

Ohio Technical Assistance Work Plan for 2009–10

June 2009



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, IL 60563-1486
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500
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.

3710_06/09

Contents

	Page
Prior Technical Assistance in Ohio: Years 1–4	1
Overview of Context and Coherence	1
Summary of Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building	2
Proposed Technical Assistance in Ohio: Year 5	6
Overview of Planned Work	6
Summary of Proposed Goals	8
Proposed SEA Technical Assistance Goals	10
Assessment and Accountability	10
Goal 1: Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process	10
Subgoal 1.A—Quality Criteria and Process for Design and Alignment of a Collaborative Assessment System	10
Goal 2: Credit Flexibility Implementation.....	13
Goal 3: Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems	15
Statewide Systems of Support	17
Goal 1: Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process.....	17
Goal 2: Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers	19
References	22
Appendix. Ohio Improvement Process	23

Prior Technical Assistance in Ohio: Years 1–4

Overview of Context and Coherence

The Ohio Department of Education (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 the Ohio Improvement Process (see the Appendix). 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.

In its Year 4 work, Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center 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). An ODE internal and external workgroup has identified key indicators at the building, district, regional, and state levels that will help evaluate the effectiveness of the Ohio Improvement Process (Stage 4). A critical part of the work has been the design and implementation of training for state support teams focused on Stages 1 and 2. State support teams also facilitated regionally based training for staff of educational service centers (ESCs).

In addition, Great Lakes East helped ODE and its partners to design data tools (*Decision Framework* and *Ohio Data Primer*) and professional development data modules to support the effective use of data by all levels of the education system. The *Decision Framework* tool is complete and includes both a district version and a building version, which ensure the development of a focused plan with strong alignment of goals, strategies, and actions from district to buildings. The *Ohio Data Primer* is complete and designed for principals to use as a data-training tool for teachers who are novice data users. Professional Development Data Modules are complete and will be used by regional trainers and through online courses to build the capacity of teachers to use data more effectively and to support the use of the statewide data system known as Data Driven Decisions for Academic Achievement (D3A2).

Great Lakes East facilitated a working group composed of regional staff from Ohio's 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 improvement processes with Cohort 1 districts identified from each of Ohio's 16 regions (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Each of these districts has formed district leadership teams and will move through this pilot in cohorts. Training and support of regional facilitators working with the first cohort of districts began in Year 3; training advanced and became more focused in Year 4. In this process, district leadership teams, and now building leadership teams, use the *Decision Framework* and Stages 1 and 2 data tools to identify a limited number of critical problems and likely causes of these problems. The result of this focused district improvement planning process is that problems become translated into goals in the district improvement plan and causes become specific research-based strategies. The working group also developed the *Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Guide* that serves as a resource for both regional facilitators and district leadership teams. Cohort 2 district and

building leadership teams will be moving through Stages 1–3 of the Ohio Improvement Process during Year 5.

Summary of Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building

The technical assistance goals codeveloped with ODE strongly align to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, as described below under each goal (see Tables 1–6). The overarching goals of ODE’s work with Great Lakes East during the past four years have been as follows: (1) to improve the quality of technical assistance provided to schools and districts not making adequate yearly progress (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 4)

**Table 1. Assessment and Accountability Goal 1:
Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process**

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable the effective use of data by all levels of the educational system to improve schools and student performance. (<i>Continues into Year 5.</i>)
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the 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. Schools and districts in need of improvement are expected to analyze and use data to plan, implement, and monitor rigorous improvement plans.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE completed the Professional Development Data Modules and offered regional training to ESC and district staff. • ODE completed the district and building <i>Decision Framework</i> tool for use by districts and buildings involved in SPDG Cohorts 1 and 2.

Table 2. Assessment and Accountability Goal 2: High School Balanced Assessment System

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High School Balanced Assessment System (<i>Continues into Year 5 as a subgoal “Quality Criteria and Process for Development and Dissemination of Formative Assessments and Common Interim Assessments.”</i>)
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To pilot, evaluate, and implement a high school balanced assessment system aligned with the Ohio Improvement Process.
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the 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. Schools and districts in need of improvement are expected to analyze and use data to plan, implement, and monitor rigorous improvement plans.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE identified 15 pilot high school teams, which have begun the development of course syllabi and embedded performance assessments. <p>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit flexibility engagement stakeholder meetings have been held in order to better understand systemic barriers for students demonstrating competency in ways other than seat time.

