Budget

Greenville City (044099) - Darke County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (68)

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	337,500.00	517,813.00	0.00	0.00	855,313.00
Support Services	0.00	0.00	58,266.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58,266.00
Governance/Admin	0.00	0.00	69,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	69,300.00
Prof Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Family/Community	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Safety	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indirect Cost						0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	465,066.00	517,813.00	0.00	0.00	982,879.00
						Adjusted Allocation	0.00
						Remaining	-982,879.00

Application

Greenville City (044099) - Darke County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (68)

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

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
Personalized Learning through Innovative Dual-District Collaboration

2. Project Summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.
With 1:1 iPads, eSpark, and shared PD at two districts, we will differentiate learning to better reach learning needs of all students.

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

58 Pre-K Special Education	115 K	121 1	342 2	340 3
184 4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	

Year 1

60 Pre-K Special Education	130 K	115 1	322 2	342 3
198 4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	

Year 2

60 Pre-K Special Education	130 K	130 1	313 2	322 3
203 4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	

Year 3

60 Pre-K Special Education	130 K	130 1	330 2	313 3
198 4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	

Year 4

60 Pre-K Special Education	130 K	130 1	330 2	330 3
198 4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	

Year 5

60 Pre-K Special Education	130 K	130 1	330 2	330 3
200 4	5	6	7	8

9 10 11 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.

All students Pre-K through eighth grade have the potential to be impacted by eSpark's personalized learning program. Additionally, students who begin using eSpark and iPads at an early age will learn the common core and 21st century skills they need for middle and high school success. Students receiving targeted instruction aligned to their academic needs will be set up for success in subsequent years, and fewer students will be involved in Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Additionally, success with 1:1 device rollout can impact technology decisions across all grades PreK-12 for future device rollouts.

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

First and last name of contact for lead applicant
Laura Bemus

Organizational name of lead applicant
Greenville City Schools

Address of lead applicant
215 West Fourth Street Greenville, OH 45331

Phone Number of lead applicant
937-548-3185

Email Address of lead applicant
lbemus@greenville.k12.oh.us

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

Teachers are unable to meet the diverse academic needs of students at both Greenville and Oakwood. Analysis of Greenville's Northwest Evaluation Association - Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) and Oakwood's iReady scores indicates that our students aren't displaying the academic growth expected of their individual ability levels. Although we provide some in-class differentiation, we do not have the resources needed to tackle such a wide range of abilities and needs. Despite our best efforts, we've been unable to challenge our high-performing students or help our struggling students catch up to their peers. Differentiation is a time-intensive process, and our educators don't always have the time or resources to construct personalized lesson plans for each of our students. We need a more efficient, effective way to differentiate instruction. In rethinking our RTI programs, we've realized that we need better progress monitoring tools and current, reliable data if we are to successfully address and track the academic needs of all our students.

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

Utilizing 1:1 iPad technology, eSpark's personalized learning plans, and professional collaboration between our two districts, we'll help our

teachers meet their students unique academic needs and improve student outcomes as measured by NWEA MAP and iReady assessments. By deploying the 1:1 iPads with a clear plan of use and supporting teachers with ongoing and collaborative professional development, we will ensure that our iPad initiative improves upon our current teaching and learning practices. We aim to bring greater focus to our RTI and enrichment programs, and give teachers and administrators access to clear and reliable data that will allow them to monitor student growth. eSpark aligns NWEA and iReady assessment data to Common Core standards and assigns individual learning goals built around each student's individual academic strengths and needs. Combined with teacher input, these goals inform students' personalized learning paths, curated streams of high-quality apps and videos to teach the Common Core State Standards. Students work independently through these plans, and eSpark continuously tracks engagement from students across the country to make sure that student activities are increasing academic success and student interest and engagement. Students record a synthesis video at the end of each standard-aligned "quest" that they complete, giving teachers a way to evaluate students' higher-order thinking skills. We hope to build upon the blended learning best practices established by Beavercreek City Schools. Beavercreek's students were assessed with adaptive, nationally-normed MAP testing, and from Fall 2014 to Spring 2015, students using 1:1 iPads and eSpark grew an average of five percentile points. As typical yearly percentile growth is expected to be zero, these results indicated that differentiating learning through technology integration had a profound impact on student achievement. In domains where students were using eSpark, students achieved an average of 161% of their expected growth, exceeding expectations in these areas of greatest need. Greenville was able to visit Beavercreek to witness the transformed classrooms. After speaking with teachers and witnessing the success of the 1:1 iPads and eSpark, we are determined to provide our students with the same advantages. Greenville has already implemented a 1:1 eSpark pilot in its first grade classrooms. After one month of eSpark, Greenville students mastered a total of 435 standards that represented a wide range of different domain and grade level combinations. Greenville's data shows that students find 92% of the activities they interact with to be engaging, and students have logged into eSpark an average of 6.1 times per week. To build upon the success of the pilot, Greenville would like to expand the initiative and partner with Oakwood Schools. Both districts see an urgent need to reduce the number of students requiring Tier 2 and 3 RTI support, and we are united in the effort to better engage and challenge our highest performing students. We believe that eSpark will help our districts achieve those goals. In addition to building upon the success of existing initiatives, this project seeks innovate PD through district collaboration. We will foster professional learning communities within and outside of each district, allowing teachers from both districts to share challenges and successes of implementing the same initiative into their classrooms. Greenville's first grade teachers will serve as district leaders, and will guide and support teachers who are new to the program. We've found that 1:1 devices give our teachers more flexibility to experiment with different teaching models to transform traditional teaching practices. By redefining the way our districts approach Math and ELA standards, we hope to narrow the achievement gap in our districts while ensuring that all of our students develop a love of learning and enjoy academic success.

