Budget

Upper Arlington City (044933) - Franklin County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (53)

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** | 19,008.00 | 2,880.00 | 10,800.00 | 40,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 72,688.00 |
| **Support Services** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 219,300.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 219,300.00 |
| **Governance/Admin** | 80,000.00 | 40,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 120,000.00 |
| **Prof Development** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 |
| **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** | 99,008.00 | 42,880.00 | 250,100.00 | 40,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 431,988.00 |
| | | | | | | **Adjusted Allocation** | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | **Remaining** | -431,988.00 |

Application

Upper Arlington City (044933) - Franklin County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (53)

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

**A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information**

1. Project Title:
XCLASS: Designing Next Generation High School Courses

2. Project Tweet: Please limit your responses to 140 characters.
High school R&D Center supports design and delivery of blended courses that prepare students for fulfilling lives and the future economy

*This is an ultra-concise introduction to the project.*

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

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

Grant Year

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

Year 1

| Pre-K Special Education | K | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 18 5 | 19 6 | 19 7 | 19 8 |
| 18 9 | 19 10 | 19 11 | 19 12 | |

Year 2

| Pre-K Special Education | K | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 25 5 | 25 6 | 25 7 | 25 8 |
| 25 9 | 25 10 | 25 11 | 25 12 | |

Year 3

| Pre-K Special Education | K | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 31 5 | 31 6 | 31 7 | 32 8 |
| 31 9 | 31 10 | 31 11 | 32 12 | |

Year 4

| Pre-K Special Education | K | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 37 5 | 37 6 | 38 7 | 38 8 |
| 37 9 | 37 10 | 38 11 | 38 12 | |

Year 5

| Pre-K Special Education | K | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 43 5 | 44 6 | 44 7 | 44 8 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 43 9 | 44 10 | 44 11 | 44 12 |

4. Explanation of any additional students to be impacted throughout the life of the project.
*This includes any students impacted indirectly and estimates of students who might be impacted through replication or an increase in the scope of the original project.*

Potentially all Upper Arlington (UA) K-12 students (5,756) will be impacted by this project over the next six years. The high school Innovation Center will serve as the prototype for establishing similar labs in all 9 schools in the district. Upper Arlington is a member of one national and one state school improvement network that find value in this project. UA is part of the CCSSO-sponsored Innovation Lab Network (ILN)-a group of states taking action to identify, test, and implement student-centered approaches to learning. Current ILN states include California, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. UA is one of 10 Ohio ILN districts with backing and support from the Ohio Department of Education. UA also is part of SOAR, a 125-district network focused on advancing teacher and leadership quality. As this project unfolds, it has great potential of impacting additional students.

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

First and last name of contact for lead applicant
Andrew Theado

Organizational name of lead applicant
Upper Arlington High School Principal

Address of lead applicant
Upper Arlington Schools, 1950 North Mallway Drive, Upper Arlington, Ohio 43221

Phone Number of lead applicant
614-487-5000

Email Address of lead applicant
atheado@uaschools.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

The vision of Upper Arlington HS is to prepare students to serve, lead, and succeed so that they can make a positive difference in the world. We have a proven track record of high academic excellence that we want to maintain. Our challenge is how to better mentor our students to succeed in a world of innovation and opportunity. This demands redesigned courses that enable both students and teachers to creatively and collaboratively tackle complex, non-standard problems. To move forward we need to solve four related problems. First, how do we help students see that failure is a vital part of the creative process? Second, how do we organize the time, technology, pedagogy, and resources needed to design and deliver these kinds of courses? Third, how do we appropriately respond to growing student and teacher demand for these courses while still honoring highly-valued traditional courses? Fourth, how do we engage parents and the community in supporting this innovation?