Statewide Systems of Support (Year 4)

**Table 3. Statewide Systems of Support Goal 1:
District/School Improvement Support System Redesign**

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District/School Improvement Support System Redesign (<i>Continues into Year 5 as the “Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process” goal.</i>)
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE is redesigning its district and school improvement support system to ensure higher quality of district improvement support by regional providers and to help build the capacity of district leadership teams to use the district improvement data and planning tools designed by ODE and its partners.
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State education agencies (SEAs) must provide or arrange for the provision of technical or other assistance to the local education agency (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.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State-level design team designed and facilitated a training process for state support teams and ESCs. State support team members are trained to use the focused district improvement planning process (Stages 1 and 2).

Table 4. Statewide Systems of Support Subgoal 1.A: SPDG Pilot of Stage 1 Data Tools and Stage 2 Focused Improvement Planning

Subgoal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPDG Pilot of Stage 1 Data Tools and Stage 2 Focused Improvement Planning (<i>Continues into Year 5 as the “Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process” goal.</i>)
Subgoal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop and refine use of data tools and improvement planning along with training and systems of support for regional facilitators and district and building leadership teams.
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE continued training regional facilitators (through SPDG) on how to facilitate district leadership teams to develop one focused improvement plan based upon needs assessment and cause analysis in Stage 1. <p>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE developed a draft of the <i>Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Guide</i> (Stages 1 and 2). • ODE facilitated the state-level design team to help design professional development and ongoing training of state support teams and ESCs to provide effective technical assistance to districts focused on Stages 1 and 2.

**Table 5. Statewide Systems of Support Subgoal 1.B:
Designing Systems of Support for Regional Providers**

Subgoal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designing Systems of Support for Regional Providers (<i>Continues into Year 5 as the “Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers” goal.</i>)
Subgoal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop a training system that builds the competencies and skills of regional providers, such as state support teams and ESCs.
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SEA 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.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential knowledge and skills are articulated for all district/school improvement providers. <p>ODE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trainer-of-trainer program is adapted for district improvement providers. Focused planning protocol is developed by a working group. <p>ODE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE provided training for state support team members, building their capacity to facilitate Stages 1 and 2 of the Ohio Improvement Process with high-support districts.

Table 6. Statewide Systems of Support Goal 2: Statewide Systems of Support Evaluation

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statewide Systems of Support Evaluation (<i>Continues into Year 5.</i>)
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assist ODE in the design of an evaluation system that assesses the impact that statewide systems of support have on defined behaviors and practices of districts and schools that support school improvement and student achievement.
Relationship to NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of what works is a significant practical and philosophical underpinning of the NCLB Act and its provisions. States have an obligation under the NCLB Act to support districts, especially those districts in corrective action and in need of improvement. Statewide systems of support—if they have the capacity to effectively support districts and schools—are a means by which states can fulfill that role.
Evidence of ODE Capacity Building	<p>ODE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework for statewide systems of support (known as the Ohio Improvement Process Evaluation Framework) is drafted by an internal and external workgroup. The framework is a matrix organized by levels of the system (state, region, district, and building) and by stages of the Ohio Improvement Process. Common, cross-cutting indicators have been identified for each level and stage within the matrix.

Proposed Technical Assistance in Ohio: Year 5

Overview of Planned Work

Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model

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 upon a measure of student subgroups not making 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. Within this model, districts and schools are treated as one connected entity that must move through the Ohio Improvement Process together. The Ohio Improvement Process work facilitated and guided by Great Lakes East in Year 5 aligns well with the requirements outlined under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model.

Ohio is developing coherent statewide systems of support for district and school improvement that include the following: development and support of district and building leadership teams; improvement processes that are applied with fidelity; system support structures that deliver high-quality training to regional providers; and data, planning, and monitoring/implementation tools that are accessible and used effectively to support the improvement process. The work of Year 5 includes the continual enhancement of existing efforts regarding the following: improvement processes; support structures; data, planning, and monitoring/implementation tools; and the completion of the Ohio Improvement Process (Stages 3 and 4 processes, structures, and tools). Much of the work will focus on developing a state system of support that functions as a regionally based system of training for Ohio Improvement Process facilitators of high-, medium-, and low-support districts. Another strand of Year 5 work will include supporting new models of assessment and accountability at the high school level through information gathering of international systems as well as technical assistance in implementing a credit flexibility plan for Ohio.

Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process

The completion of data tools and professional development modules enables a transition into planned implementation of the tools in the field and evaluation of how they are being used within the broader context of district and school improvement. A next step in this transition is translating these tools into Web-based versions accessible to all potential users. The D3A2 professional development committee will now focus on those tools and processes essential to effective implementation and monitoring of focused improvement plans (Stage 3 of Ohio Improvement Process).

Classrooms and buildings must be able to monitor adult implementation of teaching strategies as defined by their improvement plans and to monitor student progress along a progression of student learning. To meet these challenges, a working group facilitated by Great Lakes East and

external to the D3A2 committee will be formed to develop processes and guidelines for the design and alignment of different forms of assessment (formative, common interim, benchmark, and state achievement) with new state content standards. Great Lakes East is proposing that Module 4 of the *Ohio Data Primer*, which is designed as a tutorial to track student learning throughout the school year, become a data analysis tool for classrooms and buildings. Once connected to a data system through this tool, common interim assessment data within a building can be aggregated up to the district level and provide a broad look at student progress across a district over time. This approach allows district and building leadership teams the time to make midcourse corrections to their plans and to offer focused high-quality professional development.

Credit Flexibility Implementation

The adoption of a credit flexibility plan by the Ohio State Board of Education in March 2009 has set the stage for implementation of the plan by early-adoption districts and planning for implementation on a larger scale. One of the first steps will be to work across ODE centers to remove systemic barriers, such as how attendance is recorded or how credits are reported. Great Lakes East will support state implementation planning efforts as early-adoption districts begin to adopt and put into practice credit flexibility measures. These districts should reflect the diversity of the state (geography, size, and minority representation) in order to better understand challenges to implementation of credit flexibility attributed to size, geography, and other factors. Credit flexibility will happen in many different ways across Ohio; therefore, it will be essential to capture examples of how districts and schools have met the systemic challenges of credit flexibility. Great Lakes East will assist ODE in capturing Ohio models and strategies of credit flexibility implementation along with models used by other states; these models will be universally accessible through a shared work site. Another way in which Great Lakes East will support this work is through the design of quality criteria for demonstrations of competency, such as performance assessments, internships, service learning projects, or senior projects.

Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems

This new goal supports current high school work in Ohio to develop and use performance assessments across the state. It also is consistent with emerging state priorities to reform how high schools are held accountable. Great Lakes East will support Ohio's efforts to inform improvement of its high school assessment and accountability system through focused and systematic information gathering of systems from Finland, Sweden, Singapore, Australia (Queensland), and the United Kingdom (Cambridge Exams).

Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process

Great Lakes East will continue working with a subcommittee of the state-level design team to articulate the processes, structures, and tools needed for district and building leadership teams to effectively implement and monitor their focused improvement plans. Similarly, the Ohio Improvement Process Evaluation Framework is nearing completion, and it has common indicators identified for levels of the system and stages of the Ohio Improvement Process. The focus will be on articulating processes and measures that can be used to provide evidence of the

effective functioning of the system to improve districts and buildings. Great Lakes East will continue to serve as part of an external working group and help ODE align this evaluation work with the larger statewide systems of support work.

Design of Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers

Year 5 work will focus on the design of a sustainable, statewide training model that builds the capacity of regional providers to deliver high-quality facilitation, technical assistance, and support to districts and buildings implementing the Ohio Improvement Process. Such a model will depend on a highly trained cadre of trainers who are regionally based and who will design and facilitate ongoing training for both state support teams and ESC staff. This model also will need to be consistent with the Model of Differentiated Accountability approved by the U.S. Department of Education for use in Ohio. The end result will be seamless, continuous training available for these providers to facilitate both district and building leadership teams as they move through the four stages of the Ohio Improvement Process. The redesign and repurposing of the credentialing process from Year 2 will be applied to training, evaluation, and support of regional staff in this regionally based system.

