement gap.
- All identified LEAs are beginning, developing and/or accomplished in the use of formative assessments. Of the 23 identified districts, 10 are involved with Formative Instructional Practices (FIP). The FIP consultant attends our OIP Facilitator Meetings when possible. Training in the 5 Step Process has been incorporated into some of the district FIP trainings. The FIP consultant has also been invited to attend a SST 6 staff meeting to increase the understanding of each other's work.
- 100% of the 23 LEAs showed growth in at least one area.
- None of the districts had a decrease in ratings from the first to the last reporting period.
- In the area of Early Childhood, 6 or the 7 districts were rated as accomplished (3).

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Concerns:

- None of the districts currently identified through differentiated accountability received an exemplary rating by SST 6.
- After being involved in the OIP process for up to 5 years, more DLTs and BLTs should be higher functioning.
- 13 of the 23 LEAs rated themselves higher on the OIPIR Dashboard Survey in September 2011, than SST 6 rated them at the end of the school year in June 2012.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Provide greater clarity to internal and external OIP facilitators about the expectations for participation in the Ohio Improvement Process for districts identified by ODE.
- Continue to offer TBT training at the regional, district and building level.
- Place greater emphasis on developing the capacity of district staff to coach TBTs.
- Work with identified principals to create a professional learning community designed to address the real-time issues they are facing.
- Continue to promote the resources and tools that can be used to support OIP work.
- Assist districts in cascading data from the TBTs to the BLT, and from the BLTs to the DLT.
- Provide additional trainings in the use of the 5 Step Process for analyzing data.
- Increase collaboration with the RttT and FIP consultants.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

Within SST 6 there are pockets of excellence of Teacher Based Teams (TBTs) within buildings. Coaching occurred within high support districts with monitoring. Teacher Based Teams are good at bringing their data but fall back to textbook strategies instead of looking at what worked well with teachers. Post-assessments also fell short. This coming school year the Formative Assessments and Instructional Practices need to increase. This past year Formative Assessment increased by .26% while Instructional Practices by .13%.

SST 6 will continue to collaborate with the Race to the Top (RttT) and Formative Instructional Practices (FIP) consultants to model the integration of the various ODE initiatives.

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:

Celebrations:

- SST 6 has the second highest response rate in the state (54.1%) which exceeded the state average of 42.9%.
- SST 6 ranked 6th in the state in overall satisfaction (3.56). The state average is 3.46.
- Of the 46 customer comments on the satisfaction surveys, 21 contained positive comments about staff, 14 contained positive comments about professional development, and 15 contained positive comments about the technical assistance offered by SST 6 in the region.

Concerns:

- Some districts are still mourning the loss of SERRC services such as the lending library and technical assistance for individual students.
- Some districts wanted a longer laundry list of professional development opportunities. SST 6 has limited the use of “sit and get/one shot” in-service that have not been identified as a regional need.
- It is difficult for districts to release staff to attend professional development opportunities because of limited funds for substitutes or lack of substitute teachers.
- One district felt SST 6 was spread too thin and was not offering sufficient onsite technical assistance specifically for the decision framework. This comment was from a low support district.
- Two districts would like more communication about the services that are available to the region from SST 6.
- One person wanted the phones answered by a secretary during lunch. SST 6 only employs one administrative assistant, therefore this concern cannot be addressed.
- One person commented that members of the SST staff are on their computers doing other work during workshops. This issue was addressed at a staff meeting.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Increase the utilization of webinars and videoconferencing.
 - 4 webinars with Marilyn Friend on co-teaching are being offered to districts to support co-teaching teams as a follow-up to the 2 day training held in May 2012.
 - OIP webinars are being promoted and professionals are also invited to attend the webinars at SST 6 which will increase the opportunities for collegial dialogue.
 - All SST 6 consultants are producing a webinar to post on the SST 6 website in FY’13.
- As a SPoC, I will increase the number of superintendent meetings that I attend to provide information about the services offered through SST 6.
- Staff will continue to offer IEP and ETR training at the regional, county and district level as soon as the powerpoints are available from ODE.
- IEP and ETR trainings will also be offered in the train-the-trainer format to increase the capacity of ESCs and district level personnel to deliver state approved and consistent content information.