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

We have a teaching and learning Innovation Center located in the very heart of our high school. The center's primary aim is reconfiguring how we use time, technology, and pedagogy to utilize a greater share of resources in the classroom. Course design is an essential part of the solution. Our proposed innovation is informed by four evidence-based course design and delivery frameworks: formative instructional practice (FIP), universal design of learning (UDL), student growth mindset (SGM) and design thinking and design challenges. We will integrate these frameworks to support high quality design and delivery of blended courses. Each time a course is offered there is an opportunity to improve its design and delivery. Technology empowers forms of pedagogy that were not previously possible, giving students and teachers more flexibility to use their time and minds differently. Over the next 6 years, the Innovation Center will prototype at least 7 cross-departmental credit-bearing blended courses in an experimental classroom space (XClass) that also serves as a PD asset for the entire faculty. These XClass courses will set the standard for all course design and delivery in the high school. We will use a four-phase implementation strategy (FAST). FOCUS (7-12/2016): Battelle for Kids (BFK) will help in the training of two part-time faculty members to support course design and delivery teams. 3 cross-departmental teams will begin course design work: robotics, global classroom, and service learning. ACCELERATE (1-6/2017): Deliver and learn from the robotics blended course prototype. Pilot certain design features for the 2 other prototype courses, to be offered fully in 2017-18. SPREAD (6-12/2017): Deliver and assess 2 blended course prototypes. Select and support at least 1 new course design team. Engage entire staff in course design training. TIE THINGS TOGETHER (1/2018-6/2022): Design and deliver at least 4 more blended course prototypes. Leverage lessons learned from all courses to utilize greater share of resources to the classroom (e.g., more tutorial time, embedded PD). Prototype courses will align with long-standing UA experiential learning opportunities such as IB projects, community school projects, service learning, and senior capstone experiences. All prototype courses will include a section where participating high school students design and deliver an 8 session out-of-school program for UA students grades 5-8 related to the course topic (e.g., robotics, social entrepreneurship, service learning). PAST Foundation and BFK will provide workshops and coaching to help faculty and students design and deliver these out-of-school sessions leading to four benefits: -high school students will apply skills and knowledge they have learned (and may cover service learning time obligations for some of the students) -session fees from families of 5-8th graders will help sustain the work of the Innovation Center and prototype courses -strengthen family and community engagement -demand for topic-based blended courses will grow as 5-8th graders move into the high school A blended course prototype may involve a range of course models. A short and not exhaustive list of possibilities: -retain the basic structure of the traditional course and augment lectures and textbooks with technology-based, out-of-class active learning activities -reduce the number of in-class meetings and include more out-of-class, online, interactive learning activities -eliminate all in-class meetings and move all learning experiences online, using web-based, multi-media resources, open and commercial software, automatically evaluated assessments with guided feedback -rotational model customizes the learning environment for each student based on background, learning preference, and academic/professional goals and offers students an assortment of individualized paths to reach the same learning outcomes on a daily and regular basis

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 process. - (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.*

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.*

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 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).*

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to measure student achievement, 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?

☐ 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. Please enter the Net Cost Savings from your FIT.

v. List and describe the budget line items where spending reductions will occur.

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.*

-Strengthen student will and skill to think critically and creatively to solve complex, non-standard problems, understand their role in an interdependent world, and use technologies and tools for research and innovation -Use greater share of resources in the classroom (e.g., change ratio of teacher time in direct instruction to more blended and personalized mentoring) -Satisfy student and parent demand for topic-based courses that meet high academic expectations -Satisfy faculty demand for time and support to design and deliver blended courses All desired outcomes require smart implementation of 4 evidence-based course frameworks. FIP deals with learning targets, formative assessments, self-improving feedback. UDL is based on how humans learn (motivation, knowledge construction, action, and expression). SGM centers on student resilience and self-management. Design thinking and design challenges engage students in ideating, testing, and implementing solutions.

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.*

1) Building student growth mindsets helps students realize failure is a necessary part of creative problem solving 2) HS students teaching younger students strengthens the interests and talent of both 3) Spread of prototype blended courses will result in greater faculty cooperation within and across departments and subjects 4) Different use of time and technology in courses will result in greater support for faculty capacity to innovate 5) Course design grounded in formative instructional practice will result in a greater shared understanding and practice of high quality instruction 6) Teaching design thinking and using design challenges will result in greater student engagement, particularly for students who are under-challenged or over-looked 7) Existing experiential learning experiences (e.g. service learning, community school, IB projects, senior capstones) will be strengthened 8) Innovation Center will become a vital resource for professional learning and growth

