<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose Code</th>
<th>Object Code</th>
<th>Salaries (100)</th>
<th>Retirement Fringe Benefits (200)</th>
<th>Purchased Services (400)</th>
<th>Supplies (500)</th>
<th>Capital Outlay (600)</th>
<th>Other (800)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
<td>3,708.00</td>
<td>77,000.00</td>
<td>19,000.00</td>
<td>341,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>465,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Admin</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
<td>4,290.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Community</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
<td>3,708.00</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>23,290.00</td>
<td>341,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>497,498.00</td>
<td>497,498.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Allocation: 0.00
Remaining: -497,498.00
**A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information**

1. Project Title:  
Project Thrive

2. Executive summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.  
The chief goals of Project Thrive, a professional development effort to change teaching practices and increase student learning, are 1) to give teachers deep knowledge of how to use formative assessments to increase student learning; 2) to train teachers across all subjects and grades to intentionally use formative assessment and with those results to design lessons that effectively increase student achievement and 3) through the use of formative assessments, to enable students to become active and successful learners, eager to not only survive, but thrive in their school experience.  

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.

3. Total Students Impacted:  
1282  
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:  
- Pre-K Special Education
- Kindergarten
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12

5. Lead applicant primary contact: - Provide the following information:  
First Name, last Name of contact for lead applicant  
John Nolan  
Organizational name of lead applicant  
Superintendent, Wellington Exempted Village Schools  
Address of lead applicant  
201 S. Main Street, Wellington, OH 44090-1345  
Phone Number of lead applicant  
440 647 7962  
Email Address of lead applicant  
jnolan@wellington.k12.oh.us

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
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

The problem: teachers and students lack information about student progress toward goal mastery, a possible cause of miscues that produce low achievement. Project Thrive is a professional development and implementation plan to transform teacher and student skills in collecting and using learning data in the classroom to reach student goals. Three parts: 1) Initial Learning: Information about formative assessment for teachers through train-the-trainer model, beginning with representatives from Building Leadership Teams in all Wellington Exempted Village Schools. These teachers will participate in year-long training, an extension of the District Leadership Team study of Jan Chappuis’ Seven Strategies of Formative Assessment, month-by-month within our district during 2014-2015. As one of the seven strategies is mastered and used in classrooms of lead teachers, that strategy will subsequently be introduced at the building level to other teachers in the building, 2) Guided Practice: Formative assessment and teaching strategies, on a per-month schedule beginning in October 2014, will become topics for learning and discussion at TBT (Teacher-Based-Team) meetings. Teamed teachers will adapt the formative assessment practice of that month and agree on specific classroom-modified uses of the assessment, as well as the type of assessment data and collection method that will be used to identify effectiveness of the strategy studied. TBTs, which meet weekly, will be the forum in which authentic applications of assessment strategies will be discussed and evaluated for their practical use by classroom teachers and students. BLT teachers/DLT members, ESC/SST support personnel, will also attend some TBT meetings to support. 3) Evaluation of Strategies: Student progress shown by formative and summative achievement, student-reported attitudes re: goal-setting and data-keeping to measure progress, and self-reported teacher anecdotes and surveys re: implementation.

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

No longer do teachers, students or parents have the "luxury" of guessing that students are progressing satisfactorily; now all need to be able to look to hard data to see the trend, evaluate the steps needed next, and produce the desired results. The current state is that teachers and administrators feel overwhelmed by the volume and difficulty of mandated testing that has begun to take place in our classrooms and that coupled with the task of preparing students to achieve highly on new state standards makes the necessity, now more than ever before, of efficient and powerful teaching and learning the top priority. This said, in order to increase student achievement both students and teachers need to know, as quickly as possible, that students are gaining ground or not! This is not to punish, grade or otherwise make a judgment about the student, but to quickly and correctly intervene. It is equally important that students know where they are headed and how they are going to get there. They want to know: “Now what do I do?” Formative assessments, in marginal use by most teachers, are the way to eliminate "too little, too late" in our classrooms. They are the way to teach if we want our students to progress, because teaching means to meet the student with instruction that can show them the next step. To improve the current state, a concentrated and organized method of professional development, chunked in manageable layers, must be provided and all teachers must subscribed to it. Project Thrive is just that. It will dovetail itself within our District Ohio Improvement Process in a precise manner, utilizing all of the teams in place. It will teach teachers how to identify, use and benefit from the regular use of various formative assessments to determine exactly where students need help and accurately pinpoint the type of help needed. Further, it will capitalize on student goal-setting and data-keeping. The result: transformed teaching through formative assessment. Project Thrive is a professional development emphasis throughout the Wellington Exempted Village Schools that aims to increase student achievement through careful use of formative assessments in each classroom. It is an innovation within our district because it will bring a unified approach to instruction and a precise meaning to the practice of intervention for all students. In the past, through layers of changing teacher and administrative faces, students have passed from one grade level to the next with questionable mastery of neccessary reading and math skills. As skill gaps grow within the student, poor achievement results and teachers are faced with the increasingly difficult burden of knowing what to do to repair the damage. Masterful use of formative assessment can prevent and eliminate these learning gaps, but first all teachers must see the value in using formative assessment, must learn the best ways to use them, and must commit to using them with fidelity. Project Thrive will teach all faculty how to use formative assessments and will encourage use of them, and will do this within the already familiar context and district format of the Ohio Improvement Process, beginning with next fall.

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.)

