

# Ohio Technical Assistance Work Plan for 2010–11

September 2010

## Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center

.....  
at LEARNING POINT ASSOCIATES

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B050012. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

Great Lakes East is one of the 16 regional comprehensive centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education, and its work is administered by Learning Point Associates.

4944\_09/10

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Prior Technical Assistance in Ohio: Years 1–5 .....	1
Overview of Context and Coherence .....	1
Summary of Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building .....	3
Proposed Technical Assistance in Ohio: Year 6 .....	7
Overview of Planned Work .....	7
Summary of Proposed Goals .....	9
Proposed SEA Technical Assistance Goals .....	11
Standards, Assessment, and Accountability .....	11
Goal 1: Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems .....	11
Goal 2: Credit Flexibility Implementation Support .....	13
Statewide Systems of Support .....	15
Goal 1: Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team .....	15
References .....	17
Appendixes	
Appendix A. Research and Practice Literature That Supports Great Lakes East Work .....	18
Appendix B. Ohio Improvement Process .....	22

## **Prior Technical Assistance in Ohio: Years 1–5**

### **Overview of Context and Coherence**

In 2007, the U.S. Department of Education approved Ohio as one of six states to implement a different model for distinguishing between those districts that require intense interventions and those that need less intervention. This new model places districts and schools into three risk categories: low-, medium-, and high-support, based on a measure of student subgroups not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics. Each category brings with it those interventions required by law (e.g., provision of supplemental educational services) as well as a requirement to move through the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) (see Appendix B). Under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model, every district identified as medium- and high-support must engage in OIP, and all districts identified as low-support are encouraged to engage in OIP. Currently, more than 300 districts and their buildings—about a third of all districts in Ohio—have engaged in OIP.

In 2010, Ohio was awarded \$132 million in School Improvement Grants (SIG) funding to support 68 persistently low-achieving schools. In its SIG application, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) described how school-based interventions would build on the first two stages of OIP. With the Race to the Top award, ODE must implement its plan for support to struggling schools, not only the 68 schools identified for SIGs. A highly effective statewide system of support will be essential to Ohio's plan for improving all districts and schools.

### **Statewide Systems of Support and the Ohio Improvement Process**

During the past five years, ODE has made a concerted effort to develop a common language of district and school improvement, increase understanding of improvement processes, and provide universal access to data tools aligned with OIP (see Appendix B). This process articulates four stages: (1) identify critical needs of districts and schools, (2) develop a focused plan, (3) implement and monitor the focused plan, and (4) evaluate the improvement process.

The Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center facilitated a state-level design team composed of regional staff from Ohio's educational service centers (ESCs), district administrators, and staff from ODE to design a focused district improvement planning process. The result of this work has been a process that all technical assistance providers can use as they work with districts in the state. Ohio's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) has provided an opportunity to test data tools and district and building improvement processes with three district cohorts identified from each of Ohio's 16 state support regions. The state-level design team also developed the *Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Guide* that serves as a resource for both regional OIP facilitators and district leadership teams.

During the past five years, much work has focused on the design of data tools that provide a structure for OIP: Decision Framework Tool (Stage 1), revised Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning Tool (Stage 2), and Implementation Management and Monitoring Tool (Stage 3). Great Lakes East has worked with the state-level design team and ODE staff to

develop training opportunities for SPDG districts and for regional and district-based facilitators to better use these tools and facilitate their use in the field.

In its Year 4 and 5 work, Great Lakes East focused on collaborative efforts with the state-level design team to articulate structures and processes to support district and building leadership teams as they implement and monitor focused improvement plans (Stage 3) and to evaluate the impact of the plan on student performance and adult implementation (Stage 4). In Year 5, the state-level design team identified existing measures that could provide data and information about key indicators at the building, district, regional, and state levels. These indicators will provide valuable data to each level of the system about how well processes are being implemented and whether there are also changes in adult practice and student performance over time.

In Year 5, Great Lakes East collaborated with the state-level design team to envision a state system of support that functions as a regionally based system of training for OIP facilitators of high-, medium-, and low-support districts. Such a system will depend on a highly trained cadre of trainers who are regionally based and who will have the capacity to design and facilitate ongoing training for state support teams, ESC staff, and district-based staff. A draft Facilitator Competencies Tool has been designed and will be tested in Year 6. This tool will be used by regional managers, state support teams, and others to help build the capacity of the state system of support to deliver consistent, high-quality training.

