Budget

Forest Hills Local (047340) - Hamilton County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (43)

U.S.A.S. Fund #: 466

Plus/Minus Sheet (opens new window)

Object Code / Purpose 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	325,000.00	0.00	0.00	325,000.00
Support Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Governance/Admin	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prof Development	3,750.00	0.00	445,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	449,250.00
Family/Community	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00
Safety	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Facilities	0.00	0.00	175,000.00	40,000.00	0.00	0.00	215,000.00
Transportation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indirect Cost						0.00	0.00
Total	3,750.00	0.00	630,500.00	365,000.00	0.00	0.00	999,250.00
						Adjusted Allocation	0.00
						Remaining	-999,250.00

Application

Forest Hills Local (047340) - Hamilton County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (43)

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

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
District Retool: Changing mindsets, personalizing pathways, and reimagining space

2. Project Summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.
FHSD will integrate design thinking, personalized learning, and innovative learning spaces to benefit its educational culture and outcomes.

This is an ultra-concise description of the overall project. It should only include a brief description of the project and the goals it hopes to achieve.

3. Estimate of total students at each grade level to be directly impacted each year.

*This is the number of students that will receive services or other benefits as a **direct result** of implementing this project. This does not include students that may be impacted if the project is replicated or scaled up in the future. It excludes students who have merely a tangential or indirect benefit (such as students having use of improved facilities, equipment etc. for other uses than those intended as a part of the project). The Grant Year is the year in which funds are received from the Ohio Department of Education. Years 1 through 5 are the sustainability years during which the project must be fiscally and programmatically sustained.*

Grant Year

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	510 3
533 4	547 5	602 6	618 7	573 8
623 9	678 10	528 11	521 12	

Year 1

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	560 3
510 4	533 5	547 6	602 7	618 8
573 9	623 10	678 11	528 12	

Year 2

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	503 3
560 4	510 5	533 6	547 7	602 8
618 9	573 10	623 11	678 12	

Year 3

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	500 3
503 4	560 5	510 6	533 7	547 8
602 9	618 10	573 11	623 12	

Year 4

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	500 3
500 4	503 5	560 6	510 7	533 8
547 9	602 10	618 11	573 12	

Year 5

Pre-K Special Education	K	1	2	500 3
500 4	500 5	503 6	560 7	510 8

533 9	547 10	602 11	618 12

4. Explanation of any additional students to be impacted throughout the life of the project.
This includes any students impacted or estimates of students who might be impacted through future scale-ups or replications that go beyond the scope of this project.

Ultimately, this project will impact the entire Forest Hills School District - totaling nine schools and approximately 7,400 students in grades PK-12: Firstly, the project will be thoroughly evaluated and fine-tuned, then replicated and expanded in scope over time, to eventually include all District schools and students, as further detailed below. Secondly, this innovative combination of approaches will also become embedded across the District's educational and administrative culture, and will be the focus of District-wide professional development for at least the grant year and the following five sustainability years, such that all District educators and staff will be trained in these methodologies and will use them in their classrooms.

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

First and last name of contact for lead applicant
Natasha L. Adams

Organizational name of lead applicant
Forest Hills School District

Address of lead applicant
7550 Forest Road

Phone Number of lead applicant
513-231-3600

Email Address of lead applicant
natashaadams@foresthills.edu

Community School Applicants: After your application has been submitted and is in Authorized Representative Approved status an email will be sent to your sponsoring entity automatically informing the sponsor of your application.

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 (vendors, service providers, sponsors, management companies, schools, districts, ESCs, IHEs) 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. The following questions will address specific outcomes and measures of success.

a. The current state or problem to be solved; and

Forest Hills School District (FHSD) is a high performing district utilizing a recently-passed bond issue to fund modernizing upgrades to all nine of its school facilities. However, its educational framework is an outdated, traditional, didactic model that does not do its best to engage students and connect their learning with the realities of the 21st century world they will encounter. Therefore, FHSD seeks to maximize the benefits of its physical upgrades by transforming its learning landscape at the same time, such that both will reflect the shift from a 20th century teacher-centered, content-driven learning environment to 21st century student-centered, skills-based learning environment. Research confirms that in the past several decades, the industrial, manufacturing-based economy has shifted dramatically to a service economy driven by information, knowledge and innovation (Karmarkar & Apte, 2007, and Apte, Karmarkar & Nath, 2008, Anderson School of Management, UCLA). This new economy demands advanced skill sets that rise beyond easily automated tasks, to a higher level of complex thinking, problem solving, teamwork and communication, adaptability, creativity and innovation (Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, 2007). Downward trends among some Forest Hills district benchmark rates since 2012 - for example, K-12 course failures increasing from 827 to 979; grade

failures also increasing, and ninth and tenth grade suspension rates more than doubling - indicate that the district must do a better job of preparing its students for this changing economic landscape, by connecting their studies with the real-world relevance and skills they will need in the working world. Making this connection clearer will help students engage better and take more responsibility for their own learning, because they will understand the difference it makes in their long term futures.

