

Budget

Wadsworth City (044974) - Medina County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (45)

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

Plus/Minus Sheet (opens new window)

Purpose Code	Object Code	Salaries 100	Retirement Fringe Benefits 200	Purchased Services 400	Supplies 500	Capital Outlay 600	Other 800	Total
Instruction		11,305.00	349.32	0.00	0.00	897,135.00	0.00	908,789.32
Support Services		0.00	0.00	16,525.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16,525.00
Governance/Admin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prof Development		0.00	0.00	13,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,300.00
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		11,305.00	349.32	29,825.00	0.00	897,135.00	0.00	938,614.32
							Adjusted Allocation	0.00
							Remaining	-938,614.32

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 DigiLit

2. Project Summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.

In order to increase student achievement district-wide in K-4 ELA, this project creates innovative, transformative, digital classrooms.

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				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	315 1	335 2	314 3
368 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8
0 9	0 10	0 11	0 12	

Year 1				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	335 1	315 2	335 3
314 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8
0 9	0 10	0 11	0 12	

Year 2				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	335 1	335 2	315 3
335 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8
0 9	0 10	0 11	0 12	

Year 3				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	335 1	335 2	335 3
315 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8
0 9	0 10	0 11	0 12	

Year 4				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	335 1	335 2	335 3
335 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8
0 9	0 10	0 11	0 12	

Year 5				
0 Pre-K Special Education	335 K	335 1	335 2	335 3
335 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8

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.

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

First and last name of contact for lead applicant

Michele Evans

Organizational name of lead applicant

Wadsworth City Schools

Address of lead applicant

524 Broad Street

Phone Number of lead applicant

3303351315

Email Address of lead applicant

mevans@wadsworthschools.org

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

Reading achievement in Ohio, particularly among certain subgroups of students, has progressed at a painfully slow & sometimes non-existent pace. Since 2002, Ohio NAEP scores for 4th graders in reading have only increased 3 pts, slower than the national increase over the same period of time (IES, 2015). Female students outscored male students by 6 pts, and students who were eligible for free/reduced price lunch scored 26 pts lower than students who were not eligible for F/R lunch (IES, 2015). Low achieving students, those in the lowest 20% of achievement as well as spec. ed. students, have also been persistently low-performing on Ohio's state tests, exacerbating gaps between these groups & the mainstream. Students are growing up in a digital world where they are able to game, text & participate in social networking, but are unable to apply technology to the academic setting to a) locate, evaluate, use & create information; b) understand & use information presented in multiple formats from a wide range of resources; c) perform tasks effectively in a digital environment; d) read & interpret media & reproduce data & images through digital manipulation; e) evaluate & apply new knowledge gained from digital environments (Jones-Kavalier & Flanagan, 2014). On the recent digital learning report card (Foundation for Excellence in Education), Ohio earned a "D" in progress toward high quality digital learning. The 2009 PISA test of student performance in digital reading, navigation & computer use showed the strong influence of SES on digital reading performance. And while the U.S. did not participate, the digital divide linked to SES also exists for digital reading performance (ACEReSearch, 2012). WCS is considered a high-performing school district, but performance for subgroups has been difficult to move. Gaps exist for low SES, spec. ed. subgroups & progress has lagged for the lowest

achieving 20%. Smaller gaps exist between male/female performance in reading.