Jan Chappuis (2009) states in her book: Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning that "Formal and informal (are) processes teachers and students use to gather evidence for the purpose of improving learning", so it follows that Project Thrive will train teachers to use formative assessment to design and implement actions that improve learning. Black and William (1998) report these (teacher) actions are precisely to correct student misunderstandings; provide descriptive feedback, with guidance on how to improve during the learning; and develop student self- and peer-assessment skills. Because the use of formative assessment can identify misunderstandings, make corrections early on, and...
increase the self-assessment skills of all students, the goal of increased achievement will be met through Project Thrive, as attested by the three project goals: 1. Project Thrive will infuse teachers with a deep knowledge of the use of formative assessments to increase student learning. 2. Teachers across all subjects and grades, through the intentional use of regularly-administered formative assessments and their results, will increase student achievement. 3. Project Thrive, through powerful use of formative assessments, will result in internalized student beliefs that through goal-setting & data-examination of progress toward the goal, learners can not only survive, but thrive in their school experience. Students will use tablets to set/measure goals & improve performance. Project goals connect closely with grant goal of increasing student achievement. The project will look like this: Gr. K-3: A minimum of 80% proficiency on End of Year measures in reading is anticipated. Teachers will learn to use and document formative assessments of various kinds. Early detection of problems and corrective interventions used immediately and accurately over time will increase the likelihood of student mastery. Use of various formative assessments must be a daily practice among teachers in this grade band in their classrooms and at teacher-based-team discussions in the Ohio Improvement Process. Gr. 4-6: A minimum of 80% proficiency in reading/math anticipated on mandated EOY measures. Continuous feedback to students will help them apply basic skills to the problem-solving required by Common Core standards. Formative assessment will be embedded within classroom tasks and become a natural way of teaching and learning. Teachers will find that they can tier assignments/remedies for intervention groups and that grouping will become more flexible as formative assessments are used frequently and uncover student needs. Grades 7-8: math/reading performance will reach minimum of 80% on EOY measures. Junior High students arrive with undiscovered skill gaps will be assessed and treated. Teachers at this grade level in subject-specific fields will use formative assessments to help students answer questions such as "where am I now?; where am I going?; and "how can I close the gap I am experiencing?" Formative assessments will help teachers and students implement effective "fixes" for these questions and will assist students toward greater achievement. Students trained to keep their own data will gain control over and assess their own learning for greater growth. TBTs will evaluate the most effective formative assessments to use. Grades 9-12: High school departments will work together to apply the use of formative assessment as it is directly related to the aspects of the PARCC Performance Based and End of Year assessments that are in effect for 2014-2015, the writing, problem-solving and analysis skills across the curriculum. The use of student self-assessment and goal-setting will also be stressed as an important part of formative assessment training in all classes. Gaps that are identified will be tracked, reflected upon and discussed by teacher teams. The high school will see a graduation rate of 5% increase/Honor Roll increase of 10% in 2014-2015.

Over five years, an average of $28,000 in savings is anticipated each year. Time and labor dollars may be saved due to standardization of the use of one Learning Management System throughout the district; this is tied to formative assessment because students will need to be partners in keeping and tracking their own data and progress toward mastery and teachers must be able to support student learning in a unified and organized fashion grades K-12. At the present time, students cannot successfully do this due to the variety and lack of a uniform LMS K–12. Time is wasted in the sense that the technology crew must tailor assistance to meet the various programs used. As teachers become facile at the use of assessments, they will rely more and more on digital sources of media and less and less on textbooks (over the last three fiscal years, we have spent an average of $100,000 per year on textbooks. Even after sustainability costs are subtracted, we anticipate saving an average of $28,000 per year over the next fiscal periods. After this project succeeds at increasing the achievement of students K–12, Wellington Exempted Village Schools will attract to it more students who now may be students online or at parochial or private schools. This will increase the enrollment income, and in effect will save on costs overall because of increased revenues in our five-year forecast.

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

**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

**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)
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.

497,498.00 State the total project cost.

* Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.

Project Thrive will depend upon expenditures as follows: SALARY: *Stipends for teachers and staff participating in after school hours $16,000 *Stipends for coordinators at District ($2,000) & WWD, MMS & HS BLT levels ($2,000 each) = $8,000 BENEFITS: *Retirement & Medicare $3,708 PURCHASED SERVICES: *Cost of Learning Management System which can be used throughout the district = $12,000 *Digital content-1300 students @ $50 per student = $65,000 *Cost of Substitute teachers for release during the day for teacher PD = $3,000 *Travel to Exemplar Schools = $10,000 *Consultants (ESC, ITC, Technology) for training and implementation = $15,000 SUPPLIES: *Cost of Formative Assessment textbooks for all teachers: Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning (2009) Jan Chappuis, through Amazon Books: @33 x 130 teachers = $4290 *Manipulatives and supplemental non-digital teaching materials, @ $100 per grade level elementary; Core Departments @ $1000 for 4 Departments for 3 schools (junior high, intermediate, and high School department); including $400 each for non-core areas (PE, music, tech, library) such as instructional models, 3-D materials, etc. = $19,000 EQUIPMENT: *Convertible laptops for all staff members-130 x $1100 = $143,000 *Tablets -365 tablets (WWD 90; MMS 125; HS 150) 365 tablets x $500 = $182,500 *Tablet carts-11 x $800 = $8,800 *Locked storage carts for tablets-(WWD) 18 x $400 = $7,200

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.