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

UAHS has an exceptionally talented faculty that is constantly striving to improve the student learning experience. We have tested many of the stated assumptions through our IB program, our community school, and our long history of supporting service learning around projects that benefit the greater community. Our district has worked with BFK to embed formative instructional practices in all schools and classrooms. Design thinking is part of many of our courses. Many of our faculty members are trained in and regularly use Universal Design of Learning and student growth mindset practices. What we have not done is more intentionally align these evidence-based frameworks and practices in the way we design and deliver courses. This is one reason why we launched our new learning Innovation Center in Fall 2015. The creation of the Innovation Center is being led by 11 faculty members representing all department areas. As part of this process, the faculty engaged in a desired state mapping exercise in January 2016 resulting in 68 ideas for improving teaching and learning in the HS. 30 of those ideas clustered around how we design and deliver courses (use of time, alternative forms of assessment, use of technology, teacher/student roles). We clearly see that a more shared and evidence-based approach to course design and delivery is a prime driver for where we want to go next and the Innovation Center will play a significant role. Over time, we have tested 7 of the 8 stated assumptions. The value and impact of offering out-of-school learning experiences for 5-8th graders facilitated by our high school students is truly an untested assumption. Fortunately, there is research that provides support. In Tony Wagner's most recent book Most Likely to Succeed he cites several evidence-based approaches to older students tutoring or mentoring younger students. Research indicates that such relationships increase student engagement and build targeted skills for both age groups. We also have been tracking the work of The Future Project, an initiative that engages multi-age student groups in "future projects" that enable them to build will and skill around things that interest them. Their method involves the best scientifically-supported techniques from multiple research domains dealing with self-efficacy, sense of hope, growth mindset, social emotional learning, and 21st century skills. Working with the locally-based PAST Foundation and BFK, faculty and students involved in prototype blended course design and delivery will develop the capacity to offer high quality out-of-school learning experiences for 5-8th grade UA students. PAST has created a state of the art education R&D prototyping facility located less than two miles from UAHS. They have designed and delivered student-led coursework in coding, gaming, robotics, energy, biology, and engineering. BFK brings expertise and research on how to assess and strengthen student self-efficacy and a growth mindset. Our 8 assumptions can be clustered into three core dynamics that will drive the future success of our school. The first cluster focuses on better preparing our students for a world of innovation and opportunity (assumptions: student growth mindset, HS students mentoring younger students, and design thinking and design challenges). The second cluster centers on better preparing our faculty for new ways of teaching and learning (assumptions: building collaborative expertise and cooperative teaching, time and technology use, and formative instructional practice). The third cluster deals with organizational conditions for success (assumptions: leveraging existing assets and using the Innovation Center as a system of support for course design and delivery). The result of these assumptions will be the creation of next generation courses that fuel the creative juices and talents of our students and faculty.

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.*

The most recent instructional spending percentage from the state report card data is 78%. This percentage will not go down as a result of this project. This project will allow us to maintain a high instructional spending percentage as well as drive even more resources to the classroom in the form of more flexible and extended use of time, enriched course materials, and more opportunity for student-to-student mentoring. This project will allow more access for 5-8th grade students to high school instruction. As more prototype blended courses unfold and all courses continuously improve in design and delivery, students will have more opportunities to engage in classrooms that are augmented by learning resources made available through greater use of technology, cross subject synergies, and stronger community engagement.

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.*

Progress Measures: -Communication to all stakeholders will be robust and regular -Student and faculty satisfaction and school climate data will be regularly monitored -Number of students and faculty engaged in prototype courses (2-4 depts. working together on courses engaging 20-25 HS and 20-25 5-8th grade participants) -Sustainability (e.g., out-of-school program fees, district and grant support of Innovation Center) -Elementary and middle school student interest in problem-based coursework -Alignment with IB, community school, service learning and senior capstones Evaluation Plan Success Indicators: -Use and impact of formative instructional practice -Use and impact of universal design for learning -Use and impact of student growth mindset principles and techniques -Use and impact of design thinking and design challenges -Impact of prototype blended courses (e.g., costs, faculty capacity, student outcomes) -Use and impact of experimental classroom space

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

One of the designers for one of our first prototype courses identified key risks and mitigation for that particular course which readily apply to the student, faculty and organizational core dynamics identified in our 8 assumptions. RISK: FINDING TIME: 48-min blocks of time are simply not long enough to engage in design thinking and problem based learning. It takes students 5 mins to prepare a work space, lay out all the pieces, remember where they are, and resume their workflow. It takes 4 mins to clean up in a manner that preserves any sort of organization. This means close to 20% of the class time is gone. Wasteful. MITIGATION: Offer prototype courses in a variety of formats such as a 2-2.5 hour block after school twice a week. RISK: LIMITING DISRUPTION: March & April are chopped up by a constant assault of class time interruptions for Capstone release days, early release days, testing, oral commentaries, etc. These two months provide much less time than one might expect for project or problem based learning. MITIGATION: Use blended and online learning options in the prototype course to help individual students have more flexibility to navigate these kinds of distractions. RISK: UNEXPECTED COSTS: Some prototype courses might have supplemental costs. On a daily basis, students ask me for a variety of unpredictable things, a $4 app or an entry fee in a design challenge. This can quickly exhaust the monies available to me and my own out of pocket expenses (this often runs hundreds of dollars per year). MITIGATION: 5-8th grade out-of-school program fees help cover most if not all of such costs. RISK: LOSING FAITH: A highly successful high school with a tightly packed schedule and stretched faculty may experience project fatigue. MITIGATION: Innovation Center support staff and BFK monitor student and faculty engagement and make adjustments. Prototyping means some courses may not make it and lessons learned will quickly spread.