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

District DigiLit seeks to pick up where the previously funded Straight A grant (round 2) awarded to Gearity Professional Development School in the CH-UH District left off. The original DigiLit grant sought to create an innovative, technology-driven environment within a single school in order to increase student achievement, primarily in the ELA content area, but within the context of a STEM school. From the grant evaluation, large effects were seen in DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) & retell quality (comprehension). These gains were several times larger than national averages for intervention effects in elementary schools & several times larger than national averages for annual gains in reading for 4th grade students. Moderate effects were realized in acquiring STEM vocabulary. Teachers in the original grant reported positive collaboration & perceived their students were more motivated & engaged in school due to the use of technology in instruction; however they were not satisfied with the PD provided & felt there was a lack of teacher input/autonomy to make decisions, especially with regard to the apps selected. Teachers also reported the STEM vocabulary component was too restrictive & should be expanded to include academic vocabulary. One of the major problems with the implementation of the original DigiLit grant involved technical issues which created barriers for teachers and students to use the technology consistently & effectively. WCS is in an advantageous position to solve many of these issues & implement the DigiLit framework at a district level to create an innovative district-level approach to teaching ELA. This innovation was chosen because it holds great promise and aligns with the already existing district movement and philosophy. WCS is heavily invested in technology & requires only a small investment in funds to create dense wireless access in all 5 K-4 buildings. District DigiLit will capitalize on an existing K-12 STEM pathway where STEM literacy for all students is expected. District DigiLit will benefit from the WCS position as a state leader in Google Apps for Education. And finally, District DigiLit will build on the district momentum of digital literacy in classrooms and student use of digital devices, but will ramp this up considerably to create engaging, innovative, personalized environments for students & teachers in all 5 elementary schools. WCS teachers & students are fortunate in that the district has provided extensive PD in classroom application of technology and has invested heavily in Chromebooks & to a lesser extent, iPads, for classroom use. Each K-4 classroom has 4 Chromebooks for student use, Chromebook carts (1-4 per building) & an iPad cart are in each building. The WCS DigiLit classroom will be a lively, participatory environment where teachers & students understand digital tools & resources, access & utilize them in order to create innovative reading & writing projects rooted in a problem-based learning approach. WCS teachers have been trained in PBL in order to support the STEM literacy of students. Through this grant, teachers would become knowledgeable about various low-cost/no-cost digital resources for classroom ELA instruction, they will learn how to access & utilize these resources to increase student engagement & achievement & they will be able to create model ELA classrooms. Using existing in-service & PD days as well as extensive, personalized job-embedded, on-going coaching, teachers will learn about resources & technology in order to make informed choices in their classrooms. Formative assessment practices (FIP), which teachers are trained on, will be utilized in a district-wide formative assessment system. Because this is a district-level approach to ELA, district systems will change accordingly. Building on the successful collaborative effort of the original DigiLit grant, existing district collaborative structures will support the effort.

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 student achievement goals of District DigiLit are 1) close gaps between low achieving subgroups of students and the mainstream by 10% annually (special education, lowest 20%); 2) increase growth in special education and low SES students by 10% annually; 3) completely close gaps between male and female students in reading in K-4; 4) increase academic vocabulary by approximately 350 words annually; 5) create a model ELA environment utilizing digital resources in a balanced literacy approach; 6) reallocate existing district resources to support the digital literacy environment; 7) create a model for teacher decision-making about tools and materials within the ELA classroom; 8) create student knowledge and skills about tools and good decision-making about which tools to use under various circumstances to create desired learning products. At the heart of this project is teacher and student decision-making about texts, tools and choosing the best resources in order to produce desired outcomes.

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.

We intend to use the DIBELS as our primary assessment for formative and summative results for two reasons. First, the original DigiLit grant primarily utilized DIBELS as an formative and summative measure and we desire to measure our progress and achievement in the same manner. The will allow for gains in the first grant to be replicated and validated in a different setting with a larger number of students. This will help to validate the intervention. The second reason for the primary use of the DIBELS to measure outcomes is due to the inconsistency and on-going changes in the state assessment system and results. In the first year of implementation, the learning curve for teachers will be quite steep. We believe our goals are ambitious and achievable, but we are also cognizant of years of stagnation with these particular subgroups. Gaining momentum and changing instruction in significant ways will be paramount to seeing results. ODE makes available growth analyses through value added analysis and also information about gap analysis and performance of subgroups. Due to the changes in the state assessment system (this will be the third set of assessments in as many years) it can not be guaranteed that results quantified by the DIBELS will be quantified in the state systems.

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

DIBELS has been piloted at 1 elementary school to help teachers target instruction & create instructional groups from data. Parents are receiving the data well, as it is easy to understand & see progress of students in an accessible, graphical format. The data is actionable for progress monitoring & determining the success of various interventions being used with a student/group of students. WCS teachers use digital resources in classrooms. The Learning A-Z products have been used in district classrooms for several years. Teachers have received PD on these resources and how to best use them with students. Teachers have commented after such trainings that digital resources should be our primary means of instruction, indicating readiness & initial buy-in. Book Flix, Storaia (4th) & Newsela are free resources & have been used to varying degrees in district classrooms. Use of digital tools has been limited by access to devices. It is