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

Therefore, while using its bond funding for major capital improvements in all district school buildings (including heating, air conditioning, safety and security, structural safety, and other renovations needed to bring the buildings up to state standards), it is equally imperative to bring the school's learning methodologies up to date as well. The proposed innovation to solve this problem is a combination of three elements - personalized learning, design thinking, and innovative learning spaces - to refocus the district's educational framework as a learner-centered model. This combination will create a new district-wide educational culture that helps students develop relevant 21st century skills, fosters personal engagement and responsibility, and retools classrooms to facilitate these approaches. Thus the district will overhaul its educational mindset, pedagogy and learning environment, to improve outcomes and better prepare students, using the three elements as follows: FHSD began implementing personalized learning (PL) in the 2014-15 school year by developing professional development individualized to teachers' needs and interests. PL enables teachers to work to customize their professional development content and scheduling, while immersing themselves in the same PL process they will use with students. Translating PL into the classroom similarly begins with creating learner profiles for all students, to give teachers insight into how each student learns and enable students to customize their learning paths, pace, needs and interests. Leveraging technology to expand learning resources is central to PL, giving students greater autonomy, engagement, individualization and differentiation, and more active, responsible, enriched learning experiences ("Independent Learning Plans," SchoolRetool.org). Independent access to global education resources further opens students to limitless learning possibilities, while community partnerships enable students to try potential career fields, gain work experience and deepen personalization. Design thinking (DT) is a methodology that teaches new strategies to creatively solve complex problems. DT is a practical tool that integrates 21st century skills and innovative mindsets into schools and classrooms, by demonstrating the direct connection between classroom content and real world relevance ("Design Thinking," Createdu.org). Thus DT helps students build higher level skill sets like critical and creative thinking, collaboration, complex problem solving, resilience and inquisitiveness, while making learning experiences more engaging and practical. Design thinking will serve three roles in this project: (1) helping school administrators solve institutional issues, like master scheduling and multiple pathways, (2) helping educators improve learning experiences and environments, and (3) instilling valuable design thinking skills in students ("Research on Design Thinking," dschool.standford.edu). Educators and administrators will train in Summer 2016 to use design thinking to solve educational and administrative challenges, and will then apply it during the 2016-17 school year (www.designthinkingforeducators.com). The third element, the learning environment (LE), ties back to the first two, as: (1) the District creates a shared district-wide innovation incubation hub, to practice design thinking during the grant year and serve as a model for using design thinking to retool all district classrooms during sustainability years 1-3, and (2) the first Classroom Retool Team, comprised of teachers, pilots design thinking by working with and empowering students through the shared design thinking process, retooling classrooms into more flexible, "defronted" learning areas, better suited to design thinking and personalized learning ("Defront the Classroom: Set up for student-centered learning," Schoolretool.org).

9. Select which (up to four) of the goals your project will address. For each of the selected goals, please provide the requested information to demonstrate your innovative project. - (Check all that apply)

☑ a. Student achievement

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: fewer students retained at 3rd grade, increase in graduation rate, increased proficiency rate in a content area, etc.

The district seeks to increase student achievement in grades 3-12 by implementing student-centered approaches that promote positive student outcomes in academic knowledge and skills, while also encouraging mastery of essential soft skills, such as learning how to learn, connecting learning to the real world, receiving and incorporating feedback, interdisciplinary learning, and opportunities for collaboration and communication. Based upon extensive research into innovative learning practices over the past two years, as well as preliminary consultation with Xavier University's Center for Innovation, and previous collaboration with the Forest Hills Teachers Association, FHSD leadership believes that a district-wide emphasis on the student-centered approaches of design thinking, personalized learning and innovative learning space will produce the following desired student outcomes: -increase proficiency rates in core content areas (math, English language arts, science, and social studies) for all students, especially those with disabilities and those who are economically disadvantaged (FHSD's lowest proficiency students) -decrease suspension and expulsion rates -increase course passage rates, reducing the need for credit recovery -increase engagement in classroom experiences -reduce the number of students designated "at risk" and transferred to Forest Hills Academy (alternative program for at-risk students) -increase quarter and trimester class grades -increase 21st century skills like reflection, mindfulness, effective collaboration, complex problem-solving, creative thinking, and efficient use of resources -increase student ownership through student voice, choice and more control over pace and path -increase positive and hopeful feelings about the future

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Examples: early diagnosis and intervention are needed to support all children learning to read on grade level; project-based learning results in higher levels of student engagement and learning, etc.

Personalized learning helps each student customize the course of study and learning tools best suited to the student's individual strengths, interests, and learning style, while inherently empowering and engaging the student. Teachers need personalized learning professional development in order to experience it themselves before implementing it and leading the deeper cultural shift that this innovation is intended to drive. Engaging in student-centered design thinking results in improved outcomes for students, including higher rates of engagement, improved behavior, and increased proficiency in core content areas. Design thinking is a practical, replicable, step-by-step approach to developing students' 21st century learning and innovation skills, such as creativity, problem-solving, critical thinking, communication and collaboration. Design thinking is also effective for helping teachers and administrators find innovative solutions to their particular professional challenges. A flexible, "defronted" classroom learning environment enhances learning for all students and renders the retooled classroom more conducive to implementing design thinking and personalized learning. School leaders can redesign school culture by starting with small experiments called "hacks," that are built on research-based practices leading to the bigger changes we aspire to: preparing students for life in the real world. ("We believe big changes start small," SchoolRetool.org) Teachers and students

participating in the first Classroom Retool Team will be eager to use design thinking, personalized learning strategies in innovative learning spaces to improve their experiences and outcomes. Teachers and students who are not part of the first Classroom Retool Team will be curious and eager to participate, gain empowerment and generate their own ideas.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

The proposed combination of personalized learning, design thinking, and innovative learning environments is central to the district's effort to reshape its educational culture while overhauling its facilities. Early efforts to test and support the above assumptions include: The district began implementing personalized student learning this year, as an outgrowth of personalized learning professional development (PLPD) for teachers. Based on lessons learned from previous professional development models, the district recognized the importance of personalized learning that enables teachers to choose their own pathways, matching their independent learning with their needs and interests. In this vein, several small groups of self-selected teachers began studying and piloting personalized learning strategies in their classrooms. This professional development model - teachers choosing and experiencing the models they will teach their students - emerged as a highly effective, replicable approach. The partnership of the Forest Hills Teachers Association was vital to this early innovation. Research also supports personalized learning as an effective model. For example, a study on "Motivation, Engagement, and Student Voice" (Toshalis and Nakkula, "Students at the Center: Teaching and Learning in the Era of the Common Core," April 2012), observed: "to meet the challenge of reaching every student in today's diverse classrooms, customized teaching approaches that differentiate instruction tend to work far better than one-size-fits-all techniques." The U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement, echoes this idea: "This type of learning leads to better student engagement because the content is relevant to each student and tailored to their unique needs. It also leads to better student outcomes because the pace of learning is customized to each student" ("Competency-Based Learning or Personalized Learning," www.innovation.ed.gov). Building on its initial success with personalized learning, the district hosted a design thinking challenge for students, parents and staff, to explain the rationale behind design thinking, demonstrate how it works, and explain how the District could use it to enhance learning and innovation skills. Participants found the concept and potential of design thinking highly encouraging and provided very positive feedback, affirming the collective "buy-in" to implement it. Several studies corroborate this positive feedback, including one at Stanford University, which found that during design thinking activities, students showed positive affect, collaborated well, preferred active learning, felt more engaged by expressing their opinions, and were challenged to think in new ways, take risks and share ideas. ("Destination, Imagination, and the Fires Within: Design Thinking in a Middle School Classroom," Carroll, Goldman, Britos, Koh, Royalty and Hornstein, Taking Design Thinking to Schools Research Project, Stanford University Institute of Design). The report concludes that students "were energized, excited and challenged by their design tasks as they brainstormed with their peers" and that design thinking can empower students with the tools and confidence to change our increasingly complex world. Lastly, the "defronted classroom" set up for student-centered learning is also well supported by many schools that have successfully adopted this approach. School Retool, which focuses on redesigning school culture by starting with small experiments, or "hacks," makes the case that small shifts in learning space "can radically shift behavior." Shifting classrooms so the teacher is no longer the focal point helps to foster a learner-centered environment that encourages positive changes in student behaviors, such as speaking up more in class, feeling empowered, and feeling more deeply engaged and invested in learning. ("Big Ideas: Defront the Classroom," www.schoolretool.org)

