



FY2012 SST Performance Agreement Implementation Evaluation

Region: 8
Number of LEAs in Region: 39
Date of Review Conference: 10/10/2012

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) Office of the Ohio Network for Innovation and Improvement (ONII), Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) and Office of Early Learning/School Readiness (EL/SR), completes an annual review of the implementation of the Performance Agreement for Ohio’s State Support Teams (SSTs) as required by Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) Section 3312.09.

The annual review is referred to as the Performance Agreement Review Process (PARP) and ensures that the SST has met the requirements for performance agreement scope of work in: a) supporting effective use of the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP); b) improving results for students with disabilities; and c) implementation of early learning and school readiness areas of focus work.

The focus of the FY2012 annual evaluation was on the work scope outlined in the FY2012 Performance Agreement. Data sources used in the evaluation include: the first and last FY2012 progress reports; the May 2012 Customer Service Survey; professional development evaluations; regional average scaled scores in reading and mathematics for students with disabilities; Special Education Performance Profile Indicators; IDEA compliance reviews; implementation indicators for OIP and EL/SRs; and interviews with staff.

SST Region 8 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 8’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 8 Single Point of Contact
SST Region 8 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: 8

Number of LEAs in Region: 39

Date of Review Conference: 10/10/2012

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

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

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

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

General Comments: Over the time period, districts appeared to have developed a better understanding of what the expectations were in reporting out on progress reports. While not all districts participated with in-depth discussion with their SST facilitator, there were increased levels of deepened discussion and insight generated from this information. The advantage for this school year will be to have already established expectations which allow for districts to track their progress on these designated areas not only for reporting purposes but also for use among DLTs/BLTs for future planning and direction. There is a heightened sense of accountability as well. A targeted area for OIP facilitation consultants within the SST is for assisting DLTs, BLTs and TBTs in substantiating their findings with actual data.

Overall Improvements: All categories show net gains from January until June with the highest being in formative assessment modifications for students with disabilities (.69), followed closely by TBT's with special education involvement (.66). Upon analysis of these two categories, it may be indicative that efforts are highly concerted at the teacher level. An unusual finding is the highest rating for inclusion of special education staff occurred at the district level but at a lesser rating at the TBT level and even less for BLTs. That would be an area for additional data exploration. The data do not reveal suggest a natural progression among the stages as should be expected. Possible considerations may be the reduction of SST support to less intense districts, complacency by districts that full OIP implementation was not required, teams having gaps in attending trainings provided through SST, or other possibilities that have not yet been determined.

The data indicate that progress has been made in the Standards, although it is at a minimum level (.17). As Ohio educators move to full implementation of the new learning standards, the net gain will be expected to show significant increase. The collaboration in this area with our ESC partners will crucial and careful monitoring of progress in this area will provide feedback for the collaboration and its effectiveness.

Within the area of Early Childhood, the rubric developed and used as a tool to rate progress offered consistency among districts and how they approached validation of their performance progress. As districts and their varied teams make the connections between preschool and school age instruction, the expectation of larger gains (.31 from January to June) may be anticipated.

I. PROGRESS REPORTS

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Implications: The data provide talking points for initial DLT and BLT meetings to begin the 2012-2013 school year. The SST consultants have been immersed in the review of this data so as to prepare teams in differentiated accountability for addressing the varied areas of need. The data also suggest that DLTs rate themselves as between developing and accomplished. This is likely a result of the intense focus given to establishing these teams during the initial years of OIP. The significantly lower ratings for BLTs, TBTs and the level of special education support involved in these teams would suggest a direction for SST OIP work in more technical assistance and provision of resources (i.e., the OLAC website/modules) to support the development of these teams.

We have been providing regional professional development in collaboration with the ESC consultants in the use of formative assessments as they relate to the Teacher-Based –Teams. It appears that most districts are in the beginning phases of implementing these procedures. As a region, we will need to continue to supports these TBT's with creating formative assessments, as well as collecting the data that those assessments provide. To be noted, however, is that the area of Standards is at a developing level which provides evidence that district personnel have focused on rolling out the new standards to teaching staff. The progress being noted in assisting TBTs in the use of formative assessments suggests a need for the SST to continue in creating and implementing formative assessment prior to moving deeper into the five-step process and using the data gathered to impact instruction. Team progress in this area will be carefully observed and SST support will be differentiated in the five-step process during the upcoming school year to advance those teams who have made the necessary gains.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

Three LEAs on the Progress Report for SST 8 had ratings of exemplary within the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) columns with one stating exemplary in Formative Assessments and Instructional Practices. SST 8 consultants worked directly with one of these districts with OIP; another shared its best practices with assessments and instruction while also asking for additional direction; while the third LEA will need to share pieces of evidence this year to verify its exemplary status. Monthly OIP internal/external facilitators' throughout the region met on a monthly basis. This year pieces of evidence will be shared through these meetings that reflect the ratings of each LEA.