☐ 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.*

431,988.00 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.*

Admin - Innovation Center Manager $120,000 (1 FTE) for 2 half time faculty salary and benefits to oversee coordination and execution of program, lead and facilitate design/delivery of prototype courses, support cross departmental instructional team. Instruction - Teacher pay for experimental course design teams to participate in summer and fall (during after school hours) planning time; three 3-person teams, 9 faculty members, $38/hr, 64 hrs/person = $21,888 PURCHASED SERVICES Sub pay for additional Experimental Course Design Team planning days and PD days $120 rate x 10 days x 9 ppl = $10,800. -Evaluation $45,000 Multi-year contract (Grant Year- $20K, Y1-Y5 $5K/yr) for process and outcome measures (interim evaluation reports; evaluation briefs; final evaluation report). -R&D Support $40,000 Multi-year contract (Grant Year- $15K,Y1-Y5 $5K/yr) Document R&D process and findings, recommendations for future prototype course development, e.g. -Course Design $74,000 Support Innovation Center leadership in facilitation of course design (protocol development, e.g.);Multi-year contract (Grant Year- $15K, Y1-Y5 $7,800/yr); course materials and tools ($20K) -Course Branding $36,000 Common process branding at $15K; $21K for branding of courses ($3,500 x 6 courses) - promote both in school and out of school programs to teachers, students and parents. -Design Support/Tech Assistance $24,300 Design Support, and Technical Assistance to provide and facilitate pathway alignment for UA Schools with the Innovation Center, pathways work, and middle school and high school program alignment. Project Support ($7500), Design workshops ($9000), Bridge programming support ($6000), IDC 8% ($1800) -Professional Development $20,000 for Technical assistance and PD support for teachers (design thinking and problem based learning, e.g.) SUPPLIES: Course materials $40,000 Allocated across three prototype courses (ex. Robotics kits, competition entry fees) for in school and out of school programs

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.

29,000.00 a. Sustainability Year 1

29,000.00 b. Sustainability Year 2

29,000.00 c. Sustainability Year 3

29,000.00 d. Sustainability Year 4

29,000.00 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.*

This program will cost approximately $29,000 per year to sustain over the 5 years (FY18-22). Sustainability costs include: -Salary and benefits for the Innovation Center Manager $24,000/year (.2 FTE) for salary and benefits to oversee coordination and execution of the program; lead and facilitate the design and delivery of prototype courses; support cross-departmental instructional team. -Course supplies/materials $5,000/year for ongoing costs related to prototype courses (e.g. robotics kits, competition entry fees) for both in school and out of school programs.

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.*

Cost savings through this grant will cover 100% of the sustainability costs. Sustainability for FY18-FY22 will be met through cost savings in professional development. The district will see a cost savings from the partnering work of both Battelle for Kids and the PAST Foundation. These relationships will offset costs for professional development and support in Innovation Center leadership (process management and facilitation of course development) and pathway alignment (Innovation Center, pathways work, and middle school and high school alignment).

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 Team Key Personnel information by clicking the link below:

