

Budget

Defiance City (043869) - Defiance County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (265)

U.S.A.S. Fund #:

Plus/Minus Sheet ([opens new window](#))

Purpose Code	Object Code	Salaries 100	Retirement Fringe Benefits 200	Purchased Services 400	Supplies 500	Capital Outlay 600	Other 800	Total
<b>Instruction</b>		41,750.00	6,680.00	2,298.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	51,228.00
<b>Support Services</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Governance/Admin</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Prof Development</b>		0.00	0.00	268,450.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	268,450.00
<b>Family/Community</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Safety</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Facilities</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Transportation</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>		41,750.00	6,680.00	270,748.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	319,678.00
<b>Adjusted Allocation</b>								0.00
<b>Remaining</b>								-319,678.00

Application

Defiance City (043869) - Defiance County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (265)

**Please respond to the prompts or questions in the areas listed below in a narrative form.**

**A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information**

1. Project Title:

Assess, Address, Achieve: Transforming Special Education in Ohio

2. Executive summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.

Project Assess, Address, Achieve (A3) is a collaboration of Defiance City Schools, Northwest Ohio, Putnam and Wood County ESCs, the Center for Assessment and Evaluations Services (CAES), Bowling Green State University (BGSU), and Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD) to increase the academic achievement for students with disabilities. The project entails: 1) creating technology-based instruments and protocols that will allow districts, ESCs, or university personnel to perform a systematic Special Education Review (IEP review, classroom observations, stakeholder focus groups and interviews, and stakeholder surveys) of their district, 2) report results to stakeholders, recommend targeted Professional Development in areas of need, 3) produce an Action Plan to address the areas of development, 4) create Professional Learning Communities to drive the systematic change, 5) train 3 ESCs in the SER process, and 6) pilot process with 3 ESCs working with partner districts with a C or below for students with disabilities Value-Added grade on the 2013-2014 report card. The project is self-sustaining, can be aligned with ODE's Decision Framework and replicated through instrumentation, protocols, report templates, and training modules available for free on the CAES website.

*This is an ultra-concise description of the overall project. It should not include anything other than a brief description of the project and the goals it hopes to achieve.*

2565 3. Total Students Impacted:

*This is the number of students that will be directly impacted by implementation of the project. This does not include students that may be impacted if the project is replicated or scaled up in the future.*

4. Please indicate which of the following grade levels will be impacted:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K Special Education | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12           |

5. Lead applicant primary contact: - Provide the following information:

First Name, last Name of contact for lead applicant  
Michael Struble

Organizational name of lead applicant  
Defiance City Schools

Address of lead applicant  
629 Arabella Street, Defiance, Ohio 43512

Phone Number of lead applicant  
419-782-0070

Email Address of lead applicant  
mstruble@defcity.org

6. Are you submitting your application as a consortium? - Select one checkbox below

- Yes  
 No

If you are applying as consortium, please list all consortium members by name on the "Consortium Member" page by clicking on the link below. If an educational service center is applying as the lead applicant for a consortium, the first consortium member entered must be a client district of the educational service center.

## Add Consortium Members

7. Are you partnering with anyone to plan, implement, or evaluate your project? - Select one checkbox below

Yes

No

If you are partnering with anyone, please list all partners by name on the "Partnering Member" page by clicking on the link below.

## Add Partnering Members

### B) PROJECT DESCRIPTION - Overall description of project and alignment with goals

8. Describe the innovative project: - Provide the following information

*The response should provide a clear and concise description of the project and its major components. Later questions will address specific outcomes and the measures of success.*

The current state or problem to be solved; and

Over 65% of Ohio School districts have received a value-added grade of C or below on their district report card for students with disabilities. School districts in Ohio need a comprehensive and systematic method to create disruptive innovations within their own district. A3 will create a district-wide process that schools, ESCs, and Institutions of Higher Education can utilize to perform a Special Education Review of any district in Ohio to: assess areas of strengths and weaknesses of the districts special education program, address issues with targeted professional development, and achieve year-for-year growth for students with disabilities.

The proposed innovation and how it relates to solving the problem or improving on the current state.

The A3 Special Education Review Team of Defiance City Schools, CAES, OCECD, and ESC personnel will create and review: 1) technology-based instruments and protocols (IEP review checklists, classroom observations, stakeholder focus groups and interview protocols, stakeholder surveys), 2) report and presentation templates to review results with stakeholders, 3) protocols on the recommendation of targeted Professional Development in areas of need, 4) an Action Plan template and protocol to guide district-wide change process, and 5) protocol for the creation of Professional Learning Communities to drive the implementation process. In addition, SER is aligned with the Decision Framework in Ohio's School Improvement Process. SER can provide key information at Levels 1-5 of the Decision Framework. SER will also be aligned with the State Diagnostic Review Process. A3 will create and pilot Special Education Review (SER) process and instrumentation with Defiance City Schools in the Fall of 2014. Modification will be made based on the feedback from DCS, CAES, and OCECD. The consortium will train ESCs on the Special Education Review process and instrumentation. Then, 3 districts will be recruited that have a C or Below Value-Added grade on their 2013-2014 Report Card for Students with Disabilities. The ESCs will conduct a Special Education Review with technical assistance provided by CAES and BGSU faculty. The consortium will then meet to review strengths and weaknesses of the SER and modifications will be made to instrumentation and protocols before the final Manual is created. A Special Education Review Module will be created by CAES to help train ESCs and districts on the process. The Special Education Review Instrumentation, Manual, and Module will all be available for free on the CAES website. The Special Education Review will also be aligned with Ohio's Decision Framework and State Improvement Diagnostic Review.

9. Which of the stated Straight A Fund goals does the proposal aim to achieve? - (Check all that apply)

*Applicants should select any and all goals the proposal aims to achieve. The description of how the goals will be met should provide the reader with a clear understanding of what the project will look like when implemented, with a clear connection between the components of the project and the stated goals of the fund. If partnerships/consortia are part of the project, this section should describe briefly how the various entities will work together in the project. More detailed descriptions of the roles and activities will be addressed in Question 16.*

Student achievement (Describe the specific changes in student achievement you anticipate as a result of this innovation (include grade levels, content areas as appropriate) in the box below.)