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:
 SST 6 had a Customer Survey Response rate of 54.1%. Twenty-four (24) LEAs gave an overall satisfaction rating of 4; seventeen (17) LEAs rated the region a 3; and only one LEA issued the rating of 2. To increase Customer Satisfaction, SST 6 will be producing webinars, such as co-teaching, that will be posted on the SST 6 website. An expectation is that each SST 6 employee participates in a webinar. The SPoC will increase her participation in superintendent meetings at the seven Educational Service Centers. In turn the ESC External OIP facilitators attend monthly SST 6 meetings.

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:

Celebrations:

- SST 6 was one of two SSTs which had over 600 professional development evaluations submitted to ODE. This was 200+ more evaluations than were submitted by the each of the remaining 14 SSTs. The large number of evaluations can be attributed to the diligence of staff members in coaching participants on how to access the evaluation form on-line, sending participants the link to the evaluation survey via e-mail, and linking contact hours to the completion of the survey.
- Of the 625 evaluations completed, 367 participants submitted comments. 360 of the comments contained positive feedback and/or information on how the information received in the professional development opportunity will be utilized.

Concerns:

- 6 of the 7 negative professional development comments were in response to “Related Service Q & A with ODE” on March 23, 2012. There is disagreement among occupational therapists (OTs), physical therapists (PTs), and Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs) about what and how information should be written on ETRs and IEPs. The professional organizations representing related service personnel are providing information that is contrary to guidance given by OEC. This in-service was designed for related service personnel to get answers directly from OEC regarding the IEP and ETR. Unfortunately, the representatives from OEC canceled the afternoon prior to the inservice. Since it was not possible to contact over 80 participants at this late date, a staff member from SST 6 worked all evening to create a powerpoint presentation to meet the needs of the audience. The participants were extremely angry that their concerns were not addressed by OEC as promised and some participants became extremely hostile.
- One participant in the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) professional learning community did not feel enough time was spent on gaining access to content areas.
- Some districts are not able to send participants to workshops because of limited funding and/or lack of substitute teachers.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The inservice that was canceled which was designed to clarify IEP and ETR issues for related service personnel has been rescheduled with staff from OEC on October 26, 2012. Hopefully, this will eliminate any confusion regarding IEPs and ETRs for related service personnel.
- Information regarding UDL as well as links has been placed on the SST 6 website and will be updated as needed.
- Technology such as “Go To Meeting” and “Go To Webinar” will be utilized as appropriate.
- Webinars on a variety of topics will be produced and placed on the SST 6 website so district personnel can view them at their convenience.

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 6 was below the job impacted state average professional development (95.8% compared to 96.2%) while job embedded was higher (94.6% compared to 90.1%). At inservices this year the terms job impacted and job embedded will be explained prior to issuing the evaluations. This year SST 6 linked participants' contact hours with the survey response which helped with the total number of responses. During SY 2012-13 SST 6 will also incorporate “Go to Meeting” and “Go to Webinar” technology to allow personnel to view professional development at their convenience.

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:

Celebrations:

- Region 6 ranked second in the state in closing the achievement gap over a 4 year period in math.
- Region 6 has the third highest positive 4 year gap change in the state in reading.
- The 4 year trend data is on a positive trajectory for narrowing the achievement gap in reading (FY'8 - 33.5, FY'9 – 33.3, FY'10 – 31.8, FY'11 – 30.8).
- Math scores for SWD are increasing at a higher rate (FY'9 +2.2, FY'10 +2.3, FY'11 +2.0) than the math scores for typical students (FY'9 +1.6, FY'10 +1.1, FY'11 +1.4). This helps in closing the achievement gap.
- 33.3% of the districts in Region 3 made positive growth in reading and math in the SWD subgroup for 3 consecutive years.