### **Standards and Assessment Adoption**

In Year 5, Great Lakes East supported statewide adoption of revised K–8 academic content standards in science and social studies as well as the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and English/language arts. Great Lakes East assisted Ohio in the design and facilitation of regional stakeholder meetings to gather public input focused on the revised state standards and to solicit feedback about additional state standards that should be included in the Common Core State Standards. The Ohio State Board of Education formally adopted these standards in June 2010. This work sets the stage for Great Lakes East to support rollout and implementation of these standards beginning in Year 6.

### **Credit Flexibility Implementation and Support**

The adoption of a credit flexibility plan by the Ohio State Board of Education in March 2009 set the stage for implementation of the plan by early-adoption districts and planning for implementation on a larger scale. Great Lakes East collaborated with an internal credit flexibility working group to support state implementation planning efforts as early-adoption districts began to adopt and put into practice credit flexibility measures. Great Lakes East assisted ODE in capturing Ohio models and strategies of credit flexibility implementation in the form of a credit flexibility case study series. Great Lakes East also collaborated with the National High School Center to interview staff from four SEAs that have already implemented similar credit flexibility policies in Oregon, Florida, Texas, and Massachusetts and produced a summary report. The IDEA Partnership worked with Great Lakes East to develop a shared work site that will include credit flexibility documents, existing guidance documents, and examples of assessments that

districts might use. In addition, Great Lakes East collaborated with the IDEA Partnership and ODE to begin training moderators of communities of practice to facilitate sharing of challenges and best practices during implementation. Finally, Great Lakes East provided technical support in the design and production of a series of credit flexibility Web conferences that complemented state guidance documents.

### **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009**

The current ARRA funding to Ohio and flow-through funding to districts and what that means for monitoring and accountability purposes has focused much of the work at the leadership level at ODE. Now, with Race to the Top (RTTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIG) funding, ODE is prepared to engage participating LEAs (536 districts and charter schools), higher education institutions, the regional system of support, and other stakeholders in implementing plans described in Ohio’s RTTT application.

As noted in the technical assistance plan for Year 5, Great Lakes East has supported ODE as it worked through the process of submitting their RTTT and SIG applications through forums, Web conferences, and meetings designed to solicit ideas. The planned Year 6 work directly supports two major areas described in Ohio’s RTTT application: college and career-ready standards and aligned assessments and support for struggling schools.

### **Summary of Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building**

The technical assistance goals codeveloped with ODE complement and support Ohio’s RTTT plan. The overarching goals of ODE’s work with Great Lakes East during the past five years have been as follows: (1) to improve the quality of technical assistance provided to schools and districts not making AYP through statewide systems of support and (2) to build a data system and data tools that enable teachers, principals, and district administrators to improve achievement for all students.

### **Assessment and Accountability (Year 5)**

**Table 1. Assessment and Accountability Goal 1: Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process and Subgoal 1A: Design and Alignment of a Balanced Assessment System and Tools to Support the Ohio Improvement Process**

<b>Goal Name</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process and Design and Alignment of a Balanced Assessment System and Tools to Support the Ohio Improvement Process (<i>Assessment system work continues into Year 6.</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To enable the effective use of data by all levels of the educational system to improve schools and student performance.</li> <li>• To use the data support system to house formative assessments and common interim assessments that are aligned to new content standards as well as ensure that these assessments offer some coherence with statewide summative assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>Great Lakes East</b>	<b>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</b>

<p><b>and ODE Collaborative Work and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE uses the state-level design team and State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) districts evaluation to determine needs regarding changes to data tools.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision Framework Tool and Implementation Management and Monitoring Tool are Web-enabled.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE designs and offers data tool training to state support teams, ESC staff, and district and building leadership teams.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for school improvement—based on SPDG pilot and ongoing evaluation.</li> <li>• Use of formative assessments and common interim assessments is incorporated into the <i>OIP Facilitator Guide</i> (Stage 3) and into training of external and internal facilitators.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Table 2. Assessment and Accountability Goal 2:  
Credit Flexibility Implementation**