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.

Greenville and Oakwood expect to see dramatic increases in end-of-year achievement data for math and ELA. Increases in student achievement and personalization of learning plans will also lead to movement through the RTI tier system so that fewer students are in the "red zone". Both school districts hope to see more student movement into Tier 1 and out of Tiers 2 and 3. Due to the personalization of content, we also expect to see significant growth with the current highest performing students. Academically, Greenville will measure student performance using the NWEA MAP assessment. Our conservative target for the impact of eSpark is 120% growth in the domains targeted by eSpark for each student. Greenville's current data indicates more than 20% of students in grades 2 - 4 are in Tier 3. Intensive interventions are needed for these students. We want to see student movement that promotes student achievement outcomes through unique instructional strategies beyond those typically available. A continuum of a multi-layered system of prevention/intervention services, specific to learning needs of students who are experiencing difficulties in a timely manner, is greatly needed. Oakwood, in addition to closing the gap for struggling students, wants to push the academic needle for higher achieving students. Over the 5 year implementation of iPads and eSpark, Oakwood hopes to bring their lowest performing students to grade level while focusing on challenging the highest performing students. The desired outcome is significant iReady growth across student quartiles, with at least one year of growth evident.

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.

To obtain dramatic gains in academic achievement, eSpark, Greenville, and Oakwood have several key assumptions. -Greenville students will complete math and ELA NWEA tests in the fall, winter, and spring of each year. Oakwood students will complete math and ELA iReady tests in the fall, winter, and spring of each year. Accurate, timely data allows the measurement of students' progress relative to nationally normed expectations for growth between fall, winter, and spring. -The data provided by NWEA and iReady is an accurate representation of a student's learning level. -Teachers will be using eSpark in classrooms at least 3 days per week, 30 minutes per day, per subject or 5 days per week, 20 minutes per day. -Administrators will be involved in the enforcement of eSpark and iPad usage, as well as part of annual data conversations. -Students receiving personalized learning plans will be growing faster than they would without those plans.

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

In a study across 29 eSpark partners, days logged into eSpark per week and decision maker involvement both had statistically significant relationships with academic growth of students. Decision makers from Greenville and Oakwood have worked significantly with eSpark to ensure positive and effective implementation of iPads and eSpark. Greenville is also piloting eSpark with 1st grade classrooms. Initial results have shown teachers using eSpark an average of 6.1 days/week with students. The early success of the pilot is encouraging towards a full fidelity implementation with extended impact further down the year and in subsequent grades. While it is still too early to look at academic gains made by Greenville through eSpark and iPad usage, early indicators suggest that factors highly associated with growth acceleration are being met.

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).

Our long-term goals will be accomplished if students who use eSpark significantly outpace the growth rate of their peers nationally on NWEA and iReady-even after accounting for summer slide that may occur over the three year time period. Our long-term benchmarks will be evaluated between fall administrations of the assessments across consecutive years. Additionally, we will measure the percentage of students in Tier 1, 2, and 3 of RTI and analyze change over time. If goals are being met, there will be fewer students in Tiers 2 and 3. Also, the number of RIMPS will decrease in grades K - 3.

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

Greenville will analyze fall, winter, and spring NWEA data. The NWEA MAP reports data at a level in a way that makes program evaluation easy and accessible. Score reports contain two critical components. First, NWEA reports RIT scores at the domain level rather than at the subject level. Second, NWEA reports also include expectations for typical growth based on a national sample of millions of students. Expectations for typical growth are a function of students' fall baseline scores, so these are personalized at the student level. These estimates are based on a large, nationally-normed sample. Using that data, we can estimate each student's growth relative to her personalized expectations in domains he or she targeted with eSpark. This strategy has two primary benefits: (1) it controls for unobserved selection because the impact is estimated across domain-specific scores for each student, and (2) a proper counterfactual is estimated from the NWEA nationally-normed sample. Two sample t-tests will be used to evaluate whether mean differences in scores are statistically significant. Using these data points, we can analyze student growth compared to nationally-normed averages. Oakwood will be using the iReady test. iReady test reports provide adjectives to modify integers for grade level performance. To facilitate mathematical computations, data analysis will input the levels: emerging = 0.1, early = 0.25, mid. = 0.5, late = 0.75. To analyze growth, eSpark will look at how many grade levels a student grew, assuming one grade level is the average growth for a year. To analyze reading foundational skills, scores will be averaged across phonics, phonemic awareness, and high frequency words. We expect students at Oakwood to exceed 1 year of growth on iReady as a conservative target.