Concerns:

- Region 6 ranks in the bottom half of the state in SWD scores in reading, but in the top half for reading scores among typical students. This accounts for the highest gap in reading in the state.
- The 3 urban districts in region 6 with low to medium income and high poverty are identifying students as being disabled at a high rate. The average percentage of students with disabilities for Region 6 is 13.31%. Lima has a SWD enrollment of 20.5%, Urbana at 19.8% and Sidney at 19%.
- Although the achievement gap is closing, Region 6 has the largest gap in the state in both reading and math.
- There is a correlation between large achievement gaps in reading and/or math, and not meeting the state target for least restrictive environment (indicator 5). In the districts with the highest achievement gaps in reading and/or math 11 districts did not meet the state target for LRE. The middle third of the districts in terms of the achievement gap had 8 districts that did not meet the state target for LRE. The third of the districts that had the lowest achievement gap only contained 5 districts that did not meet the LRE target.

Opportunities:

- Special education contacts will be invited to attend monthly OIP Facilitator Meetings to make connections and strengthen the philosophical belief that districts are responsible for the growth of ALL students.
- The dismal scores in reading and math for students with disabilities can help to create a sense of urgency for our region. Students with disabilities need greater access to the general curriculum and to be educated with non-disabled peers as much as possible.
- Intervention specialist need to participate in district curriculum mapping, and in the development of pacing guides and formative assessments to better understand the new standards. We will promote this whenever possible.

IV. SCALED SCORES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

- To assist in increasing access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities, on-site technical assistance, webinars and face-to-face professional development opportunities will be available to district co-teaching teams as a follow-up to the 2 day training with Marilyn Friend which was held in May, 2012.
- Professional development for reading across the curriculum, and meeting the needs of low level readers will be offered at the district level for districts with the greatest achievement gaps.
- Professional development on balanced literacy for students with complex needs will be offered regionally.
- Teacher based teams must be in place, beginning in kindergarten, to meet the needs of ALL students. Early intervening practices need to be in place. This will break the cycle of waiting until students fail and then referring them for special education services. This training will be offered at the district, county and regional level as needed.

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 6 has analyzed the scaled scores for SWD and the SPP/APR Indicators and found that there is a correlation between the smaller districts which are closing the achievement gap and the larger districts that are not closing the achievement gap. The correlation is LRE. SST 6 continues to challenge the districts in their region to set high expectations for all students and to make appropriate decisions on location of services that are based on student need. SST 6 shared that it would be interested in learning more about the decision tree framework being utilized by districts in SST Region 7. This could be a useful resource for districts within SST Region 6.

The sixteen districts that are currently not meeting the LRE target for Indicator 5 have been invited to training on co-teaching, which was facilitated by Marilyn Friend. After the training, the districts were required to complete an action plan on how they were going to implement the training within their districts across all buildings. An SST consultant conducted follow up visits to each of the teachers' classrooms to see if the training was being implemented in their lessons.

In addition to co-teaching, Michael Reddick has providing training on scheduling. There have also been training seminars on teaching reading and math to students with low level needs, and training will be provided to strengthen the general education curriculum.

SST 6 has also invited all of the special education directors to the monthly OIP Facilitator Meetings to make sure that the special education directors understand the Common Core Standards as well as the extended standards. SST 6 is constantly striving to make connections across their region so that everyone that works with SWD is at the table and part of the discussion. Currently, SST6 is showing the BLTs and TBTs the commonalities of OTEs and co-teaching can help students grow and move forward if evidenced based instructional practices are being implemented with fidelity in the regular education classroom. SST 6 views co-teaching as an opportunity to build the capacity of all general education teachers and a step in helping to close the achievement gap for all students.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Following a review of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) data for Indicators 5, 11, 12, and 13, please comment on regional status. In addition, please comment on regional status of LEAs selected for IDEA on-site monitoring or selective review during the 2011-2012 school years.