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to measure progress toward your desired outcome.
These should be measurable changes, not merely the accomplishment of tasks. Example: Teachers will each implement one new project using new collaborative instructional skills, (indicates a change in the classroom) NOT; teachers will be trained in collaborative instruction (which may or may not result in change).

Design Thinking & Personalized Learning: Each teacher trained in the first cohort will implement at least two design challenges in the classroom. The first will be the classroom retool at the beginning of the school year. The second will focus on a real-world topic to be determined with the class and explored using design thinking throughout the school year. District administrators will utilize design thinking to resolve specific administrative issues, such as creating new district master schedules, multiple pathways, and planning a personalized professional development learning program. Students will have increased learning options, instead of 'one-size-fits-all'. Students will have more voice, choice and control over pace and path through teachers providing at least 5 student-centered lessons per quarter/trimester. Students will feel engaged with their learning. Students will have more opportunities to develop 21st century learning and innovation skills, such as problem solving, creative thinking, collaboration and flexibility. The innovation incubation hub will be the shared home base for district-wide design thinking during the grant year. Administrators, teachers and students will use the hub to practice applying design thinking to their respective work. The hub will also serve as the model for the classroom retools to be rolled out across all schools within the first two sustainability years of the grant. Students will have more opportunities for college-career readiness opportunities, like guest speakers, "experienceships" and internships. Innovative learning environments: Classrooms will become defronted/decentralized learning environments that are student-centered, rather than teacher-centered. The retooled classroom setup will be more conducive to personalized learning and design thinking, with dynamic, adaptable classroom layouts encouraging increased student participation, collaboration and empowerment.

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to measure student achievement, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.

Quarterly measures: - Forest Hills Academy (alternative program for at-risk students): As of November 2015, there are 32 students in the program, already exceeding the amount in the entire previous school year. - Quarter and trimester grades Annual measures: - Course passage rates: K-12 three-year increase from 827 course failures to 979. - Grade level failure rates: Most concerning grades are: 9th (4.2%) and 10th (4.6%). - Discipline rates: 5th-12th grade (2014-15): Suspensions (105), Expulsions (9) - Proficiency rates in core content areas Preliminary data-(American Government, American History, English Language Arts (ELA), Math, Reading, Science, Social Studies (SS): - Most concerning grade levels and subjects are: 3rd Reading (93%), 4th ELA (85%), 5th ELA (87%), 6th ELA (86%), 7th ELA (88%), 8th ELA (86%), 9th ELA (91%), 3rd Math (82%), 4th Math (84%), 5th Math (87%), 7th Math (87%), 8th Math (82%), 4th SS (89%), 6th SS (79%), 5th Science (82%), 8th Science (84%), 10th American History (84%), 12th American Government (81%) - Students with Disabilities (2013-14): Reading (65.5%) & Math (53.3%) (2014-15 Preliminary): ELA (36%) & Math (37%) - Economically Disadvantaged Students (2013-14): Reading (83.2%) & Math (78.8%) (2014-15 Preliminary): ELA (67%) & Math (66%) Qualitative measures: - Personalized Learning & Design Thinking: The District does not currently collect perception data of student engagement or 21st century skills. Therefore, the District will begin administering the Gallup Hope and Engagement survey (http://www.gallupstudentpoll.com/) annually to 5th-12th graders as well as co-develop a tool to measure 21st century skills.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

Since different measures will be taken at different intervals during the school year, as outlined above, reviewing these measures will be an ongoing process. If assumptions prove false and/or outcomes are not realized, the project leaders will conduct a team design thinking process in order to review the quantitative and qualitative data, identify and retain the project components that are working as intended, and determine how to modify the components that are not working as intended. The project leaders may also consult with the Xavier Innovation Center as needed, and may bring in the Xavier consultants and/or District instructional coaches for additional training sessions, if warranted. Thus, the project team is prepared to methodically alter the course of the project if necessary. The District will thereby demonstrate its own flexibility to adjust project plans as appropriate, in order to achieve the desired educational outcomes for the Forest Hills School District and its students.

☑ b. Spending reductions in the 5 year forecast

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: lowered facility cost as a result of transition to more efficient systems of heating and lighting, etc.; or cost savings due to transition from textbook to digital resources for teaching.

Significantly reduced cost for substitute teachers (who were previously used when teachers participated in offsite professional development), resulting from bringing professional development 'in-house' for the grant year and the five sustainability years, as compared with what the District would have spent on professional development expenses otherwise. Cost savings due to fewer teacher leader positions needed to support the new personalized professional development model. At least one FTE teacher leader is expected to retire during the grant or sustainability period and the position will not be rehired.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Example: transition to "green energy" solutions produce financial efficiencies, etc.; or available digital resources are equivalent to or better than previously purchased textbooks.

Bringing professional development 'in-house' for the grant year and the subsequent five sustainability years will cost significantly less than what the District would have spent on professional development otherwise, mainly due to the reduced cost for substitute teachers who were previously needed when teachers participated in offsite professional development. With an in-house program, far fewer substitutes will be needed, because most teachers will not need to go offsite to participate in professional development during the school day, as the personalized program can be scheduled at teachers' convenience. Reducing the need for teacher leader positions to support the new personalized learning professional development model will also reduce total professional development staffing costs, because at least one FTE teacher leader is expected to retire during the grant or sustainability period, and the position will not be rehired, because the new in-house program reduces the need for staff support.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

The district's primary early efforts to test these assumptions include both the initial pilot implementation of the personalized professional development model, as well as the carefully calculated cost savings that are outlined in both the budget and the financial impact table, and also borne out in practice in the initial pilot implementation. In short, this is simply a logical argument based on the projected cost reductions in the professional development budget, which are explained above (including reductions in the need for substitute teachers, the need for offsite professional development programs/materials/etc., and the need for professional development staff support), and which are thus far proving accurate based on the current implementation.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcome.
These should be specific dollar savings amounts. THESE MUST MATCH THE COST SAVINGS AS PROJECTED IN THE FINANCIAL IMPACT TABLE (FIT).