<p><b>Goal Name</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Credit Flexibility Implementation (<i>Continues into Year 6.</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Goal Description</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide technical assistance and support to ODE as it plans for implementation of credit flexibility plans in early-adoption districts and scale-up to other districts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Great Lakes East and ODE Collaborative Work and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building</b></p>	<p><b>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE determines supports and guidance needed for early-adoption districts through a series of public meetings.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE guidance is established for early-adoption districts.</li> <li>• Draft policy language is made available to local school boards.</li> <li>• ODE provides guidance for “test-out” options and performance assessments.</li> <li>• ODE and Great Lakes East collaborate to offer a series of Web conferences that complement state credit flexibility guidance.</li> <li>• ODE collaborates with ODE and National High School Center to produce a summary report of other states implementing credit flexibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership for the 21st Century recognizes and awards Ohio’s credit flexibility work as a 21st Century Best Practice</li> <li>• ODE and Great Lakes East design shared work site for credit flexibility; this site is made available to districts.</li> <li>• ODE and Great Lakes East produce a series of Ohio credit flexibility case studies that highlight implementation practices.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE and Great Lakes East begin implementation of communities of practice with IDEA Partnership.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Table 3. Assessment and Accountability Goal 3: Ohio Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems**

<b>Goal Name</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems (<i>Continues into Year 6.</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To assist with the design and facilitation of regional stakeholder meetings to gather public input into revised state standards for science and social studies and solicit feedback about the inclusion of state standards into the common core standards in mathematics and English/language arts; and to gather information and artifacts of assessment and accountability systems in high-performing countries in order to inform performance assessments, curricula and course syllabi, and accountability in Ohio.</li> </ul>
<b>Great Lakes East and ODE Collaborative Work and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building</b>	<p><b>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional stakeholder meetings provided public input into adoption of English/language arts and mathematics Common Core State Standards.</li> <li>• Regional stakeholder meetings provided public input into revised state academic content standards (science and social studies).</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produced a technical document, <i>A Brief on Performance-Based Assessment: Technical Considerations From an International Perspective</i>, based on a review of high-performing nations and regions.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE plans for rollout of Common Core State Standards and revised state standards.</li> </ul>

### Statewide Systems of Support (Year 5)

**Table 4. Statewide Systems of Support Goal 1: Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process**

<b>Goal Name</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process (<i>Work completed in Year 5.</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To continue working with the state-level design team to articulate processes and structures for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process and to support operationalizing the measurement of indicators for a highly effective statewide system of support.</li> </ul>
<b>Great Lakes East and ODE Collaborative Work and Evidence of ODE</b>	<p><b>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE uses SPDG districts evaluation and feedback from the state-level design team to generate district and school needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</b></p>

<b>Capacity Building</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading indicators of Stage 4 ongoing evaluation are finalized.</li> <li>• Stage 3 improvement processes and structures are complete and incorporated into the <i>OIP Facilitator Guide</i>.</li> <li>• State support teams and ESC staff are trained to work with districts and buildings implementing Stages 3 and 4.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State system of support provided training for OIP facilitators focused on Stages 3 and 4.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 3 Implementation Management and Monitoring Tool is available online to districts and buildings.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---

**Table 5. Statewide Systems of Support Goal 2: Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers**

<b>Goal Name</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers (<i>Work completed in Year 5.</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE is redesigning its district and school improvement support system to ensure higher quality of district and building improvement support by regional providers and to develop a regionally based training system that builds the competencies and skills of regional providers such as state support teams and ESC staff.</li> </ul>
<b>Great Lakes East and ODE Collaborative Work and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building</b>	<p><b>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional system of support provides feedback on core competencies for facilitators.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core competencies are defined for OIP external (regional) and internal (district-based) facilitators.</li> <li>• Professional development parameter and fidelity checklist is developed for regional training teams.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Lakes East collaborates with regional leadership to design a training system for the regions.</li> <li>• Online video modules are available to external and internal facilitators through the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) website.</li> </ul> <p><b>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator Competency Tool is field tested and improvements made.</li> </ul>

# **Proposed Technical Assistance in Ohio: Year 6**

## **Overview of Planned Work**

Federal initiatives like Race to the Top (RTTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIG) are driving much of ODE's planned work for Year 6 and beyond. Funding for both initiatives will enable Ohio to pursue innovative and transformative work. Great Lakes East is presented with a challenge and an opportunity to align the work proposed for Year 6 with projects proposed in RTTT.

The Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) is a foundational element for the support for struggling schools and SIGs described in Ohio's RTTT plan. For example, districts applying for SIG funds must show evidence that they have moved through Stages 1 and 2 of OIP and that identified buildings have plans that are aligned to the district improvement plan. Furthermore, schools must monitor and document implementation of interventions through use of the Implementation Management and Monitoring Tool (IMM Tool), the tool used in Stage 3 of OIP. With the design of processes and structures for Stages 3 and 4 of OIP complete, ODE will now turn its attention to implementing monitoring and ongoing evaluation processes to both demonstrate the impact of OIP on student performance and adult practice as well as strengthen the capacity of the statewide system of support to better support district and building improvement. Completion of the design phase of OIP by the state-level design team means that this leadership structure will be replaced by a newly formed OIP leadership team. Great Lakes East will be a thought partner to ODE and to the regional system of support through its participation on this leadership team.