Student achievement data can be measured at the individual, district, and State level for A3 during the 6-year span of the grant. \* Increase in individual achievement of students with disabilities annual growth and achievement measures \* Increase district Value-Added grade for students with disabilities \* Increase district graduation rate for students with disabilities \* Increase number of districts that improve their Value-Added grade for students with disabilities in the State of Ohio that utilized the SER \* Increase graduation rate for students with disabilities in the State of Ohio that utilized the SER Planning: Aug-Oct 2014-The (A3 ) Consortium of CAES, BGSU Faculty, OCECD, districts (LEAs) and ESCs staff will meet to discuss data collection instruments & procedures, organization of site visit, communication & reporting. BGSU will create, review, and modify all instruments and protocols (IEP review, classroom observations, stakeholder focus groups and interviews, stakeholder surveys). A3 will format the SER instrument into technology-based data gathering tools. A3 will also create templates for the Action Plan, report, and presentation. BGSU will give DCS timeline and activities for each day of the SER. Implementation. Pilot Special Education Review will evaluate: a) 504, IAT, & IEP referral process, b) review of policies, practices, & documentation for Special Education Program, c) review of IEPs & 504s disaggregated by grade levels, buildings, & disability status, d) classroom observation & follow-up interviews with every Intervention Specialist (IS) across all building & settings & general education teachers (GET) in inclusive settings, e) a list of instructional programs, curriculums, strategies utilized by ISs & GETs during observations & evaluation of the practices by BGSU, f) assessment mapping of all instruments discussed in interviews with ISs & GETs g) focus groups with administrators, paraprofessionals, school psychologists, guidance counselors, & parents, h) based on the site visit, BGSU will create an online survey for ISs, GETs, & parents to collect overall perceptions' of service delivery, policies, practices, & support within the Special Education Program, i) draft & final report including: Executive Summary, strengths, areas of development/weaknesses, recommendations, & targeted areas of professional development, j) presentation of findings to stakeholders. Training of SER. BGSU will train ESCs and districts on the SER process, protocols, and instruments. Districts will gather all documentation and schedule the SER. CAES will assist DCS in developing an Action Plan based on

each area of development from the report. The Action Plan will include: activities, action steps, timelines, roles of responsibility, & expected outcomes. CAES & DCS will finalize the professional development topics based on feedback from staff & parents.

Spending reductions in the five-year fiscal forecast or positive performance on other approved fiscal measures (Describe the specific reductions you anticipate in terms of dollars and spending categories over a five-year period in the box below or the positive performance you will achieve on other approved fiscal measures. Other approved fiscal measures include a reduction in spending over a five-year period in the operating budget approved by your organization's executive board or its equivalent.)

Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom (Describe specific resources (Personnel, Time, Course offerings, etc.) that will be enhanced in the classroom as a result of this innovation in the box below.)

Implementing a shared services delivery model (Describe how your shared services delivery model will demonstrate increased efficiency and effectiveness, long-term sustainability, and scalability in the box below.)

10. Which of the following best describes the proposed project? - (Select one)

New - never before implemented

Existing: Never implemented in your community school or school district but proven successful in other educational environments

Mixed Concept: Incorporates new and existing elements

Established: Elevating or expanding an effective program that is already implemented in your district, school or consortia partnership

### C) SUSTAINABILITY - Planning for ongoing funding of the project, cost breakdown

11. Financial Documentation: - All applicants must enter or upload the following supporting information. The information in these documents must correspond to your responses in questions 11-14.

\* Enter a project budget in CCIP (by clicking the link below)

[Enter Budget](#)

\* If applicable, upload the Consortium Budget Worksheet (by clicking the link below)

\* Upload the Financial Impact Table (by clicking the link below)

\* Upload the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics (by clicking the link below)

[Upload Documents](#)

For applicants without an ODE Report Card for 2012-2013, provide a brief narrative explanation of the impact of your grant project on per pupil expenditures or why this metric does not apply to your grant project instead of uploading the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metric.

*The project budget is entered directly in CCIP. For consortia, this project budget must reflect the information provided by the applicant in the Consortium Budget Worksheet. Directions for the Financial Impact Table are located on the first tab. Applicants must submit one Financial Impact Table with each application. For consortium applications, each consortium member must add an additional tab on the Financial Impact Tables. Partners are not required to submit a Financial Impact Table.*

*Applicants with an "Ohio School Report Card" for the 2012-2013 school year must upload the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics to provide additional information about cost savings and sustainability. Directions for the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics are located on the first tab of the document. If your organization does not have an "Ohio School Report Card" for the 2012-2013 school year, please provide an explanation in the text box about how your grant project will impact expenditures per pupil or why expenditure per pupil data does not apply to your grant project.*

*Educational service center, county boards of developmental disabilities, and institutions of higher education seeking to achieve positive performance on other approved fiscal measures should submit the budget information approved by an executive board or its equivalent on the appropriate tabs of the Financial Impact Table. Educational service centers should use the "ESC" tab and county boards of developmental disabilities and institutions of higher education should use the "non-traditional" tab.*

12. What is the total cost for implementing the innovative project?

*Responses should provide rationale and evidence for each of the budget items and associated costs outlined in the project budget. In no case should the total projected expenses in the budget narrative exceed the total project costs in the budget grid.*

317,380.00 State the total project cost.

\* Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.