FHSD will save a total of $440,659 by reducing the costs of substitutes by one third. (Including 3% expected cost of living, annual amounts = $83,000 year 1, $85,490 year 2, $88,055 year 3, $90,697 year 4, $93,418 year 5.) FHSD will save a total of $433,224 through the reduction of 1 FTE teacher leader position. (Including 3% expected cost of living, annual amounts = $81,600 year 1, $84,048 in year 2, $86,569 year 3, $89,166 year 4, $91,841 year 5.)

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to measure spending reductions, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.

Expenditures for substitute teachers, currently at $253,192.50 per year. The reduction by one third, beginning with $83,000 in the year 1, provides the basis for the spending reduction calculation. Reduction of 1 FTE: Currently, the cost of one FTE Teacher Leader is $81,600 (salary + benefits). The loss of this position through attrition provides the basis for the spending reduction calculation.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

If project assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized, the project team and treasurer are prepared to adjust the project's timeline and roll out plan as needed. If necessary, they will conduct a team design thinking process in order to review assumptions and outcomes, identify what needs to be modified, and determine the appropriate fixes to implement. The project leaders may also consult with the Xavier Innovation Center, if warranted. In short, the project team will carefully and methodically determine how best to alter the project if necessary. The District will thereby demonstrate its own flexibility to adjust project plans as appropriate, in order to achieve the desired educational outcomes for the Forest Hills School District and its students.

☐ c. Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom

i. List the desired outcomes.
Example: change the ratio of leadership time spent in response to discipline issues to the time available for curricular leadership.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Examples: improvements to school and classroom climate will result in fewer disciplinary instances allowing leadership to devote more time to

curricular oversight.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

iv. Please provide the most recent instructional spending percentage (from the annual Ohio School Report Card) and discuss any impact you anticipate as a result of this project.
Note: this is the preferred indictor for this goal.

v. List any additional indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcome. Provide baseline data if available.
These should be specific outcomes, not just the accomplishment of tasks. Example: fewer instances of playground fighting.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

☐ d. Implementing a shared services delivery model

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: increase in quality and quantity of employment applications to districts; greater efficiency in delivery of transportation services, etc.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Example: neighboring districts have overlapping needs in administrative areas that can be combined to create efficiencies.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, data analysis etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcomes.
These should be measureable changes, not the accomplishment of tasks.
Example: consolidation of transportation services between two districts.

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to evaluate the success of your efforts, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.
Example: change in the number of school buses or miles travelled.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

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

☐ a. New - Never before implemented

☐ b. Existing - Never implemented in your community school or school district but proven successful in other educational environments

☐ c. Replication - Expansion or new implementation of a previous Straight A Project

☑ d. Mixed Concept - Incorporates new and existing elements

☐ e. Established - Elevating or expanding an effective program that is already implemented in your district, school or consortia partnership

C) BUDGET AND SUSTAINABILITY

11. Financial Information: - All applicants must enter or upload the following supporting information. The information in these documents must correspond to your responses in questions 12-19.

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

Enter Budget

b. If applicable, upload the Consortium Budget Worksheet (by clicking the Upload Documents link below)

c. Upload the Financial Impact Table (by clicking the Upload Documents link below)

Upload Documents

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 of the workbook. Applicants must submit one Financial Impact Table with each application. For consortium applications, please add additional sheets instead of submitting separate Financial Impact Tables.

999,250.00 12. What is the amount of this grant request?

13. Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.
Responses should provide a 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.

Purchased Services/Professional Development: $24,000 for 80 individuals to participate in design thinking simulation presented by Xavier University. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $18,000 for 6 individuals to participate in Train-the-Trainer Facilitator training presented by Xavier University. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $50,000 for design thinking consultation by Xavier University. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $30,000 for academics outcome assessment/evaluation by Xavier University. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $50,000 for design thinking & personalized learning outcomes assessment/evaluation by Ramsey Ford, Design Impact. Supplies and Materials/Instruction: $325,000 for Incubator Spaces - furniture and supplies for flexible learning spaces ($225,000); equipment for videography, recording and photography studios; 3D printers and other technology ($100,000). Purchased Services/Facilities: $215,000 for Incubator Space Elevator ($175,000); infrastructure - wireless, phone, copiers, cabling, TVs, Chrome box for meetings, ($40,000). Purchased Services/Professional Development: $205,000 for consultants to assist in designing a robust, research-based course for sustainable learning in personalized learning, design thinking and space redesign. Consultants may include professionals such as David Jakes for classroom retool, Sheryl Nussbaum-Beach for online course design, Tim Kubik for Authentic Relevel Complex project based learning, and Dr. Lauren Angelone for blended learning. Salaries/Professional Development: $3,750 to pay teachers for professional development sessions for Teacher Leaders (5 days x 6 hours x $25 curriculum pay x 5 people). Supplies/Professional Development: $25,000 for professional development materials and supplies. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $10,000 for certificated meeting expenses. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $13,500 travel costs for team members to visit high-performing schools and design thinking districts. Purchased Services/Professional Development: $20,000 fees and travel costs for team member to attend Stanford d.school training. Purchased Services/Family-Community: $10,000 for marketing materials for community education and engagement.

14. Please provide an estimate of the total costs associated with maintaining this program through each of the five years following the initial grant implementation year (sustainability costs). This is the sum of expenditures from Section A of the Financial Impact Table.

73,800.00 a. Sustainability Year 1

76,014.00 b. Sustainability Year 2

78,294.00 c. Sustainability Year 3

90,644.00 d. Sustainability Year 4

93,062.00 e. Sustainability Year 5

15. Please provide a narrative explanation of sustainability costs.
Sustainability costs include any ongoing spending related to the grant project after June 30, 2017. Examples of sustainability costs include annual professional development, staffing costs, equipment maintenance, and software license agreements. To every extent possible, rationale for the specific amounts given should be outlined. The costs outlined in this 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.