Statewide adoption of college- and career-ready standards is another area of focus within RTTT. The public release of the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics followed by formal adoption of these standards in June by the Ohio State Board of Education provide much of the impetus and direction for Great Lakes East work in Ohio. Great Lakes East will partner with ODE to assist with the rollout and statewide adoption of the Common Core State Standards, and on the assessment side, Great Lakes East will support the design and use of performance assessments aligned with the Common Core and Revised State Standards.

Both implementation of rigorous standards that prepare students for college and career and approaches to increasing graduation rates are aims of the RTTT plan and relate to credit flexibility. During the 2010–11 academic year, all districts must provide credit flexibility options for students; this requirement will create greater need for continued implementation support. Great Lakes East will continue working with ODE as it supports effective district implementation of credit flexibility opportunities for all students.

## **Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team**

As Great Lakes East closes out its design and facilitation work with the state level design team and with ODE's Center for School Improvement, it transition into the role of a thought partner with ODE and participation in a cross-center OIP Leadership Team. This team will help facilitate

timely and accurate communication across ODE about the OIP and state system of support work and will enable greater coordination efforts across ODE. The OIP Leadership Team will also be responsible for oversight of continued refinements to data tools, improvement processes, and capacity-building efforts at the regional level.

### **Ohio Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems**

The Ohio State Board of Education formally adopted the English/language arts and mathematics Common Core State Standards in June 2010. This action has enabled ODE planning for adoption and implementation support at the district level. Great Lakes East will assist the Center for Curriculum and Assessment at ODE to design a rollout plan, a systemic professional development process utilizing the regional support system, and use of a curricular framework to help scaffold development of district curricula aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

On the assessment side, ODE is a member state of both national assessment consortia. Through its early work with the Ohio Performance Assessment Pilot Project and presence on both consortia, Ohio has advocated for the use of performance assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards. In order to accomplish this, ODE will use its anticipated RTTT funding to fund a validity study using pilot districts participating in the performance assessment pilot. Great Lakes East in collaboration with ODE and REL Midwest has offered to provide the technical expertise needed to conduct a validity study on performance assessments. Great Lakes East also will work with ODE and REL Midwest to design and operationalize regional scoring and moderation panels.

### **Credit Flexibility Implementation Support**

In Year 5, Great Lakes East was instrumental in organizing a series of Web conferences focused on aspects of implementing a credit flexibility policy. This Web conference series will continue in fall and winter of Year 6. Great Lakes East also will continue to work with an internal credit flexibility group to draft additional credit flexibility cases of implementation focused on those district examples that fill a gap—for example, an urban district or a district that is using credit flexibility for students with disabilities or for accelerated students. Great Lakes East also will continue to work with the IDEA Partnership to form communities of practice, facilitated by trained moderators, across Ohio.

### **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009**

The current ARRA funding to Ohio and flow-through funding to districts and what that means for monitoring and accountability purposes has focused much of the work at the leadership level at ODE. Now, with RTTT and SIG funding, ODE must make real all of the projects noted in its RTTT plan and focus its attention on the persistently lowest achieving schools.

Great Lakes East needs to communicate well both across work teams in Ohio and with staff across ODE and with key regional partners. It is through effective communication that we can anticipate any misalignment in our work with ODE and even strengthen those connections. Great Lakes East must also show how this work continues to support the RTTT plans and SIG.

## Summary of Proposed Goals

Table 6 indicates the Ohio technical assistance goals for Year 6. The overarching goals for Year 6 will be implementation of Common Core State Standards, performance assessments, and monitoring and evaluation processes designed to improve the statewide system of support. Great Lakes East will play a significant role in assisting ODE to move from a design phase to implementation, monitoring, and ongoing evaluation of OIP.