widely understood that students are not accessing digital resources for learning—they see digital tools primarily for entertainment & for social networking purposes (Jones-Kavaliar & Flanagan, 2014). In order to maximize use of digital resources & tools for academic purposes, students must have access to them in the classroom & be taught to consume information & produce products using these tools. Students & teachers need a variety of tools to use & make conscientious choices about which tool would be most appropriate in a given situation, but in order to do so, tools must be readily available. Students & teachers must see digital resources as a means to create, build, innovate & communicate in ways that engage both learners & various audiences (parents, other students, etc.) For many children who live in economically challenged environments, these digital tools are not readily available—thus the term "digital divide." If given the opportunity in an academic environment to test, try, & become proficient with these tools to further learning & maximize the ability to produce highly engaging learning products, the gap between low income students & the mainstream will close. According to a Stanford University study of the digital divide, "In our society, where the distribution of wealth is already heavily unbalanced, access to computers & the Internet is unbalancing the situation even more. Those with computers & access to the Internet are becoming even richer through the power of information, while those without them are becoming even poorer in comparison. According to William Kennard, the Chair of the FCC, 'In a society where increasingly we are defined by access to information & what we earn is what we learn, if you don't have access to technology, you're going to be left in the digital dark ages.'" (Stanford University, 2000). A more recent study by the Pew Research Center indicates in 2015, 78% of households making less than \$30,000 per year have Internet access while in households making between \$100,000 & \$150,000, 98% of these households have Internet access (Pew Research Institute, 2015). In WCS, drawing on use statistics of unique devices which have joined the district network in BYOD at the high school, it is estimated that 87.9% of households have Internet access at home, but this statistic, if this grant were to be awarded, would be verified in each elementary, so that we know exactly what home access looks like, since it is anticipated that students will want to continue reading & creating at home. Teachers have been trained in PBL with NASA Glenn & some teachers have experimented with maker spaces in their classrooms. Due to very high class sizes (27-30 students/room) at K-4 & a district commitment to lower class size, it is anticipated that many useable classroom spaces may be converted to classrooms in upcoming years. The idea of a mobile maker space, where teachers have input on materials, will further enhance teacher decision-making & input, an area of concern.

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).

By the start of SY 2016-17, all equipment will be purchased, installed & teachers will be trained in preparation for the upcoming school year. The ELA framework will be established by the "Team of Ten" & teachers will receive training on the framework & digital resources during the district in-service day in August. Principals will be trained in a walk-through protocol specific to the elements in the literacy framework & for the use of technology (which technology is being utilized, which resources, by whom, how frequently, etc.) Principals will be asked to complete these walk through protocols on an on-going basis throughout the grant year in order to detect change in practice and in order to inform future PD needs. The protocols will be shared with the "Team of Ten" as they work with the University of Akron coaches to drive the content of the building-specific PD/coaching needs for each cycle of coaching. Tech help desk tickets are already an outcome that is measured & this will continue, noting the frequency of tickets related to specific hardware & software difficulties that would indicate the grant technology is not consistent nor effective. These tickets will be monitored, as they are now, for themes & emerging themes will be identified for future tech PD. DIBELS data will be collected at 3 points during the year. Areas of strength, growth and needs for improvement will be identified at all levels. This data will also be disaggregated in order to monitor subgroup performance. The data will provide a basis for future PD needs and on-going coaching needs. At the conclusion of the year, the CSU evaluation report will be analyzed for changes needed & an analysis will be conducted to drive the next year. The district will continue evaluating the grant in subsequent years & the same analysis will drive the upcoming year's changes in order to maximize effectiveness & student achievement.

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

DIBELS data will be collected at the beginning, middle and end of year for all students. For students in intervention, data will be collected either bi-weekly or monthly, depending on the tier of intervention. The beginning of year data collection will serve as the baseline and growth and gap analyses will be driven from this data point for all subgroups (spec. ed, economically disadvantaged, lowest 20% in achievement, male/female differences in achievement). Growth will be measured from beginning of the year to the end of year data points and the expectation is that gaps will close during this time period also. The fall 2016 administration of the Iowa will serve as baseline at grades 2 and 4 for the vocabulary subtest. ODE data will be examined, once it is available, for relevance in the gap analyses and progress data for the subgroups of focus of this project.

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

Implementation and impact data will be monitored during each of the 90 day cycles. Adjustments will be made, as needed in order to correct any issues in implementation (i.e. technology issues, account issues, access issues, etc.). The "Team of Ten" will provide leadership and input from the building level and the walk through protocols will provide a valuable source of "on the ground" data collection in terms of implementation. If, at the conclusion of the grant year (FY 17) the student achievement goals are not realized, growth will be examined to see if there are positive changes in student achievement and if an upwards trajectory for subgroups has started and that momentum is building, but acceleration has not been realized as of yet. This data pattern would indicate the implementation and design of the program is sufficient, but perhaps more time and intensity is needed. If the trajectory of student achievement is flat or falling, then substantial changes in design will be needed. The leadership team will determine the changes needed in order to get the project on track.

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.

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.

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. 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).

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

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

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 indicator 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.

938,614.32 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.