\$48,930. Defiance City Schools Cost: Defiance City Schools will serve as the Pilot District for the Special Education Review. Costs include:

Substitute teachers, teacher stipends, parent meetings, administrative costs for organizing and conducting SER, reviewing SER tools, serving as lead of Core Team, providing feedback for all aspects of SER, and professional development as part of SER. \$268,450. Bowling Green State University cost include: -\$74,756 for BGSU Faculty salary and fringe to help create the Special Education Review instruments and protocols, conduct the SER, create SER report, train ESCs on SER, provide technical assistance to ESCs, and assist in creation of SER Module and Manual. -\$45,988 for Center for Assessment and Evaluation Staff salary and fringe to organize and administer SER, create Evaluation Plan, collect Evaluation data, and assist in: creating SER report, training ESCs on SER, providing technical assistance to ESCs, and creating of SER Module and Manual. -\$35,100 for BGSU faculty salary and fringe to provide targeted PD to all pilot districts. -\$13,600 for WBGU staff salary, fringe, and equipment to assist in creating video training modules on SER Process. -\$7,121 for Technology staff salary and fringe to make all SER instruments, protocols, and report template technology-based and accessible across multiple platforms. - \$30,000 at \$10,000 per ESC (Northwest, Putnam, Wood) for reviewing SER instruments and providing feedback, SER training, conducting Phase 2 SER, writing report, and serving on Core Team. \$30,000 at \$10,000 per school-determine 3 schools based on 2013-2014 Report Card data of C or below on Value-Added grade for students with disabilities. -\$5000 for Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities for review of all SER protocols and instruments and serving on Core Team. -\$5000 for Faculty and CAES travel to Defiance City and Phase 2 Pilot schools as well as trainings. -\$2000 for SER process, manual, and module. -\$19,885 is 8% Indirect Cost

13. Will there be any costs incurred as a result of maintaining and sustaining the project after June 30th of your grant year?

*Sustainability costs include any ongoing spending related to the grant project after June 30th of your grant year. Examples of sustainability costs include annual professional development, equipment maintenance, and software license agreements. To every extent possible, rationale for the specific amounts given should be outlined. The costs outlined in the narrative section should be consistent and verified by the financial documentation submitted and explained in the Financial Impact Table. If the project does not have sustainability costs, applicants should explain why.*

Yes - If yes, provide a narrative explanation of your sustainability costs as detailed in the Financial Impact Table in the box below.

No - If no, please explain why (i.e. maintenance plan included in purchase price of equipment) in the box below.

There will be no recurring costs due to the fact that the findings of Special Education Review will be incorporated into service delivery, policies, & procedures through the Action Plan as well as our CCIP. Districts will record all professional development to utilize for new staff, & instructional leaders will be identified to utilize for our professional development communities that will be incorporated as part of the OTES system within the Professional Growth Plan. All SER instruments, report templates, procedural documents, manual, and training module will be uploaded to the CAES website.

14. Will there be any expected savings as a result of implementing the project?

Yes

No

*Applicants with sustainability costs in question 13 or seeking to achieve significant advancement in spending reductions in the five-year forecast must address this response. Expected savings should match the information provided by the applicant in the Financial Impact Table. All spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. Applicants may only respond "No" if the project will not incur any increased costs as a result of maintaining and sustaining the project after June 30th of your grant year. The Governing Board will use the cost savings as a tiebreaker between applications with similar scores during its final selection process. Cost savings will be calculated as the amount of expected cost savings less sustainability costs relative to the project budget.*

338,175.00 If yes, specify the amount of annual expected savings. If no, enter 0.

If yes, provide details on the expected savings (i.e. staff counts and salary/benefits, equipment to be purchased and cost, etc.). If no, please explain

Defiance City Schools (14.7%) is currently higher than State of Average (14.3%) in percentage students with disabilities. However, for a more valid comparison, the 5 most similar districts to Defiance City have an average of 12.5% of students with disabilities in their districts. This proposal seeks to identify ways in which we can strength all the Tiers of our service delivery to reduce the amount of students who are identified with disabilities. Our short and long-term benchmarks will be to reduce the percent of students with disabilities within our district by 3% each year. This will be a reduction of approximately 15 students per year. The current additional allotment by ODE for students with disabilities, category 1 is \$1,503.00. The total saving will be \$22,545.00 after the first full year of implementation. With a projected saving to ODE of \$338,175.00 (approximately 75 students) over 5 years. All other districts recruited will have all received below a C on their value-added grade for students with disabilities on their 2014-2015 Report Card. By implementing a high quality review of their service delivery with targeted professional development, there reduction in costs should be similar to that of Defiance City Schools.

15. Provide a brief explanation of how the project is self-sustaining.

*All Straight A Fund grant projects must be expenditure neutral. For applications with increased ongoing spending as documented in question 11-14, this spending must be offset by expected savings or reallocation of existing resources. These spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. This information must match the information provided in your Financial Impact Table. Projected additional income may not be used to offset increased ongoing spending because additional income is not allowed by statute. Please consider inflationary costs like salaries and maintenance fees when considering whether increased ongoing spending has been offset for at least five years after June 30th of your grant year. For applications without increased ongoing spending as documented in questions 11-14, please demonstrate how you can sustain the project without incurring any increased ongoing costs.*

*For educational service centers and county boards of developmental disabilities that are members of a consortium, any increased ongoing spending at the educational service center or county board of developmental disabilities may also be offset with the verifiable, permanent, and credible spending reductions of other members of the consortium. This increased ongoing spending must be less than or equal to the sum of the spending*

reductions for the entire consortium.

Explain in detail how this project will sustain itself for at least five years after June 30th of your grant year.

The project is self-sustaining due to the fact that Special Education Review will be incorporated into service delivery, policies, & procedures through the Action Plan, Professional Learning Communities as well as districts' CCIPs. School districts will record all professional development to utilize for new staff, & instructional leaders will be identified to utilize for our professional development communities that will be incorporated as part of the OTES system within the Professional Growth Plan. A Special Education Review Module will be created by CAES to help train districts on the process. The Special Education Review Instrumentation, Manual, and Module will all be available for free on the CAES website. In addition, SER is aligned with the Decision Framework in Ohio's School Improvement Process. SER can provide key information at Levels 1-5 of the Decision Framework. SER will also be aligned with the State Diagnostic Review Process. Ohio's State Diagnostic Review has only been completed district-wide with 7 Ohio Schools. The SER process will be more streamlined for any district, ESC, State Support Team to access and utilize to help improve their service delivery for students with disabilities.

