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Project Narrative

The Central Ohio Partnership for College and Career Readiness Expansion (CCRE), led by Columbus State Community College – in partnership with seven local education agencies (Columbus City, Groveport Madison, Hamilton Local, Licking Heights Local, Reynoldsburg City School District, South-Western City, and Whitehall City School Districts), Jobs for the Future (JFF), Educational Service Center of Central Ohio (ESC), and Metro Early College High School – will dramatically improve college and career readiness among high-need students in the Central Ohio region. CCRE will do so through multi-district, regional expansion of the evidence-based Early College High School (ECHS) model, which has been validated through rigorous study as significantly increasing the success of underrepresented and high-need students in demanding college-preparatory programs of study. Through ECHS implementation, this project will address Absolute Priority 3—Implementing Comprehensive High School Reform and Redesign, and will feature: expanded access to dual enrollment opportunities at CSCC, through which at least 10,000 students will complete college credit courses while in high school; high engagement instructional strategies that prepare all students for college level work; curriculum aligned with Ohio core standards for college readiness and the rigorous criteria set by the Ohio Board of Regents and CSCC for college course completion; and comprehensive, integrated academic supports that ensure for all students, including high-need students, access to and success in accelerated learning opportunities and increased college preparation.

This effort will be anchored by CSCC, which already serves as the intermediary organization at the center of guided pathway efforts linking Central Ohio high schools, industry, and college. Through this project, CSCC will demonstrate how a high capacity postsecondary partner can accelerate high quality and cost-effective comprehensive high school regional reform. This will
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include scaling of dual enrollment opportunities and coordinated regional delivery of professional development and student support services. CCRE implementation will further benefit from: JFF’s deep experience in supporting high school redesign through expansion of the ECHS model to almost 300 schools nationwide; the ECHS professional development platform developed and refined by JFF over the past decade, which will be coordinated by and delivered in partnership with ESC; and by Metro ECHS, which will share best practices and serve as a benchmark model.

CCRE will also meet all three competitive preference priorities. For **Competitive Preference Priority 1**, CCRE will improve student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs. The project will monitor and demonstrate how the cost of training and certifying a corps of high school and college faculty to deliver courses for dual credit to a critical mass of college ready students will be lower than the cost of delivering a traditional sequence of courses separately in high school and college. The example below highlights how one high school can save $49,000 annually by offering English as a dual-credit course – just one contributing factor to the cost-efficiency of the early college design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Course/ Number of Students</th>
<th>Cost as High School Credit-Only Course</th>
<th>Cost as Dual-Credit College Course</th>
<th>Potential Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-level English Grade 12, 160 students</td>
<td>2 FTE teachers @ $65,000/teacher (salaries + benefits)</td>
<td>Tuition for a 4-credit class ($25 per credit x 4 credits x 160 students) = $16,000 1 FTE high school teacher to offer course = $65,000</td>
<td>High schools can invest the savings in teacher professional development, supportive services, advising and other supportive services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ECHS model is cost-effective compared with the alternative of offering a 12th grade English course to the same students for high school credit alone. Advanced Placement courses, another alternative with similar college-level credential requirements for instructors, require students to
pass the AP exam for college credit and are inconsistently accepted for credit by colleges. Successful completion of courses through dual enrollment, on the other hand, results in college credit by the sponsoring college. International baccalaureate programs are difficult to implement and expensive, costing $23,000 to enroll and $10,000 in annual fees per school.

The i3 grant constitutes an initial investment for technical assistance, capacity-building, professional development, and evaluation that will enable CCRE to: build a regional structure for centralized ECHS coordination; provide joint professional development across partnering districts; more effectively use adjunct faculty for instruction; cover costs for curriculum development; and bolster online technology for alternate delivery modes. Once the high schools fully implement the ECHS model, the majority of operating costs will be personnel and college tuition. CSCC charges schools a discounted rate of $25 per credit hour, 82% less than the standard rate of $135.93. Students graduating with 12 credits will save $1,631 in tuition and $1,000 in books and supplies. i3 grant costs per student will decline from $2,608 in year one to $729 in year five and zero out upon completion of the grant (see budget).

To evaluate cost-effectiveness, CCRE will conduct an exploratory study employing the widely-used ingredients method (Levin & McEwan, 2001, Kelley, 2002) to tabulate the program inputs and costs of alternative programs. Using the ingredients method as a framework, this analysis will investigate space, facilities expenditures, operating costs, and personnel. To investigate strategies that could reduce costs and facilitate scale-up, CCRE leadership will inspect key elements of program delivery with an emphasis on exploring achieved cost savings via online program delivery.

CCRE is also applying under **Competitive Preference Priority 2**. With the help of JFF, CCRE will adapt the ECHS model to create a coordinated regional approach to implementing
dual enrollment at scale. With this unique and new approach to ECHS expansion, CCRE and its partners will identify and assess the effectiveness of key design elements that are critical to successful regional scaling and sustainability. The research collected will inform future expansion in Central Ohio and will serve as a unique exemplar for other regions across the nation. The diversity of settings and people represented in the region will further facilitate the assessment of replicability and adaptability of the model in a variety of contexts, to which CCRE is committed. From this evaluation, CCRE will create a deployment manual, or technical guide, to enable replication of the model and scaling strategy in other sites. The guide will include best practices, a readiness checklist, and important considerations for launching and scaling the ECHS model. In addition, CCRE will develop digital tools and resources for use by the field, such as case studies, a faculty professional development guide, learning objects, iBooks, websites, videos on effective practices, templates, and protocols for peer-to-peer feedback.