From January to June, 2012, the Formative Assessments column increased by .52% while Instructional Practices rose by .31%. These increases led to more dialogue among the districts about the connection with OIP, common core, and closing the performance gap. Strong changes in instructional practice occurred in LEAs and were showcased in a regional "Pep Showcase" fair during late May. To make even larger gains in these two columns for this school year, individual conversations will occur with districts concerning formative assessments. Refining, reinforcing, and integrating ODE initiatives will also help to increase these percentages.

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:

The survey provides our region with the indication that the overall satisfaction across the region is in the top half of SSTs across the state (3.50). It was also noted that our region's percentage of response was the highest across the state at 59.7%. Noted overall strength areas include OEC Compliance as well as Instructional Practice. We have developed a very strong team working in the area of compliance that embeds within districts to provide detailed and specific feedback on compliance areas (IEP/ETR development) and interactive professional development to support connections of educators between understanding of the rules and regulations and creating a document that supports the student to access the general education curriculum with appropriate supports. The region 8 averages in both of these categories were between satisfied and very satisfied in the rating system. A significant finding was the Region 8 ELSR team was rated the highest among all regions of the state. The organization and leadership of Sarah Jackson is a strong impetus for this result.

Areas that were noted and to be addressed include:

- 2 Districts who gave overall satisfaction ratings of 2 which raises the question as to what their expectations would be. The SST spent considerable time with one in supporting OIP, PEP and through a compliance review. Another varies in their amount of support requested from the SST.
- A desire to increase response rate: we will consider having consultants make individual contact with survey respondents when the survey is released and again near the due date to encourage them to complete the survey; possibly review who is being asked to complete and make modifications if necessary. We did make contacts with them, however, in certain cases, we may want to have a larger selection of potential respondents

Review of comments:

- Many positives, including ELSR, supporting districts in improving team-based processes and strategic via OIP, keeping districts in compliance with state and federal rules and timelines, providing opportunities to network, responding to individual district PD/TA needs, resource for answers, info, and help (words "support" and "responsive" were used repeatedly, indicating that we are fulfilling our mission on a fundamental level)

Recommendations for improvement included using technology (e.g., webinars) to reach teachers who cannot be out of building but need training/support, communicating information to districts about updates/changes at ODE (although this was also a strength), flexibility from ODE to work with districts on self-identified areas of need and time to "get in the daily trenches" to provide that support. Many districts indicating no areas of improvement and wanted to see SST 8 continue in the same direction, or possibly add personnel support to increase capacity.

We were confused with having a comment included a district which is not in our region.

II. CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

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

SPoC/SPEC Comments (continued):

Additional considerations regarding the survey included how to better select representatives from the region. Not every respondent would have insight of services through the same lens. While many services were provided within districts, the intra-district communications may not have been expansive enough to allow this knowledge of services to be shared with these stakeholders who completed the survey.

The final “take-away” is that we are moving in a direction that is meeting our regional needs and what we will focus on is how to do more of this, increasing our presence in the schools and work toward assisting districts to make connections of all supports (how they align with the OIP plan for the district). This was stated at our Summer Institute as an important element of our work and our SST has already had extensive discussion on ways to accomplish this goal. The meetings we are having with our DLTs, BLTs and TBTs have already incorporated making the connections as a talking point.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

Within the Customer Services Responses fifteen LEAs gave SST 8 an overall satisfaction of 4; ten LEAs rated the region a 3; and two LEAs issued a rating of 2. SST 8 had a return customer services rate of 59.6% which was the highest in the state. Some nonresponses could have been due to email addresses. To increase responses this school year webinars will be used to reach district personnel as well as having SST 8 consultants make individual contact.