$45,000-- renewal of annual application licenses LMS and digital content or updates and new licenses, a need for which might be discovered through use of formative assessments K-12. $3000-- per year, funding for professional development to continue the staff development for formative learning techniques (via LCESC and other professional presenters who may assist us). $3000-- per year cost of substitute teachers for inschool work on assessments each year. $3000-- for consultation each year. $30,000-- we are budgeting per year beginning in FY 18 for replacement for equipment, repairs to technology equipment (multi-media), upkeep.

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

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
140,000.00 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

We have spent an average of $100,000 per year on textbooks over the past three years. In subsequent years after the grant year there will a savings of at least $100,000 a year due to the selection and use of online and digital resources for teaching, along with efficient use of the Learning Management System throughout the district. Cost savings each year are: FY 16 100,000-54,000=46,000 FY 17 100,000-54,000=46,000 FY 18 100,000-84,000=16,000 FY 19 100,000-84,000=16,000 FY 20 100,000-84,000=16,000 Total Cost Savings is $140,000.

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.

The Ohio Improvement Process, an organizational plan used by districts of different sizes/incomes throughout the state, is required for our own district due to past poor academic achievement at some grade levels. The OIP process is not dependent upon financial wealth but rather it is based upon internal organization of all parts of the district, its actual human resources, the expertise of district employees and actual academic and demographic data. Because the success of OIP is not dependent on a certain level of spending, the OIP organizational process, through district human resources, vision, mission, goals and strategies, will continue to sustain the grant’s activities beyond the grant year without substantial increased spending. It is anticipated that grant activities described within this proposal will be edited and amended for the immediate subsequent year (school years 2015-2016) and each year thereafter; formative assessments will continue to be utilized in classrooms and examined by staff for their efficacy without increasing costs to the district. It is also anticipated that through the OIP process in future years, student achievement will rise to the proficient level and beyond, attracting more students and thus more revenue. Formative assessments & other areas of research-based pedagogy will be studied and implemented in a similar fashion, e.g. differentiated instruction, blended learning utilizing technology, portfolio construction and maintenance, and use of student-led conferences. Funds would need to be made available, as they are budgeted now, in subsequent years for normal technology upkeep; normal purchase or renewal of professional development licenses and materials; nominal stipends to teachers for beyond-the-school-day work if this becomes a need; costs for substitute teachers when warranted for release of teachers for training during the day in addition to that outlined in the grant; conference fees including travel and housing (for teams needing support); and purchase of formative assessment resources, digital licenses, etc., including fees for trainers and support from ESC personnel, all of which can be expected to increase slightly over that spent in the grant year due to cost of living increases but remain within expectations. Expenses can be offset by attrition of aging faculty, meaning that the teaching faculty as a whole may be less expensive to maintain, and remaining resources can be redistributed so that a greater percentage is used for grant activities (teacher development and student achievement) in the future. Another issue would be student enrollment; Wellington, by more accurately meeting the needs of its students and by increasing the level of student achievement, may attract and keep more students at each grade level. The increase in enrollment would make more dollars available in the general budget and these could be designated for grant-related expenses in subsequent years. On the whole, though, the way this grant spending will operate, once begun the grant, activities and expenses would no longer be additional, but even the expenses listed here would be seen as “normal” operational expenses for a business that educates students in the best, most efficient manner possible through, among other things, the wise use of formative assessment and expert teaching. Finally, the Project Thrive will be self-sustaining because instructional pedagogy will be vastly improved to the point that professional development dollars can be largely kept within the district, rather than expended in large amounts to send teachers outside to training and bring expensive trainers inside to support staff efforts to improve. This grant will build the expertise of teacher-leaders, administrators and the organization itself to identify and remedy weaknesses in instruction and student achievement in an expedient and continuous fashion district-wide thus sustaining grant impact.

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 June 2014 - September 2014

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

Administrative Team & District Leadership Team (DLT) will meet late May through early September to solidify the detailed communication plan to be used throughout the district for the 2014-2015 year for the funded grant, implementation dates, implementation procedures, and the manner of project evaluation. Activities will coincide with: monthly DLT session dates, Annual Professional Development Dates, and monthly Building Leadership Team (BLT) dates for work sessions, and new “Late-Start- Wednesday” work sessions (each Wednesday all year in all buildings). Support from the ESC/SST offices will be solidified in June; a calendar with grant topics of work will be finalized in June, Jan Chappuis textbooks for teacher work sessions will be ordered by June. Dr. Roth, administrative team, DLT will clarify roles and responsibilities for leaders and teachers in June. In August/September “roll-out” activities district-wide for Project Thrive will occur.

Professional Development will begin at “big picture” level, so all staff will hear same presentation and gain joint understanding of why Formative Assessment training fits perfectly within the OIP district process for Wellington improvement. Communication and grant study activities will flow from District Leadership Team to the three Building Leadership Teams to the Teacher Based Teams at the classroom level; however, as the year progresses, the use of formative assessments and the study of how to use them to inform instruction will produce data, discussions will come from TBTs to BLTs then again to the DLT. Clear learning targets, effective feedback, self-assessments, goals-setting, focused teaching, revision, tracking progress, reflection, shared learning topics will be studied and implemented over seven months. Project evaluation will occur in April, May and June at all levels, including written communications from DLT.