Summary of Proposed Goals

Table 7 indicates the Ohio technical assistance goals for Year 5. The overarching goal for Year 5 will be building the capacity of the state systems of support to effectively facilitate and monitor the Ohio Improvement Process within districts and buildings. Great Lakes East will play a significant role in assisting ODE to complete improvement processes, support structures, and data and monitoring tools within Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process and to design a system of training and support that ensures quality and fidelity of implementation.

Table 7. Ohio Technical Assistance Goals: Year 5

Assessment and Accountability	Statewide Systems of Support
<p>Goal 1. Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process—To enable the effective use of data by all levels of the educational system to improve schools and student performance. <i>(Continued from Year 2.)</i></p> <p>Subgoal 1.A. Quality Criteria and Process for Design and Alignment of a Collaborative Assessment System—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. <i>(Continued from Year 4.)</i></p> <p>Goal 2. Credit Flexibility Implementation—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. <i>(New for Year 5.)</i></p> <p>Goal 3. Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems—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. <i>(New for Year 5.)</i></p>	<p>Goal 1: Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process—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 assist an external team in operationalizing the measurement of indicators within Stage 4 across levels of the system. <i>(Continued and expanded from Year 4.)</i></p> <p>Goal 2. Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers—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. <i>(Continued and expanded from Year 3.)</i></p>
Relationship to NCLB	
<p>Under the 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>
Connection to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	
<p>ARRA connection is as follows: 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 longitudinal data system; 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>ARRA connection is as follows: 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 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

Assessment and Accountability

Goal 1—Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process

To enable the effective use of data by all levels of the educational system to improve schools and student performance.

Subgoal

- **1.A—Quality Criteria and Process for Design and Alignment of a Collaborative Assessment System**—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.

Scope of Services. ODE will have in place coherent statewide systems of support to districts, as described in the Ohio Improvement Process. As more and more districts load their data into the statewide data system (known as D3A2), the data warehouse requirements of this system will need to accommodate the data required by the *Decision Framework*. Much of the work until now has supported the development of data tools used in Stages 1 and 2 of the Ohio Improvement Process. Year 5 work will focus on data tools and technology needed for Stages 3 and 4.

Trained regional service providers will be able to guide district and building leadership teams in the use of a Web-enabled *Decision Framework* tool to identify their most critical needs and in building aligned action steps, which then become part of the focused improvement planning process. Data needed to address essential questions within the *Decision Framework* will move electronically from the D3A2 warehouse. The needs-assessment portion of the online planning template, known as Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plans (CCIPs), will be reconfigured to accept the new version of the needs assessment from the *Decision Framework* process. Principals will access the *Ohio Data Primer* on the Web and use it to support building-based professional development of teachers. Module 4 of the *Ohio Data Primer* will be used by building and district leadership teams to track student progress on learning goals identified through improvement plans. Finally, an Ohio Improvement Process website designed by Great Lakes East will be available to both regional providers and to districts and buildings and will include tools and research-based resources linked by Ohio Improvement Process stages. Ultimately, this coherent constellation of data tools, processes, and professional development will help educators at all levels of the system to make better choices for students.

A collaborative assessment system will be one that is focused and aligned from the local formative assessment to the statewide achievement test. In addition, a quality criteria process facilitated by Great Lakes East will guide the design of formative assessments and common interim assessments accessible through the D3A2 website. Formative assessments and common interim assessments will be developed and connected to learning progressions articulated through the new Ohio content standards scheduled for completion in June 2010. Common

interim assessments will be used in Stage 3 of the Ohio Improvement Process to monitor student progress toward a defined learning goal. Formative assessments will inform instruction and serve as a focal point for data team conversation at the building level. The collaborative assessment system workgroup will focus on aligning and focusing all forms of assessment across levels of the system: classroom, building, district, and state.

Key Team Members. The key team members from ODE on the D3A2 professional development committee are Stephen Barr, Deborah Telfer, and Eric Bell. Other key team members include Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager) and Karen Sanders (lead, Great Lakes East consultant), Arie van der Ploeg (REL Midwest), and Bob Reece (Ohio State University).