**Table 6. Ohio Technical Assistance Goals: Year 6**

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability	Statewide Systems of Support
<p><b>Goal 1. Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems</b>—To both be a thought partner and provide technical assistance as ODE designs systemic supports for district and building adoption of the Common Core State Standards. These supports may include regionally based professional development, curricula framework, aligned assessments, and a communication plan. Great Lakes East also will provide technical assistance to ODE especially focused on the use of performance assessments within a larger assessment system, including design of moderation and scoring. <i>(Expanded from Year 5.)</i></p>	<p><b>Goal 1. Ohio Improvement Process Leadership Team</b>—To be a thought partner to ODE as the OIP moves from the design phase to statewide implementation and ongoing evaluation of the improvement process and its impact. <i>(New goal for Year 6.)</i></p>
<p><b>Goal 2. Credit Flexibility Implementation Support</b>—To provide technical assistance and support to ODE as it plans for implementation of credit flexibility plans by all school districts. <i>(Continued from Year 5.)</i></p>	
<p><b>Relationship to NCLB</b></p>	
<p>Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, achievement levels of students—especially subgroups—are tracked over time. Schools and districts are expected to make AYP as evidenced by data and to use these data to improve. Performance assessments are part of a strategy to make high schools more engaging and better able to retain, graduate, and prepare students for the workforce and college.</p>	<p>SEAs must provide or arrange for the provision of technical or other assistance to the LEA identified for improvement. ODE must establish statewide systems of intensive and sustained support and improvement for LEAs and schools receiving funds under Part A of Title I.</p>
<p><b>Connection to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</b></p>	
<p>Providing ODE assistance in reshaping its assessment and accountability system through design of data tools embedded within a statewide systemic improvement process and connected to a</p>	<p>Providing ODE assistance in building the capacity of its state system of support to effectively facilitate and monitor the Ohio Improvement Process in all districts but especially for those</p>

<p>longitudinal data system, support adoption of rigorous academic standards that prepare students for 21st century college and careers, sharing and synthesizing international models of assessment and accountability systems from high-performing countries, and implementing strategies that enable students to earn credit based upon demonstrations of competency.</p>	<p>high- and medium-support districts. This capacity building will require a long-term commitment and support by all levels of the system: building, district, region, and state.</p>
--	---

# Proposed SEA Technical Assistance Goals

## Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

### Goal 1—Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems

To both be a thought partner and provide technical assistance as ODE designs systemic supports for district and building adoption of the Common Core State Standards. These supports may include regionally based professional development, curricula framework, aligned assessments, and a communication plan. Great Lakes East also will provide technical assistance to ODE, especially focused on the use of performance assessments within a larger assessment system, including design of moderation and scoring.

**Scope of Services.** In June 2010, the Ohio State Board of Education formally adopted the English/language arts and mathematics Common Core State Standards along with revised academic content standards in science and social studies. This adoption set the stage for teacher teams to begin development of model curriculum aligned to the common core.

Districts and buildings will need comprehensive supports to effectively teach and assess to these new standards. In its RTTT application, ODE describes a suite of supports for district adoption and implementation of these new standards. Great Lakes East has offered to provide assistance in the following ways, both as a thought partner and as a partner in designing some of these supports: design or adaptation of an existing curriculum framework that can help districts modify existing K–8 curricula in mathematics and English/language arts to align with the common core, integration of 21st century skills into aligned curricula, and a plan for systemic rollout of professional development using the regional system of support.

During the past two years, Ohio has moved deliberately and strategically to develop a new generation assessment and accountability system. With RTTT funding, Ohio will be able to continue working with and even expand pilot districts involved in the Ohio Performance and Assessment Pilot Project. Leadership teams from these pilot districts will design and pilot performance assessments. ODE has asked Great Lakes East to include REL Midwest staff who would design and conduct a validity study on the use of performance assessments by these pilot districts.

Ohio also has become a member state of both national assessment consortia (*SMARTER Balanced* and *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers*) and has been a consistent voice for the design and use of performance assessments as part of state accountability systems. This involvement has positioned Ohio to assume a national leadership role in determining how states could use performance assessments in the context of accountability. Part of this work will involve the design and implementation of a system of scoring and moderation panels. Although the creation of a state-level moderation panel may not occur until 2012, a technical team composed of Great Lakes East and REL Midwest staff will serve as a thought partner in the design of the state and regional moderation and scoring panels.

**Key Team Members.** From Great Lakes East, the common core standards work group includes Beth Ratway (lead), Tori Cirks, Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager), and Karen Sanders (RMC Research Corporation). From ODE and representing the Center for Curriculum and Assessment are Sasheen Phillips, Stan Heffner, Jim Wright, and Brad Findell. From Great Lakes East, the performance assessment and accountability work group includes Beth Ratway (co-lead), Tori Cirks (co-lead), Nick Pinchok, and Mark Mitchell. From REL Midwest, representatives are J. T. Lawrence, Arie van der Ploeg, and Andrew Swanlund. From ODE and representing the Center for Curriculum and Assessment are Stan Heffner, Jim Wright, and Sasheen Phillips.