#### D) IMPLEMENTATION - Timeline, scope of work and contingency planning

16. Please provide a brief description of the team or individuals responsible for the implementation of this project, including other consortium members and/or partners.

*This response should include a list of qualifications for the applicant and others associated with the grant. If the application is for a consortium or a partnership, the lead should provide information on its ability to manage the grant in an effective and efficient manner. Include the partner/consortium members' qualifications, skills and experience with innovative project implementation and projects of similar scope.*

Enter Implementation Team information by clicking the link below:

[Add Implementation Team](#)

*For Questions 17-19 please describe each phase of your project, including its timeline, scope of work, and anticipated barriers to success.*

*A complete response to these questions will demonstrate specific awareness of the context in which the project will be implemented, the major barriers that need to be overcome and the time it will take to implement the project with fidelity. A strong plan for implementing, communicating and coordinating the project should be outlined, including coordination and communication in and amongst members of the consortium or partnership (if applicable). It is recognized that specific action steps may not be included, but the outline of the major implementation steps should demonstrate a thoughtful plan for achieving the goals of the project. The time line should reflect significant and important milestones in an appropriate and reasonable time frame.*

17. Planning - Activities prior to the grant implementation

\* Date Range August 2014 -

\* List of scope of work (activities and/or events including project evaluation discussions, communication and coordination among entities).

August 2014-The (A3) Consortium of CAES, BGSU Faculty, OCECD, districts (LEAs) and ESCs staff will meet to discuss data collection instruments & procedures, organization of site visit, communication & reporting. CAES will give an overview of previous SERs. A3 will give input into instruments, procedures, and documentation that each district must provide for the SER. A monthly phone conference will be scheduled as well as process for project communication and collaboration. A Dropbox and Listerve will be created for the Project. CAES will create an Evaluation Plan and Timeline to report on progress of the project. September 2014- A3 will create, review, and modify all instruments and protocols (IEP review, classroom observations, stakeholder focus groups and interviews, stakeholder surveys). Every Monday that drafts of each new or modified instrument and protocol will be sent out for review with comments requested by Thursday and modifications completed by Friday. October 2014 - A3 will format the SER instrument into technology-based data gathering tools. A# will then test the instruments to make sure that all formatting issues are addressed before they pilot the instruments at Defiance City Schools (DCS). A3 will also create templates for the Action Plan, report, and presentation. CAES will give DCS timeline and activities for each day of the SER. DCS will organize the schedule accordingly.

\* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the planning phase

Getting a consensus and comments on multiple instruments and protocols by a large group of professionals in a timely manner will be a barrier. However, the timeline and expectations of grant will be made clear to all parties in August. For each instrument, a BGSU Faculty Member-District/ESC staff member pair will be given the responsibility for Final Draft Authority. When creating technology-based SER instruments, glitches and issues can be a barrier as well. A3 has built in sufficient time to work through the barriers addressed above.

18. Implementation - Process to achieve project goals

\* Date Range November 2014 - June 2015

\* List of scope of work (activities and/or events, including deliverables, project milestones, interim measurements, communication, and coordination).

Nov 2014: The site visit portion of SER will take 1 week: Day 1: a) review of 504, IAT, & IEP referral process, b) review of district assessment & curriculum mapping, c) review of policies, practices, & documentation for Special Education Program (SEP) d) review of IEPs & 504s disaggregated by grade levels, buildings, & disability status, Day 2-3: e) classroom observation & follow-up interviews with every Intervention Specialist (IS) across all building & settings & general education teachers (GET) in inclusive settings Day 4: f) focus groups with stakeholders Day 5: g) Team review, write-up of preliminary findings of strengths & weakness, h) presentation of preliminary findings to DCS administration, & i) draft of stakeholder surveys. During the next week, the A3 will finalize: an online stakeholder survey for ISs, GETs, & parents. CAES will create the SER draft report. Dec 2014: CAES will present the final report of the SER to DCS stakeholders to gather input & feedback. CAES & DCS will identify which topics for their PD. A3 will modify all SER tools based on feedback. Jan 2015: CAES will train ECSs & districts on the SER process & tools. CAES will assist DCS in developing an Action Plan (AP) based on SER. Feb 2015: ESCs will perform the SER with technical assistance provided by BGSU. CAES will recruit BGSU staff with expertise in each topic area to deliver the PD/support. DCS will start to receive PD. Mar 2015: A3 will complete a debriefing meeting on SER. CAES will review reporting & AP process with ECSs. ESCs will

complete final SER reports & APs. DCS will complete PD. PLCs will utilize the APs to continue to address their issues. Apr 2015: The A3 will debrief on the reporting, AP, & PLCs & start to revise templates & create SER Manual. ESCs & districts will choose PD that needs to be addressed & create their PLCs. May/June 2015: Districts will receive targeted PD. PLCs will utilize the APs to continue to address their issues. A3 will finalize SER tools, manual & module.

\* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the implementation phase.

Scheduling for the SER site visit, & ESCs level of comfort performing & completing the report for the SER. ESC staff will take part in all pilot meetings so they will be familiar with process even before training. Onsite technical assistance will be provided as they perform their SER.

19. Summative Evaluation - Plans to analyze the results of the project

\* Date Range August 2014 - March 2015

\* List of scope of work (activities and/or events, including quantitative and qualitative benchmarks and other project milestones).