The collaborative assessment system workgroup includes the following key team members: Rachel Quenemoen (National Center on Educational Outcomes), Mark Mitchell (Great Lakes East), and Karen Sanders (RMC Research Corporation). From ODE and representing the Center for School Improvement, Center for Curriculum and Assessment, and Office for Exceptional Children are Stephen Barr, Deb Telfer, Eric Bell, Kathe Shelby, Debbie Roshto, Jim Wright, Brad Findell, and Kara Waldron. Margaret Heritage of the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) will advise the group and assessment process.

Table 8 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: “Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process” and Subgoal 1.A: “Quality Criteria and Process for Development and Dissemination of Formative Assessments and Common Interim Assessments.”

Table 8. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of ODE Capacity Building (Start and End Date in Parentheses)
<p>ODE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations to the data warehouse (D3A2) are made to support the storage and retrieval of data for building- and district-level <i>Decision Framework</i>. (June 2009–December 2009) • District- and building-level leadership teams report that they are able to use Stages 1–3 data tools to identify critical needs, develop a plan, and implement and monitor the plan. (January 2010–June 2010). • Evidence-based differences observed in Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plans (CCIPs) are submitted, based on indicators and needs-assessment rubric. (June 2009–July 2009)
<p>ODE develops solutions to address needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working group is established to guide formative assessment and common interim assessment work and revisions of Module 4. (May 2009–July 2009) • Design of quality criteria and process for developing and disseminating formative assessments and common interim assessments are done. (June 2009–December 2009) • Ohio Improvement Process website is complete and ready to support facilitation and implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process. (July 2009–August 2009)
<p>ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-based form of the <i>Decision Framework</i> (district and building level) is available to any district or building. (November 2009–December 2009)
<p>ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D3A2 data warehouse is retooled to accommodate formative assessments and common interim assessments. (December 2009–January 2010) • Module 4 of the <i>Ohio Data Primer</i> is redesigned to use in Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process. (September 2009–January 2010) • CCIP Needs Assessment is redesigned to accommodate the new version of the needs assessment from district and building levels. (March 2010–June 2010) • ODE identifies data gaps and develops additional online tools, surveys, and other instruments; these new data sources are linked to the <i>Decision Framework</i>. (June 2009–January 2010) • ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for school improvement—based upon SPDG pilot and ongoing evaluation—and accountability. (May 2009–June 2010) • Use of formative assessments and common interim assessments is incorporated into the <i>Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Guide</i> (Stage 3) and into training of state support teams and ESC staff. (December 2009–May 2010)

Research and Practice Literature. The following key resources from the research and practice literature support the work of Goal 1: “Data Support Systems and the Ohio Improvement Process.”

Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessments. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–148.

Boudett, K. P., City, E. A., & Murnane, R. J. (2006). The “data wise” improvement process: Eight steps for using test data to improve teaching and learning. *Harvard Education Letter*, (22)1. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from <http://www.hepg.org/document/1/>

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Attributes of effective formative assessment*. Washington, DC: Author.

Hezel Associates LLC. (2007). *Supporting D3A2 professional development through evaluation*. Syracuse, NY: Author. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.d3a2.org/docs/Report_2_Year%201%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf

Perie, M., Marion, S., Gong, B., & Wurtzel, J. (2007). *The role of interim assessments in a comprehensive assessment system* (Policy Brief). Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Van der Ploeg, A., & Thum, Y. M. (2004). *Finding additional value in new accountability systems*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from <http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/pdfs/value.pdf>

Goal 2—Credit Flexibility Implementation

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.

Scope of Services. During Year 4, Great Lakes East assisted ODE in the design, facilitation, and summary of 15 stakeholder engagement meetings. A summary of these meetings became part of a credit flexibility report to the Ohio State Board of Education. The State Board formally reviewed and adopted the credit flexibility plan, and ODE will begin designing supports and guidance to districts for implementation of innovative approaches to demonstrating competency other than seat time.