Table 7 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems.

**Table 7. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems**

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
ODE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With support from regional providers, ODE will identify test districts based on identified need to pilot curricular framework, professional development, and integration of 21st century. (October 2010–November 2010)</li> </ul>
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designs and implements a curriculum framework that will help scaffold construction of this aligned curriculum. (October 2010–May 2011)</li> <li>• ODE generates strategies and approaches for professional development and training that utilizes the regional system of support. (November 2010–February 2011)</li> <li>• ODE identifies standards of validity, reliability, scalability, and comparability of performance assessments through a validity study in Ohio. (January 2011–September 2011)</li> <li>• ODE aligns selected assessment models for high school improvement with the larger OIP. (January 2010–September 2011)</li> </ul>
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE works with the statewide systems of support—state support teams and ESC staff—to build upon its professional development skills and knowledge of the Common Core State Standards and revised academic content standards as they support district implementation. (January 2011–May 2011)</li> <li>• ODE works with the statewide system of support to provide opportunities for learning in teacher preparation programs about performance assessments. (March 2010–January 2011)</li> </ul>
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The performance assessment website is continually updated with international models of assessments, examples of portfolio building, and course syllabi. (January 2011–May 2011)</li> </ul>

**Goal 2—Credit Flexibility Implementation Support**

To provide technical assistance and support to ODE as it plans for implementation of credit flexibility plans by all school districts.

**Scope of Services.** Districts in Ohio must provide students the option to earn credit, through means other than seat time, beginning in the 2010–11 school year. Great Lakes East will continue to provide significant support for statewide implementation of credit flexibility through its facilitative role with the internal ODE credit flexibility work group. As districts head back to school, they will need additional guidance and support for implementation from ODE and Great Lakes East.

The credit flexibility work group and Great Lakes East will host another Web conference series beginning in fall 2010. Topics planned for fall include credit flexibility and guidance counseling; instructional considerations; district and community communications; and parents, family, and the community. Based on feedback gathered from Web conferences held during Year 5, Great Lakes East will support a revised process for disseminating credit flexibility guidance and implementation information. This process includes a one-hour Web conference followed by a live chat to address additional implementation questions. Opportunities to ask follow-up questions will also be available to people on the Shared Work discussion board.

Great Lakes East also will assist ODE in producing additional case studies of credit flexibility implementation. Great Lakes East and the credit flexibility work group also will collaborate with the IDEA Partnership to plan for the implementation of a statewide credit flexibility community of practice. These moderated online discussions will be an opportunity for practitioners to share effective practices as well as voice common needs that they have as district begins to implement credit flexibility policies.

**Key Team Members.** Key team members from Great Lakes East include Tori Cirks (lead) and Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager). Also supporting this effort is Joanne Cashman (IDEA Partnership). The key team members from ODE and representing several offices and centers at ODE are Kathy Shibley, Mike Hubbell, Tom Rutan, Pete LuPiba, Wesley Williams, Kathe Shelby, and Tom Lather.

Table 8 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 2: Credit Flexibility Implementation Support.

**Table 8. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Credit Flexibility Implementation Support**

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
ODE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE identifies significant credit flexibility implementation challenges. (October 2010–November 2010)</li> <li>• ODE determines supports and guidance needed for districts. (October 2010–November 2010)</li> </ul>

<b>Core Elements of Capacity Building</b>	<b>Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)</b>
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE supports the formation of community of practice with GLE and the IDEA Partnership. (October 2010–January 2011)</li> <li>• Web conference series provides implementation support to districts. (October 2010–May 2011)</li> </ul>
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development strategy for establishment of community of practice, including training of community of practice moderators. (October 2010–November 2010)</li> </ul>
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE evaluates its guidance and support to districts and plans for improvement of tools and systems. (January 2011–May 2011)</li> </ul>

## Statewide Systems of Support

### Goal 1—Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team

To be a thought partner to ODE as the OIP moves from the design phase to statewide implementation and ongoing evaluation of the improvement process and its impact.

**Scope of Services.** With completion of the design of improvement processes, structures, and data tools that define OIP and with completion of a design to regionalize training and support of OIP facilitators, a new OIP leadership structure will be formed. This new structure will include key regional staff along with Great Lakes East and cross-center ODE staff. Ongoing work, including work to support this goal, will happen within a standing committee structure formed for this purpose.