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

SPoC/SPEC Comments:**Celebrations:**

- 47 out of 49 LEAs earned a determination of “Meets Requirements”
- Only 1 district did not meet the state risk ratio for the suspension discrepancy rate by race of less than 3.5 (indicator 4B - the district barely missed the target by receiving a rating of 3.5)
- All LEAs were below the state target of less than 3.5 for disproportionality in special education and specific disabilities (indicators 9 and 10).
- All districts met the state target of 100% in early childhood transition (indicator 12).
- All districts met the state target of 100% in secondary transition (indicator 13).
- There are no uncorrected noncompliance issues in Region 6 (indicator 15).
- All LEAs have submitted timely and accurate data (indicator 20) and therefore there are no current data investigations.

Concerns:

- 16 of the 49 LEAs (33%) did not meet the state target of at least 59.8% of students with disabilities in the regular classroom setting at least 80% of the time. (LRE indicator 5).
- In 9 of the districts that did not meet the LRE target, only 50% or less of their students with disabilities were proficient or better in reading.
- In 14 of the districts that did not meet the LRE target, only 50% or less of their students with disabilities were proficient or better in math.
- Two districts did not meet the state target of 100% for child find for three consecutive years (indicator 11).
- Two districts did not meet the state target of 100% for child find for the first time (indicator 11).
- There is a correlation between large achievement gaps in reading and/or math, and not meeting the state target for least restrictive environment (indicator 5). In the districts with the highest achievement gaps in reading and/or math 11 districts did not meet the state target for LRE. The middle third of the districts in terms of the achievement gap had 8 districts that did not meet the state target for LRE. The third of the districts that had the lowest achievement gap only contained 5 districts that did not meet the LRE target.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Opportunities for Improvement:

- As verified through the data, the greatest issue facing SST 6 is the fact that 33% of the districts we serve have not made the state target for LRE (indicator 5). As a result, too many students with disabilities do not have adequate access to the general curriculum. SST 6 began aggressively addressing this issue in May 2012. The 16 district that did not make the state target for LRE were encouraged to send teams comprised of a regular education teacher, intervention specialist and an administrator to a 2 day inservice on co-teaching with Marilyn Friend. Prior to the workshops, participants completed a survey that identified the conditions and dispositions they think are important for the successful implementation of co-teaching strategies. Participants also rated the same conditions and dispositions according to what was actually in place in their district. This survey was based on the CO-ACT, but modified by SST 6 staff to include ideas gained through a book study of Elise Frattura’s work on social justice. At the end of the workshop, districts developed an action plan to identify steps for implementing co-teaching strategies with timelines. Each team received an onsite visit by a SST 6 staff member to review the results of the survey and action plan. This fall, the teams received a second visit by a SST 6 staff member and were presented with a menu of options to support of their co-teaching practices. Options included 3 additional days of professional development, 3 webinars with Marilyn Friend, external observations of co-teaching teams during both planning sessions and actual classroom co-teaching implementation, and debriefing of on-site observations with the administrator and co-teaching team members.
- Because of the critical need to increase the least restrictive environment options for students with disabilities, SST 6 will reimburse districts for the cost of substitute teachers so co-teaching team members can attend professional development opportunities.
- Professional development on scheduling will be offered in December to assist teams in creating time to plan and evaluate their co-teaching efforts.
- One of the districts that did not meet the state target for child find 3 years in a row has been identified for an onsite IDEA compliance visit by OEC in FY’13. This district also missed the state target for LRE. These issues can be addressed during the onsite visit.

Onsite Monitoring

- The 2 districts that were selected for onsite monitoring by OEC in FY’11 have cleared both prong one and prong two.
- The 2 districts that were selected for onsite monitoring by OEC in FY’12 have had their corrective action plans (CAP) approved, and have submitted corrected ETRs and IEPs that were found to be out of compliance for approval by OEC. They are in the process of implementing their CAP activities to ensure systemic changes have been made.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 6 recognizes that districts often struggle with the reporting of Child Find in EMIS and in meeting the 60 day timeline for initial evaluations. To address these issues, SST 6 has provided training and technical assistance educating districts on the requirements. They also review the SPP/APR data with the districts when they receive their Profile and strategize with them on how to best address the areas of noncompliance. SST 6 has encouraged the districts begin the evaluation process sooner once receiving parental consent for an evaluation so that the evaluation team report can be completed within the 60 day timeline.