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

Data scientists at eSpark will analyze Greenville and Oakwood's data three times a year for the duration of the partnership. The cycle of up-to-date data can inform the course of the project in several ways. First, students that grow can receive new goals more appropriate to their levels, so they will be continue to be challenged and engaged. Second, if teachers disagree with levels that have been set based on data, they have the power to set a new, more accurate goal for students. Third, if less than desirable growth is seen, teachers and eSpark Partner Managers can adjust student goals and eventually student content. eSpark is routinely improving the curriculum, so any lack of growth associated with Common Core domains may show change reflected in restructuring eSpark content. In the case of low usage or participation from teachers and administrators, eSpark will provide specifically-aimed professional development to match the needs of those affected. Any hesitations in implementation can be addressed through provided professional supports regarding the use of the technology in classrooms, as well as the appropriate use of eSpark.

☑ 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.

Through the implementation of eSpark and iPads, Greenville hopes to reduce textbook/curriculum materials costs ($85,000), the number of intervention tutors needed ($45,000), and number of classroom computers and their replacement costs ($38,000). Also, the digitalization of the instructional process will cause a decrease in printing/consumable and copier costs ($10,000). Computer costs will be a reallocation of funds to future technology purchases/updates, and the other areas are cost savings. Oakwood would like to incur spending reductions in textbook/workbook costs ($50,000), RTI resources ($4,000), printing/copier expenses ($10,000), and reduce the need for intervention tutors ($40,000). Those would be cost savings. MDM license savings ($1,140), professional development costs ($15,000), and apps ($1480).

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.

Teachers will use iPads and digital resources instead of printing worksheets. Digital curriculum resources will reduce the need for physical textbooks. eSpark will replace some of the current apps the district is buying, eliminate the cost of an additional mobile device management solution (included with eSpark), and through individualized learning plans, reduce the need for intervention teachers and RTI resources. eSpark's professional development will replace some of the district's current professional development. The iPads will reduce the need for computer labs.

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

In the pilot implementation at Greenville, we have begun to test these assumptions by implementing 1:1 iPads in first grade. Qualitatively, teachers seem to be benefiting from the professional development (so it is likely that it can replace some other district professional developments) and staff has positive things to say about the ability of eSpark's personalized learning plans to meet the wide needs of students. Greenville literacy specialists have been pleased with the results they have seen after the first month of implementation, so we feel we are on-track to meet our RTI goals, but we will be able to quantitatively measure this after end-of-year data analysis. Though it is too early to determine the pilot's financial impact and it will be on a smaller scale than this proposed project, we will be able to see the impact of printing/consumable costs at the end of the year as well. As shown in the Apple Feature, Philadelphia Performing Arts: A String Theory Charter School, has been able to save $100,000 in textbook costs (with textbooks that would have quickly become obsolete) by implementing iPads.

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).

Greenville and Oakwood assign budget codes to the district purchases. Using budget data from previous years, we plan to biannually inspect and compare: 1. technology 2. printing 3. curriculum material These category costs will be used to measure the realized savings in each area. We plan to reflect on these outcomes as an administrative team and make adjustments as needed. More specifically, at Oakwood, we will be looking at line items for new curriculum materials, or lack of expected expansion of curriculum materials, lack of expected cost of training for staff, fewer purchases and spending on professional development, hardware purchases and repair items, charges or lack thereof for Meraki Mobile Device Management licenses, and decrease in our monthly charges for our districtwide cost per copy agreement with Woodhull USA. Oakwood expects to save an average of $1480 per year on apps (based on the last 2 years for app curation), $4,000 per year on RTI resource reduction, $10,000 per year on printing and copier costs, $15,000 per year on professional development, $40,000 per year for intervention tutor costs, $ for replaced textbooks , and $5,700 for a 5 year license ($1,140 yearly) for an MDM to manage devices. Greenville will use budget data to compare the before and after costs of K4 textbook/materials adoption ($85,000 yearly), intervention tutors ($45,000 yearly), copying costs ($10,000 yearly), 35 computer replacement costs ($38,000) and and measure the savings in each area. .

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

We plan to measure data points from the budget against previous years to measure cost savings. We plan to examine printing costs to estimate the savings from digital curriculum. We will use these FY 2015 and 2016 budget numbers as a baseline to examine progress toward our projected reductions as a result of this project.. Budget/spending updates, provided by our treasurers will allow us to compare monthly the cost trend and accurately measure spending reductions in the areas of: 1. technology 2. printing 3. curriculum material

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

If we aren't seeing the projected decrease in need for intervention tutors, we can work with teachers through professional development and eSpark's support to help better address needs of RTI students. We can also work with teachers to set better goals to make sure that the personalized learning is effective. If the teachers are meeting expectations in use of eSpark and it doesn't seem to be working for RTI students, eSpark can review its app and video curriculum and make necessary changes. If eSpark's professional development isn't satisfactory to teachers (and we have assumed we can replace some current PD with this), we will work with eSpark to improve and get teachers what they need to be effective. If we are not seeing the projected cost decreases from printing and curriculum materials, we can work with teachers to help them use the iPads to more effectively to replace and transform current material consumption. We can set expectations around using digital resources and decreasing printing costs. This can be done through professional development, digital resource distribution, and district decisions about textbook purchases and communication of expectations.