Aug 2014: CAES will collect all Report Card Data from each LEA, and create an A3 database to track all Report Card data over 5-year grant period. CAES will also create an A3 Checklist that tracks progress of each deliverable based on the timeline with corresponding documentation. Sept-Oct 2014: CAES will collect each draft of the: Instruments, Protocols, Evaluation Plan, Action Plan (AP), Report and Presentation Templates. CAES will create a survey to examine barriers of Planning Phase for A3 members. Nov-Dec 2014: CAES will be present at SER and have access to all SER documentation. CAES will create a SER satisfaction survey to be given to DCS staff to examine strengths and weakness of the SER. CAES will analyze the results of the IEP review, classroom observation, surveys, and stakeholder focus groups and interviews. CAES collect each draft and final report as well as modifications of any instruments and protocols. Jan 2015: CAES will collect SER training materials and survey participants on satisfaction with training. CAES will collect each AP draft from DCS. Feb 2015: CAES will be present at SER and have access to all SER documentation provided by the ESCs. Mar 2015: CAES will collect the list of issues discussed at debriefing and survey ESCs on their level of comfort in creating AP & reports. Each draft and final report(s) that ESCs create will be collected. CAES will survey DCS staff on their satisfaction with PD. Apr 2015: CAES will survey LEAs on their AP and PLC process. May 2015: CAES will collect final copies of all documents deliverables. CAES will create summative evaluation report with each survey results on each aspect of A3: planning, training, instrumentation, site visit, AP, PLC, PD, manual, and report card data.

\* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the summative evaluation phase.

Lack of participation in the evaluation process by LEAs or ESCs. CAES will be present at every portion of the grant, so communication and collaboration for the evaluation should mitigate that issue.

20. Describe the expected changes to the instructional and/or organizational practices in your institution.

*The response should illustrate the critical instructional and/or organizational changes that will result from implementation of the grant and the impact of these changes. These changes can include permanent changes to current district processes, new processes that will be incorporated or the removal of redundant or duplicative processes. The response may also outline the expected change in behaviors of individuals (changes to classroom practice, collaboration across district boundaries, changes to a typical work day for specific staff members, etc.). The expected changes should be realistic and significant in moving the institution forward.*

Please enter your response below:

The purpose of the Special Education Review is to identify critical instructional and/or organizational changes within districts to provide data, recommendations, and an Action Plan to guide systematic changes. The Professional Development model will support instructional changes that will need to be implemented. Action Planning Process and Professional Learning Communities will be the driving force behind implementing changes in the organization, service delivery, policies, and procedures. The Action Plan will include: activities, action steps, timelines, roles of responsibility, and expected outcomes. LEAs will create Professional Learning Communities (PLC) of staff to address each issue. LEAs will record all professional development to utilize for new staff, & LEAs and BGSU will identify instructional leaders will be identified to utilize for our PLC that will be incorporated as part of the OTES system within the Professional Growth Plan. The strong collaboration between Defiance City Schools and BGSU's College of Education and Human Development and Center for Assessment and Evaluation Services is the foundation of this proposal. Defiance City Schools, Northwest Ohio, Putnam, and Wood ESCs and BGSU have a strong history of collaboration in placing BGSU pre-service teachers in LEAs classrooms and hiring BGSU graduates. DCS also is a school-partner site for BGSU's innovative Inclusive Early Childhood program (allows BGSU undergraduate students to attain 3 licenses: Early Childhood Education, Early Childhood Intervention Specialist, and Birth to Age 3 Early Intervention Specialist). BGSU had partnered with ESCs and LEAs for over 15 grants and contracts in the past 10 years. The Special Education Review has been designed specifically to be the tool that guides instructional and organizational change for special education service delivery within any district in Ohio. All Special Education Review products (Manual, Instruments, Training Module) will be available for free on CAES website for all Ohio school districts.

## **E) SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT AND LASTING VALUE - Impact, evaluation and replication**

*The responses in this section are focused on the ability to design a method for evaluating the project's capacity for long-term sustainable results. Therefore, the questions focus on the method of defining the problem(s) the project hopes to solve and the measures that will determine if the problem(s) have been solved.*

21. Describe the rationale, research or past success that supports the innovative project and its impact on student achievement, spending reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast or utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom.

*The response should provide a concise explanation of items which provide rationale that will support the probability of successfully achieving the goals of the project. Answers may differ based on the various levels of development that are possible. If the proposal is for a new, never before implemented project, the response should provide logical, coherent explanations of the anticipated results based on some past experience or rationale. For projects that have been implemented on a smaller scale or successfully in other organizations, the response should provide the quantifiable results of the other projects. If available, relevant research in support of this particular proposal should also be included.*

Please enter your response below.

The Ohio's Value-Added Report Card Rating for students with disabilities has highlighted the fact that many districts across the State need to address their instruction & service delivery for students with disabilities. Many of districts in high monitoring status of the Ohio Improvement Process are due in part to the growth status of their students with disabilities. The Decision Framework of OIP allows district to examine their testing data in a strategic manner. "School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR) conducted by ODE can help districts improve student performance by analyzing current practices against effective evidence & research-based practices, identifying areas of strength & areas needing improvement, & aligning evidence & research-based practices" (ODE, 2014). In the past year, ODE was only able to complete a district-wide SIDR with 7 districts. This grant would like to create technology-based & user-friendly tools available to districts & ESCs to examine their service delivery for students with disabilities that is aligned with Ohio's Decision Framework & SIDR. Project A3 will create instruments that schools & ESCs can use to evaluate their overall special education program & highlight strengths & weakness within their district that is aligned with OIP & SIDR. ESCs & districts can then use the data to create an Action Plan that will guide their PD. Too often districts have had little or no PD resources to spend on special education, are only able to utilize their PD resources on band-aid fixes for special education, or to devote their PD time on State-mandated initiatives. Through the SER process, teachers within the districts with specific skills (co-teaching, technology use, data-based decision making) can be recommended to lead Professional Learning Communities in areas of need within the district. The SER Manual & Module will take districts & ESCs step-by-step through the process that will allow them to assess their needs, address their issues, & achieve AYP growth for students with disabilities. CAES staff has conducted SERs on a smaller scale than the current proposal of a similar district of Defiance City. The similar district now has lower levels of students identified with disabilities, higher ratings of progress & AMO score for students with disabilities.

22. Describe the overall plan to evaluate the impact of the concept, strategy or approaches used in the project.

*This plan should include the methodology for measuring all of the project outcomes. Applicants should make sure to outline quantitative approaches to assess progress and measure the overall impact of the project proposal. The response should provide a clear outline of the methods, process, timelines and data requirements for the final analysis of the project's progress, success or failure. The applicant should provide information on how the lessons learned from the project can and will be shared with other education providers in Ohio.*

\* Include the name and contact information of the person who will be responsible for conducting the evaluation and whether this will be an internal or external evaluation.