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the planning phase

Possible major barriers could be the following 1) Teacher resistance to a new approach, resulting low morale that must be overcome as a “new” initiative is introduced— if administrators do not sufficiently control rumors and misinformation spring (2014), in the planning stage, then over the summer resistance can build in anticipation for fall implementation. 2) Potential failure of an operating tax levy, which is up for passage in May; this could result in possible restructuring of available non-grant resources, so in the planning stages of the grant this possibility must be explored and any ill effects discussed ahead of time, 3) Possible leadership changes could effect commitment to this grant; one of the three buildings has experienced 5 principals in as many years; a second building has experienced changes in administrative roles; a third building has experienced what could be informally termed a hostile work environment undergoing correction and changes in administrators to produce a more effective building operation. The point here is that unless building leaders can successfully monitor and engage in grant activities, the grant’s effects on students will be less powerful, in not mute. 4) Potential breakdown in communication over time, if not guarded, the OIP process should ensure a constant and circular flow of information and reinforcement, but a breakdown in that process (DLT-BLT-TBT) could be a barrier and cause grant activity to be ineffective and misunderstood, If the process works as planned, the grant activities will be unified and strong. 5) Failure of leadership to take responsibility for project evaluation, Surveys need to be conducted with integrity. 6) Failure of DLT leadership to make clear to teachers the way in which the seven strategies for formative assessment tie closely with the OTES rubric and will therefore assist teachers in meeting their own personal evaluation goals. If teachers fail to see linkage, instruction may suffer.

18. Implementation - Process to achieve project goals

* Date Range Late October 2014 to April 2015

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

Scope of work: The project uses the OIP already-established communication pipeline (DLT-BLT-TBT) for instructional improvement. Meetings of three layers of OIP work will facilitate teachers’ and administrators’ learning re: correct use of formative assessments. The scope of work is meant to increase accuracy of teaching methods and improve student achievement in the most timely manner possible. To do this, DLT will use a text by Jan Chappuis (2009) to learn one of seven formative assessment strategies per month, to share this learning through the three school BLTs and into the TBTs which already are formed in each school. Each month, teachers in the TBTs will decide how to best incorporate that month’s form of formative assessment into their classrooms, will decide how to interpret that style of assessment at their grade level or in their department for the designated month, and will agree on its implementation and on what rubric of factors to assess its impact on students. Following a month-long implementation, the TBTs will determine effectiveness, complete a survey or rubric form to record their reflections, and submit their findings to the BLT. The process will then begin again with a second formative practice studied next. This cycle of learn-select-plan-implement-assess-communicate will continue throughout the school year until all seven of the Chappuis strategies have been explored. Deliverables will include either a form (such as a rubric) or results of a brief on-line survey that will be submitted monthly to each Building Leadership Team; BLTs will collect, reflect upon and report Adult Implementation to the DLT via a survey sent and collected by the Director of Curriculum or the DLT. Interim measurements of student performance, achievement reports following results of PBAs from PARCC, NWEA, Lexia, etc. EYoY assessments will report achievement at year-end. Project milestones: 80% teachers implementation/student proficiency EYoY ELA/MA 80%.

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the implementation phase.

Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the implementation phase include: 1) Teacher resistance to formative assessment emphasis in their classrooms, resulting low morale that must be overcome as a “new” initiative is introduced and teachers self-examine their own practices. Some practices will fit best in some classrooms and for some teachers, but the purpose of this grant into inform and prepare all teachers; 2) Potential failure of an operating tax levy, which is up for passage in May; this could result in possible restructuring of available non-grant resources, teacher lay-offs, etc., and morale, thus implementation, might be affected. 3) Possible leadership changes could effect commitment to this grant; one of the three buildings has experienced 5 principals in as many years; a second building has experienced changes in administrative roles; a third building has experienced what could be seen as a hostile work environment undergoing correction and changes in administrators to produce a more effective building operation will need to be in effect during implementation ensuring that building leaders monitor and engage in grant activities, 4) Potential breakdown in communication over time, if not guarded, can road-block...
19. Summative Evaluation - Plans to analyze the results of the project

* Date Range Late April 2015 through August 2016

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

Scope of work for Summative Evaluation: Quantitative Benchmarks: Classroom summative assessment scores would serve as markers of student progress when contrasted with pre-assessment baseline date for particular units of study. NWEA MAP RIT scores and where these fall within acceptable RIT ranges at three points in the year (fall, winter, spring) will give teachers, students and parents baseline, interim and summative data in genera in three chunks, two of which can also be used as formative; NWEA MAP reports also break student data and performance down into every possible sort for use by teachers to pinpoint and triangulate their classroom performance data. Lexia diagnostic data is precise in reading in grades K-3 and can be used as summative data at some points during the year; the alternative reading assessment our district will use during Summer School (Terra Nova 3) will yield summative data for students with reading problems. Title I teachers can provide summative data found in DRA 2. result. PARCC End of Year data in reading and math K-12 and End-of-Year Next Generation Tests in Science and Social Studies will give summative data in designated grades. For students in grades 11 and 12 and some who may not have succeeded in passing all of the OGT in grade 10, OGT subtest data will provide quantitative scores at the end of 2015, 2016 and 2017. Monthly teacher surveys will provide quantifiable data. Qualitative Benchmarks: Notes from TBT, BLT & DLT as well as agendas; teacher comments on surveys and in discussions. Other project milestones: evaluation feedback from School Improvement Office at ODE for Westwood Elementary and McCormick Middle School (both collect TBT and BLT records, send them to ODE at the end of each quarter, and receive official feedback on their activities). These reports, coordinated through region 2 SST personnel, provide a milestone on school improvement activities, of which this grant would be a support.