☑ 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.

With the introduction of personalized technology resources to differentiate to students, teachers will be able to spend more time analyzing data, creating flexible learning groups based on individual learning needs of students, working with students to set learning goals, and prescribing best practices based on testing data for students. According to external research conducted by MIT, students using eSpark and iPads have displayed lower rates of tardiness and suspension, allowing for more teacher time to be spent on learning and more administrator time to be spent supporting teachers. Through eSpark, teachers have access to dashboards which track student's academic growth and needs and receive weekly emails that summarize data. Students can be grouped by standard through the dashboard, and teachers can check in on student progress. Teachers will also have access to a digital portfolio of student videos without having to spend time creating one for each student. Together, this will enable teachers to leverage the data from MAP and iReady testing and use that information for learning in action. Teachers will be able to allow students to work independently on their learning plans and have more one-on-one or small group time with students, thus increasing the effectiveness of teaching time. They will also be able to spend more time designing activities that empower and motivate students to learn on their own. They'll have more time to examine their teaching practices and evaluate them to make them more student led, authentic, and collaborative. Teachers will have the tools, time, and data necessary to redefine their role and their students' roles in learning.

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.

Students are working independently on eSpark and are actively engaged with the curriculum, and teachers are using the time that students are working on eSpark to work with individual students and small groups. Teachers are using this time effectively to examine teaching practices and design meaningful activities for students. Teachers will be using and understanding the dashboards and data to make classroom instructional decisions. The technology is working as expected.

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

In just the first month of the Greenville pilot, we have found that teachers have been able to successfully implement eSpark into the classroom and have begun to use that time to pull small groups and work with the students. Students seem to enjoy eSpark (as shown by 92% engagement). There have been few technology issues and teachers are actively using their dashboards; the robust professional development was a big contributor to this success. We expect these trends to continue as we expand the initiative at Greenville and begin at Oakwood. To evaluate eSpark's effectiveness, MIT researchers compared the impact of eSpark on both academic and behavioral outcomes among students in the same school. Students who used eSpark had significantly lower rates of tardiness and in school suspension compared to their peers. If teachers and administrators are spending less time dealing with disciplinary issues, they will have more time to dedicate to student learning. Effect Estimates for Behavior (results from MIT study) Q2 - Q4 Stacked, cluster on sasid Tardiness N=1260 Non-eSpark mean (1) 2.610 (5.002) First stage (2) 0.919*** (0.019) OLS (3) -0.550 (0.419) Reduced form (4) -0.835* (0.494) 2SLS (5) -0.908* (0.536) In-School Suspension N=1188 Non-eSpark mean (1) 0.206 (0.638) First stage (2) 0.938*** (0.018) OLS (3) -0.104** (0.051) Reduced form (4) -0.099** (0.043) 2SLS (5) -0.106** (0.046) As the differentiated iPad programming will allow our teachers to dedicate more time to targeted small-group instruction and new 21st century lesson plans, we expect this to positively influence growth in non-goal domains as well. In other eSpark implementations across the country, thousands of students in school districts, such

as Beavercreek City Schools, have met or exceeded non-goal annual growth targets due to excellent teaching practices and the utilization of teacher time.

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.

72.6% of Greenville's funds and 74.6% of Oakwood's funds are spent on classroom instruction. Greenville ranks 6 out of 105 in comparison to other districts of similar size for the highest percentage spent on classroom instruction. This is also higher than the State average of 67.4%. Greenville's operating spending per pupil is $8,116, with $5,890 spent on classroom instruction. In comparison, the State operating spending per pupil is $9,189, with $6,192 for classroom instruction and $2,998 for non-classroom spending. Oakwood's operating spending per pupil is $12,186, lower than the average of similar districts ($15,104) but higher than the state average of $10,913. Greenville City is not among the 20% of public districts with the lowest operating expenditures per pupil and is also not among the 20% of public districts with the highest academic performance index scores. The source of funds for both districts are as follows: Greenville Oakwood State Total Local 39.1% 67.0% 40.0% State 47.5% 33.0% 45.0% Federal 8.6% 0.1% 8.0% Other 4.8% 0.0% 7.1% If awarded this grant, Greenville and Oakwood will experience savings as a result of the implementation of this innovative project. These savings include: fewer intervention tutors, reduction in materials adoption, reduction in replacements of classroom computers (Greenville), printing and consumable reductions, and intervention tutor materials and supplies.

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.

In order to track the greater utilization of teacher time in the classroom using eSpark, we will look at student achievement in both eSpark goal and non-goal domains for students. If teachers are able to better utilize teaching time as a result of the implementation of iPads and eSpark, we would like to see statistically significant achievement growth in both goal and non-goal domains. We will also look at instances of suspensions and tardiness to determine if this project impacts those measures. As previously stated, we will use data points to determine the financial impact of the utilized resources in the classroom. We will also analyze student achievement data by subgroup, with the goal of impacting all students (seeing trends across ethnic/racial groups, learning level, etc.) and measure teacher satisfaction through surveys in order to monitor our progress toward our goals.