During the stakeholder engagement process, many challenges were identified, including systemic barriers that must be addressed at the state and local levels in order for students to demonstrate competency in flexible ways. Many of these barriers, such as reporting requirements through the Educational Management Information System, exist at the state level and require conversations and problem solving across centers at ODE. Great Lakes East along with other partners will help to broker these conversations through the ODE Leadership Council. Beginning in September 2009, some districts will step forward as early adopters of credit flexibility policy and will begin to operationalize strategies that enable students to earn credit through demonstrations of competency. Guidance to early-adoption districts will come in the form of documents and model policy language on credit flexibility opportunities that local school boards can adopt. Great Lakes East will support ODE through the design of a shared work site that can serve as an

incubator of effective strategies tested through the early adoption network and as a repository for successful national models. Great Lakes East also will continue the design and facilitation of stakeholder engagement meetings especially focused on the business community, with an emphasis on articulating some potential models for internships and other opportunities for students. Finally, to promote consistent assessment quality and other measures of competency, ODE will identify a list of approved assessments as well as establish a platform in which locally generated assessments can be peer reviewed.

Key Team Members. The key team members from ODE are Stan Heffner, James Wright, Sara Luchs, and Cynthia Clingan. Key team members from Great Lakes East include Tori Cirks (lead) and Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager).

Table 9 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 2: “Credit Flexibility Implementation.”

Table 9. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Credit Flexibility Implementation

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"> • ODE identifies systemic barriers and incorporates them into a work document for implementation. (June 2009–July 2009) • ODE determines supports and guidance needed for early-adoption districts. (June 2009–December 2009)
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE identifies a list of approved assessments in collaboration with the College Board, Career Tech, ACT, and other institutions. (July 2009–September 2009) • Guidance is established for early-adoption districts. (July 2009–September 2009) • Draft policy language is made available to local school boards, especially early adopters of credit flexibility. (June 2009–December 2009) • State provides guidelines for “testing out” options and performance assessments. (September 2009–December 2009) • Stakeholder engagement meetings are held with business partners across Ohio. (July 2009–August 2009)
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared work site is developed. It enables dissemination of locally generated assessments, state implementation models, and examples of credit flexibility strategies and is used as a forum for communication. (September 2009–December 2009) • Findings from early-adoption districts are incorporated into the work document and used to plan the larger scale-up. (January 2010–March 2010)
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and information gathered from international models of assessment and accountability and credit flexibility implementation inform the assessment and accountability system at the secondary level. (January 2010–June 2010) • Data from secondary schools related to credit flexibility and approved assessments are connected to <i>Decision Framework</i>. (May 2010–June 2010)

Research and Practice Literature. The following key resources from the research and practice literature support the work of Goal 2: “Credit Flexibility Implementation.”

Achieve Inc. (2005). *Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work?* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.achieve.org/files/pollreport_0.pdf

Achieve Inc. (2007). *Creating a world-class education system in Ohio.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.achieve.org/files/World_Class_Edu_Ohio_FINAL.pdf

Goal 3—Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems

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.

Scope of Services. Information gathering and analysis of international assessment and accountability systems will inform the performance assessment pilot project work in Ohio. The pilot project work includes 15 high school teams from across the state charged with developing course syllabi in mathematics, science, and English/language arts. Performance assessments are designed and embedded into these syllabi.

ODE is interested in gathering information about assessments and accountability systems in high-performing international countries on such measures as Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Specifically, Great Lakes East will gather information about how 21st century skills are embedded in their assessments; how teachers are prepared to use these assessments; what units or syllabi look like in these countries; who or what institutions are responsible for setting standards, designing assessments, scoring assessments, and monitoring performance; and whether and how these assessments are tied to accountability measures. Great Lakes East also will look to see how these countries ensure reliability, validity, scalability, and comparability within their assessment systems. All of this information will be synthesized and become part of a written brief that will inform how ODE shapes its assessment and accountability system.

Key Team Members. The key team members from ODE and the performance assessment pilot are Stan Heffner, James Wright, Deb Roshto, and Raymond Pecheone. From Great Lakes East, staff members include Nick Pinchok (lead) and Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager).

Table 10 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 3: “Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems.”