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:

Providing high-quality, useful PD is an area of strength of Region 8. Overall, participants find PD offerings in R8 to be “valuable” to “very valuable” (average rating of 3.45 out of 4). Nearly all (97.9%) of respondents stated that the content of the PD session will impact or be used in their work.

Participants indicated that trainings will help them design and implement better (more compliant) plans for students, work with their teams, integrate across initiatives (e.g., sharing with RTTT teams, DLTs), work with students with disabilities or limited English proficiency to promote communication skills, promote inclusive culture within buildings, organize resources and strategies for closing achievement gap, integrate research-based instructional strategies into teaching. Participants appreciated the specificity of information on new state requirements (e.g., Peterson scholarship, surrogate parents, alternate assessment), as well as general and special education teaching strategies (ECT, UDL, Marzano).

It has been noted that there is consistency of high performance across the various categories that were reported on. This observation from the data suggests SST consultants are all operating at a high quality level, possessing and implementing necessary skills to accomplish the work as outlined in the performance agreement. Additionally, there is a strong collaboration among all SST members to share what is occurring and to make connections among the various aspects of our own work so as not to allow it to become fragmented or disjointed.

As it is recorded that our responses were fewer in number (94), our region has made adjustments to gain more respondents (discussed in next paragraph). In any research based upon data collection, when the responses are low in comparison to numbers participating, observations are made and considered but it is difficult to know if these data generalize across the regional respondents.

Our region attempted to use the on-line surveys to limit the need for paper surveys and to reduce duplication of work. What was discovered is that for small groups of participants, this strategy could be accomplished in most instances. However, when larger groups were together, having ample access for survey completion at the location of service was not always successful. Sending the survey to participants’ e-mail accounts resulted in a much lower level of responses. Ultimately, we are doing what many other regions are also doing: completing paper surveys immediately after the session (an advantage for us is that we can review these for immediate feedback). We also tie in receipt of contact hours, certificates of attendances, etc. to completion of the surveys. Although this requires an additional level of work entering these after the fact, we are going to have more data to represent the various categories of our work.

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:

In the areas of Professional Development, SST 8 was slightly above the state averages in responses for PD (3.45 compared to 3.44) and job impacted (97.9% compared to 96.2%). Job embedded was slightly lower (89.4% compared to 90.1%). For increases in percentages this year the terms job impacted and job embedded will be clarified by consultants at each PD session. Professional development data will also be analyzed on a quarterly basis. A hard copy of the PD survey will be given on site and must be returned in order for a recipient to receive a certificate of attendance.

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:

One area of note when reviewing the regional gap changes is that our region was typical to the other regions: a slight improvement in closing the gap for reading and an increase in the gap in the area of math. Regardless of the slight closing of the reading gap, the concern is that the gap is still significant (28.7 in 2010-11) and with the gap increase in math to 36.2. Many implications can be gathered from this data. One is that accessing general education curriculum and differentiated instructional practices should be looked at within our regional schools to monitor progress in the TBTs and how is the BLT discussion addressing these gaps as well as rolling up to the DLT. Next, it could be hypothesized that TBTs are not near the operational level necessary to demonstrate change in adult behavior which would positively impact the student achievement level. This data suggest a correlation with the progress monitoring ratings that indicated a beginning level for formative assessments and in particular, for making modifications for students with disabilities.

Another finding from reviewing the gap data is that while reading and math are both making small but incremental gains across the region, reading scaled scores in all years are considerably higher than math scores (for 2010-11, reading at 402.3 and math 397.9). Discussion on math instruction, including intervention and acceleration is an area for SST/ESC collaborative work. An observation that is noted but offers no consistent correlational pattern is between districts that have not made gains in both content areas and districts that are below target on Indicator 5, LRE. Many questions can be raised from this area:

- Are students receiving greater opportunities to participate in general education in reading over math?
- Is the instruction provided in the general education environment differentiating for students based upon needs or is the instruction at a lower level of expectation for SWD in general classes as well as in resource classes?
- Have districts/schools explored the use of technology and assistive technology to allow SWD to maximize learning opportunities in the general education curriculum?

There are districts demonstrating gains in both math and reading and also have been well-above the target for LRE. These districts can be used as possible exemplars for other regional districts.

Performances of community schools demonstrate extremes. Several are examples of have done poorly in closing gaps while others have made significant gains. Again, there are no clear patterns found in reviewing the data. It is also noted that these same community schools have less significant gaps. However, the data also reveal that the scaled scores of the typical peers in these community schools were lower in their performance in most cases when compared to traditional district typical students.