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

If students are not engaged with the curriculum, eSpark's learning design team will evaluate the apps and videos and make any necessary changes to increase student engagement. Professional development could help address classroom management issues and help teachers use data more effectively. Collaboration and professional learning communities between teachers will allow them to brainstorm solutions to classroom issues and share best practices to make sure they are getting the time they need with students and using it effectively. If technology is not working as expected, eSpark's Implementation Manager will provide extra technology support and will meet with technology teams to improve infrastructure if necessary.

☑ 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.

By entering a consortium, Greenville and Oakwood will be sharing the resource of professional development around their iPads and eSpark usage. Teachers will be able to collaborate in both in-person and in virtual sessions with eSpark. Both districts desire a space for their teachers and administrators to discuss and brainstorm methods of continual improvement.

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.

The basic assumptions are that Greenville and Oakwood will continue to work together with a strong, collaborative relationship. We also assume that professional development scheduling will align closely enough to ensure collaborative opportunities. We also assume that teachers in both school districts will be experiencing similar types of challenges and successes while implementing both iPads and eSpark.

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.

Currently, Kimbe Lange (Oakwood) and Laura Bemus (Greenville) have a strong working relationship. In the past, Greenville has worked closely with Beavercreek City Schools during the implementation of 1:1 iPads and eSpark in first grade. Greenville observed and worked with Beavercreek to begin on a very small scale. Oakwood Schools saw Greenville's success and have visited, along with several school districts, as Greenville shared their implementation and progress in first grade. Oakwood and Greenville have a plan to share PD resources and also to include other districts, so that they can share the cost of PD, and ultimately be more efficient and collaborative. Planning has begun in terms of timing and locations of collaborative professional development.

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.

Successful outcomes will be measured in several ways. The first is to look at the number of collaborative PDs executed between the two school districts. A successful implementation would mean several collaborative sessions a year. To measure effectiveness of professional development, we will use teacher and administrator surveys to measure the satisfaction and benefit of the PD and the collaboration achieved. The agreement also encourages school visits from the two districts for observation of iPad and eSpark usage in classrooms.

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.

We will measure data in three ways: 1.Participation in collaborative professional developments. Currently, Greenville and Oakwood are not

attending any collaborative professional developments catered to their districts specifically. We will measure the success by the number of PDs attended by the two districts in a collaborative space, both in person and virtually. 2.Teacher and administrator surveys will allow us to measure satisfaction of the PD provided. Part of these measures will be focused specifically on the perceived use and effectiveness of the collaboration experienced by teachers and administrators. 3.Student logins in eSpark should be meeting or exceeding expectations for a successful implementation. If teachers feel prepared as a result of the collaborative professional developments, they should be using eSpark at the expected level, as demonstrated by average student logins per week.

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

Professional development provided by eSpark is personalized to the current situation for every district. If assumptions are false or expected outcomes are not being realized, any future professional developments can be customized to address situations and shortcomings experienced in the districts. If schedules do not align to always do shared sessions, virtual professional development may be provided. This is provides an added layer of flexibility. To further counteract this, teachers can visit the opposite school district on their own schedule. Finally, if the needs are drastically different, the specialized professional development will address any needs and teachers will further benefit from brainstorming and collaborating on a diverse set of problems.

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
- [x] 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.

982,879.00 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.

Greenville & Oakwood will be using $982,879 to fund technology and personalized learning plans. Greenville will spend $224,400 on iPads and $23,400 on cases. Oakwood will spend $268,853 on iPads with AppleCare protection and $1,160 on cases. Devices will be used throughout the grant and sustainability years. These funds will provide 1:1 devices in the classroom, allowing students to personalize their learning experience and opening doors for teachers to create engaging academic experiences with classroom-implementation fidelity. The remaining $465,066 will be spent on eSpark Learning services for both districts. The grant will cover a multi-year contract for software licenses, data analysis, and professional development. The breakdown of costs to serve both districts are as follows: -eSpark Software & Services: $312,463 ($62,492/year). eSpark's team analyzes students' standardized test scores (NWEA MAP at Greenville and iReady at Oakwood) to diagnose learning needs and create a personalized learning profile for each student. eSpark's experts have thoroughly unpacked state standards and continually scour the App Store for the most rigorous and engaging learning apps. The curriculum changes annually in response to data. The vast library, custom diagnostics, and teacher-selected goals are combined to create a personalized learning plan for each student. Teachers and school leaders can log-in to robust online dashboards to track daily usage, view quiz scores and student-created videos, and monitor academic progress to identify opportunities for follow-up, intervention, and celebration. Since new students will be using eSpark each year, and each student using eSpark will continue to grow and gain value as he or she interacts with new content, there is new and substantial value to every year of eSpark software and services. -Professional Development and Ongoing Support: $78,171 ($20,267 for the first year, $14,476/year following). High-quality, interactive professional development plays an integral role in the short- and long-term success of an iPad program, so each teacher will be required to complete a minimum amount of training. eSpark's expert blended learning consultants develop & deliver custom PD sessions, starting with an immersive, collaborative kick-off training on adapting instructional practices. Teachers also receive several hours of virtual & on-site post-launch professional development, an online resource center, and 24/7 1:1 on-call phone and email support. Data experts review mid- and end-of-year data with administrators to gauge success. Through this consortium project, these PD sessions will be collaborative between the two districts. The first year will include Greenville's experiences from their pilot implementation in the