Table 10. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment 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"> • Districts need support to move from a system of traditional assessments to a system that uses a balanced assessment approach, including performance assessments. These needs—such as assessment of 21st century skills—will be identified through the performance assessment pilot project. (June 2009–December 2009)
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE generates strategies and approaches for professional development and teacher preparation and mentoring through international models of assessment and accountability. (September 2009–December 2009) • ODE identifies standards of validity, reliability, scalability, and comparability of performance assessments in countries and regions of the world. (January 2010–March 2010) • ODE determines which model(s) show promise. (January 2010–February 2010) • ODE aligns selected assessment models for high school improvement with the larger Ohio Improvement Process. (May 2009–June 2009)
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE works with the statewide systems of support—state support teams and ESC staff—to build its knowledge and skills of performance assessment: design, professional development, and scoring. (March 2010–June 2010) • ODE works with the Board of Regents to incorporate greater opportunities for learning in teacher preparation programs about performance assessments. (March 2010–June 2010)
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance assessment website is continually updated with international models of assessments, examples of portfolio building, and course syllabi. (July 2009–June 2010) • International models of assessment and accountability inform Ohio’s accountability model. (May 2010–June 2010)

Research and Practice Literature. The following key resources from the research and practice literature support the work of Goal 3: “Ohio Performance Assessments and International Assessment and Accountability Systems.”

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: The Education Sector.

Stanley, G., & Tognolini, J. (2008). *Performance with respect to standards in public examinations*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Centre for Educational Assessment. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.iaea2008.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/ca/digitalAssets/164888_Stanley.pdf

Statewide Systems of Support

Goal 1—Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process

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 assist an external team in operationalizing the measurement of indicators within Stage 4 across levels of the system.

Scope of Services. In Year 5, Great Lakes East—in collaboration with a state-level design team and an evaluation workgroup—will complete the design of processes, collaborative structures, and tools needed for implementation and monitoring of focused improvement plans (Stage 3) and the evaluation of the improvement process (Stage 4).

Stage 3 is characterized by adult implementation of strategies and actions identified at Stages 1 and 2 of the Ohio Improvement Process and monitoring to gauge the degree of implementation and impact on student progress toward a learning goal. In many ways, this stage is the most challenging for districts and buildings because it depends on changes in adult behaviors and practices in the ways that district leadership teams and building leadership teams do the following: collaborate, use common interim assessments and formative assessments to monitor student progress and inform instruction, and enable data about student progress and adult implementation to flow up and down the system. The implementation management and monitoring tool is the major tool in Stage 3 and will be transformed into an electronic tool in Year 5. Another tool project for Stage 3 is a redesigned Module 4 of the *Ohio Data Primer*. This redesign will enable tracking of individual student growth in learning and facilitate the aggregation of data across buildings to the district level.

Stage 4 is defined by evaluation of the Ohio Improvement Process. Great Lakes East was an active participant in the external working group that identified common indicators for each stage of the Ohio Improvement Process and for each level of the system: state, region (state support teams and ESCs), district, and building. At the beginning of Year 5, these indicators will be completed and the focus of the work will turn to designing processes for the systematic and systemic analysis of the effective functioning of the system. Much of the work of Year 5 will be in making these processes and measures within the system fully functional. Great Lakes East is uniquely positioned, because of ongoing facilitation of Ohio Improvement Process design work, to ensure that the completed Ohio Improvement Process will function as a coherent and systemic approach to improvement of education throughout Ohio.

Key Team Members. The key team members from ODE include Stephen Barr, Deb Telfer, Tom Lather, and Sandy Vasu-Sarver. The key state-level design team members include Sue Zake and Brian Davis, state support team region 1; Jane Sadinski, quad lead; Seena Skelton, quad lead; and Michele DiMuzio, coordinator of SPDG. Key team members from Great Lakes East and other organizations include Sheryl Poggi (lead, Great Lakes East consultant), Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager), Claudette Rasmussen (Great Lakes East), and Brian McNulty and Connie Kamm (Leadership and Learning Center).

The evaluation workgroup includes key team members from ODE representing the Center for School Improvement, Office of Policy and Accountability, and Office for Exceptional Children: Stephen Barr, Deb Telfer, and Sandy Vasu-Sarver. Other members include Sue Zake, Vikki Clemons, and Larry Magliocca. Great Lakes East is represented by Karen Sanders (lead, consultant) and Mark Mitchell (Ohio state manager).

Table 11 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: “Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process.”

