

Budget

Grand Valley Local (045864) - Ashtabula County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (193)

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
Instruction		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Support Services		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	190,000.00	0.00	190,000.00
Governance/Admin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prof Development		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Family/Community		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Safety		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Facilities		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	190,000.00	0.00	190,000.00
							Adjusted Allocation	0.00
							Remaining	-190,000.00

Application

Grand Valley Local (045864) - Ashtabula County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (193)

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

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
Getting the Conditions Right for Our Students' Futures

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

The Grand Valley Local School District is committed to ensuring our students are immersed in teaching and learning systems that are new and innovative especially with regard to mobile technology. Although staff have received extensive training in electronic pedagogy, only 1 in 4 of our classrooms are able to regularly integrate 1:1 technology into their instruction, with a small fraction of students having abundant access to 1:1 technology, because the current infrastructure cannot meet the demands of concurrent connected devices. Grant funds requested will be utilized to increase the current LAN capacity to a recommended 10GB backbone without which we would only be able to upgrade over multiple years leaving our district disjointed in its technological ventures.

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.

1400 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 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
William Nye

Organizational name of lead applicant
Grand Valley Local Schools

Address of lead applicant
111 Grand Valley Ave. Orwell, Ohio 44076

Phone Number of lead applicant
4404376260

Email Address of lead applicant
william.nye@neomin.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

Given the low socio-economic status of the community very few students have access to robust technology. The technology available at school has to be shared, despite the school-wide wireless Internet access. Limited access to computing devices in schools is a primary reason given by teachers to explain the limited use of technology in their classrooms. Research is clear that computers can make a difference in student achievement when students have continued access. Walk-through and survey data have provided us with baseline data that show 30%-64% of teachers are not consistently integrating technology of any kind into instruction and assessment, and 50%-82% of students are not engaged in any form of technology in the learning system. The vast majority of staff agrees that they would like to integrate more technology to meet federal, state and local demands, as well as provide the students with 21st century skills, but they are unable to do so. The district has started implementing a 1:1 program. As the district has installed current wireless infrastructure over this school year our network assessment shows that 100MB switch ports are inadequate for widespread use of our wireless technology. Other districts have also added wireless technology and found that the access points need to have access to 1GB ports. Typically an access point serves slightly more than one classroom, about 30 devices. The original infrastructure in place is built on a 100MB local area network (LAN) with a 1GB backbone. We've expanded access to our network by providing district wide wireless; 93 wireless access points (WAPs). Our student body is quickly adapting by primarily using wireless devices. When groups are using the wireless they are sharing the 100MB port that the wireless access point uses. Vendor recommendations are to upgrade to a 1GB network with a 10GB backbone to allow for adequate usage of our resources.

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

A primary goal of the GVLSD's Technology Strategic Plan is that all teachers and students integrate 1:1 technology into instruction and learning by accessing web-based information and software through the use of electronic devices. We know for the state testing (OGT, OAA, PBA, EOY) we need a minimum of 140 devices, approximately 4 classrooms, currently all of which will be wireless. This use will stress our current infrastructure to its physical limit. This stress is simply caused by a large amount of students in a small area. Meeting the state testing requirements will essentially "shut down" any other teacher and student use. The district's commitment is to ensure that every classroom has a lab and that every student has access to a device to use throughout the year. In order to accommodate current and future needs we would replace the existing LAN to increase the client capacity from 100MB to 1GB and the backbone from 1GB to 10GB. This would literally increase our wireless capacity ten-fold. The district has plans to upgrade the infrastructure over several years but grant funding would allow us to move forward with the upgrade in a single year and enable us to focus on growing our district's mobile technology by purchasing more devices.

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.)

As a result of this project, GVLSD students and staff will have access needed for electronic lessons, units, research and assessment/testing. More importantly, they will be afforded the equal educational opportunities as their counterparts in other districts.

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.)

Without this funding, the district's cost could increase by \$15,000 if installation and configuration were done in phases. Once the infrastructure is upgraded, student/teacher use of 1:1 technology will increase. The use of more 1:1 technology and digital lessons would then decrease copier expenditures and hard-bound textbook purchases.

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.)

The savings incurred by not having to gradually implement the infrastructure upgrades would be used to provide more devices for students and teachers as well as the necessary professional development for teachers to learn electronic pedagogy.