2015-2016 school year. Teachers will continue to receive sessions and participate in professional learning communities that cover different topics and address experiences they have in the classroom, so each session is customized and provides additional value for implementation past the initial training. -iPad Setup with Orchard MDM: $14,960 ($4,400 for the first year, $2,640/year following). eSpark Orchard MDM solution enables easy, wireless iPad setup designed to help deliver personalized learning to students. Orchard provides basic device view, student-content assignment, and security profiles. Additionally, eSpark provides online guides to assist schools in VPP purchasing, downloading, installing, and managing apps on iPads. eSpark's team is also available for virtual trainings and support for device setup. -App Library payable to Apple (Math and ELA): $59,472 ($33,040 for the first year, $6,608/year following). Curated apps included in eSpark's learning plans allow districts to build a library of the best Common Core-aligned content. Each year, apps are reviewed via achievement & engagement data and are continually refreshed and updated. Apps are permanently owned by the districts.

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.

0.00	a. Sustainability Year 1
0.00	b. Sustainability Year 2
0.00	c. Sustainability Year 3
0.00	d. Sustainability Year 4
86,028.00	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.

Because implementing this program requires software that continually exposes students to new content, access to data and assessments, professional development trainings, and continuous evaluation, Greenville and Oakwood contracted with eSpark for the the first five years of the program to fully implement and serve the first cohort of students using iPads and eSpark through this project (pre-paid in grant year to serve through FY21). These costs are required to implement the program with fidelity, and each professional development training, personalized "quest", app, and session of data analysis, provides new value to students, teachers, and success of the project. By the 2021-2022 school year, all students who began using iPads and eSpark in the grant year will have moved through the grades we plan to serve in this program. At this point, we will take over the cost of sustaining the cost of the fully implemented program for a new cohort of students (in the current scope of grades) in FY22. This cost reflects maintenance of the current program, and we plan on taking over this cost using realized savings from implementation. This will allow us to continue to sustain the fully implemented program into the future, past the sixth year. If we decide to serve the first cohort of students past the specified grades, we would need to expand the scope of the grades served. The total cost for sustaining this project would be $86,028 for the consortium. The costs to sustain a fully implemented eSpark/iPad program will begin in FY22, as described above. $43,752 for Greenville and $42,276 for Oakwood is the amount to sustain the eSpark part of the budget: eSpark's software and services, professional development, tech support, and app curriculum. After the fifth year, the only additional anticipated sustainability costs would revolve around refreshing the technology bought through the grant. iPads do age, but since Greenville and Oakwood are buying devices rather than leases, both districts will be able to sell any and all devices to fund further refreshes. Additionally, the investment in iPad cases at Greenville and AppleCare at Oakwood will help ensure the longevity of the devices and the potential for high resale values when the time comes. The high resale and the intended longevity of the iPads, replacement and repair costs should not require excessive reassignment of funds. As new technology is continually developing, when and if the devices need to be replaced in the near-term, the decision will be made based on contemporary best practices.

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.

The cost of eSpark licenses and services in the 2021-2022 school year ($43,752 at Greenville and $42,276 at Oakwood) will be paid for through cost savings from reduced printing and curriculum resources, textbooks, computers, and reduction in RTI tutors through adoption of this project.

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.

NA

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 RangeNov. 1, 2015 - Sept. 30, 2016

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

2015: -Nov: Grant writing and completion to submit. Project planning and assignment personnel responsible for oversite and management 2016: - July: Greenville and Oakwood purchase and receive iPads - August: Administrators and eSpark complete kickoff call to set measurable goals for the program - August: Districts set iPads up on MDM, enroll in Apple Programs (VPP, DEP) - August/September: eSpark will upload student rosters and student achievement data from eSpark and iReady upon test are completion - September: iPads will be rolled out to all applicable students *Ongoing 24/7 support

22. Implementation(grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date RangeSeptember 1, 2016 - June 16, 2017

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

2016: - September: Teachers complete onsite full day professional development - Mid-October: All students will have logged into eSpark to complete launch quest. - Late October: Administrators complete 4 week check-in after launch with eSpark - November/December: Teachers complete collaborative virtual training based on needs; teachers have the option for classroom visits 2017: - Late January: Administrators complete mid-year data review with eSpark - January: eSpark Partner Manager work with teachers to update student goals using recent data - March/April: Teachers complete collaborative virtual training based on needs. Teachers have the option for classroom visits. - May/June: Administrators meet with eSpark Partner Managers to review end-of-year data and revisit goals set at the beginning of the school year *Ongoing 24/7 support

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

a. Date RangeJuly, 2017 - Ongoing

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

The implementation cycle will repeat every year for the 5 year project plan to insure accurate and collaborative training to continue adding value for all teachers, as well as adequate training for new students/grades.