The majority of the grant funds requested (\$710,350) will be used to equip each K-2 classroom with a cart of 30 iPad minis and each 3rd-4th grade classroom with a cart of Chromebooks. Existing Chromebook carts in each building purchased with district, not parent group, funds will be repurposed and used in classrooms as part of this effort. Additionally, the 4 Chromebooks which are located in each 3rd-4th grade classroom will be gathered, placed on carts in order to reduce the total number of devices needed. \$97,875 will be needed to create the wireless density in all five buildings. Wireless access currently exists, but a site survey indicates it will not be dense enough to support the number of devices that will be on the network after the equipment purchases are completed and all devices are up and running. \$27 per device will be allocated for the purchase of apps at teacher discretion to answer to the critique in the original DigiLit grant that teachers felt they did not have enough input into the apps on the devices. \$73,490 will equip ten mobile maker spaces (2/building) with a mobile cabinet on casters, a laptop, a Makerbot 3D printer with extra filament, and a GoPro camera. Additionally, \$500 seed money for teachers to purchase building materials (Legos, Makey Makey, Snap Circuits, etc.) they deem appropriate for their students and their needs in their maker spaces. The grant evaluation will be \$16,525 and will be conducted by Dr. Justin Perry from Cleveland State University, who did the original DigiLit grant evaluation. University of Akron coaches will be contracted for 38 days (5 days of planning with the leadership "Team of Ten" teachers; three days of district-wide PD and 30 days of building-level, personalized, job-embedded PD/coaching depending on the specific needs of the building). The "Team of Ten" will be paid \$11,654.32 for their summer work and leadership bringing the grant total request to \$938,614.32.

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.

8,027.00 a. Sustainability Year 1

2,743.00 b. Sustainability Year 2

2,812.00 c. Sustainability Year 3

2,882.00 d. Sustainability Year 4

2,954.00 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.

Sustainability year 1: 3 days of summer work for the "Team of Ten" to debrief and adjust from the year, lend direction for the upcoming year's PD, and guide the work for the upcoming year, \$8,027. This will come from the existing PD budget. Additional costs may be incurred if new teachers are hired and need to be trained in Orton Gillingham (\$850/person). This training has been accounted for the in the district PD budget.
Sustainability year 2: 1 day of summer work for the "Team of Ten" to debrief and adjust from the year, lend direction for the upcoming year's PD, and guide the work for the upcoming year, \$2,743. This will come from the existing PD budget. Additional costs may be incurred if new teachers are hired and need to be trained in Orton Gillingham (\$850/person). This training has been accounted for the in the district PD budget.
Sustainability year 3: 1 day of summer work for the "Team of Ten" to debrief and adjust from the year, lend direction for the upcoming year's PD, and guide the work for the upcoming year, \$2,812. This will come from the existing PD budget. Additional costs may be incurred if new teachers are hired and need to be trained in Orton Gillingham (\$850/person). This training has been accounted for the in the district PD budget.
Additionally, the existing full-size iPad cart in each building will need to be replaced. The cost of replacement will be saved, but some of the savings will be spent to place five iPad minis in the 3rd & 4th grade classrooms to give teachers & students choice in tools. Original Chromebook carts will need to be replaced. These costs have been anticipated in the district tech budget.
Sustainability year 4: 1 day of summer work for the "Team of Ten" to debrief and adjust from the year, lend direction for the upcoming year's PD, and guide the work for the upcoming year, \$2,882. This will come from the existing PD budget. Additional costs may be incurred if new teachers are hired and need to be trained in Orton Gillingham (\$850/person). This training has been accounted for the in the district PD budget. Additionally, Chromebook carts purchased in 2015-16 with district funds will need to be replaced. This has been accounted for in the district tech budget.
Sustainability year 5: 1 day of summer work for the "Team of Ten" to debrief and adjust from the year, lend direction for the upcoming year's PD, and guide the work for the upcoming year, \$2,954. This will come from the existing PD budget. Additional costs may be incurred if new teachers are hired and need to be trained in Orton Gillingham (\$850/person). Additional replacement of devices will occur per the district tech plan and budget. WCS will need to renegotiate the district license renewal if Learning A-Z products are to continue to be used in the ELA block, although in a five year period, digital reading resources could change substantially and this expenditure may not be necessary.

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.

Anticipated cost savings: \$87,297.90 savings for ELA adoption in 2016-17. FIT table savings: Chromebooks will not need to be replaced as anticipated in Sustainability years 1 and 2 = savings of \$102,000; paper savings \$2,495/year; imprints in years 3, 4 and 5 once the existing contract is renewed \$10,000 savings per year for 3 years = \$30,000. Replacing iPad carts with loose iPad minis for 3rd & 4th grade classrooms only = \$17,575.

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.

Not applicable.