Center for Assessment & Evaluation Services (CAES) at Bowling Green State University ([www.bgsu.edu/.../centers-institutes-labs/center-of-assessment-and-evaluation-services--caes-.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/.../centers-institutes-labs/center-of-assessment-and-evaluation-services--caes-.html)) will be the external evaluator for this project. Dr. Stacey Rychener and Mrs. Kandy Current have evaluated more than 30 grants and programs in Special Education. Dr. Rychener and Mrs. Current have also conducted the evaluation or 2 Federal Teacher Training Grants in Intervention Services; the State Evaluator for Comprehensive School Reform Grant and Entry-Year Teacher Evaluation, and Project MORE. CAES has also conducted multiple district-wide Special Education Reviews. CAES is currently evaluating three Round 1 Straight Fund Grants. Dr. Rachel Vannatta Reinhart, CAES Co-Director & Professor in School of Educational Foundations, Leadership & Policy, has assisted in BGSUs development of the K-12 Online Teaching & Learning Graduate Certificate, has published multiple articles on the technology integration & assessing technology competencies in K-12 education, & has worked with school districts across Ohio as a technology consultant & evaluator for blended & online learning courses, & technology integration into K-12 instruction. Dr. Toni Sondergeld, CAES Co-Director & Assistant Professor in School of Educational Foundations, has worked with school districts across Ohio as a consultant on how to integrate assessment data & technology to inform instructional practices, & has served as evaluator for 1-1 laptop initiatives. CAES currently has 8 Masters & PhD students in education as graduate assistants.

\* Include the method by which progress toward short- and long-term objectives will be measured. (This section should include the types of data to be collected, the formative outputs and outcomes and the systems in place to track the project's progress).

Assess 1. To conduct classroom observation: -Use of content specific instructional strategies -Use of evidence-based programs and practice at Tier II and III -Use of differentiated instruction -Use of classroom management best practices -Use of co-teaching best practices 2. To conduct classroom interviews with Intervention Specialist and General Education Teachers regarding co-teaching: -Use of Reliable & Valid Assessment Tools -Knowledge of Students' IEP Goals & Objectives -Level of collaboration & planning between ISs & GETs 3. To conduct surveys for ISs, GETs, and Parents: -Perceptions of RTI, IAT, IEP process -Overall Perceptions of DCS Special Education Program & Staff -Overall Satisfaction with DCS SEP Service Delivery Address 1. Targeted PD: -# of PD training, modules, or supports provided -# of DCS staff trained -Increase in knowledge of content of PD -# of CEUs and graduate credit earned -# of DCS staff to include this PD as part of their Professional Growth Plan -Level of satisfaction with PD 2. Action Planning Process (APP) -# of stakeholders involved in the APP -Perceptions of stakeholders' level of input in the APP -# of changes made to service delivery, policies, or procedures -Perceptions of stakeholders' satisfaction in APP Achieve - Long-term objectives 1. Individual -Increase in achievement of SWD on curriculum-based measures & annual growth & achievement measures -Increase graduation rate for SWD 2. District -Decrease in referrals and identification rate of SWD -Changes in special education service delivery, policies, & procedures -Increase use of evidence-based instructional practices -Increase use of assessment data and data-based decision making -Increase in collaboration between general education teachers & intervention specialists 3. State -Increase use of districts that use the SER system -Increase # of districts that increase VA grade for SWD in Ohio -Increase grad rate for SWD in Ohio -Increase use of SER as part of OIP

\* Include the method, process and/or procedure by which the project will modify or change the project plan if measured progress is insufficient to meet project objectives.

The project will have multi-tiered system in place to change project plan if there are barriers to the project meeting our goals. Tier 1: Project Director will create a progress update email to Core Partners oversight of each aspect of the grant on a weekly basis. Tier 2: Monthly Core Stakeholder Meeting with Progress Monitoring as Part of the Agenda will be conducted. Tier 3: The CAES evaluator will also create a Progress Monitoring Checklist within the Evaluation Plan. Tier 4: Formative Evaluation report in January will be presented to stakeholders in an open forum for discussion on overall modifications on service delivery, materials, support, technical assistance, & content of the blended courses as well as administration, collaboration, & communication of the project. Tier 5: Year 1 Summative Report will also be presented in an open forum to goals, benchmarks, & outcomes from Year 1. Modifications to Evaluation Plan, Project Plan, & Benchmarks will be addressed at this time.

23. Describe the substantial value and lasting impact which the project hopes to achieve.

The response should provide specific quantifiable measures of the grant outcomes and how the project will lead to successful attainment of the project goals. Applicants should describe how the program or project will continue after the grant period has expired.

Please enter your response below.

Project Assess, Address, Achieve has the potential to have lasting impact to special education service delivery, policy, and procedures across the State of Ohio. By creating Special Education Review tools and training, Ohio districts can utilize a systematic data collection method that will provide them feedback about their spectrum of special education services. The substantial value of A3 is all schools in Ohio will have the tools to assess their strengths and weakness, address their issues, and help their students with disabilities achieve their goals. The lasting impact of A3 has the potential to achieve can be measured for individuals, districts, and the State of Ohio. The individual impact of A3 can be measured by: \* Increase in achievement of students with disabilities on curriculum-based measures and annual growth and achievement measures \*Increase graduation rate for students with disabilities The district impact of A3 can be measured by: \* Decrease in referral and identification rate of students with disabilities \* Changes in special education service delivery, policies, & procedures \* Increase use of evidence-based instructional practices \* Increase use of assessment data and data-based decision making \* Increase in collaboration between general education teachers & intervention specialists The first initial district that BGSU worked with to complete a Special Education Review was still utilizing, updating, and expanding their Action Plan five years after the BGSU completed the Special Education Review. Parents and community stakeholders still discuss and refer to action plan in stakeholder meetings with the district. The involvement of parents and community in the process strengthens accountability and transparency and increases the lasting impact of the grant. The State impact of A3 can be measured by: \* Increase use of districts that use the Special Education Review system to evaluate their service delivery in the State of Ohio \* Increase # of districts that increase their Value-Added grade for students with disabilities in the State of Ohio \*Increase graduation rate for students with disabilities in the State of Ohio \*Increase use of SER as part of the Ohio Improvement Process

24. Describe the specific benchmarks, by goal as answered in question 9, which the project aims to achieve in five years. Include any other anticipated outcomes of the project that you hope to achieve that may not be easily benchmarked.