LRE continues to be a concern for fourteen of the districts that did not meet the LRE target. SST 6 has found that there is a correlation between not meeting LRE targets and the large achievement gaps in both reading and math. To address this issue, SST 6 has provided training on co-teaching and is conducting a book study of Elise Frattura's work on social justice. Districts are being asked to develop action plans to identify the steps for implementing co-teaching strategies with timelines. An SST Consultant then reviews the results of the action plan with the teaching teams and then observes the teacher in the classroom for implementation. SST 6 continues to offer a variety of training and technical assistance options to support the teaching teams in their co-teaching practices.

All districts within SST 6 have met their targets for postsecondary transition (Indicator 13) and early childhood transition (Indicator 12). Supports and services are available for the districts if needed.

In regards to IDEA onsite monitoring, SST 6 reported that they model and encourage peer reviews. SST 6 also provides differentiation in their training sessions to account for who has already attended the training so that it is not a repeat and the information is based upon the needs of the educator. If more intensive training or technical assistance is needed, then a consultant will work one-on-one with the teacher/intervention specialist to effect systemic change.

VI. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Implementation indicators extracted from the performance agreement for the areas of: (A) General Indicators; (B) OIP Implementation; and (C) EL/SR are listed below. SPoCs/SPECs shall complete a self-rating for each of the areas denoting implementation status for the entire Region on each indicator using the following scale.

0 = Not Applicable or Addressed Elsewhere

1 = No

2 = Needs Improvement

3 = Yes*

*When a self-rating of “3” is indicated, the SPoC/SPEC should be prepared to provide evidence supporting that rating.

<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	A: GENERAL INDICATORS
3	3	Provided high quality professional development based on regional needs
3	3	Submitted in a timely and accurate manner required and/or requested data and reports, including but not limited to subcontracted work and services provided by persons funded by the performance agreement
3	3	Attended ODE required and sponsored meetings and trainings
0	0	Corrective action plan completed by fiscal agent if work within the scope of the performance agreement is deemed unsatisfactory
2	2	Provided and maintained an SST website adhering to the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE
2	2	Collaborated within and across regions as well as with other regional resource providers (e.g. higher educ., other ESCs, etc.)
<u>Self-Rating</u>	<u>PARP Rating</u>	B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS
3	3	Provided technical assistance to priority districts, buildings and community schools to help increase the use of the Ohio 5-Step Process
0	0	Used GRF allocated funds to provide Ohio 8 districts one FTE* for each district to assure implementation with fidelity and an “Accomplished” level of implementation as per the OIP Implementation Rubric. (*One FTE = 180 school days per school year)
2	2	Provided technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM
3	3	Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
3	3	Provided assistance in implementing corrective actions from an SIDR review and/or the ODE SSoS reviews
3	3	Provided assistance and support to non-fiscal agent, within region, ESCs to build the capacity of personnel to provide support and technical assistance to DLTs/CSLTs/BLTs/TBTs
3	3	Provided assistance in embedding subgroup performance in OIP
3	3	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
3	3	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3	3	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
2	2	Organized and conducted monthly meetings with SST staff and ESC/District OIP practitioners to identify and discuss OIP implementation strategies to meet the needs of the region
3	3	Served as liaison between ODE and LEAs on matters related to OIP

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

A. General Indicators

- A combination of regional data and needs assessments are utilized to determine high quality professional development based on regional needs.
- The current SST 6 website meets the guidelines, template and manual standards provided by ODE, but we are in the process of transitioning to a new website format which will be easier to navigate.