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

Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the summative evaluation phase: 1) Less than strong leadership from building principals with respect to the time they can invest in grant activities, especially ongoing project evaluation. This minimum of support for teachers attempting new practices and evaluating how effective these practices are in the classroom would be a major barrier throughout ongoing evaluation. 2) Stress and confusion resulting from other required PD activities involving alignment with Core Curriculum or New Learning Standards. This might compromise teachers' investment in grant flow and evaluation. 3) Inclement weather days, resulting in disjointed continuity of instructional units, lessons, and assessment of instruction in classrooms and a restructuring of the calendar, thus affecting evaluation integrity. 4) Teacher push-back, meaning reluctance to try new approaches and put time into reflection and evaluation of the project. 5) New PARCC and Next Generation Assessment implementation (including technology readiness) may consume more time than anticipated or may cause other building schedules to become more complicated, so the timetable for conducting grant PD and evaluation might have to be altered accordingly. 6) Lateness of ODE assessment reporting may elongate the evaluation process of assessing achievement gains or losses. 7) Changes in administrative personnel could become a barrier if central office leaders do not sufficiently assist and proctor new employees.

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:

Critical instructional and/or organizational changes resulting from implementation of the grant and the impact of each change: 1. Overall communication among teachers and schools will improve significantly. At the present time, it is disjointed and sporadic; schools operate as individual cells and teaching groups within schools operate as silos. There is little collaboration other than what some teams who have long worked together may have developed over the years. Teaching practices are seldom evaluated or shared, though all would agree that the organization has leaks and gaps. There is no one improvement that can be agreed upon, nor is there a common language for beginning or sustaining the discussion. For these reasons, one of the most important instructional and organizational changes would be to bring a study together across the district within which teachers and administrators can begin to jointly address new learning and meaningful change inside classrooms. 2. The key instructional change would be the deliberate appreciation for and correct use of the wealth of formative assessments available to teachers and to their students and the skills involved in designing improved instruction to meet the needs of students. Use of this technique, formative assessment, exists in that it is already used by some teachers to some degree. The downfall of some is that the results of these assessments are seldom used for an exact and deliberate change in instructional methods to follow. Also, students seldom have the information they need to take the next step toward mastery; they are unaware of what to do next. This predicament results is students and their teachers feeling frustration and it results in progressively wider skill gaps as students is forced to move "forward" with those gaps in place. The critical change here would occur at the end of the grant year when teachers, having experimented with seven different key strategies that are informal assessments, have learned to modify their teaching practice in targeted ways to help students succeed. 3. Another change would be that teachers, though they might score many kinds of assessments, would "grade" assessments only when students have proven mastery through the informal assessment beforehand. This would be a big esteem-builder to students and also help teachers find the success they seek. 4. Students would become keepers of data, and would take more interest in keeping a record of progress. 5. Assessment would be seen as an organic part of good lesson-planning and delivery, rather than just a way to record a grade. Organizational changes: 1. TBTs would be focused and become action-research teams, an exciting change in emphasis for some faculty; the effect could be that teachers would realize the excitement and confidence that comes with knowing more precisely where there students are, where they are going, and the different routes they might follow to arrive. 2. A common language about formative assessment would prevail.
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.

Some teachers use formative assessments, but on the whole here at Wellington, all teachers can benefit from a more thorough understanding and commitment to their use. The rationale that supports this innovative project and its impact on student achievement is that educational research and real on-the-job experience tells us that teachers need to know the learning intentions and success criteria of their lessons (Hattie, 2009), know to what degree they are meeting these with current instruction, and know what to do next to reach students who are not learning. Rather than looking at student mistakes as failures, teachers need to accept that a close and timely look at mistakes is an arrow to solution of the problems (Roth) they might be having. Something is keeping Wellington students from hitting the mark. We can begin to solve this dilemma with the wise and continual use of formative assessment. The impact on student achievement can be huge if this kind of assessment takes the place of red-pencil-thinking; students can learn from their mistakes if the teachers can assess progress frequently and precisely and use what is learned from the assessments to make adjustments in instruction. An analysis of gains reported in large studies of educational intervention (Black and Wiliam, 1998) found that formative assessment produce score gain of 15 to 25 percentile points on commonly used standardized achievement test scores and greatly increase the achievement of low-performing students. Use of formative assessments, “if applied to performance on recent international assessments, would move the United States’s rank from mid-rank to among the top five nations in academic achievement” (Pg 3, Chappuis, Formative Assessment and Assessment for Learning, 2009). This is a significant reason to learn how to use formative assessments. Formative assessments can become for teachers and students a sort of academic GPS for teaching and learning. Classroom time will be used more efficiently, resources will be purchased for specific tasks and used to best advantage with students, professional development costs will have far-reaching economical worth due to longer-lasting achievement effects and over the years money will be moved to categories where it does the most good for students. Initial outlays of capital investments, if used wisely to produce higher achievement, will generate a successful student population and this will result in greater retention of students, particularly high achieving students, which will bring in greater revenue. Formative Assessment is already in its initial phase of study here in Wellington, having been introduced to our district by the SST region 2 coordinator, Martin Linder. For this reason, and because it is makes powerful, research-based promises toward advancing student achievement, it offers the probability that the teaching innovation it supports will cause significant achievement changes in our district. Another rational for attempting this change with the funded grant initiative is that funding will provide adequate support for human and technical resources in the initial stages of program implementation. After the funding year, a minimum of financial sustainability will be required, and all of that in the normal cost-of-doing-business category, such as equipment replacement costs, renewal of licenses, professional development expenditures, etc. The organizational structure of OIP will function throughout the coming years as this granted study is continued, refined and its topics expanded upon. This means that within the OIP structure, the organization of the project will permit solid communication and ongoing growth as a faculty, to meet future student needs.