The applicant should provide details on the quantifiable measures of short- and long- term objectives that will be tracked and the source of benchmark comparative data points. Responses should include specified measurement periods and preliminary success points that will be used to validate successful implementation of the project. If a similar project has been successfully implemented in other districts or schools, identification of these comparable benchmarks should be included.

\* Student Achievement

The goal identified in Question 9 was student achievement. The process of increasing student achievement requires system-level change. A3 has short & long term goals for each area of focus. Assess (Special Education Review): Our short-term objectives will be for CAES to establish a baseline for areas listed below by June 30th, 2015. Variable specific long-term benchmarks will be created based baseline data for each variable. Target outcome goals will be created for 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 within the Action Plan. 1. To conduct classroom observation in order to evaluate: \* Use of: content specific instructional strategies, evidence-based programs & practice at Tier II & III, differentiated instruction, classroom management best practices, co-teaching best practices 2. To conduct classroom interviews with Intervention Specialist (IS) & General Education Teachers (GET) in Co-Teaching classrooms to evaluate: \*Use of Reliable & Valid Assessment Tools \*Knowledge of students' IEP Goals & Objectives \*Level of collaboration & planning between ISs & GETs 3. To conduct surveys for ISs, GETs, & parents to evaluate: \*Perceptions of RtI, IAT, & IEP process \*Overall perceptions of SPED program, service delivery & staff Address 1. Targeted PD: # of PD training, modules, or supports provided, DCS staff trained, CEUs, graduate credit earned, and DCS staff to include this PD as part of their Professional Growth Plan 2. Action Planning Process: # of stakeholders involved in the APP & changes made to service delivery, policies, or procedures, perceptions of stakeholders' satisfaction in APP Achieve (Student Outcomes) \*Decrease number of students who are identified with disabilities & gap between OAA scores for SWD and students without disabilities \*Increase SWD achievement on OAA, OGT, Alternative Assessment Overall, A3 project goals: \*Increase district use of SER system to evaluate their service delivery in Ohio, use of SER as part of OIP, increase VA scores, & SWD grad rate

\* Spending Reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast

\* Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom

\* Implementation of a shared services delivery model

\* Other Anticipated Outcomes

25. Is this project able to be replicated in other districts in Ohio?

Yes

No

If the applicant selects "Yes" to the first part of the question, the response should provide an explanation of the time and effort it would take to implement the project in another district, as well as any plans to share lessons learned with other districts. To every extent possible, applicants should outline how this project can become part of a model so that other districts across the state can take advantage of the learnings from the proposed innovative project. If there is a plan to increase the scale and scope of the project within the district or consortium, it should be included here.

\* Explain your response

Project A3 is built on premise of replication with specific objectives about the use of SER across the State of Ohio. A3 will align with both the Decision Framework of Ohio Improvement Process as well as School Improvement Diagnostic Review. A3 has already contacted ODE

personnel from both areas to discuss collaboration potential, tools, and protocol. The Special Education Review can provide critical information in Levels 2-4 of the Decision Framework for districts (LEVEL 2: Instructional Management -Curriculum, Assessment and Instructional Practice; Educator Quality; Professional Development; LEVEL 3: Expectations and Conditions Leadership, Climate, Parent/Family, Students and Community Involvement; LEVEL 4: Resource Management). This information is critical with over 65% districts receiving a C or Below on the Value-added data for students with disabilities. Project A3 will provide tools and training for districts and ESCs to assess their needs, address their weaknesses, and help their students achieve their educational goals. All Special Education Review products (Manual, Instruments, Training Module) will be available for free on CAES website for all Ohio school districts.

By virtue of applying for the Straight A Fund, all applicants agree to participate in the overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund for the duration of the evaluation time frame. The Governing Board of the Straight A Fund reserves the right to conduct an evaluation of the project and request additional information in the form of data, surveys, interviews, focus groups and other related data on behalf of the General Assembly, Governor and other interested parties for an overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund.

**PROGRAM ASSURANCES:** I agree, on behalf of this applicant, and any or all identified consortium members or partners, that all supporting documents contain information approved by a relevant executive board or its equivalent and to abide by all assurances outlined in the Straight A Assurances (available in the document library section of the CCIP).

Michael R. StrubleSheri Steyer

Sections 

**Consortium Contacts**

No consortium contacts added yet. Please add a new consortium contact using the form below.

## Partnerships

Defiance City (043869) - Defiance County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections 

## Partnerships

First Name	Last Name	Telephone Number	Email Address	Organization Name	IRN	Address	Delete Contact
Michael	Ogawa	419-372-2481	ospr@bgsu.edu	Bowling Green State University	062893	220 Mcfall Center, Bowling Green, OH, 43403-0001	
Kerri	Gearhart	567-444-4800 ext 4646	kgearhart@nwoesc.org	Northwest Ohio Educational Service Center	124297	205 Nolan Pkwy, Archbold, OH, 43502-8404	
Jan	Osborn	419-523-5951 ext 3002	josborn@pm.noacsc.org	Putnam County ESC	049304	124 Putnam Pkwy, Ottawa, OH, 45875-8657	
Kyle	Kanuckel	419-354-9010	kkanuckel@wesc.org	Wood County ESC	050666	1867 N Research Dr, Bowling Green, OH, 43402-8835	
Margaret	Burley	800-374-2806	ocecd@ocecd.org	Oh Coalit Educ Child W Disabil	119784	165 W Center St Ste 302, Marion, OH, 43302-3741	