The OIP Leadership Team will provide oversight for statewide implementation of the OIP and long-range planning and support to the regional system of support. The team will also coordinate related work across centers at ODE and ensure alignment with RTTT projects and SIG-supported schools. Great Lakes East can help broker connections to other resources and to the larger technical assistance network as well as use their experience codesigning the OIP and working with the state system of support to help inform long-range planning.

This team will likely oversee refinements to existing OIP data tools, design of a systemic monitoring and evaluation system, and capacity-building efforts at the regional level to ensure consistent, high-quality training of OIP external and internal facilitators.

**Key Team Members.** Key team members from Great Lakes East and other organizations include Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager), Sheryl Poggi (lead, external contractor), Claudette Rasmussen (Great Lakes East), and Karen Sanders (RMC Research Corporation). The key team members from ODE include Cynthia Lemmerman, Kathy Harper, Kathe Shelby, and Jane Wiechel. The OIP leadership team has yet to be formed but will include ODE staff along with key regional support staff such as Jane Sadinski (coordinator of SPDG).

Table 9 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team.

**Table 9. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Design and Implementation of Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team**

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
ODE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OIP Leadership Team is formed and its ongoing work is informed by assessment of needs from the field. (November 2010–June 2011)</li> </ul>

<b>Core Elements of Capacity Building</b>	<b>Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)</b>
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate data sets are finalized for progress review of statewide system of support. (November 2010–November 2010)</li> <li>• Data collection process and data information sharing is designed. (December 2010–January 2011)</li> </ul>
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 4 OIP evaluation along with ongoing, systemic evaluation provides evidence of how statewide systems of support and the Ohio Improvement Process can be improved. (January 2011–September 2011)</li> </ul>
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation instruments, existing data tools, and redesigned tools are adapted for measurement of impact. (January 2011–September 2011)</li> <li>• Summary of findings from ongoing, systemic monitoring and evaluation of statewide system of support used to improve the system of support. (May 2011–September 2011)</li> </ul>

## References

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-5, 123 Stat. 115 (2009). Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111\\_cong\\_bills&docid=f:h1enr.txt.pdf](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111_cong_bills&docid=f:h1enr.txt.pdf)

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved September 21, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>

Ohio Department of Education. (2007). *Ohio's state personnel development grant (SPDG): A statewide leadership development model to close the achievement gap for students with disabilities and other at-risk learners* (CFDA No. 84.323A). Columbus, OH: Author. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=33345>

## **Appendix A**

### **Research and Practice Literature That Supports Great Lakes East Work**

All citations below refer to the research- or practice-based literature that supports Great Lakes East's work with the Ohio Department of Education. The underlying or primary sources of the cited literature are available within the bibliography or reference sections within the documents. In all instances, the primary intent of Great Lakes East was to locate research-based literature; however, at times research literature was unavailable or non-existent. In those instances, practice-based literature was utilized.

#### **Standards, Assessment, and Accountability**

##### **Goal 1—Common Core State Standards, Performance Assessments, and Accountability Systems**

Much of the performance assessment practice literature guiding the assessment system and accountability work in Ohio comes from international models of assessment but also from lessons learned in the United States (Maryland). The need for common core standards was first articulated by William Schmidt and reinforced through TIMSS.

Cumming, J. J., & Maxwell, G. S. (2004). Assessment in Australian schools: Current practice and trends. *Assessment in Education*, 11(1), 89–108. Retrieved June 16, 2009, from <http://cmap.edu.fi/servlet/SBReadResourceServlet?rid=1G5NHJ2KK-1NV5F2G-2BS>

Darling-Hammond, L., & McCloskey, L. (2008). *Benchmarking learning systems: Student performance assessment in international context*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Silva, E. (2008). *Measuring skills for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Education Sector. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://www.educationsector.org/usr\\_doc/MeasuringSkills.pdf](http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/MeasuringSkills.pdf)

Stanley, G., & Tognolini, J. (2008). *Performance with respect to standards in public examinations*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Centre for Educational Assessment. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://www.iaea2008.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/ca/digitalAssets/164888\\_Stanley.pdf](http://www.iaea2008.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/ca/digitalAssets/164888_Stanley.pdf)

W.H. Schmidt, H. C. Wang, & C. McKnight (2005). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards from an international perspective, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 37(5), 525–559. G.A. Valverde & W. H. Schmidt (2000).

Yen, W. M., & Ferrara, S. (1997). The Maryland School Performance Assessment Program: Performance assessment with psychometric quality suitable for high stakes usage. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 57(1), 60–84.