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.

Dr. Sally Roth, Director Curriculum/Instruction, Wellington Exempted Village Schools, through Lorain County Educational Service Center, Office phone: 440 647 736. Office address: McCormick School, 201 South Main Street, Wellington, OH 44090. sroth@wellington.k12.oh.us. This will be an internal evaluation, assisted by District Administrative Team, District Leadership Team, Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams & Region 2 SST consultant, Martin Linder. Process: Triangulated Evaluation—1) Survey Results; 2) NWEA MAP achievement benchmark results; and 3) OAA/Next Generation Assessment Results (includes Performance-Based-Assessments and End-of-Year Assessments). This evaluation process will both qualitatively and quantitatively gather data from teachers, administrators, and students about the impact of Project Thrive. Short term objectives to be set by BLTs. Timeline: 1) Surveys will be given monthly to TBTs in October 2014 through April 2015 to gather adult implementation data; 2) NWEA MAP benchmark testing will occur in September and November 2014 and early February 2015, and will gather achievement data grades K-8; 3) Next Generation tests K-12 & OGT will provide achievement data twice, February and April/May 2015. Process: collect, analyze and disseminate data from (1), (2) and (3), via DLT sessions, as data becomes available from BLTs and from test reports. Final evaluation summary report will be compiled by Dr. Roth in July/August 2015 digitally sent to all. Success/failure: reflected on rubric that reflects 3 long-term grant goals and to what extent there is documented evidence supporting each
Method and Types of data to be collected: Progress will be measured by District Administrative Team, District Leadership Team, Building Leadership Teams, & Teacher Based Teams through 1) Teacher Survey Results (monthly short term objectives re: adult implementation); 2) NWEA MAP achievement benchmark data (student progress toward long term achievement objectives); and 3) OAA/Next Generation Assessments data (Performance-Based-Assessments & End-of-Year Assessment results will measure progress toward long term achievement goals). Formative Outputs and systems in place for tracking outcomes: 1) Surveys will be given monthly to TBTs in October 2014 through April 2015 to gather adult implementation data. The results of which may indicate need to modify plan. Modification can be done at the DLT, BLT, and TBT levels; 2) NWEA MAP benchmark testing will occur in September and November 2014 and early February2015, and will gather achievement data grades K-8; the November NWEA reports will indicate patterns in student achievement; modifications to instruction re: use of formative assessments at classroom level can be made Dec.-February; 3) Next Generation tests K-12 & OGT provide achievement data in February and April/May 2015; Feb. assessments can be used formatively to change instruction; April/May will be summative results. Process: collect, analyze and disseminate data from (1), (2) and (3), via DLT sessions, as data becomes available from BLTs & from test reports. Final evaluation summary report will be compiled by Dr. Roth in July/August 2015 digitally sent to all. Success/failure: reflected on a rubric of the 3 long term grant goals. Data will show with documented evidence to what extent each benchmark was met. Summary Evaluation report in August will contain qualitative and quantitative data as described above.

Method to change or modify process or project plan if measured progress is insufficient to meet project objectives: 1) Teacher Survey Results (monthly short term objectives re: adult implementation). Surveys will be given monthly to TBTs October 2014 through April 2015 to gather adult implementation data. Results may indicate need to modify plan, e.g. if less than 80% of teachers are implementing formative assessments in their classrooms. Modification can be done at the DLT, BLT, and TBT levels and reinforced by lead teachers and principals as part of the process as both BLTs and DLT review a summary of survey of month (prepared by Curriculum Director each month). 2) NWEA MAP achievement benchmark data (student progress toward long term achievement objectives) will display the percentage of students in each grade 3-8 who test on track or off track in a projection toward mastery of Common Core objectives; classroom teachers will use benchmark data in November to adjust instruction, supplemented by use of formative assessments to measure incremental steps toward mastery. TBT study of these NWEA MAP data will facilitate this action. 3) OAA/Next Generation Assessment data from Performance-Based-Assessments (PBA) & End-of-Year Assessment results will measure progress toward long term achievement goals. The Performance Based Assessment data will give teachers some indication of how students are prepared for End of Year Assessments and will assist the district grades K-12 in making adjustments to instruction, incorporating to a greater degree applicable formative instruction. PBA results may indicate a rearrangement of FA topics for our study and this would be decided at the DLT level from recommendations from the BLTs.