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 Range 2/1/2016-2/29/2016

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

Utilizing the 90 day cycle approach, developed by the Carnegie Foundation and utilized in the original DigiLit grant, will be used to support the planning and implementation of this grant. 90 day cycles offer a systematic process for producing and testing models in support of change, allowing project teams time and opportunity to a) conceptualize frameworks; b) prototype processes, tools and practices; c) test to gauge potential efficacy of a model's components. PRE-CYCLE UPON PROJECT AWARD (2/1/16-2/29/16): The team will complete start up tasks i) execute consultant contracts; ii) plan PD curriculum content and timeline; iii) finalize equipment purchase; iv) determine training for digital curriculum content; v) communicate plan to Board of Education, teachers, parents and community; vi) formative/summative evaluation tools and viii) set-up a regular project implementation timeline/calendar that includes all project partners and the district technology staff. By February 29, 2016, the project team will finalize the project management plan and calendar around four 90 day cycles of implementation.

22. Implementation(grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date Range3/1/2016-6/30/2017

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

IMPLEMENTATION CYCLE 1 (3/1-5/31/16): Teachers will attend PD on DIBELS & digital resources to be used in the project, allowing summer access to ensure familiarity & confidence. The "Team of Ten" will organize & coordinate summer work sessions. This aligns with existing district practice following a new curriculum selection/adoption. Equipment will be ordered by WCS tech dept. Mobile maker spaces will be customized by teachers & materials ordered. Teachers will begin to explore apps to be selected for devices. CYCLE 2 (6/1/16-8/31/16): The "Team of Ten" will meet for 5 days with U of Akron literacy coaches to create specifics of the literacy framework; teachers will receive PD in Aug. on the framework before school begins; monthly project team meetings will occur to ensure the project gets off to a productive start & issues can be quickly resolved. CYCLE 3 (9/1-11/30/16): The first district PD day occurs in Sept. & teachers will receive PD with U of Akron literacy coaches. The "Team of Ten" will address other relevant PD needs. The first cycle of PD/coaching will occur. Each building will receive 2 days of job-embedded, personalized PD/coaching. Primary grades will receive PD/coaching one day & 3rd/4th grade another. This will ensure support is personalized & needs are met. It is anticipated that PD/coaching will initially involve in-classroom modeling by literacy coaches & will move through a gradual release of control through the school year to coaches observing teachers & providing feedback. Baseline data collection will occur. CYCLE 4 (12/1/16-2/28/17): The second district PD day occurs in Jan. & teachers will receive PD with U of Akron literacy coaches. The "Team of Ten" will address other relevant PD needs. PD/coaching cycle 2 will occur (2 days/building). Mid-year data collection will occur. CYCLE 5 (3/1-5/30/17): The third PD/coaching cycle will occur (2 days/building). End-of-year data collection will occur; analysis complete by 6/30/17.

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

a. Date Range7/1/2017-6/30/2022

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

In WCS, all content areas review materials on a six year cycle. K-6 ELA is being examined during the 2015-16 SY & adopted for the 2016-17 SY. If this project is funded, a portion of what was allocated for the purchase of materials will be used for the Learning A-Z content (district GRF expense) & a multi-year license would be secured that will take the district through the 2020-2021 school year after which this resource would be reexamined. Budgeted cost for ELA materials will be reduced by 47% for the K-4 content purchase. This is not represented in the FIT table as it occurs during the grant year. A-Z products and other free digital resources would constitute the reading content until the next study year. WCS is committed to training teachers in Orton Gillingham (at district expense) for the phonemic awareness and phonics content of the literacy block. The "Team of Ten" would work to create the framework for spelling, utilizing a hybrid approach outlined by K. Davis (2011) that incorporates sight words, developmental words and content words. Word study & vocabulary protocols would be adjusted from the original DigiLit grant & words would be drawn from academic vocabulary. PD on writing protocols would be part of the implementation year PD & would become on-going PD opportunities. These areas would be combined to create a model ELA block as described & outlined by the Florida Center for Reading Research. Students would also read for 15-30 minutes of daily where they would choose their own reading material primarily from the digital resources available. Existing PD & inservice days would be used to provide on-going PD based on need and would be guided by the "Team of Ten." Many collaborative district processes already exist that support the work of this grant and would ensure success throughout the sustainability period. Dr. Perry will advise on district evaluation structure during sustainability period.

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:

Instructionally, it is anticipated that classrooms will become lively, highly-engaged reading & writing studios where students are able to have time within the literacy block to choose engaging reading materials & pursue topics of interest, both in reading & writing. This reading & writing will, to a large degree, be done using technology as a tool. Students will have access to high-tech tools to create meaningful learning products using mobile maker spaces & digital resources. K-2 classrooms will be equipped with a cart of iPad minis, as they are economical & it is believed that the touch interface & ability to record video & photographs will enable young learners to most appropriately interact with their learning environment & the objects they are investigating. In learning products from the original DigiLit grant, students often took photographs of their STEM projects & annotated the photographs so that audiences could see their learning. This arrangement is advantageous for young learners, especially those just learning to read & write. K-2 classrooms will still have access to Chromebook carts