Although most of the project costs are one-time purchases during the grant year, such as visits to other sites, consultants to design and implement professional development and train district leaders, and to purchase furniture and equipment, there are several sustainability costs to continue the program through FY22: The District will hire a .5 FTE to lead and manage the district innovation incubation hub (Personal Services: Salary + Benefits = $216,613, calculation includes 3% expected cost of living increase/year). Ongoing operational costs of $175,202 associated with the district innovation incubation hub include: copiers (annually $3,150), internet service ($2,400), and square footage costs of space. Expected replacement costs for infrastructure and/or equipment include $10,000 each in years 4 and 5.

100 16. What percentage of these costs will be met through cost savings achieved through implementation of the program?

Total cost savings from section B of the Financial Impact Table divided by total sustainability cost from section A of the Financial Impact Table. If the calculated amount is greater than 100, enter 100 here.

17. Please explain how these cost savings will be derived from the program.
Applicants who selected spending reductions in the five-year forecast as a goal must identify those expected savings in questions 16 and 17. All spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. Explanation of savings must be specific as to staff counts; salary/benefits; equipment costs, etc.

In Years 1-5, the project will save the cost of 1 FTE (Personal Services: salary + benefits = $433,224) in the position of Teacher Leader (calculation includes 3% expected cost of living increase/year). This position is responsible for conducting teacher professional development. There is an expected retirement in this position, and the position will not be refilled due to the creation of the Personalized Learning Professional Development that is part of this project; the availability of online courses and materials will lessen the need for some person-to-person professional development activities. In Years 1-5, the project will save the cost of professional development (Purchased Services: $440,659, calculation includes expected increases of 3% in substitute teacher costs each year) through a reduction in substitute teacher costs for 750 fewer days per year spent in professional development pull out sessions due to the creation of the Personalized Learning Professional Development.

0 18. What percentage of sustainability costs will be met through reallocation of savings from elsewhere in the general budget?

Total reallocation from section C of the Financial Impact Table divided by total sustainability cost from section A of the Financial Impact Table
Note: the responses to questions 16 and 18 must total 100%

19. Please explain the source of these reallocated funds.
Reallocation of funds implies that a reduction has been made elsewhere in the budget. Straight A encourages projects to determine up front what can be replaced in order to ensure the life of the innovative project.

N/A

D) IMPLEMENTATION

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

This response should include a list of qualifications for the applicant and others associated with the grant. Please list key personnel only. 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 Key Personnel information by clicking the link below:

Add Implementation - Key Personnel

For Questions 21-23 please describe each phase of your project including its timeline, and scope of work.

A complete response to these questions will demonstrate awareness of the context in which the project will be implemented and the time it will take to implement the project with fidelity. A strong plan for implementing, communicating and coordinating the project should be apparent, including coordination and communication in and amongst members of the consortium or partnership (if applicable). Not every specific action step need be included, but the outline of the major steps should demonstrate a thoughtful plan for achieving the goals of the project. The timeline should reflect significant and important milestones in an appropriate time frame.

21. Planning

a. Date RangeFebruary-March 2016

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks.

Design Thinking (DT): District Project Team (Director of Instructional Services, Assistant Superintendent, Director of Technology and Information Systems, Director of Student Services) begins work with Xavier University's Center for Innovation, laying out a timeline of tasks and project team responsibilities for the grant year. DT: District lead attends Stanford d.school design thinking training. Personalized Learning (PL): Personalized Professional Development Team (Director of Instructional Services and Coordinators; District Instructional Coaches; District Digital Learning Specialists; District Department Chairs) begins planning Personalized Learning Professional Development (PLPD) course framework, identifying consultants to assist with course development. PL: Identifying community partners to support personalized learning experiences. (Assistant Superintendent and Curriculum Coordinators) Learning Environment (LE): Learning Environment Retool Team (Assistant Superintendent, Director of Technology and Information Systems, Teacher Leaders) begins planning for district-wide innovation incubation hub design and classroom retool options for teachers. DT: Identify Design Thinking Train the Trainer Team (Assistant Superintendent, Director of Technology and Information Systems, Director of Student Services, Elementary/Secondary Program Coordinators). DT/PL/LE: Identify teachers to be included in Classroom Retool Team #1 (teachers who have a foundational knowledge of personalized learning, who will receive design thinking development and personalized learning instructional coaching, will give feedback on the project and how it can be designed for others, will retool classrooms using a design challenge, and will undergo project evaluation). Evaluation (EV): Build evaluation plan with evaluators (academic measures, design thinking metrics, engagement metrics). Community Engagement (CE): Identify best use of CERKL resource for communication and engagement strategies.

22. Implementation(grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date RangeMarch 2016 - June 2017

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

3/16: PL: Develop PLPD course. (*Continues through July.), CE: Conduct community engagement activity. 4/16: DT: Design Thinking Train-the-Trainer session., LE: Finalize innovation incubation hub plan. 5/16: DT: Design Thinking Professional Development (PD) session for Classroom Retool Team #1, LE: Project team determines classroom retool sites; innovation incubation hub preparation begins. 6/16: DT: Design Thinking PD session for District administrative team. 7/16: CE: Plan for ongoing project communication & partnerships. 8/16:DT: District-wide training for all 600 teachers; use training to identify and solve building problem via design "hack," led by building principals., PL: Launch PLPD course faculty-wide, LE: Innovation incubation hub opens; use for PD sessions. (*Ongoing) 9/16: DT: 1st teacher Classroom Retool Team #1 classes prepare for classroom retool challenge, DT/PL: 1st in-house PD for Classroom Retool Team #1 (*Continues monthly through 5/17.), DT: 1st District-level design hack begins work on master schedule redesign. (*Continues monthly through 1/17.), PL: Small groups of Classroom Retool Team #1 teachers begin monthly topic intensives (e.g. Blended Learning, Project-Based Learning, etc.) with instructional coaches. , LE: Classroom retool models emerge. 10/16: Visits to high-performing and design thinking schools/districts (WI, VT, NC). 11/16: LE: Based on 1st District design hack outcomes, begin planning additional uses of innovation incubation hub. 12/16: EV: Project team data review, assessment, initial outcome, adjustments. 1/17: PL: Begin building 2018 PLPD plan. 2-5/17: DT/PL: In-house PD for Classroom Retool Team #1. 6/17: DT: Train-the-Trainer Team develops Design Thinking PD session for all teachers for next year. EV: Year-end evaluations; project team 1st year review, progress, outcomes, adjustments, challenges, issues to address in planning

sustainability year 1. CE: Progress report/community update on grant year.