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 Thrive goals are 1) to give teachers deep knowledge of how to use formative assessments to increase student learning; 2) to train teachers across all subjects and grades to intentionally use formative assessment and with those results to design lessons that effectively increase student achievement and 3) through the use of formative assessments, to enable students to become active and successful learners, eager to not only survive, but thrive in their school experience. The substantial value of the project (quantifiable measures of outcomes) will be measured by these quantifiable pieces: 1) % of teachers complying with adult implementation, as self-reported on monthly surveys, with a goal of no less than 80% participation. 2) Attendance sheets at any professional development sessions dealing with formative assessments (95% minimum expected); attendance sheets at DLT, BLT, & TBT sessions (95% expected attendance); Agendas/notes (specifying how Formative Assessment is used) from Vertical-Articulation meetings involving math, ELA, science and social studies departments, held no less than 2x per year; sample lesson plans specifying changes in instruction due to use of FA. 3) Sample goal-setting and progress tracking documents, either digital or paper/pencil from students whose Formative Assessment data indicated need for changed instruction along the course toward mastery, grades K-12. Lasting Impact after the grant period has expired: Jan Chappuis, in her book Seven Strategies of Assessment For Learning (2009), specifies (Pg.4) that formative assessment is not an instrument, but rather is the use of the information gathered. Teachers in this district are becoming accustomed to gathering, even displaying data about their students, but they have lacked sufficient and helpful information about how to USE that data specifically to assist learners. Project Thrive will provide lasting impact by 1) thoroughly training teachers at all levels ways in which to use data formatively, 2) providing enough resources (digital and otherwise) to have sufficient means to address student needs, 3) activating students, by providing frequent and meaningful performance feedback, and 4) demonstrating that the OIP process is a cyclical mechanism for professional growth and sustenance of communication through all levels of the school district. In addition, the leadership capacity of the district will have been enhanced through Project Thrive grant activities so that the impact of strongly confident teachers and administrators working together to achieve the district's mission and vision will continue to be realized over subsequent years. More fully aware of goal-setting and tracking of progress, and bolstered by frequent meaningful feedback from formative assessments, students may be successfully challenged to increase achievement in the classroom and on mandated assessments, resulting in a greater % of our students graduating and going on to post-graduate training. Another sustainability measure would be that the LMS would be in place and further training would be less needed each year after the grant.

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 include:

* Student Achievement

1. Project Thrive will give teachers a deep knowledge of formative assessments & increase student learning. 2. Teachers across all subjects/grades, through the intentional use of regularly-administered formative assessments & their results, will increase student achievement. 3. Project Thrive, through powerful use of formative assessments, will result in internalized student beliefs that through goal-setting & data-examination of progress toward the goal, learners can not only survive, but thrive in their school experience. Project goals help teachers increase student achievement & students will use tablets to set/measure goals & improve performance. For Project Goals 1, 2, 3 the measurement periods will be monthly (teachers) & periodic student assessment: NWEA 3 X per yr, & ODE 2X. September 2014: Presentation to Curriculum/Technology Committee and Board of Education to explain Project Thrive; notes as a beginning benchmark along with NWEA Benchmark results, baseline grades 4-8. October '14 Clear Learning Targets Formative Assessment: Teacher survey results will provide measurable documentation of adults using this method; notes of Professional Development at TBT and BLT meetings will substantiate; principal walk-throughs will give anecdotal evidence. November '14: Effective Feedback: Teacher survey results, team meeting data, and work samples; NWEA student benchmark data grades 4-8. December '14: Student Self-assessment & Goal Setting: Teacher survey results, team data, work samples of student goal setting and record-keeping via Excel spreadsheets or use of LMS January '15: Focused Teaching & Revision: Teacher survey results, team notes, sample test items used by teachers; achievement scores from informal assessments used. Feb.'15: Tracking, Reflecting, Teacher survey results, team notes, reflections samples, tracking examples. NWEA Benchmark 3, 4-8, PBA/ODE March '15: Sharing Learning; Surveys April '15: Evaluating: What practices have changed? May '15: Final Eval.

* Spending Reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast

Assumptions and notes for reports on the five-year forecast can be the source of annual monitoring of expenditures and savings related to Project Thrive. The Board of Education receives a monthly update from the treasurer on the progress of the five year forecast, and the director of curriculum reports to the Board on instructional progress which would include Project Thrive. Benchmarks would be monitored monthly and annually in this way.

* 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

This project could be easily replicated by any district that has either been involved in the OIP process or has adopted a similar internal organization or infrastructure for communication, professional development and fiscal budgeting. Key to a project like this is that the different departments involved must communicate together and must have a similar vision. For Project Thrive, for example, the curriculum and technology departments worked closely to plan a grant that could take place with a minimum of external assistance because the district can use existing infrastructure to develop staff teaching expertise. As it turns out, a small but substantial cost savings can be projected following initial implementation, but even if this were not the case, the project itself after the first year would not be expensive to maintain because it relies on careful scheduling of existing personnel into professional development modules. None of these things is dependent on the size or relative wealth of a district for success. It is more accurately dependent on attitude and perseverance. Obviously good organization is a must. To that end, the grant-writing crew referred often to the district Technology Plan to make certain that grant goals were consistent with the capacity of our district & the direction in which the Curriculum/Tech Committee agreed was a sound compass for Wellington Exempted Village Schools, a small, rural but very determined district, determined to increase student success at all levels. This project can be expanded upon because as achievement data is analyzed over the next two years, and compared with previous data for trend examination, teachers will be able to select which of the formative assessment strategies "seemed, according to performance data" to produce the greatest change in student achievement. Teachers can then recommend more in-depth study and experimentation (or action research) with those teaching methods most productive with their objectives. Another way Project Thrive would be able to be expanded would be for our district to use the same infrastructure or organization of deliverables to delve into another subject: how to help our students achieve on FORMAL ASSESSMENTS & ODE 2X. September 2014: Presentation to Curriculum/Technology Committee and Board of Education to explain Project Thrive; notes as a beginning benchmark along with NWEA Benchmark results, baseline grades 4-8. October '14 Clear Learning Targets Formative Assessment: Teacher survey results will provide measurable documentation of adults using this method; notes of Professional Development at TBT and BLT meetings will substantiate; principal walk-throughs will give anecdotal evidence. November '14: Effective Feedback: Teacher survey results, team meeting data, and work samples; NWEA student benchmark data grades 4-8. December '14: Student Self-assessment & Goal Setting: Teacher survey results, team data, work samples of student goal setting and record-keeping via Excel spreadsheets or use of LMS January '15: Focused Teaching & Revision: Teacher survey results, team notes, sample test items used by teachers; achievement scores from informal assessments used. Feb.'15: Tracking, Reflecting, Teacher survey results, team notes, reflections samples, tracking examples. NWEA Benchmark 3, 4-8, PBA/ODE March '15: Sharing Learning; Surveys April '15: Evaluating: What practices have changed? May '15: Final Eval.