Implementation Team

Defiance City (043869) - Defiance County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections ▶

Implementation Team						
First Name	Last Name	Title	Responsibilities	Qualifications	Prior Relevant Experience	Delete Contact
Kerri	Gearhart	NWOESC Superintendent	Reviewing SER instruments and providing feedback, SER training, conducting Phase 2 SER, writing report, and serving on Core Team.	Keri Gearheart has spent the majority of my 25 year career in education working on behalf of students with disabilities, first as a teacher of students with severed behavioral disabilities, then as a special education supervisor, special education director, and now as superintendent of NwoESC.	I am familiar with the full gamut of disabilities covering preschool through high school, as well as programming and staffing to assist students in reaching their full potential, and am passionate about continuing to improve results for students with disabilities through collaborative efforts.	
Margaret	Burley	Executive Director	Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities for review of all SER protocols and instruments and serving on Core Team.	Margaret Burley has been the Executive Director of OCECD since 1979. In this short time, she has expanded the organization from five parent and professional organizations, working out of her home with no money for the phone bill or staff to assist her to an over \$2.5 million budget today. She has been able to obtain and sustain grant funds from the state and federal departments of education. She has built the organizational members from five in 1979 to over 40 member governing board which includes parent and professional organization representatives. She directs public policy and research for OCECD. Margaret is known nationally for her work in the field for over 45 years. Tom, her son, is the youngest of four children and has multiple disabilities from Congenital Rubella Syndrome. Margaret lives on the family farm with husband.	The Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD) is a statewide nonprofit organization that serves families of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities in Ohio, and agencies who provide servicesto them. OCECD works through the coalition efforts of over 40 parent andprofessional disability organizations which comprise the Coalition. OCECD hasalso been funded since 1984 to serve as the Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) for the state of Ohio from the federal government, U.S. Dept ofEducation, Office for Special Education Programs. Established in 1972 andstaffed primarily by parents of children and adults with disabilities, personswith disabilities, and education professionals, the Coalition mission is toensure that every Ohio child with special needs receives a free, appropriate,public education in the least restrictive environment to enable that child toreach his/her highest potential. Throughout Ohio, the Coalition's services reach families of children and youth, birth through twenty-six, with all disabilities.	
Jan	Osborn	Putnam ESC Superintendent	Reviewing SER instruments and providing feedback, SER training, conducting Phase 2 SER, writing report, and serving on Core Team.	Dr. Jan Osborn have spent the majority of my 42 year career in education working on behalf of children with disabilities. I started my teaching career in 1972 as a teacher for Educable Mentally Retarded Students. Since then I have also been a special education supervisor, director of special education, and for the past 21 years an	I have also had the privilege to be an adjunct special education college instructor for the past 30 years. Currently, I am on the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence Advisory Board as well as a 30 year member of the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities.	

				ESC superintendent in charge of numerous special education programs and services.		
Michael	Struble	Defiance City Schools Superintendent	As Chief Administrator for the Defiance City Schools, I am determined to improve our instruction and subsequently our test scores in our increasingly diverse school district. I want to collaborate with Bowling Green State University in examining our Special Education policies, procedures, and staffing and teaching methods as a means of achieving district goals. We want to collaborate with BGSU in improving our regular education teachers' differentiated instruction in teaching our special education students.	I have forty-one years of experience in public schools. Thirty-two have been spent in administration, and I am completing my eighteenth year as a superintendent.	Previously, I have worked in seven districts all with diverse student populations. I have been in city and local districts in a variety of Special Education settings.	
Rich	Wilson	CAES & BGSU Faculty for College of Education	Team will include: Stacey Rychener, Toni Sondergeld, Rachel Reinhart, Mary Murray, David Hampton, Starr Keyes, Mary Heather Munger, Kim Christensen. Create SER protocol instruments, Conduct Pilot SER, Create Report, Action Plan, Presentation, Modify SER instruments and protocols, Provide Targeted Professional Development, Conduct training of SER for consortium partners, Provide technical assistance for consortium partners, Create SER Module, Manual, and Final Instruments and place them on CAES website	CAES is a university-based center at Bowling Green State University & has served the assessment & evaluation needs of K-12 schools, districts, & agencies for the past 13 years. Dr. Rich Wilson, Emeritus Professor at BGSU, former Chair of Intervention Services for 13 years & CAES Co-Director, will lead the SER. A3 BGSU Faculty have qualifications in the following areas: Special Education, Educational Assessment & Evaluation as well as specializations in: RtI, Co-Teaching, Early Literacy, Autism, Dyslexia, Applied Behavior Analysis, PBIS, and Curriculum-Based Measurement.	CAES has conducted SERs with 3 other districts on a smaller scale than this current project. CAES has evaluated over 20 Federal, State, district-wide, & school wide special education initiatives and evaluated the Northwest Ohio OISM schools, which involved quantitative & qualitative data collection for over 40 schools implementing RtI & PBIS. A3 BGSU Faculty have participated in National	
Kyle	Kanuckel	Wood County ESC Superintendent	Reviewing SER instruments and providing feedback, SER training, conducting Phase 2 SER, writing report, and serving on Core Team.	Kyle Kanuckel has been an educator for 35 years and has served as an LEA and ESC Superintendent for 17 years. He has served on Special Education Regional Resource Center Board, Muskingum University Special Education Advisory Board, WC Family Children First Council, WC Prevention Coalition, WC Safe	Currently, Wood County ESC has a staff of over 400 staff with approximately 200 educators working directly in special education. Wood County ESC administers: 10 classrooms for students with MD, 7 classrooms for students with ED, 13 preschool classrooms for students with disabilities. The Living Classroom is been recognized at the State and Local levels for best practices	

Schools/Healthy Students  
Core Management Team.

in teaching functional living skill.  
Superintendents, Special  
Education and Curriculum Staff  
from each ESC will be trained in  
the SER process to pilot the  
process with districts.