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.

190,000.00 State the total project cost.

* Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.

Total cost for implementing the project from grant funds would be \$190,000.00. The break down would be as follows: Purchase of switches \$180,000.00 4 Days Installation 10,000.00 TOTAL \$190,000.00

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.

Once the new/additional switches are installed no additional costs will be incurred. The vendor's warranty period will last for five or more years. Support staff is already in place for equipment maintenance.

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.

17,000.00 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

To a certain degree there would be an expected savings if the switches were installed at one time. Since the district is committed to ensuring students and teachers have needed/appropriate access to 1:1 technology, it is therefore committed to making sure the infrastructure is in place to meet their needs. If the project were implemented piece meal, the overall cost would be greater. Each time additional switches would be installed, the district would pay \$3000-\$4000 for the vendor to be on site for a day whether they need a full day or not. It does not matter if the vendor is installing/configuring 5 or 95 switches. If the district does not have access to grant funding, we would be forced to implement the upgrades in phases. By splitting the costs in this manner, we could be increasing expenses by \$15,000 or more. Instead of the project costing \$190,000 it could reach a cost of \$205,000 or more. Although difficult to quantify, there are some critical educational costs. The district can only make upgrades as funds become available. In the meantime, there will be reduced productivity and inequitable opportunities for both students and staff. Some would be able to utilize the upgrades some of the time while others would still be using the older infrastructure. The one year project at a cost of \$190,000 could turn into a five year project at a much greater expense both fiscally and educationally. As a result of an adequate infrastructure and ensuing increased use of technology, we expect copying costs and paper usage to decrease roughly 15%-30%, which translates to approximately \$7,000 to \$14,000 per year. In addition, as students and staff access more digital resources, educators can identify what works for which populations and deploy the most effective electronic materials on a student-by-student basis. Therefore the need for hard copy textbooks would decrease dramatically. We expect an annual savings of \$10,000 to \$15,000.

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.

As previously mentioned, once the switches are installed and warranties are in place, the project would provide adequate bandwidth for a minimum of 8 years. Equipment maintenance is already a part of the IT person's job description and salary. In addition, if the district can only afford to install a 1GB network, it may not last for the required period of time where the recommended 10GB would provide adequate bandwidth for current as well as future technology needs.

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 April/May 2013

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

The GVLSD has already completed the following planning activities. April 2013 - Hired vendors to evaluate the network to prepare for wireless infrastructure May 2013 - Made recommendations on wireless and wired LAN

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the planning phase

The vendor recommendations were to upgrade LAN in order to meet any state and local requirements. The greatest barrier is the cost of being able to do so in a timely manner. Without the grant funding, our plan is to make upgrades over multiple years. Even those may not meet the recommendations. The district might only be able to install 1GB instead of the recommended 10GB.

18. Implementation - Process to achieve project goals

* Date Range July 2014 - Jan. 2015

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

July/August - Order equipment July/August - Schedule vendor(s) to install December 19-21, 2014 - On-site configuration and installation January 2-4, 2015 - On-site configuration and installation. January 4, 2015 - Phase 1 - Test equipment and ensure everything is working as expected. January 31, 2015 - Phase 2 - Test equipment and ensure everything is working as expected.

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the implementation phase.

Delay in funding could affect installation dates. If the district would have to finance the entire infrastructure update, it could only do so as funds become available. Equipment out-of-stock or backordered could delay installation.

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

* Date Range February - June, 2015

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

There are two parts to our Summative Evaluation - The first Summative Evaluation will happen in January 2015. This evaluation will be about our short term goal of implementing the district's infrastructure. We will use network analytics to determine our long term goals of the district's 1:1 initiative is achievable. The analysis will determine not only if the infrastructure implementation is complete but if we are lacking in other areas such as wireless capacity or bandwidth to the internet. Similar Evaluations will take place yearly to determine bandwidth needed by the district. The second part to our Summative Evaluation is directed towards the district's long term goal of the 1:1 program. Administrative Evaluations will be used as baseline data and continuing biannual evaluations will be used to determine the increased use of technology in the curriculum as well as the student use of technology in each subject area. Teacher pre surveys to ascertain plans to incorporate tech into weekly and daily lessons, periodical "checkpoint" surveys to gauge classroom use and identify any areas of professional development that may be needed to enhance usage rates and improve student achievement and student growth. Post surveys given in May to teachers to compare attitudes from the beginning of the year to each checkpoint to the end. Will be able to ascertain growth in classroom use and performance assessment use, as well as identify any areas that need to be addressed going forward in professional development sessions in order to ensure proper student achievement and growth is being met and enhanced through technology use. Student pre surveys at the beginning of implementation to gauge self-evaluation of tech use and comfort in utilizing tech. Post surveys in May to compare attitudes, student engagement, usage habits, experiences with tech, and comfort in utilization after the innovation has been implemented for the entire school year.