An overall comment about the data would be that SWD continue to perform well below typical. While looking at the limited gains for SWD, another observation of the data demonstrates small gains also for scaled scores for typical students. Of concern, while both have made small gains in scaled scores, in comparison, SWD scaled scores have made less of an increase.

The “big picture” to take away from studying the data is that the gap between typical students and students with disabilities is not closing at any rate that will change the current performance for SWDs. A sense of urgency and an understanding of changing the culture of expectations is an important part of the work.

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 8 has been reviewing SWD's scaled scores in comparison with nondisabled peers and is beginning to investigate whether SWD are accessing the general education curriculum and whether instructional practices are being differentiated to meet the needs of the student. The SST is challenging districts participating in the OIP process to have their TBTs monitor student progress and BLTs discuss the gaps and move the discussion up to the DLT team level.

SST 8 made personal contact with all the districts in their region after reviewing the districts' indicators and student performance data. For September and October SST 8 is providing compliance training for the districts that had CAPs developed during the last school year, and is looking at a training plan so districts can embed compliance into the OIP process for districts that are in differentiate accountability status.

SST 8 reported that districts are starting to better understand how compliance incorporated with best practices can improve student achievement. Districts are beginning to write goals aligned to formative assessment and instructional practice and actively seeking technical assistance and training from the SST. SST 8 and the ESC are collaborating on professional development for the differentiation of instructional practices so that districts can achieve improved results 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:

Indicator 5 (LRE): This is an area of considerable need across Region 8 districts. A handful of districts have made notable improvement across FYs 09-11 and other districts have consistently maintained high rates of service delivery within more general education environments. 22 of the 39 LEA's with Region 8 have not achieved the goal target of 59.8% for 2010-2011. This percentage increased significantly from the previous years, resulting in 11 districts who had met target goals in the past lagging, several significantly this time. The majority of these districts not meeting the target this year are in the "high-performing" category overall.

Indicator 11 (Child Find): Reviewing the data for this indicator, there were 14 districts failing to meet the 100% goal for this compliance indicator for 2010-2011. While this number is large, it reduced from 21 during the 2009-2010 school year. There are only two districts, one large urban) which has been addressing this issue during their special education review with OEC also. We have had a consultant working with them, however, there are internal conditions making this goal challenging. The other district is very small and changes were in progress, possibly being resolved when the most recent school year data is available. There is also a new director in the district which may offer a new way to look at the problem, if still existing.

Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition): This indicator has been and continues to be in full compliance across the entire region. The efforts of Dr. Sarah Jackson, early learning coordinator and her team have provided ongoing support, some with high intensity to yield these results. A great amount of work was done by the EC SST to collaborate among school programs, community providers and all other parties needed to accomplish the successful transitions.

Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition): Only three LEA's in the region did not meet this indicator for this year. Two of these LEA's are community schools and the one district has had 100% compliance in the past and was at 99.2% for this year. Helen Brophy, the SST Transition Coordinator has made diligent efforts to provide the support to the districts to get to this level. Many contacts have been attempted with the community school. As of this fall, one of the programs has been reconstituted as a new charter, and they have already established a working relationship with us. It is anticipated that these changes could positively influence their future performance on this indicator.

LEA's in Region 8, as a whole have achieved the compliance target goals.

V. OEC SPP/APR INDICATORS and MONITORING

Data: Regional FYs 09-11 SPP indicator data.

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

SST 8 reported that meeting the LRE target has been difficult for some of the districts in their region due to budget cuts and a loss of staff members. Some of the leadership changes that have taken place have led to noncompliance because of limited background/experience of leadership and in some instances a lack of understanding of IDEA requirements. There have also been situations where there have been high rates of turnover in special education director positions or the same individual has been in the special education director position for too long and their philosophies have not evolved with the educational system.

SST 8 reported that demographics are also changing within some of the districts and that this has posed challenges to the leadership and teaching staff in meeting students' needs. For example, some of the students that formerly attended urban districts have been moving into more rural settings and the rural districts were not adequately prepared for meeting the needs of some of these students. There are also some very small districts with a small student population and if their numbers change even slightly it can lead to them not meeting the LRE targeted percentage.