Add Implementation Team

*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 Range08/2016-12/2016

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

Rationale: Prototyping next generation HS courses is an iterative process and failure is expected. Pre/post-grant award planning positions project for fast cycle innovation Pre-Grant Award (Readiness): 9/2015 Innovation Center advisory team established (11 faculty members, 2 students) 10-11/2015 Visit to PAST Innovation Labs 10-12/2015 Advisory team training in design thinking and R&D process 12/2015 Innovation Center plan completed 1/2016 Full faculty engagement in identification of R&D focus (prototype course design) 3/2016 Secured funding for experimental classroom in Innovation Center 4-5/2016 Identification of first 3 prototype courses and faculty design teams (2 science teachers for robotics; 2 teachers covering English, science, social studies & math standards for service learning and social entrepreneurship; and 3 IB teachers covering business management, English, and environmental science for global classroom) 6/2016 Innovation Center management team onboard 8/2016 Experimental classroom space completed Post-Award Project Planning Highlights (July-Dec/2016) -Innovation Center staff and evaluators fully develop evaluation plan -Design training and planning sessions with 10 prototype course teachers, Innovation Center support team, BFK and PAST Foundation -Sponsored curriculum design time for 3 prototype course teams -Review and determine course scheduling options for 16/17 (e.g., independent study, add 9th period to school day) -Customized PD for faculty involved in different courses (e.g., service learning PD workshop for social entrepreneurship faculty, IB cross-subject training for global classroom faculty) -Communications to staff, student, & parents about project -Baseline data student and faculty surveys -Design and training sessions with PAST Foundation and BFK on out-of-school 5-8th grade workshops -Secure needed course materials -Pilot course elements in redesigned existing service learning course and engineering robotics course in Fall semester

22. Implementation(grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date Range07/2016-06/2017

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

Rationale: By end of this phase, prototype course teachers will be fully trained in blended course design and delivery, including out-of-school 5-8th grader workshops, Innovation Center support team and experimental classroom space will be fully operational, evaluation/communications infrastructure established, and two courses piloted (both are redesigned courses, the third course is totally new

and needs a full year of design). We are treating this project as a design challenge requiring fast cycle learning from pilot to prototype to regular course. Highlights (Jan-June/2017)" -Place all 3 prototype courses in 2017/18 high school schedule -Recruit students for all 3 prototype courses for 17/18 school year -Small scale piloting of aspects of Global Classroom curriculum in existing courses -Robotics course and out-of-school workshop delivered and evaluated (PAST and BFK support) -Students in service learning pilot program within existing course will develop and implement out-of-school project for 5-8th graders (PAST and BFK support) -Engage all interested UAHS faculty in professional learning experiences around FIP, UDL, Student Growth Mindset, design thinking and design challenges, and Future Project curriculum (BFK) -Engage all interested UAHS faculty in general awareness/professional learning around PAST Foundation middle school workshop design and delivery -Identify at least 1 new prototype course and faculty team -Begin planning for additional prototype course to be piloted in 2017/18 -Communications audit (BFK) to identify where information and messages need to be adjusted to continue to secure student, faculty, parent, and community engagement and support -Evaluation plan data collection and in-process analysis (e.g., baseline data, surveys, focus groups, interviews, site visit) -BFK and PAST debrief with prototype course faculty and Innovation Center support team on regular basis with an intensive full day session in June 2017

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

a. Date Range07/2017-06/2022

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

Rationale: Prototype course design and delivery is part of a coherent plan for supporting evidence-based teaching and learning innovation. The Superintendent, Board of Education, Treasurer, high school principals, and Innovation Center faculty and course design teams are committed to implementing an integrated system of changes resulting in preparing students to serve, lead, and succeed. Ongoing communication between Innovation Center leaders, prototype course designers and full faculty is critical for project and innovation success. Buy-in is essential and the 22 faculty members engaged in this project represent nearly 20% of the faculty. Their expertise and experience enhance project success when combined with expertise from BFK and PAST Foundation. Parent and community engagement as well as resources generated from the MS workshops affiliated with prototype courses strengthen program quality, impact, and fiscal sustainability. Highlights (July 2017-June 2022): -Service Learning & Social Entrepreneurship course is offered with 2-3 sections/year -Global Classroom and Robotics courses offered 1/year -Design and delivery of at least 3 more prototype blended courses -All evaluation processes and deliverables are realized -All communication processes and deliverables are realized -Innovation Center institutionalized -Experimental classroom in Innovation Center fully and productively used Example of Program Sustainability: The prototype robotic course is designed for students to prepare for physics AP test and engage in project work. Class is offered in a blended form and could meet outside the school day. First, students focus on AP Physics C Mechanics test or the AP Electricity and Magnetism test. Next, students engage in robotics project work, perhaps satisfying Capstone and service learning options. Students work in small groups to conceive, develop, and deliver a 16-hour science and/or engineering experience for middle and elementary students.