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

Part 1: Delays in grant funding or funding availability, equipment availability - back orders, delays in shipping, out of stock, possible scheduling conflicts, increased costs. Part 2: Funding availability to purchase additional devices, staff resistance, more professional development needed than anticipated.

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:

Changes we expect to see in educational practices include but are not limited to: * Digital content integrated into all instruction as appropriate * Students and staff have expanded access to curricula and support related to local and state standards and requirements * Students have access to instruction and instructional resources that incorporate current best practices * Students have on-line assessment practice that mirrors the new state assessments * Students have access to a broader range of resources * Tech used daily across the curriculum * An increase in student motivation and engagement * Students manipulate and explore content until it provides meaning * More engaging and relevant learning environment * More efficient workflow * More student-centered strategies such as project-based learning and independent research * Teacher as coach/facilitator * Technology as main writing tool * More time in demonstration and collaboration * Teachers and students as partners * Teachers and students create content that is relevant and meaningful * Teachers and students become critical explorers, problem solvers, and communicators who use imagination and initiative to guide teaching and learning * Information becomes dynamic, questioned, researched and relevant * Other school conventions are assimilated to conform to digital resources * Students receive immediate feedback to inform next steps for individualized learning * Simultaneous student and teacher interaction and the development of collaborative products

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.

A goal of the US Department of Education (USDOE) is that, "All students and educators will have access to a comprehensive infrastructure for learning when and where they need it." The National Educational Technology Plan states, "An infrastructure for learning is necessary to support a learning society in which learning is lifelong and lifewide." (U.S. Dept. of Education, National Educational Technology Plan, January 4, 2012) A vital element of the infrastructure is a broadband network of adequate performance and reach, including abundant wireless coverage. There must be enough bandwidth to support concurrent usage by students and educators anywhere in the building. Comparing students in 1:1 classrooms with those that are not, research shows that those in classrooms where laptops are provided, spend more time working collaboratively, participate in more project-based instruction, generate writing of greater quality and length, readily access information, and improve their research analysis skills. In addition, these students take more ownership of their learning, rely more on active learning strategies, think more critically, and show deeper and more flexible uses of technology. As we have learned from other districts with successful projects, there are areas where money can be saved, mainly in hardware-related and training costs. Hardware related - The district already has in place an IT person who is able to do the standardization and centralization required to cut costs. He is also able to train the staff in how to use the hardware appropriately. Training - There are several teachers already on staff whose responsibility it is to teach students and teachers about the educational technology, which will save costs on hiring additional "outside" consultants. These teachers will ensure that their colleagues place less reliance on someone else being the "expert" and are themselves accountable for learning the skills being taught.

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.

Internal evaluation will be conducted by: Technology Contact: Mark Brewster 440-437-6260 X - 7 mark.brewster@neomin.org Curriculum Contact: Louise Casagrande 440-437-6260 X - 4172 louise.casagrande@neomin.org

* 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).

The methods for evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that reflect the intended long and short term outcomes of the project, and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. All data will be compared with baseline data to determine the extent of change that occurs. Student data will be tracked directly from classrooms and buildings. The focus will be to quantify change attributable to the project within a year of implementation. Measurement for teachers will include appraisals of pedagogical knowledge and skills associated with the applied technologies, the increase of technology integration into instruction and assessments as compared to baseline data. Additionally, attitudes and perceptions regarding the 1:1 device program, professional capabilities and changes in practice patterns will be addressed. Short Term Obj: 8/1/14 - 1/1/15 Progress toward short term objectives will be measured by the completed and tested installation and configuration of the additional switches. Long Term Obj: 2/1/15 - ongoing Increase usage of 1:1 technology: * Instruction/ assessment as measured by comparing usage to original baseline data. * students in the learning environment as measured by comparing usage to original baseline data. Increase in knowledge and understanding of specific professional development topic areas, using pre/post surveys.