SST 8 reported that noncompliance with Child Find is typically due to staffing shortages, particularly school psychologists. One district is struggling to get the work done because there are not enough school psychologists to keep up with initial evaluations, re-evaluations and IDEA monitoring/compliance. SST 8 has a consultant working with this district to assist them in becoming compliant with Child Find requirements.

SST 8's transition coordinator has been working diligently with district to provide support not only for compliance with Indicator 13 but also to prepare them for the work generated from SB 316. The transition coordinator is providing job embedded PD to the LEAs to help build their capacity regarding the changes in transition promulgated by SB 316.

SST 8 reported that they have taken a proactive approach with all LEAs in their region by reviewing IEPs and ETRs with districts who not currently participating in and IDEA onsite review. SST 8 reported that the knowledge they have gained in working with OEC reviewers during an onsite review last school year has helped them better prepare districts for future reviews. This school year, SST 8 is taking a more aggressive approach by making contacts with districts that have areas of concerns within their data and are encouraging these districts to work with them.

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	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
3	3	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
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)
3	3	Provided technical assistance on the proper use of the DF and IMM
2	2	Provided OIP overview initial and update DLT/CSLT/ BLT/TBT training to appropriate regional audiences
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
2	2	Reinforced the awareness and utilization of the OLAC training modules
2	2	Monitored and evaluated OIP implementation progress
3	3	Assured that all activities outlined in the scope of work for the OIP are performed
3	3	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:

The General Indicators for Region 8 have been addressed appropriately and have all received a rating of “3.” Required meetings were attended by the necessary SST staff and documents, etc. were completed and submitted in a timely fashion. Karen Majeski was out for the month of February and adjustments were made around that situation to continue the work as necessary.

High quality professional development was offered to all stakeholders across Summit, Portage and Medina counties. Focus areas for HQPD included detailed support for the development of compliant IEPs and ETRs as well as going in-depth in sessions as “From PLOP to Progress” to develop goals and objectives that addressed student areas of need and considerations for measurement of the goal progress. The areas of preschool and transition were included in these sessions based upon the need of the audience. PD in the compliance areas included hands-on work to allow participants to actively engage and practice with mentoring and follow ups as the individuals may need. The regional SPP data, findings from PACTS reviews and specific requests from schools/districts determined these needs for the region. PD/TA Areas addressing inclusive educational environments and co-teaching were highly requested as gauged by the data from our PEP (participation, engagement and progress) teams and requests from schools. All of the aforementioned PD/TA included opportunities for administrators and teacher leaders to support them in their roles. The OIP PD to support the five-step process was needed by the teams (as evidenced from the survey) and the high attendance by teams and positive feedback indicated that this need was being met from our offerings. PD/TA was also provided in the areas of monitoring progress and the IM/M tool to support the evaluative process.

Partnerships were evident with all three of our counties within the region as well as supports with the University of Akron, Kent State University and the University of Central Florida. Connections for our parent offerings from within the community resources were also established.

Progress with our large urban was not to the level that we had strived for, however, gains were made that began to open doors to what is a much stronger linkage for us this school year. We made attempts to provide OIP support at the stages as necessary and include the use of the OLAC modules, but our team feels this area and better communication regarding OIP could be enhanced for our regional educators based upon the data.

A: GENERAL INDICATORS

B: OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

Some LEAs were reluctant with the monitoring and evaluation of OIP through the SST 8 consultants. When contacted, LEAs would state that they did not need help and that they “got it covered.” This school year additional contact with LEAs from SST 8 will occur through core group training of Teacher Based Teams (TBT) and monthly internal/external OIP facilitators’ meetings. Email distribution with reinforce the utilization of the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) modules with those LEAs in differentiated accountability. A three year initiative, PEP District Teams, will continue to help LEAs develop an action plan that is focused on closing the achievement gaps of all students.