## 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:

Project is designed to be replicable, sustainable, and transformative at a time when American high schools must make the leap to designing and delivering next generation courses that fuel creative juices and talents of all students, particularly those that are at risk of disengaging. We picked the Straight A goal of utilizing a greater share of resources in the classroom because it best fits what changes we are making to district and school instructional and classroom support processes that lead to change in time and technology use, pedagogical practices and greater student ownership of learning. This project is an exercise in the value, impact, and sustainability of prototyping high school courses that build collaboration across teachers, subjects, departments, and schools. As a true R&D experience we cannot fully identify all the organizational changes that may evolve (e.g., changes to typical instructional staff day for some or all; shifts in student success pathways). We are committed to seeing the teaching and learning changes related to the 8 assumptions identified in question 9ii. 1) Students realize failure is a necessary part of creative problem solving 2) High school students teaching younger students strengthens interests and talent of both 3) Greater faculty cooperation and use around UDL, SGM and design thinking 4) Increase faculty capacity for rapid cycle course design 5) Formative instructional practice as essential part of high quality instruction 6) Greater student engagement, particularly for students who are under-challenged or over-looked 7) Existing experiential learning experiences like service learning, community school, IB projects and senior capstone experiences will be strengthened The Innovation Center and an evidence-based course design and delivery process will be essential resources for realizing all these desired organizational and institutional changes.

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:

Brad Mitchell, Managing Director, Innovation Battelle for Kids 1160 Dublin Rd., Suite 500 614-481-3141 bmitchell@battelleforkids.org

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

*This plan should include the methodology for measuring all of the project outcomes. Applicants should make sure to outline quantitative approaches to assess progress and measure the overall impact of the project proposal. The response should provide a clear outline of the methods, process, timelines and data requirements for the final analysis of the project's progress, success or shortfall. The applicant should provide information on how the lessons learned from the project can and will be shared with other education providers in Ohio. Note: A complete and comprehensive version of the evaluation plan must be submitted to ODE by all selected projects.*

Project evaluation will be managed by Innovation Center staff in partnership with BFK and OU's Voinovich School. The evaluation plan includes process/outcome measures & documentation of the R&D work connected to prototype course development. We will document the implementation of the project, fidelity to project design, any mid-project changes made, & attainment of desired outcomes. Evaluators will use a mixed-methods approach. The qualitative framework will employ a single case study design with multiple & embedded units of analysis (Yin, 1994). Qualitative data will be collected through ongoing document reviews, periodic interviews/focus groups with school staff, students, and parents engaged in prototype courses. Classroom observations of teachers before and after they engage in prototype course design and delivery. The quantitative component will deploy a time series design using 2 years of baseline data on goal indicators, outcome indicators, and indicators across five years. Scientific surveys of students and staff as well as student performance data tied to each prototype courses' assessment system. The case study will provide a rich description of how to utilize a greater share of resources in the classroom. The plan will include benchmarking course design practices of UAHS Innovation Center with high school R&D centers identified in research (e.g., Scarsdale, Phillips Andover, Pomfret, Sidwell Friends, Riverdale Country School, & American School of Bombay). Once the project is funded, a full evaluation plan will be developed with a detailed timeline for measuring all outcomes (deliverables include interim reports, implementation briefs and final evaluation report). Primary Evaluation Questions -What is the use and impact of the Innovation Center support on prototype course design and delivery? -What is the use and impact of prototype courses on desired student outcomes? -What is the impact of evidence-based course design and delivery processes on school organization, climate, and instructional effectiveness? Progress Measures -Communication to all stakeholders will be robust and regular -Student and faculty satisfaction and school climate data will be regularly monitored -# of students and faculty engaged in prototype courses (2-4 depts. working together on courses engaging 20-25 HS & 20-25 5-8th grade students) -Sustainability (e.g., out-of-school program fees, district and grant support of Innovation Center) -Elem and MS student interest in problem-based coursework -Alignment with IB, community school, service learning a nd senior capstones Evaluation Plan Success Indicators -Use and value of experimental classroom space in Innovation Center Prototype Course Outcome Measures -Use and impact of formative instructional practice -Use and impact of universal design for learning -Use and impact of student growth mindset principles and techniques -Use and impact of design thinking and design challenges -Impact of blended learning technology (e.g., costs, faculty capacity, student outcomes) Each of the 4 phases of the innovation will be documented. BFK and Voinovich evaluators will maintain regular consultation with Innovation Center staff. Staff and student surveys will be administered each year to assess understanding and commitment to new course design/delivery. Site visits at the end of the first, third and fifth year to assess implementation progress. Existing databases will be reviewed across years to explore changes/trends in student outcomes. Prototype course faculty will be surveyed and participate in focus groups to assess implementation progress. Summary Evaluation Milestones Timeline: Yr 1: Baseline data; Benchmarking; Surveys; Focus Groups; Site Visits Yr 2: Course Perf. Data; Surveys; Focus Groups Yr 3: Course Perf. Data; Benchmarking; Surveys; Focus Groups; Site Visits Yr 4: Course Perf. Data; Surveys; Focus Groups Yr 5: Course Perf. Data; Benchmarking; Surveys Yr 6: Final Evaluation Report