* 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.

Should the data indicate insufficient progress; a root cause analysis will be conducted to determine the reason(s). Once these data are collected and analyzed, adjustments to program will be made that will enable us to move closer to our goals. The changes will also undergo periodic checks to determine the impact of the strategies and actions. The district plans to follow Dr. W. Edwards Deming's model of Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) Cycle, throughout the entire project.

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.

The impact and efficacy of this initiative will be both formative and summative. Formative evaluations will help program directors/facilitators

monitor and adjust the program as they go, and to make process improvements. Summative evaluations will serve to inform judgments of overall program/process effectiveness. As previously stated, Dr. W. Edwards Deming PDSA Cycle will be utilized throughout the project. PLAN: Validate the need for improvement. Walkthrough and survey data have provided us with baseline information indicating that between 30% and 64% of teachers are not using technology in their instructional and assessment practices; and 50% to 82% of students are not engaged in any form of technology during classroom instruction. We learned that the root cause of this low usage is due to the inadequate infrastructure. DO: Develop aligned actions Update the infrastructure Purchase more devices Add wireless hardware (access points) Provide additional training for staff STUDY: Analyze data collected Number of teachers integrating technology into instruction and assessment Number of students engaged in technology oriented learning systems Wireless bandwidth sufficient to support concurrent usage of technology, district-wide Quarterly staff/student survey results Professional development needs met Number of devices used in the classroom Number of devices added to the classrooms. ACT: Make improvements Make improvements/adjustments based on data results. Determine readiness/need for additional devices. Determine readiness of more teachers to integrate technology into instruction and assessment Determine future professional development needs Repeat the cycle.

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

By the end of SY 2014-15 all academic content area teachers will have devised 8 examples of how technology could be integrated into their lessons. By the end of SY 2014-15 all students will engage with educational technology two times per month in each academic content area. In two years, English, Science, Math and Social Studies curricula will have at 50% of their lessons incorporating technology. Within two years, student grades on reports and presentations will increase an average of 10 points or one letter grade. Within three years student scores on standardized tests will increase by 10%.

* Spending Reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast

Textbook costs will be reduced by \$10,000 to \$15,000 annually. Within three years copying expenditures will be reduced by 15% to 30% (\$7,000 to \$14,000) Within three years, all core content area teachers will have developed online instruction that can be delivered during periods of emergency school closures.

* Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom

By the end of SY 2018-19, teacher:computer and student:computer will be 1:1 By the end of SY 2014-15, at least 75% of teachers and students will display at least an intermediate usage of district technology. Intermediate usage = students engaging with educational technology two times per month in each academic content area.

* 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

Since this project is being replicated by the GVLS D, the assumption is that it is duplicable in other districts. However, we have learned that costs may be greater in districts that: * Do not have a full time IT person on staff.* Have multiple buildings and are separated by geography (GVLS D is a K-12 district in one building). Other districts may need additional infrastructure in place such as fiber run between building locations. * Do not have educational technology instructors on staff. * Do not have teachers/staff that are not ready for the technology changes. Districts need to have a clear vision and plan to implement in a efficient and effective manner. Time to implement infrastructure also could be more or less depending on the size of the district. The project scale and scope can dynamically shift over time as technology requirements grow and change.

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).

Accept. Dr. William R. Nye, Jr. , Superintendent, Grand Valley Local Schools 4/17/14

Sections 

Consortium Contacts

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

Partnerships

Grand Valley Local (045864) - Ashtabula County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections ▶

Partnerships

No partners added yet. Please add a new partner by using the form below.

Implementation Team

Grand Valley Local (045864) - Ashtabula 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
Mark	Brewster	Technology Coordinator, IT	Vendor quotes and selection Scheduling of installation Inspect/oversee final installation Test system Maintain system	Certified IPC-A-610	10 years on the job experience	
Louise	Casagrande	Curriculum, Instruction, School Improvement	Plan and implement professional development Assist monitoring teacher and student technology usage Evaluation design Data collection and analysis	M.S. in Education Educational Technology Certificate	24 years - Teacher in grades 1 through 9 18 years - Director of Curriculum and Instruction Deliver professional development Assessment/evaluation design Data collection and analysis	