(1-2 per building) which have been purchased by parent (WHYS-Wadsworth Home Youth School) groups in buildings and/or building level computer labs. In third & fourth grade classrooms, where the use of Chromebooks is already prevalent, a cart of Chromebooks will be present in each classroom. Chromebooks will allow students to write more extensively, utilizing Google Apps for Education. Chromebooks are limited in photography & video capabilities, but as building full-sized iPads carts are replaced using existing district technology funds, iPad minis will be purchased & placed in each 3rd & 4th grade classroom so students have the same photography/video capabilities available in earlier grades. Prior to replacement, students have access to the current iPads as well as anticipated photo and video equipment on the mobile maker spaces. Each building will have autonomy within this grant to select apps identified by teachers for classroom use. An app allocation is designated for each building per device & the building will customize purchases for their needs. This is a departure from the way apps have been managed in the past by the district technology department. Additionally, mobile maker spaces will be customized by each building. Materials available in classrooms differ between buildings, as some WCS buildings have invested in Lego story starter kits for classroom use, robotics equipment, etc. Providing the ability to choose materials will afford teachers opportunity to customize the mobile maker spaces to their needs & specifications. A seed allocation will get them started. Because WHYS groups in each building have been investing heavily in Chromebooks for buildings and this will no longer be needed, it is anticipated that the WHYS groups will become involved in helping to stock & maintain the mobile maker spaces in buildings. This type of customization for instructional purposes will be different for WCS, where typically, instructional materials & district-purchased and supported materials are uniform across buildings. Additionally, it is expected that this grant will dramatically change the work of the district tech department. Having many more devices in buildings will cause the department to further enhance management systems and practices that ensure dependable access & consistent classroom use. Although the infrastructure in WCS is robust, this project will add hundreds of new devices to the network & the efficiency and effectiveness of the tech department will need to grow accordingly. Tech personnel have been involved from the beginning conversations of this project & are enthusiastic about supporting it and recognize the ability to transform teaching & learning in K-4 buildings through this project.

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:

The external evaluator for the project is Justin Perry, Ph.D., who is the Director of the Center for Urban Education at Cleveland State University and serves as Chair and Associate Professor in the Department of Counseling, Administration, Supervision, and Adult Learning. Under the auspices of the Center, Dr. Perry previously led his team at CSU in completing the evaluation for the Straight A funded DigiLit project awarded to Cleveland Heights-University Heights City School District from 2014 to 2015. Dr. Perry is already highly familiar with DigiLit and has the capacity and resources to effectively oversee, manage, and carry out the evaluation in a timely and efficient manner. He can be reached via telephone at 216-875-9778 (office) or via e-mail at j.c.perry96@csuohio.edu.

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.

Given that District DigiLit proposes to implement the intervention to all students enrolled in its five elementary schools, the evaluation design will be based on comparing growth rates in the main outcome of interest between the different student subgroups of interest, as measured by the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Literacy Skills (DIBELS) composite score and various subtest scores. The growth rates of the identified sub-groups of interest in the project (i.e., lowest 20%, special education, mainstream, male versus female) will be specifically examined. Multilevel modeling will be performed as the primary approach to test for differences in longitudinal growth at both the school and classroom unit of analysis. The above analytic strategy will enable the evaluator to examine growth in literacy outcomes between different subgroups. In addition, the evaluator will conduct basic descriptive analyses to examine the extent to which gaps in literacy achievement are closed between different sub-groups of interest, such as comparing male to female students. In order to complement these descriptive analyses, a more advanced statistical method using propensity score matching will be employed; this method was also used in the previous DigiLit grant. More specifically, the evaluator will establish baseline equivalence on the DIBELS according to set of demographic covariates and the pre-test scores (beginning of the school year); as such, post-test scores will then be compared between different subgroups. Multiple comparison procedures will be used to adjust for the inflation of type 1 error, based on analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). The Benjamini and Hochberg's stepwise multiple hypotheses testing procedure will adjust for this potential error. Effect sizes will be calculated using Cohen's d, which can be converted into policy-based benchmarks with respect to comparing the results to norms for average annual gains from national reading tests. Comparisons on the DIBELS can be made as a function of several factors, including school building, grade level, gender, special education status, and so forth. All students in the project will have taken the DIBELS at pre- and post-test data points. The post-test (or end of school year) DIBELS test scores will not be available for analyses until June or July of 2017. Consequently, the analyses used to test for differences in DIBELS (e.g., differences between male and female students, differences between different schools) will occur during the summer of 2017. During Implementation Cycle 1 (3/1/16 - 5/31/16), the evaluation team in the Center for Urban Education will consult with the Wadsworth City School personnel in designing a brief survey that will be administered to all of the participating teachers in each school via online or paper-and-pencil methods. This brief survey will be designed to conduct a needs assessment for professional development activities in subsequent implementation cycles during the course of the grant. The Center will also analyze the survey data and submit a report to key personnel. By August 2017, the Center will provide a final evaluation report. Lessons learned from the project will be disseminated to education providers in Ohio through the Ohio Education Research Center (OERC). It will be spotlighted on the Wadsworth City Schools website, and shared with a wide range of teachers and other stakeholders via public announcements, electronic newsletters, and social media outlets. Further, information about the project will be disseminated to teacher education programs across the state of Ohio and nationally, including but not limited to conferences like the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Education Research Association (AERA).