<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
0		Promoted improved outcomes for English language learners based on regional needs
3		Promoted the use of interagency agreements as a tool for systems building
3		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:

Attended monthly OEL&SR meetings and took advantage of information and capacity building professional development

- Our ELSR team was in attendance at all required ELSR monthly meetings as well as state required SST trainings

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

- Early Childhood Regional forums were held in August, November and March to focus on updates and strategies to address SPP indicators 7,6, 12, and 20
- Year long study was facilitated with districts focused on Indicator 6, supporting a continuum of service options, and itinerant service deliver models
- Trainings were offered on understanding implications of Indicator 7 district data
- Quality assurance reviews were conducted in 17 districts on their use of the Early Childhood Outcome Summary form
- Trainings were offered twice during the year on completing the Early Childhood Outcome Summary Form.
- Overview of preschool special education was provided to all new preschool supervisors in September
- ELSR state facilitated webinars with ODE for the region and provided follow up meetings with districts to support implementation of policies and procedures

Participated in district IDEA monitoring visits, particularly at exit meetings an assisted districts in the completion of corrective action plans

- ELSR coordinator was present at all initial and exit meetings associated with the OEC reviews of Hudson City Schools
- ELSR coordinator was part of the planning to support follow up professional development and technical assistance with Hudson City Schools

Provided professional development and TA to districts, ESCs, boards of DD and the early learning community at large on topics

- Navigating Through the World of Preschool Special Education: September 13, 2011
- Get it, Got it, Go: September 16, 2011
- ASQ-SE Training: September 16, 2011
- Learning in a World I Cannot See: September 23, 2011
- ECO Training: September 30, 2011
- Economics Social Study Standards: September 30 and October 28, 2011
- CLASS Observation Training: October 3 and 4
- Autism Study Group: November 4, December 9, January 13, February 17
- Core Literacy: 2 sessions were offered, each facilitated 5 days each
- Making Meaningful Connections with Technology: October 21, December 2, February 24, March 16, April 20

C: EARLY LEARNING / SCHOOL READINESS INDICATORS

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

SPoC/SPEC Comments:

This review of regional data has provided our SST team with an overall view that the work we have done to date has been of high quality and with detail and accuracy. The plan is to continue what we have been doing and continue to enhance. We monitor each other in presentations, etc. to ensure the message is accurate and consistent and our professionalism high at all times.

The work that is being done in the area of compliance continues to improve based upon the consultants continual updates to presentations and the ability to embed the PD within the district. With the new provision in S.B. 316 impacting transition, this will be a huge area of focus for the transition coordinator. Likewise, the third grade guarantee and new alternate assessment are critical and districts are actively seeking our SST assistance in these areas. A proactive approach has occurred regarding reviewing IEPs and ETRs with districts who are not under review. The knowledge gained from working with the OEC reviewers in districts has been incorporated in this proactive work. Districts have become more interested in being involved with this support. This year we are also being more aggressive in making contacts with districts that have data indicating areas of concern and strongly encouraging them to work with us. There are many new directors in our area and we want to demonstrate the support that can be offered by the SST.

The SST PEP work with districts will continue as the number of teams with us continues to grow and there are data demonstrating positive results from students from based upon changes in culture regarding all students accessing general education curriculum and changes in instructional practices. We have added an additional layer of accountability upon ourselves as consultants to progress monitor throughout the school year.

SST8 has been and will continue to offer assistance to district and school teams to make connections between various directions (i.e., RTTT, CAPs, PEP strategies, etc.). Teams are at times struggling to do this and are reluctant to make changes until they can see the alignment among the components of the work.

The direction and level of support with the urban will be intense (currently, there are 15 schools on the simulation list). There has already been a very productive planning meeting with the team and a thorough plan for the school year.

Plans have been generated to increase contact and communication with internal facilitators for OIP information, updates and OLAC updates through regional meetings, e-mail correspondence and via updates at regional curriculum director meetings. Training on how to complete the dashboard survey has already been scheduled for differentiated accountability teams. Review of the OIP process to improve the DLTs and BLTs knowledge of their roles will be done emphasizing the OLAC modules and offering TA and resources to teams that have become less engaged over the past two years.

Understanding and implementation of the five-step TBT process will continue to have a high priority in the role of the SST consultants.

VII. PLAN OF ACTION MOVING FORWARD

PARP Reviewer(s) Comments:

ONII Response:

SST 8 is to be commended on its high level of analyzing data. Consultants will continue to deliver technical assistance to districts either by individual consultation or regional meetings. This school year the following goals will be followed to increase the implementation of OIP with fidelity:

1. Contact and communication will increase with internal/external OIP facilitators through regional meetings, email correspondence and updates at regional director meetings.
2. Expansion of the Teacher Based Teams (TBT) 5 Step Process through consultant work will occur within the medium/high support districts so that OIP will go beyond awareness to implementation with fidelity.

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