23. Programmatic Sustainability (years following implementation, including institutionalization of program, evaluation and communication of program outcomes)

a. Date RangeJuly 2017-June 2022

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

Each Summer: PL: Summer Learning Series; personalized professional development opportunities. Each Summer/Winter: EV: Evaluation of progress with evaluators. Each Fall/Winter/Spring: PL: District professional learning days will be teachers working through a personalized professional development course on pedagogies related to topics such as personalized learning, design thinking, blended learning, and problem-based learning. Each Winter: PL: Evaluate status of community partnerships and how to expand and/or improve connections with the classroom. 2017-2018 Summer: DT: Incorporate DT refresher PD into Summer Learning Series. LE: Based on outcomes of district and building level hacks with master schedule and multiple pathways, develop plans for learning environment needs, adjustments, and developments. Fall: DT: Classroom Retool Team #2 & 3; Design Thinking professional learning. Fall/Winter/Spring: LE: Continue learning environments "hacks" with all learning spaces. Teachers will receive new furniture/technology designated with bond funds after professional development has occurred. Winter/Spring: DT: Classroom Retool Team #4 & 5 and #6 & 7; Design Thinking professional learning (as above). 2018-2019 Summer: DT: Incorporate DT refresher PD into Summer Learning Series. Fall/Winter/Spring: DT: Students will be developed to use design thinking as part of the curriculum. DT: Classroom Retool Teams developed as needed for design thinking professional learning (ex. new staff, refreshers). Spring: LE: Re-evaluate how innovation incubation hub is being used. Consider additional purchases based on program development and/or technological advances to enhance the space. 2019-2020 & 2020-2021 Fall/Winter/Spring: DT: Classroom Retool Teams developed as needed (as above).

E) SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT AND LASTING VALUE

24. 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 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:

Implementing the grant-funded innovations will result in several critical, impactful, lasting changes in instructional and organizational practices becoming deeply embedded across the Forest Hills School District, with support from the Forest Hills Teachers Association and the Forest Hills Foundation for Education. By implementing the innovative educational approaches of personalized learning, design thinking and innovative learning spaces, the District will measurably improve its capacity to prepare students for today's world. These innovations will fulfill the project's overarching goal of reshaping how administrators, teachers and students practice and experience their respective roles in the learning process, to maximize each student's engagement, motivation, progress and potential. Changing the educational culture includes refocusing it around students' particular needs and interests, so they take more personal responsibility for their educational experiences and outcomes, and begin to see in their educations more relevance to their adult lives. The proposed changes will thrust the District to the forefront of 21st century education, by combining the methodologies of personalized learning, as they apply to both teacher professional development and student academic development; design thinking as an avenue to developing the creative, innovative, collaborative problem-solvers the information economy requires, and innovative learning and incubating environments that facilitate and reinforce these methods at all organizational levels. Implementing these methods and embedding them into the District's culture will help administrators solve complex challenges; help teachers engage in continual professional learning that is meaningful, effective and economical, and help students by refocusing the physical educational environment around them, utilizing technology to enhance and personalize their learning, and using design thinking to instill valuable, lifelong skills. As teachers continue their professional learning, they will be required to continue using design thinking challenges with their students, to "hack" their learning environment and incorporate it into the curriculum as appropriate. It is likely that such district design "hack" outcomes will also enable FHSD to plan for district-level efficiencies - such as shared high school programming at the innovation incubation hub - to initiate new ways of doing business in a two high-school district. Through ongoing use of design hacks, FHSD will promote a culture of innovation, in which the district consistently rethinks and retools ways of doing business, at the district, building, and classroom levels. Future topics will likely include: full day kindergarten, summer school, special education service delivery model, and community partnership development. Increased engagement with more community partners is especially important in creating hands-on student 'experienceships' that help students broaden their thinking about post-high school options. To summarize, the substantial impact and lasting value of this project will be a significant overhaul of the district's instructional and organizational practices that is nested across its entire culture, with administrators and teachers using the same methodologies in their work as they teach students to use in their studies, and the Teachers Association and Foundation partnering with the project team, supporting these concepts and helping to propel them forward. The project's ultimate and most substantial impact and lasting value will be the better equipped graduates the district sends out into the world, and the achievements they are significantly more empowered to accomplish, including completing and succeeding in college, obtaining high-demand jobs, and becoming innovators in their fields, while improving their quality of life and their ability to provide for their future families' needs.

25. Please provide the name and contact information for the person and/or organization who will oversee the evaluation of this project.

Projects may be evaluated either internally or externally. However, evaluation must be ongoing throughout the entire period of sustainability and have the capacity to provide the Ohio Department of Education with clear metrics related to each selected goal.

Please enter your response below:

Lead Evaluator: Dr. Tom Merrill, Professor/Director, School of Arts and Innovation, Center for Innovation, Xavier University, 3800 Victory

Parkway, Cincinnati, OH 45207, (513) 745-3135, merrillt@xavier.edu Design Thinking Evaluator: Ramsey Ford, Co-Founder/Design Director, Design Impact, 205 West Fourth Street, Suite 1150, Cincinnati, OH 45202, (513) 206-9138, ramsey@d-impact.org

26. Describe the overall plan for evaluation, including plans for data collection, underlying research rationale, measurement timelines and methods of analysis.

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 shortfall. The applicant should provide information on how the lessons learned from the project can and will be shared with other education providers in Ohio. Note: A complete and comprehensive version of the evaluation plan must be submitted to ODE by all selected projects.