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.

Because this project is the district scale-up of an existing, successful Straight A funded project, we believe it is uniquely situated for replication and expansion to other districts. Creating innovative, personalized ELA environments at the elementary level where students and teachers have access to digital resources and tools is an aspiration of many districts. A project of this size, scale and scope has not yet been attempted. With so many schools and districts pursuing STEM constructs and few examples being available at the elementary level (the OSLN has no process for elementary schools to complete in order to be recognized as a STEM elementary school), we believe our district would become a showcase to others. WCS is well-networked within Medina and Summit counties, among our career-tech partners and with other northeastern Ohio schools through various projects (KEEP Academy at Kent State University, Education Policy Fellows Program at Cleveland State University, on-going relationships with the University of Akron, Malone University, Walsh University, WVIZ, etc.). We believe our status as a leader in northeastern Ohio affords WCS the opportunity to promote DigiLit as a viable district solution and a high-tech, high-interest alternative to a traditional elementary ELA program. WCS personnel are willing and interested to pursue writing and presentation opportunities to illustrate the success of this program, once implemented. Such opportunities would first be sought among our existing networks.

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).

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).

Consortium

Wadsworth City (044974) - Medina 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

Wadsworth City (044974) - Medina 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
Lisa	Lenhart	330-972-6664	lenhar1@uakron.edu	University Of Akron	062869	Zook Hall 210, Akron, OH, 44325-4201	
Justin	Perry	216-875-9778	j.c.perry96@csuohio.edu	Cleveland State University Ub	085753	2121 Euclid Ave Rm 303, Cleveland, OH, 44115-2214	

Implementation Team

Wadsworth City (044974) - Medina 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
Phil	Luthman	Supervisor of Technology	Mr. Luthman will be responsible for the acquisition of technology, the blueprint for device deployment and ongoing technical support for classroom teachers. Mr. Luthman will also be responsible for technology PD for teachers so they are able to lead students in the use of the various devices and digital tools in the project. Mr. Luthman directs the work of the WCS tech team. It is anticipated in the initial 3 months of roll out, Mr. Luthman and the rest of the tech team members will devote 50% of their time to this project.	Mr. Luthman advises the district on purchasing compliance with technology expenditures, infrastructure compatibility and necessary implementation support and leadership with WCS technology and instructional staff, contractors, and vendors to bring the tools to the students within deadlines. Mr. Luthman is well-connected professionally and is considered a leader in his field. Mr. Luthman has six years of school technology experience and twelve years of private technology experience.	Mr. Luthman has overseen large deployments previously, both in WCS and in previous districts where he was employed. He has pioneered the use of Apple devices in multiple school systems, and has recently lead the charge to adopt Google Apps for Education in WCS, putting the district in a position as a state leader in this area. He regularly conducts PD for district instructional staff.	Kent State University, B.S. in Information Technology	30	
Team of Ten	teacher leadership team	ELA Lead Teachers (2/building)	Responsible for leadership at the classroom and building level. The Team of Ten will work directly with the University of Akron literacy coaches to design PD and coaching sessions to meet building and teacher needs. They will develop processes and products, under the guidance of the University of Akron literacy coaches, including the literacy framework, for use in the project. Development of this team will give the district internal capacity to sustain the grant after the initial grant year. The Team of Ten will assume	The Team of Ten will be selected from existing teaching staff for their leadership and knowledge in ELA. They are anticipated to be early adopters of digital resources in their classrooms.	Although the specific individuals for this team have not yet been selected, it is anticipated that they will have at least 5 years of relevant teaching experience and considerable expertise, interest and education/training in the ELA area.	Education will vary among the ten teachers.	5	