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:

The Straight A grant will allow Greenville and Oakwood to implement significant instructional change. A 1:1 iPad initiative will facilitate the switch to student-centered learning and allow teachers to work closely with individuals and small groups rather than presenting one-size-fits-all lessons to the entire class. We expect that this face-to-face targeted support will decrease the number of students that enter into our RTI programs and will help us ensure that high performing students are challenged and engaged. iPads in the classroom mean that our educators will have the resources they need to efficiently teach our students essential 21st century skills such as media and digital literacy, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration. Implementing a joint professional development program between our two districts will result in lasting organizational change. With eSpark, teachers will have access to 24/7 tech support and intensive PD sessions. iPad deployment can be an overwhelming process, and we hope that by committing to high-quality professional instruction, we will empower our teachers to incorporate more technology into the classroom. Collaborating across district boundaries, teachers will be able to learn from each other's success and challenges and share a set of blended learning best practices. Additionally, instating joint PDs will allow both Greenville and

Oakwood to reduce the amount of funding spent on PD.

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:

Jennifer McGill eSpark Learning, Senior Partner Associate 516-567-2250 jennifer@esparklearning.com

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.

Academically, evaluation will be completed using assessment data. Greenville will use the NWEA MAP assessment and Oakwood will be using iReady. Students will take the respective assessment in reading and math three times a year: fall, winter, spring. Taking assessments multiple times a year allows for more accurate growth data. Interventions can take place if students are not improving at the rate desire by the winter. The schools will take the assessment and securely send the data to eSpark Learning for analysis.Two-sample t-tests will be used to evaluate whether mean differences in scores are statistically significant. eSpark's team of data scientists will be able to report on the findings thus far and work with the Partner Support team to ensure proper goal setting. Regarding spending reductions in the 5-year forecast, highlighted budget line items will be compared in planning and usage. Greenville will make comparisons of resources used, money spent on curriculum and textbooks, intervention resources and salaries, and classroom computers. Oakwood plans to compared RTI resource reduction, printing and copier costs, professional development savings, and Mobile Device Management system savings. To measure utilization a greater share of resources in the classroom, we will rely on two factors. The first is looking at substantial non-eSpark-goal growth academically on NWEA and iReady. According to several case studies completed by eSpark, students using eSpark have also shown growth in non-targeted areas. School districts have attributed this to the amount of time teachers have been able to spend on small group and individual instruction while other students focus on eSpark. Additionally, we will use teacher surveys to measure changes in perceived time spent on individualized instruction and data analysis. To evaluate the shared services delivery model, we will measure the amount of collaborative professional developments. Currently, Greenville and Oakwood are not attending any collaborative professional developments catered to their districts specifically. We will measure the success by the number of PDs attended by both districts in a collaborative space, be it in person or virtually. We will also be using teacher and administrator surveys. These surveys will be completed anonymously and digitally so eSpark Partner Success team members can track the data between schools and over time. Traditionally, the eSpark survey is used to gauge satisfaction with a product. Part of these measures will be focused specifically on the perceived use and effectiveness of the collaboration experienced by teachers and administrators. The survey will be analyzed after every professional development, so several times a year throughout the 5-year timeline. Gap areas will be addressed for future professional development.

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.

If successful, this project is one that can be replicated at other school districts. As this is a collaborative iteration of Beavercreek's past project, other districts and consortia can continue to learn from each other and incorporate new elements as incorporating personalized learning into the classroom. We would encourage districts to employ the basic tenants of the project, like authentic differentiation and technology innovation, and continue to tweak other aspects, always determining outcomes by which they will measure success, the most important being student achievement. If this project can show significant achievement growth for students, as others like it in the past have, it is likely that other districts will want to replicate the integration of innovative technology, personalized learning plans to differentiate to individual student needs in Math and ELA, and a cross-district collaborative environment of professional development by administration and teachers. We chose to start this project with 1:1 iPads because we have the goal of students eventually bringing home the technology (once we have the best practices in the classroom in place), and giving students the opportunity to take personal responsibility for their iPads. They will also be used as learning tools which will take the place of some of our current curriculum materials. We chose to implement with a few grade levels at each district rather than rolling out the project for all K-6 students at once, because we think the project will be more manageable for each district from a technology and teaching standpoint to start smaller and scale up. We also want to test and make improvements on our collaborative professional development model. If other districts would like to implement a similar project, they may decide they have different technology needs, would like to start on a different scale, or that they would like to do the project in partnership with more districts or independently, and a variety of other variables to consider in their version of an expanded or replicated project. It is our estimation that this solution would be very useful in other districts. As we measure the financial impact of introducing iPads and eSpark learning plans, we will be able to determine cost savings and reallocation to help interested districts determine financial feasibility past the initial investment year. This will also help determine the likelihood that we can scale up the project. In order to share what we've learned, we will have events inviting others in the state (Greenville has already done so once with the pilot project), can be a resource to districts considering technology implementations, can invite regional press to cover the project, and in partnership with eSpark, can write a case study summarizing the project and student achievement results.

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).