Table 11. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Completion of Processes, Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process

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"> • State systems of support to districts and buildings in Stages 3 and 4 are consistent with Ohio’s Differentiated Accountability Model. (August 2009–December 2009)
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading indicators of Stage 4 evaluation are finalized. (June 2009–July 2009) • Stage 3 improvement processes and collaborative structures are completed and incorporated into the <i>Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Guide</i> and training for regional teams. (June 2009–August 2009) • State support teams and ESC staff are trained to work effectively with district and building leadership teams implementing Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process. (August 2009–September 2009) • Stage 4 indicators are tested with selected districts and buildings working with regional providers. (September 2009–December 2009)
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio Improvement Process evaluation influences state policy, and goals are written into performance agreements with ECSs. (January 2010–March 2010) • Ohio Improvement Process evaluation provides evidence of how statewide systems of support and the Ohio Improvement Process can be improved. (January 2010–June 2010)
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation instruments, existing data tools, and redesigned tools are adapted for measurement of impact. (September 2009–March 2010) • The Stage 3 implementation management and monitoring tool is made into an online tool. (July 2009–September 2009) • Improvements are made to processes and structures used in Stages 3 and 4. (January 2010–June 2010) • Districts use some of these instruments internally to evaluate the impact of the Ohio Improvement Process and statewide systems of support. (January 2010–June 2010)

Research and Practice Literature. The following key resources from the research and practice literature support the work of Goal 1: “Completion of Processes, Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process.”

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.

Goal 2—Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers

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.

Scope of Services. Ohio and other states must provide or arrange for the provision of technical or other assistance to school districts identified for improvement. Ohio needed to establish statewide systems of intensive and sustained support and improvement for its local districts and schools receiving funds under Part A of Title I. ODE responded to this imperative through the design and implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process, which is intended not only for Title I districts and schools but for all districts and schools.

The sustainability and impact of the Ohio Improvement Process depends not only upon the coherence and connectedness of the tools, structures, and processes across the four stages but also upon high-quality facilitation, technical assistance, and support to districts and buildings from trained state support teams and ESC staff. In Year 5, Great Lakes East will focus on assisting regional leaders to develop a statewide training center concept. Under this concept, a highly trained cadre will be responsible for training and coordinating the training with other regional providers. Up to this point, much of the training has been initiated by ODE. A sustainable training model is envisioned that will push responsibility for training of Ohio Improvement Process facilitators out to the regional level.

Key Team Members. The key team members from ODE include Stephen Barr, Deb Telfer, and Sandy Vasu-Sarver. Regional leaders (quad leads) include Sue Zake, Brian Davis, Helen Flowers, and Michele DiMuzio. Sheryl Poggi (lead), Mark Mitchell (Great Lakes East manager), Karen Sanders (RMC Research Corporation), and Claudette Rasmussen (Great Lakes East) will be involved.

Table 12 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 2: “Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers.”

Table 12. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers

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"> • Core competencies are defined for Ohio Improvement Process facilitators working with high-, medium-, and low-support districts. (July 2009–August 2009) • Training and core competencies are designed to meet the needs of large urban school districts. (July 2009–September 2009)
ODE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A quality assurance process for selection, training, and evaluation of Ohio Improvement Process facilitators is designed and modeled after the credentialing work done in Year 2. (August 2009–September 2009) • Districts report that school improvement providers who have gone through a quality assurance process are helping build the internal knowledge and skill level of teachers and principals. (December 2009–May 2010)
ODE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District and school improvement providers who have gone through a quality assurance process are able to use district improvement tools to help districts through planning and implementation of a focused plan to improve student achievement. (January 2010–May 2010) • Great Lakes East collaborates with quad leads to design the training system for the region. (July 2009–September 2009) • A trainer-of-trainers cadre moves through a training process; its members become official trainers of state support teams and ESC staff. (August 2009–December 2009)
ODE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Continuum of Ohio Improvement Process Facilitator Skills is developed and tested in the field. (October 2009–January 2010) • Stage 4 indicators are used to determine the effectiveness of regional providers in facilitation and technical assistance to districts. (January 2010–June 2010)

Research and Practice Literature. The following key resources from the research and practice literature support the work of Goal 2: “Design of a Sustainable, Statewide Training for Regional Providers.”

Elmore, R. F. (2006). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

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.

Waters, T. W., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

References

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-5, 123 Stat. 115 (2009). Retrieved June 1, 2009, from 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 June 1, 2009, 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 June 1, 2009, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=981&ContentID=33344&Content=33474>

Appendix

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