B. OIP Process Implementation Indicators

- The IMM is not being utilized by many of our low priority districts. Most of these districts are receiving OIP support from their ESC. Even though we have demonstrated the use of the IMM at OIP facilitator meetings and have used the IMM modules created by ODE, many ESC OIP facilitators are not comfortable with providing technical assistance for the implementation of the IMM.
- Region 6 has had only one State Diagnostic Team Review. The results of the review confirmed that Lima City Schools had developed a solid OIP District Plan and have the structure in place for OIP implementation. The greatest need is in the area of monitoring adult implementation. Lima City Schools has a new superintendent and she has made this a priority.
- In FY'12, 5 meetings were held for OIP internal and external facilitators. Monthly meetings have been scheduled in FY'13.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response: Additional training/technical assistance on the DF and IMM will be needed for the low support districts. This will ensure that the appropriate data will be entered. Collaboration will increase this year by participation at outside meetings and inviting additional personnel, such as special education directors, to the OIP monthly facilitators' meetings. Also collaboration is occurring across regions with professional development and a technology fair. An additional piece within the high support district will be part-time employees as well as a SST 6 employee assigned to each building to build capacity for OIP fidelity in the Teacher Based Teams(s). A regional summary also exists with each district's OIP action plan and each district's OIP implementation progress. By the end of October, 2012 the region's new website should be launched.

<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
2		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
2		Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
1		Participated in building a statewide professional development system
1		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:

- The Early Childhood Coordinator and the Early Literacy Specialist are well respected in the region.
- The early childhood team has reviewed the Performance Agreement and divided and/or shared in the delivery of all of the performance indicators.
- There continues to be a need to recruit additional teachers from private and Head Start programs to participate in the variety of early literacy programs we are expected to offer. The ELS consultant has scheduled meetings with early childhood personnel in the institutions of higher education in the region, the Child Care and Referral Agency serving Region 6, and Head Start administrators to discuss professional development opportunities that can be offered to them.
- Greater emphasis will be placed on promoting early childhood parent engagement activities throughout the region.
- The Early Childhood Coordinator and the Early Literacy Specialist will strive to share professional development opportunities with their colleagues in order to begin to build a statewide professional development system.

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

Please see “Opportunities for Improvement” documented in sections I, II, III, IV and V.

Summary:

OIP

- All districts identified through differentiated accountability have DLTs and BLTs. Now that the structure is in place, SST 6 must focus on the quality and fidelity of implementation.
- As verified through statewide and regional TBT Survey data, districts are able to carry out Steps 1 and 2 in the 5 Step Process, but need assistance in identifying SBR instructional strategies, monitoring the implementation of the strategies, and analyzing data to determine if the strategies that were implemented were effective.
- SST 6 must ensure that all districts required to participate in the OIP have the technical assistance necessary for the implementation of the IMM.
- Continue to conduct monthly meetings with our external ESC OIP facilitators and district internal facilitators, but also involve special education personnel to assist in closing the achievement gap.

IDEA

- All of the SST 6 consultants (special education and school improvement) will be involved in supporting the co-teaching teams that have been established in the region. Through this effort, we will reduce the number of districts that have not made the state target for LRE, and continue to close the achievement gap by giving students with disabilities great access to the general curriculum.
- Districts involved in IDEA onsite monitoring will receive assistance in writing and implementing their Corrective Action Plan in order to meet both prong 1 and prong 2 within the required timelines.
- All districts will have the opportunity to receive professional development and technical assistance in writing compliant ETRs and IEPs.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 6 is modeling for the region how the initiatives within the offices of ONII, OEC and EL/SR are integrated through collaboration. For SY 2012-13, SST 6 will work on the following goals:

For OIP

- Increase the number of TBTs in the buildings and the fidelity of implementation.
- Ensure that the five step process is occurring with fidelity in all DLTs, BLTs, and TBTs.

For IDEA:

- For districts to not see co-teaching as a special education initiative but a regular education initiative. We want to develop and support co-teaching teams across the region.
- We want to make sure teachers are prepared so we are focusing on instructional strategies in reading and math.

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