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.*

This solution will be useful to others. The Innovation Center and course design process will be shared with all 9 schools in the district. UA is part of the CCSSO-sponsored Innovation Lab Network (ILN)-a group of states taking action to identify, test, and implement student-centered approaches to learning. Current ILN states include California, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. UA is one of 10 Ohio ILN districts with backing and support from the Ohio Department of Education. UA also is part of SOAR, a 125-district network focused on advancing teacher and leadership quality through collaborative innovation. UA is both committed and well positioned to advance this Straight A-funded innovation across these networks. The benchmarking process with high schools identified in research literature that effectively support course design and delivery would enable UAHS to both learn from and share with these influential high schools. Over the life of the project UAHS faculty and students will present at BFK's annual Educators Connect for Success conference that attracts over 1,000 people. BFK and Voinovich School will work with UAHS to produce publications based on process and outcome evaluation to be distributed through research and professional journals, organizational web sites (e.g., ODE, professional associations, and school improvement networks) and social media. The very existence of the Innovation Center facilitates replication work. We are interested in forming replication partnerships with urban high schools around innovations that connect high school and elementary and middle schools together through the prototype course and out-of-school sessions with 5-8th graders. This innovation will fuel middle school student interest and talent for eventually participating in next generation high school courses as well as building parent and community engagement.

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

Consortium

Upper Arlington City (044933) - Franklin County - 2017 - 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

Upper Arlington City (044933) - Franklin County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

| Partnerships | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Telephone Number** | **Email Address** | **Organization Name** | **IRN** | **Address** | **Delete Contact** |
| Brad | Mitchell | 614-481-3141 | bmitchell@battelleforkids.org | Battelle for Kids | | 1160 Dublin Rd., Suite 500, Columbus, Ohio, 43215 | |
| Dr. Annalies | Corbin | 614-340-1208 | annalies@pastfoundation.org | The PAST Foundation | | 1003 Kinnear Rd., , Columbus, Ohio, 43212 | |

Implementation Team

Upper Arlington City (044933) - Franklin County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