			leadership responsibilities and guide professional development needed during the five years of sustainability.					
Shelley	Houser	Literacy Coach, Center for Literacy, University of Akron	Responsible to provide leadership, professional development at the district-level and on-going, job-embedded, customized coaching and professional development in district buildings.	Ms. Houser has provided professional development in many areas of literacy (writing, foundational skills, vocabulary, reading, spelling, assessment, etc.). She serves as an adjunct faculty member at the University of Akron.	Ms. Houser has been a literacy coach embedded into classrooms for the past six years in a variety of settings such as Head Start (4 years), Copley Fairlawn City Schools (3 years), Green City Schools (2 years), Twinsburg City Schools (2 years).	Master's degree in education and currently is pursuing a doctorate.	20	
Justin	Perry, Ph.D.	Director of Center for Urban Education, Cleveland State University.	Responsibility for grant evaluation for the grant year (2016-17) and advising district on evaluation for sustainability years.	Dr. Perry was the evaluator for the original CH-UH DigiLit grant and understands the project well. He is uniquely qualified to evaluate the scale-up of the DigiLit approach to the district level outlined in this project. Dr. Perry has served as the external evaluator on numerous large projects in K-12 settings and is knowledgeable and experienced in working with schools and school districts.	Dr. Perry has served as an external evaluator for many federal, state and local grants in his capacity as the Director for the Center for Urban Education at Cleveland State University. He has considerable experience evaluating grants in K-12 environments and his experiencing with the initial DigiLit grant makes him uniquely qualified for this evaluation.	Ph.D. (Counseling Psychology), Boston College; M.A. (Mental Health Counseling), Boston College; B.A. (Psychology), Tulane University.	8	
Pam	Oviatt	Literacy Coach, Center for Literacy, University of Akron	Responsible to provide leadership, professional development at the district-level and on-going, job-embedded, customized coaching and professional development in district buildings.	Ms. Oviatt has provided professional development in many areas of literacy (writing, foundational skills, vocabulary, reading, spelling, assessment, etc.). She is an adjunct faculty member at the University of Akron.	Ms. Oviatt has been a literacy coach embedded into classrooms for the past six years in a variety of settings such as Head Start (4 years), Copley Fairlawn City Schools (3 years), Green City Schools (2 years), Twinsburg City Schools (2 years)	Master's degree in education.	20	
Lisa	Lenhart, Ph.D.	Director, Univ. of Akron Center for Literacy; Professor of literacy	Dr. Lenhart will provide organization and oversight for the literacy coaches assigned to this project. She will also provide leadership and insight for the project implementation. It is anticipated that she will be heavily involved during the initial planning and Implementation Cycle	Current responsibilities include oversight of all literacy projects through the Center for Literacy at the University of Akron; purchasing, contracts and communications for the Center. Dr. Lenhart has considerable grant experience across multiple settings and has collaborated on	Dr. Lenhart has extensive experience in grant implementation and developing on-going, job-embedded professional development opportunities for in-service and pre-service teachers. She has worked on numerous grant-funded projects through the Ohio Department of Education, the U.S.	Ph.D., Kent State (Literacy); M.Ed. (Prof. Teacher), John Carroll Univ.; B.S., Bowling Green Univ. (Elem. Ed.)	10	

			1 and less so after that.	numerous research studies and publications. She teaches graduate and undergraduate classes in literacy at the University of Akron.	Department of Education and has evaluated grants at both the state and national level. Dr. Lenhart has authored books, articles and presentations for international and national publication and presentation. She is highly regarded in the field of literacy.			
Michele	Evans, Ph.D.	Director of Instruction and Professional Development	Dr. Evans will be responsible for overall management and oversight of the project. She will be responsible for convening the project team; implementing the 90 day cycles; coordinating data transfer with Dr. Perry for the grant evaluation; procuring and managing digital resources and assessment tools, organizing professional development and leading and supporting all aspects of the project. She will also be responsible to manage the budget for the project.	Dr. Evans has worked in large scale literacy projects while previously employed at the Ohio Department of Education and has evaluated literacy projects for the US Dept. of Education under two different grant competitions. She is currently responsible for the overall instructional program in WCS. Her dissertation focused on the evaluation of professional development within a large-scale, federally-funded literacy project. She currently serves as an adjunct faculty member at Malone University in the area of principal licensure.	State Director for Reading First-Ohio (Ohio Dept. of Education) Director of Testing, Evaluation and Research (Canton City Schools) Superintendent (Canton City Schools) Principal, Gearity Professional Development School/STEM (Cleveland Hts-University Hts Schools). Dr. Evans has led large literacy grant-funded projects and had led the development and implementation of the K-12 STEM program in WCS. She has led technology-driven literacy projects in prior positions. Dr. Evans has developed and implemented data driven decision-making processes and protocols in large scale literacy projects at the state and at the district level. She has worked with Dr. Lenhart and Dr. Perry previously.	Ph.D. (ed. policy & leadership); M.A. (ed. admin.); B.S. (elem. ed. & literacy) all from The Ohio State University.	35	