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.
No consortium contacts added yet. Please add a new consortium contact using the form below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Wellington Exempted Village (045658) - Lorain 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Prior Relevant Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>Dr. Sally Roth, Director of Curriculum, is the Internal Facilitator of the District Leadership Team (DLT), along with Martin Linder, External Facilitator of the DLT, who is also the SST Region 2 consultant for Wellington Exempted Village Schools, Dr. Roth will attend all DLT meetings and help to further a deep knowledge of the use of Formative Assessment. She is responsible for providing all teachers with the study curriculum authored by Jan Chappuis, of the Assessment Training Institute (Pearson), whose book: Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning, the DLT and all teachers will study in the first year of the grant. She will be responsible for coordinating the OIP (Ohio Improvement Process) goals with the goals of this Project Thrive. She will assist Supt. John Nolan in interpreting activities of the grant, its expenditures, professional development, and outcomes and communicating these to the public, the staff, and the Board of Education. She will work with Mr. Linder and Moira Erwine, Director of Professional Development at the Lorain County ESC to arrange study opportunities for staff. Dr. Roth will lead the following members of the DLT: Wendy Rappach, Title I Teacher, Grades K-3; Catherine Selzer, Grade 3 Teacher; Toby Runkle, Grade 8 Intervention; Katie Haas, Grade 3 Intervention; Lois Lane-Unger, Title I Teacher, Grades 4-6; Brook Ruffing, High School Intervention; Nathan Morris, High School Math; Martin Linder, SST Consultant, Region 2; Wellington Principals (all); John Nolan, Superintendent; Dr. Sally Roth, Curriculum. This team engages at least monthly in the OIP (Ohio Improvement Process) discussions to review district data, clarify priorities, and review district vision, mission, goals and strategies in order to provide forward direction for Building Leadership Teams.</td>
<td>Dr. Roth is licensed as a teacher K-8, reading specialist, principal, supervisor and superintendent. She has been an educator over 45 years. Her degrees in Middle and Childhood Education are from The Ohio State University and her doctorate in Educational Leadership is from Ohio University, Athens; in addition she holds a Master in Fine Arts in Writing for Children and Young Adults from Vermont College. She initiated a Multiage Education Program at Perkins Local Schools which is now nearly a decade in successful operation, born of a Venture Capital Grant from ODE. She initiated a Reading First Grant at Sandusky City Schools, the effects of which produced a turn-around in successful reading instruction there in grades K-3. She has been a central office team member for over 13 years, in various venues, and has served on successful negotiations teams.</td>
<td>All of Dr. Roth's prior experience has been in Ohio Public Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Mr. Nolan, Superintendent, will lead the team of administrators to full engage in Project Thrive. He officially supervises all personnel the exception of the district treasurer. He will hold regular meetings with the following personnel to discuss the progress of the grant: Chris Wert, Wellington High School Principal; Todd Hodkey, Wellington High School Assistant Principal; Tim Simpson, McCormick Middle School Principal, grades 4-6; Craig Housum, McCormick Middle School Principal, grades 7 &amp; 8; Jill Beiser, Principal, Westwood Elementary School; Laura Groboske, Special Education Coordinator; Dr. Sally Roth, Director of Curriculum; Suzanne Wilson, Treasurer. The administrative team plus other district supervisors will meet regularly to share and plan operations and progress in buildings and to coordinate professional development for Wellington Principals (all) and to coordinate professional development for the staff, and the Board of Education. She will work with Mr. Linder and Moira Erwine, Director of Professional Development at the Lorain County ESC to arrange study opportunities for staff. Dr. Roth will lead the following members of the DLT: Wendy Rappach, Title I Teacher, Grades K-3; Catherine Selzer, Grade 3 Teacher; Toby Runkle, Grade 8 Intervention; Katie Haas, Grade 3 Intervention; Lois Lane-Unger, Title I Teacher, Grades 4-6; Brook Ruffing, High School Intervention; Nathan Morris, High School Math; Martin Linder, SST Consultant, Region 2; Wellington Principals (all); John Nolan, Superintendent; Dr. Sally Roth, Curriculum. This team engages at least monthly in the OIP (Ohio Improvement Process) discussions to review district data, clarify priorities, and review district vision, mission, goals and strategies in order to provide forward direction for Building Leadership Teams.</td>
<td>Mr. Nolan is in his second year as Superintendent of the Wellington Exempted Village Schools. His experience as a teacher, building administrator and superintendent spans over 40 years and includes roles in both public and career tech institutions in locations throughout Ohio. His academic background includes The Ohio State University.</td>
<td>Mr. Nolan has overseen a number of innovations in other school districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the teachers surrounding the goals of the grant. This team will share information in monthly news bulletins and presentations to the Board of Education at public Board of Education meetings, as directed by Supt. Nolan. In this sense, the Administrative Team is a team that will oversee the grant progress. Mr. Nolan will participate in a leadership role for updating the district about Project Thrive and its impact on teachers and students. He will work closely with the treasurer regarding the five-year forecast and any savings or expenses attributed to the grant.