## **Goal 2—Credit Flexibility Implementation Support**

Much of the knowledge base used to support the credit flexibility work comes from the policy and practice literature focused on high school reform. There is a very limited body of empirical research that directly applies to credit flexibility and alternatives to using the Carnegie unit. There are other related bodies of research focused on alternative assessment practices and drop-out prevention that might inform credit flexibility implementation. The literature cited below by Achieve was useful in establishing the need and a rationale for Ohio to move beyond the Carnegie unit as well as providing specific credit flexibility policy recommendations for Ohio.

Achieve Inc. (2005). *Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work?* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://www.achieve.org/files/pollreport\\_0.pdf](http://www.achieve.org/files/pollreport_0.pdf)

Achieve Inc. (2007). *Creating a world-class education system in Ohio*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://www.achieve.org/files/World\\_Class\\_Edu\\_Ohio\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.achieve.org/files/World_Class_Edu_Ohio_FINAL.pdf)

## **Statewide Systems of Support**

### **Goal 1—Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) Leadership Team (Support for Transition to Statewide Implementation)**

There are virtually no models of statewide implementation of a district-based improvement process, so therefore no research literature that speaks directly to this work. There is, however, a growing body of practice literature related to design and implementation of state systems of support, most notably from the Center for Innovation & Improvement. There is also an extensive literature related to leadership practices and impact on district and school improvement and the impact of effective professional learning communities on improvement. Support for informed statewide implementation comes from the work of Dean Fixen and others cited below.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining professional learning communities* (Research Report RR 637). London, England: General Teaching Council for England, Department for Education and Skills. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR637.pdf>

Denton, C. A., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. M. (2003). Bringing research-based practices in reading intervention to scale. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18*(3), 201–11.

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a “professional learning community”? *Educational Leadership, 61*(8), 6–11. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://pdonline.ascd.org/pd\\_online/secondary\\_reading/el200405\\_dufour.html](http://pdonline.ascd.org/pd_online/secondary_reading/el200405_dufour.html)

- Filbin, J. F. (2008). *Examining the effects of changes in pedagogical precision, principal data use, and student achievement on collective efficacy*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Denver.
- Fixsen, D., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, D. A., Friedman, R. M., Wallace, F. (2005) *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature* (FMHI Publication #231). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from [http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph\\_full.pdf](http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph_full.pdf)
- Fullan, M. (2008). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garmston, R. J., & Welch, D. (2007). Results-oriented agendas: Transforming meetings into valuable collaborative events. *JSD*, 28(2), 55–57. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/getDocument.cfm?articleID=1447>
- Garmston, R. J., & Wellman, B. (1999). *The adaptive school: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, Texas: Southeast Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved September 21, 2010, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/change34/>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496–528.
- Louis, K., & Marks, H. (1998). Does professional learning community affect the classroom teachers' work and student experience in restructured schools? *American Journal of Education*, 106(4), 532–75.
- McDonald, J. (2003). *The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Redding, S., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook on statewide systems of support*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation & Improvement.
- Redding, S., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Strengthening the statewide system of support: A manual for the comprehensive center and state education agency*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation & Improvement.
- Reeves, D. (2007). *The daily disciplines of leadership: How to improve student achievement, staff motivation, and personal organization*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

# Appendix B

## Ohio Improvement Process

**Who** is involved?

District/Building Leadership Teams  
 State Diagnostic Teams (SDTs) work with selected high support districts  
 State Support Teams (SSTs) work with districts and schools in need of improvement  
 Educational Service Centers (ESCs) work with other districts requesting assistance

**How** do these teams work in districts and schools?

Teams use data tools to identify critical needs

**Who** is involved?

District/Building Leadership Teams  
 State Diagnostic Teams  
 State Support Teams  
 Educational Service Centers  
 Regional Managers  
 Single Point of Contact

**How** do these teams work in districts and schools?

Review data  
 Gather evidence of implementation and impact

**STAGE 1**

Identify Critical Needs of Districts and Schools

**STAGE 2**

Develop a Focused Plan

**STAGE 4**

Evaluate the Improvement Process

**STAGE 3**

Implement and Monitor the Focused Plan

**Who** is involved?

District/Building Leadership Teams  
 State Diagnostic Teams  
 State Support Teams  
 Educational Service Centers

**How** do these teams work in districts and schools?

Work with leadership to develop research based strategies and action steps focused on critical needs identified in stage 1.

**Who** is involved?

District/Building Leadership Teams  
 Regional Service Providers  
 External Vendors  
 Higher Education

**How** do these teams work in districts and schools?

Provide technical assistance and targeted professional development  
 Leverage resources

Revised November 2008