The design of the evaluation work is established to track district academic data that is readily available and to expand the district's capacity to measure and report on the development of 21st century skills and the impact of retooling classrooms. The District does not currently collect perception data in a systematic way. Therefore the tools co-created by the district and evaluator will be developed in a way to easily scale and monitor work as part of typical operating procedures. Academic evaluation will be completed using the District's data management systems (DASL and SchoolNet). The District will also begin administering Gallup's Hope and Engagement Survey to students in 5th-12th grade. The academic data will be analyzed to connect the essential data components of academic achievement, program information, discipline data, demographic details and perception data. Reports will be disaggregated by district, school, grade level, gender, and subgroups. Academic data will be collected on an annual basis, as well as quarterly or trimester basis depending on grade level. Achievement data will be collected on all students in grades 3-12 because all educators in the system will be receiving some level of professional development in year one. However, there will be a first team of teachers who receive more intensive professional development and support, and complete classroom retool projects; therefore, data can be used to look for comparisons or patterns. Design thinking evaluation will be completed using a variety of tools and techniques, including: interviews, stakeholder surveys to include a 360 degree perspective, student self-report questionnaires, teachers' reports on students, learning walk-through data with predetermined coding systems to record observations, and formal observations. During the March 2016 project planning phase, the district and lead evaluators will collaborate to finalize the details of the DT measures, as follows: DT assessment will be evaluated in three categories: (1) understanding process stages, (2) acquisition of process skills, and (3) reflection and mindfulness. The following five phases of DT will each be assessed for the above three categories: (1) empathy, (2) define/point of view, (3) ideation, (4) prototype, and (5) testing/validation. Through Spring and Summer 2016, the evaluation team will finalize the instruments to be used. Once the school year begins, the evaluator will complete collection of baseline data in perception and 21st century skills. District participants will begin using the data collection tools. In December 2016, the evaluation team will meet to review and evaluate data collected and make necessary adjustments. Additional data will be collected through the following months and then post data will be collected and reviewed in late Spring/early Summer 2017. In June 2017, the team will compile and analyze the data on perception and design thinking skills. Finally, the district team will complete a full report on the grant year before beginning plans for the next school year. The district treasurer will work with the project leader to track and review all financial evaluation.

27. Please describe the likelihood that this project, if successful, can be scaled-up, expanded and/or replicated. Include a description of potential replications both within the district or collaborative group, as well as an estimation of the probability that this solution will prove useful to others. Discuss the possibility of publications, etc., to make others aware of what has been learned in this project.

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 this 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 noted here.

The District fully expects that this project, if successful, will be scaled-up across the entire Forest Hills School District within the grant's sustainability period. The District also anticipates sharing its experiences and lessons learned with other districts considering similar changes, as this solution has a high probability of proving useful to them and saving them the time of creating from scratch. In terms of scaling: As indicated in the table completed in question three, and elsewhere above, although some teachers will participate in a more intensive first cohort training, all teachers will receive some initial professional development and begin putting their new skills into practice during the course of the grant year. Therefore, scaling the project after the grant year will focus more around continuing to develop the personalized learning professional development system and content, having instructional coaches work with teachers to customize their individual professional learning paths based on particular needs and/or interests, and coaching teachers to apply what they learn to benefit their students. Scaling will also include regularly revisiting the professional learning program and soliciting feedback from teachers and instructional coaches, to assess what is working well, what needs improving, additional content that would be helpful to add, ways to try out and incorporate more learning "hacks" (described above) in their classrooms, and generally adjusting to teaching in a changed school environment and culture. In terms of replication: The project team is eager to share its guidance, experience and lessons learned, by creating some form of toolkit or guide (in a format to be determined, such as a blueprint, process outline, or road map). This document, potentially publishable online and/or in print, and shared with the Ohio Department of Education and any interested districts statewide, will describe the District's decision-making and implementation processes around personalized learning, design thinking and innovative learning environments, including recommendations and lessons learned for districts seriously considering their own projects. Similarly, the District could share the professional development course using a SCORM compatible tool such as Schoology and share how it developed a personalized learning professional development track with course content, customized learning pathways and instructional coaching, including the cost savings that make this model sustainable and likely attractive to other districts, as well. In terms of the time and effort it would take to implement this project in another district: There are of course many variables that could potentially influence any district's capacity to undertake such an ambitious cultural overhaul. However, at a minimum, the Forest Hills School District's ability and willingness to share its model and lessons learned would significantly reduce the need for other districts to "reinvent the wheel" and would help them avoid undertaking the same labor-intensive process that Forest Hills has undertaken, as one of the first Districts to create and implement this unique, tripartite combination model, to the best of its knowledge.

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).

Tom Durbin, Superintendent and Richard R. Toepfer, Treasurer agree with all assurances and will adhere to all assurances.

Consortium

Forest Hills Local (047340) - Hamilton County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Consortium Contacts

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

Partnerships

Forest Hills Local (047340) - Hamilton County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Partnerships							
First Name	**Last Name**	**Telephone Number**	**Email Address**	**Organization Name**	**IRN**	**Address**	**Delete Contact**
Dr. Tom	Merrill	513-745-3190	merrillt@xavier.edu	Center for Innovation, Xavier University		1601 Dana Avenue, , Cincinnati, Ohio, 45207	
Ramsey	Ford	513-206-9138	ramsey@d-impact.org	Design Impact		205 W 4th Street, #1150, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202	
Dee	Stone	513-520-5409	info@fhfe.org	Forest Hills Foundation for Education		7550 Forest Road, , Cincinnati, Ohio, 45255	
Donna	Lauver	513-474-5407	donnalauver@foresthills.edu	Forest Hills Teachers Association		1500 Nagel Rd., , Cincinnati, Ohio, 45255	

Implementation Team

Forest Hills Local (047340) - Hamilton County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Implementation Team								
First Name	Last Name	Title	Responsibilities	Qualifications	Prior Relevant Experience	Education	% FTE	Delete Contact
Cary	Harrod	Instructional Coach	Personalized learning professional development designer and instructional coaching.	9 years elementary classroom; 10 years Gifted Intervention Specialist; 9 years Instructional Technology Specialist	District Instructional Technology 2006-Present; Member of the FHSD District Curriculum Team, 2006-Present; Co-Lead on BYOD Initiative 2011-2014; Powerful Learning Practice Fellow 2008-2011; Co-Facilitator of the "1st Grade Connecting Literacy and Technology" initiative; Co-Facilitator of FUSE, a personalized learning project with Grade 3-6 math teachers;	Bachelor of Science in Education 1-8; Masters of Arts in Instructional Media; Gifted Endorsement	50	
Mike	Broadwater	Assistant Superintendent	Oversee the implementation of the grant from the district office, liaison for development of community partnerships, oversee furniture purchases.	Licensed Math/Computer Science Teacher, Secondary Administration and Superintendent Licensure.	14 years of high school teacher in the field of Math and Computer Science; Principal of a 1200 student high school with a focus on academic rigor.	Bachelors in Math Masters in Secondary Administration Superintendent Licensure	10	
Natasha	Adams	Director of Instructional Services	Project Lead, coordinate professional development team, oversee consultants, evaluators, innovative learning spaces and data collection.	18 total years of experience as teacher, Middle School Principal, and Director of Instructional Services.	Project management experience, leadership in personalized professional development, strategic visioning experience, team building experience, and design thinking training.	Bachelors in Middle Level Education Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies Masters Instructional Leadership	50	
Richard R.	Toepfer II.	Treasurer	Financial - budget verification, sustained costs, cost savings Grant Management	15 years of experience as the district Treasurer	27 years financial/operational experience	BBA Finance / Management	5	
Trisha	Underwood	Instructional Coach	Personalized learning professional development designer and instructional coaching.	15 years of experience in education including 5+ years of middle school teaching experience, 8 years in instructional coaching position, 2 years in district	Designing and implementing professional development for teachers and administrators; Instructional Coaching role with emphasis on innovative educational	Bachelor of Science in Middle School Education (Science & Mathematics); MS in Instructional Technology; Ed.S. in Administration &	50	