Straight A Assurances from ODE's document library section of the CCIP is signed and on file by: Douglas Fries, Superintendent, CEO Carla Surber, Treasurer, CFO

Consortium

Greenville City (044099) - Darke County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Consortium Contacts							
First Name	Last Name	Telephone Number	Email Address	Organization Name	IRN	Address	Delete Contact
Kimbe	Lange	937-297-7801	lange.kimbe@oakwoodschools.org	Oakwood City	044586	20 Rubicon Rd, Dayton, OH, 45409-2239	

Partnerships

Greenville City (044099) - Darke 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**
Meghann	Johnson	708-285-5520	meghann@esparklearning.com	eSpark Learning		833 West Jackson Blvd. STE 700, , Chicago, IL, 60607	

Implementation Team

Greenville City (044099) - Darke 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
Jennifer	McGill	Senior Partnership Associate, eSpark	Responsible for training, monitoring, and coaching teachers to ensure a successful implementation of eSpark in the classroom	Teaching experience, Training and monitoring teachers using eSpark.	2 years of teaching experience	Bachelor's Degree + Alternative Teaching Certificate	13	
Meghann	Johnson	eSpark, New Partnnerships Associate	Planning the project with Greenville and Oakwood, facilitating early conversations between eSpark, Apple, Oakwood, and Greenville. Ongoing support on grant project.	1.5 years experience helping districts across the country plan personalized learning programs B.A. from University of Chicago in Public Policy and Psychology	1.5 years experience helping districts across the country plan personalized learning programs	B.A. from University of Chicago in Public Policy and Psychology	1	
Daina	Levine	Assistant Technology Director	Professional Development Technology, Technology support	Assistant Technology Director Instructional Designer, Teacher	Assistant Technology Director Instructional Designer, Teacher, Wright State: Certification: Instructional Design for Online Learning	BM Music Education, Bowling Green: M.Ed. Technology in Education, Wright State	20	
Bill	DeMange	Onsite Engineer, Oakwood	Deployment of devices, technology support, repair	Onsite Engineer Apple hardware technician AAT Computer Electronic Engineering Technology	Onsite Engineer Apple hardware technician AAT Computer Electronic Engineering Technology	AAT Computer Electronic Engineer	20	
Allyson	Couch	Director of Educational Services, Oakwood	Professional Development, grant management	CCIP grant management, Student Services Assistant Superintendent, Superintendent License Principal	CCIP Grant Manager	BS in Elementary Education from Wilmington College, MS in Educational Leadership from University of Dayton, Principal and Supt. Certificati	10	
Gilbert	Vega	Implementation Manager, eSpark	Overseeing deployment of eSpark and Orchard (mobile device manager), understand the technical requirements of eSpark and Apple	Lead Apple Tech at Loyola University Medical Center (Maywood, IL), Learning & Development Trainer at Apple Inc (Cupertino, CA), Family Room	Lead Apple Tech at Loyola University Medical Center (Maywood, IL), Learning & Development Trainer at Apple Inc (Cupertino, CA), Family Room Specialist at Apple Retail (Orland Park, IL)	B.A. in Psychology from DePaul University (Chicago, IL), M.S. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from DePaul University (Chicago, IL)	2	

			deployment programs, hardware, and software, act as a technical liaison to Oakwood and Greenville's IT teams, support in troubleshooting issues	Specialist at Apple Retail (Orland Park, IL)				
Laura	Bemus	Assistant Superintendent	Purchasing programs, budget management, oversee project at Greenville	Superintendent License, Assistant Superintendent, CCIP Grant Management	Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Director, Principal, District Test Coordinator, CCIP grant management, Teacher	BS, Elem. Ed., OSU: MA Ed. Leadership, UD	30	
Stanley	Hughes	Technology Coordinator	Supervise technology, purchase technology, infastructure	Technology Supervisor, Principal License (4-12)	Assistant Principal, District Test CoordinatorTechnology Supervisor	BA Biology, Kenyon College: MA Secondary Education, Urbana University	23	
Robert	Warner	District Network Specialist	District Network and IT	CCNA, Adjunct at Edison and Sinclair Colleges, 1District Network and IT 8 years CIS instructor, business owner, curriculum development for state team IT works (ODE and Board of Regents), CIS approval of a CTAG program	Current set up eSpark and iPads for use in kindergarten and first grade	BS Zoology, OSU	20	
Kimbe	Lange	Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	Professional Development, purchasing educational materials, oversee project at Oakwood	Assistant Superintendent, Superintendent License	Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Director, Director of Gifted Education, Principal	BS in Elementary Education, OSU: MS in Educational Leadership, UD: Ed.D in Organizational Leadership, NSU	25	
Nathan	Sharp	Teacher for CIS student team	Student Computer Apprentice Teacher: Manage students who are enrolled in Computer Information System classes for assist in technical setup and maintenance of iPads and eSpark	14 years as CIS Instructor	Current set up eSpark and iPads, CISCO networking academy hardware and software)	Associate Degree in Computer, Edison Colllege	12	

Matt	Sproat	Technology Director	Management of purchasing technology, management of technology professional development, management of deployment, technology Support	Technology Director Teacher	Technology Director, Teacher	BA in Computer Science, Malone University: MA in Instructional Technology, Akron University	25	