| Implementation Team | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Name | Last Name | Title | Responsibilities | Qualifications | Prior Relevant Experience | Education | % FTE on Project | Delete Contact |
| Curt | Bixel | Physical Science teacher | Course developer and course instructor | 25 years of experience teaching math and science, National Board Certified Teacher (initial license 1998, renewed 2008) | Developed and launched blended learning offerings at high school and post-secondary levels, facilitated curriculum development at the high school level, successful athletic coach at high-school level. | BA Physics (cum laude), Wittenberg University, Springfield, OH 1988; MEd University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 1990 | 20 | |
| Brad | Mitchell | Managing Director, Innovation | Brad will serve as the Professional Learning System Design Expert. In this role, he will facilitate the implementation team to ensure they conduct current mapping and establish a design process for the first year. | Brad has 35 years of experience in educational policy and innovation, in the following roles: Professor of educational administration, The Ohio State University; Chief policy analyst, two governors; Policy analyst, US Secretary for education; CEO, Educational non-profit, and managing director of Innovation for Battelle for Kids. | In his role with Battelle for Kids, Brad has led multi-million dollar grant-funded projects to lead innovation and educational development across rural networks, nationwide. Brad established the professional development system of support for the Ohio Appalachian Collaborative, for rural districts in Ohio, and currently leads the Blended Learning Teacher Practice Network and Teacher Practice Network, which span across Ohio, Tennessee, and Colorado. These Networks allow for online professional development peer-networks for teachers working to enhance student learning in 21st century classrooms. | Ph.D, Educational Admin, University of Utah,1985; MPA, University of Utah, 1983; B.A Political Science, University of Utah, 1978 | 10 | |
| Melissa | Hasebrook | Language Arts Teacher | Course Developer and Course Instructor | Member/leader of a team of teachers who develop and implemented a successful, innovative program (the Community School) in Upper Arlington High School. | 20 years teaching experience; 10 years teaching Upper Arlington Community School; National Board Certified English Language Arts Teacher | BA Secondary Language Arts Education, The Ohio State University, 1996; MA Education Leadership, The Ohio State University, 2004 | 20 | |
| Lynn | Reese | Biology and Life Sciences | Course developer and course | 17 years in education, all as | Taught Anatomy and Physiology, Biology, | BA Secondary Science | 60 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Teacher | instructor | teacher; 8 years teaching in UAHS | Integrated Science, and Environmental Science in non-traditional program; designed and delivered real-world, experienced-based educational experiences for students; led trips abroad for students for several years. | Education, Florida State University, 1998; MEd Curriculum and Education, Ohio Dominican University, 2011 | | |
| Karen | D'Eramo | Career Based Intervention teacher | Course developer and course instructor, integration of service learning in courses, establishing partnerships to support courses | 21 years in education, all as a teacher, with over 15 in career-based educational learning; completed training in service learning through the Growing Together Network (levels 1 and 2). | Design and deliver individualized career-based instruction, established partnership with Crimson Cup coffee company and co-designed and implemented student-run coffee shop in 2008. | BS English, Michigan State University; Post-Bach Teaching, Denison University; MA Cultural Studies, The Ohio State University | 60 | |
| Lisa | Shambaugh | Instructional Coach | Facilitate the development of elementary opportunities and build capacity among elementary teachers | Elementary instructional leader, serving Wickliffe, Windermere, and Greensview elementary schools; K-12 Teacher Leader Endorsement Ohio Dominican University; Learning Technologies certification The Ohio State University | Experience teaching both high school and elementary school students; experience creating hybrid high school electives, professional development workshops, and afterschool programs at Upper Arlington City Schools. | BSEd Ashland University; MLIS Kent State University; MAT Marygrove College | 20 | |
| Cynthia | Ballheim | AP/IB Coordinator | Support the development of courses as part of the implementation team | IB Workshop leader and workshop creator, President of the Ohio Association of IB World Schools | Special program coordination (International Baccalaureate; Middle, Diploma, and Career Related programs, Advanced Placement, Education First, and University of Calgary Education High School Mathematics Coordinator). | BS Mathematics, DePaul University; MA Human Services, DePaul University | 20 | |
| Andrew | Theado | Upper Arlington High School Principal | Project Oversight and Management | Licensure in 7-12 Life Science (The Ohio State University), 5-12 Principal (Ashland University), and Superintendent (University of Dayton, expected 2018) | 13 years in education, 5 years in administration at Upper Arlington High School. | MEd Science Ed., Ohio State University; MEd Ed. Admin., Ashland University; PhD Ed.Leadership, University of Dayton (expected) | 20 | |
| Bryan | Wenger | Science | course developer | Certified teacher | 16 years in | BS Chemistry, | 20 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Teacher | | for chemistry, biology, geology, and all science 7-8; facilitated transition to standards-based grading in AP Chemistry; National Board Certified Teacher (2004, expired). | education, all as teacher; 10 years in Upper Arlington High School; Coach of UA Science Olympiad team; coached students to build and test a robot arm controlled by an Arduino microprocessor | Miami University, Oxford, OH 1989; PhD, Pharmacology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 2003 | | |
| Eva | Frustaci | Business Education teacher, Department Chair, and Business Coordinator | Course developer and course instructor | IB trained with 7 years teaching experience; Golden Apple recipient in 2013 for Excellence from the UA Civic Association; certified to teach College Credit Plus through Columbus State Community College as an Adjunct Professor | 10 years in education, all in teaching business education; teaching IB Business Management for 7 years at Standard Level and Higher Level; business and marketing experience prior to teaching; expert on curriculum design and Adjunct Professor at The Ohio State University teaching a course in curriculum design; published author in Career-Technical Journal | BSBA Marketing and Logistics, The Ohio State University Fisher College of Business; MA Business Education, The Ohio State University | 60 | |
| Beth | Bailey | Environmental Science Teacher | Course developer and course instructor, integration of service learning in courses, establishing partnerships to support courses | IB and AP trained with 15 years teaching experience; Comprehensive Science Education Certification | 24 years in education, all as a teacher; created the environmental science program at UAHS in 1999; co-designed the IB and AP curriculum at UAHS with service and system components; taught sciences classes that were honors level, on-level, collaborative, and adjusted; established partnerships with external conservation organizations and co-designed learning experiences to address real environmental issues. | BA Biology with Comprehensive Science Education Certification, Muskingum College, 1993; MA Education, Marygrove College, 2000. | 60 | |