				curriculum	practices	Technology		
Becky	Johnson	Diverse Learner Coordinator	Design thinking lead train the trainer, coordinator of professional learning for special education and pre-school, and evaluation support.	30+years in education (SLP, ICF/MR, Wildey, Clermont County MRDD, Norwood, Princeton)	Student Services coordinator, preK supervisor, speech pathologist, analyzing subgroup data, compliance expertise, professional development leadership, and Response to Intervention.	Bachelors and Masters at Marshall University. Administrative License from Xavier University.	15	
Anita	Eshleman	Elementary Programs Coordinator	Design thinking lead train the trainer, coordinator of professional learning for elementary schools, and evaluation support.	6 years teaching experience at elementary & middle schools; 10 years administrative experience including: Elementary Curriculum creation (curriculum maps, pacing guides, district assessments, and classroom resources); Coordination and delivery of Professional Development through 10 years administrative experience (created and delivered presentations; solicited outside presenters; coordinated choice pathways for teachers, etc); Leadership development using the DLT, BLT, and PLC process	2 years Elementary Principal; School Improvement Consultant working with schools in emergency status receiving the School Improvement Grant or "SIG" grant through the state of Ohio; Full-time consultant with South Avondale Elementary during the 3 years of the grant, using OIP (Ohio Improvement Process) to guide change to move this building from Academic Emergency to Excellent status on the Ohio Report Card	Master of Education Administration + 30 additional coursework hours	25	
John	Cook	Teacher Leader	Coordinator for implementation of district and school innovation incubation spaces. Support for technology purchases and training.	Master's degree in Education State certified in Computer Science 7-12 for 25 years.	25 years teaching high school Computer Science courses and 2 years as a district technology coordinator. 20 years as adjunct professor in Computer Information Technology.	BS in Education Master of Arts in Education MBA studies in Information Systems	10	
Betsy	Ryan	Director of Student Services	Oversee personalzied professional development for special educators and design thinking trainer.	35 years of experience as special education teacher focused on emotional disturbances, consultant, supervisor, coordinator, and director.	Change leadership experience, managing conflict, leading a continuum of specialized services, problem-solving, mediation and team building.	Bachelors in Special Education and Elementary Education, Masters in School Counseling, Principal, and Superintendent License,	5	

Christine	McCormick	Director of Information Technology	Design thinking district lead, innovative incubator project planning, visioning, strategic thinking, and implementation. Oversee technology purchases.	11 years of experience as Director of IT, spending the last several years studying innovative learning/work spaces	11 years leading innovation disruption (technology) into education.	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Wright State University, Master of Science, Information Technology, Capella University	25	
Meghan	Lawson	Secondary Programs Coordinator	Design thinking lead train the trainer, coordinator of professional learning for secondary schools, and evaluation support.	12 years of experience in secondary education; 7-12 Integrated Language Arts certified; Masters of Arts in Teaching; 5-12 principal's license; superintendent's license; gifted endorsement (pending)	8 years of middle school and high school teaching experience; 2 years of middle school assistant principal experience; central office administration experience	Bachelor of Science and Masters of Arts in Education from Miami University; 5-12 principal's license; superintendent's license	25	
Amy	Wettengel	Instructional Coach	Personalized learning professional development designer and instructional coaching.	18 years of experience in secondary education; 7-12 Mathematics certified; Masters in Curriculum and Instruction	9 years of middle school teaching experience; 9 years of instructional coaching	Bachelor of Arts in Mathematical Sciences; Bachelor of Sciences in Secondary Education; Masters in Curriculum and Instruction	40	
Kathy	Kallmyer	Instructional Coach	Personalized learning professional development designer and instructional coaching.	Co-Facilitator of "FUSE, fusing mathematics and technology" initiative; Plan, organize and deliver professional development at the district level; Contribute to co-creation and implementation of the FHSD Elementary Mathematics Framework; K-6 Grade Level Mathematics Curriculum Maps and K-6 Grade Level Standards-Aligned Report Cards; Math Solutions Consultant-leading professional development	22 years of elementary and secondary classroom instruction; 4 years middle school math coach; 5 years elementary mathematics leader; 10 years part-time consultant for Math Solutions	Bachelor of Science in Education 1-8 and Secondary Mathematics; Masters of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction	40	
Julie	Thorp	Instructional Coach	Personalized learning professional development designer and	Resident Educator Program Coordinator, 2012-Present; Elementary Literacy Leader,	Co-led Elementary English Language Arts Course of Study Committee, 2013-2015; Assistant	University of Cincinnati, University of Dayton, B.S., Elementary	25	

			instructional coaching.	2013-Present; Member of the FHSD District Curriculum Team, 2013-Present; Facilitator of the "1st Grade Connecting Literacy and Technology" initiative; Plans, organizes and delivers professional development at the district level; Contributed to co-creation and implementation of the FHSD Elementary ELA Framework, K-6 Grade Level ELA Curriculum Maps and K-6 Grade Level Standards Aligned Report Cards; Ohio State Assessor for the Resident Educator Summative Assessment (RESA)	Principal, Mercer Elementary, Forest Hills School District 2006-2010; 13 Years of elementary teaching experience in grades 2-5	Education M.S., Educational Administration;		