Furthermore, Central Ohio benefits from having a strong ECHS exemplar in its own backyard – Metro Early College High School, established in Columbus in 2006 – which will serve as a demonstration site. CCRE has partnered with Metro to capture best practices and lessons learned about implementation and will use them to inform practice throughout the region. Metro will serve as a living laboratory for administrators and teachers to investigate daily operations, obtain practical solutions to scheduling, and address operational questions.

Columbus State Community College also qualifies for Competitive Preference Priority 3; it has not received nor participated in an Investing in Innovation Fund grant.

A. SIGNIFICANCE

(1) Promising New Strategies that Build on an Existing Strategy.

CCRE represents a highly promising new strategy that builds upon the evidence-based Early
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College High School model. Developed and refined over the past decade, the ECHS model features a set of core design elements: 1) a rigorous academic program, including a coherent instructional framework aligned to college-ready standards and engaging instruction, including project- and inquiry-based learning; 2) a head-start on college, including an aligned sequence of college courses and support as part of the high school program of study, that both challenges and inspires students; 3) comprehensive wraparound student supports; and 4) organizational structures and practices that drive and sustain these reforms, including strong secondary-postsecondary partnerships and job-embedded professional development for secondary school and college faculty. The ECHS model has a demonstrated record of increasing student achievement among low-income students: higher graduation rates (93% at ECHS’s versus 76% at other high schools in the same districts); college credit attainment while in high school (ECHS students earn an average of 23 college credits by graduation, and 56% of graduates earn two years of credit or an associate’s degree); and persistence in postsecondary (82% of ECHS graduates persist to their second year in college, compared to 69% of low income or first-generation college goers nationally) (Jobs for the Future, Early College, 2011). The significant positive impact on student achievement of the ECHS model is also well supported by three rigorous research studies that surpass the moderate level of evidence threshold outlined in the i3 regulations and the What Works Clearinghouse (See Appendix D).

As a strategy for expanding the ECHS model, CCRE offers a new and highly promising approach. While ECHS expansion characteristically has been local in nature (driven by districts) or accomplished through geographically disbursed networks of participating schools (e.g., driven by state-level or multi-state intermediary organizations), CCRE implementation represents a new, highly efficient regional approach, anchored by a community college that already has
established strong relationships with multiple districts. As noted earlier, and described more fully in Section C of this proposal, CCRE’s approach will feature centralized coordination through CSCC for regional ECHS implementation, joint professional development across LEA partners, expansion of LEA staff serving as adjunct community college faculty for dual enrollment coursework, shared costs for curriculum development. It also features the use of on-line technology across the region to provide alternative dual enrollment course delivery modes, among other regional strategies that will be demonstrated through this project.

In addition, the CCRE approach will build upon a strong existing regional foundation of partnerships between secondary, postsecondary, and industry. This includes the Central Ohio Compact, a regional collaboration of secondary and postsecondary education and industry seeking to ensure that by 2025, 60% of the region’s adults have earned a postsecondary certificate or degree. It also includes the Ohio Department of Education’s Straight A grant program that has spurred the launch of secondary-postsecondary pathways within all seven CCRE partner districts. And importantly, the CCRE approach directly builds CSCC’s guided pathways initiative, which is designed to improve student outcomes by mapping out highly structured, educationally coherent grades 9 – 14 program pathways for students. CSCC will coordinate implementation of the ECHS model across LEA partners to build upon and align with guided pathways, which lead students toward a certificate, a degree, or a credential with market value and which are aligned with regional high-need industries.

(2) Replicability.

Over the past decade, the ECHS model has been replicated in a variety of settings – urban and rural districts, small and large districts – with a diverse array of student populations, including economically disadvantaged and minority youth. Notwithstanding, the model has developed a
strong track record of increasing student achievement outcomes across multiple settings and populations. States like Ohio implementing high standards and assessments need proven models to increase the number of high-need students who succeed in college-preparatory courses and are on-track for high school and college graduation. CCRE will accelerate the adoption and scaling of ECHS, including its professional development platform, throughout the region.

The replication and expansion of the model is facilitated by a few key factors particular to the region: led by CSCC, which has long-standing relationships with district and school leaders across Central Ohio, the model consists of a multi-district regional approach resulting in economies of scale; the current state policy environment, as a result of College Credit Plus and other state and regional initiatives, supports district adoption of cost-effective models for providing dual enrollment opportunities to high school students at scale; and the extensive experience lent by JFF and the ESC in designing and leading education reform will bring it to fruition. To further add to the diversity of settings, districts will experiment with anytime, anywhere approaches such as extended learning, out of school time, use of summer classes, and online courses or hybrid courses with online components.

(3) Addressing a National Need.
Nationally, it is clear that many high school graduates are not prepared for college-level academic work or for jobs and careers in high-demand growth industries. In 2014, only 44% of high school students met college-readiness benchmarks in reading, and 43% of students met these benchmarks in math (ACT, 2014). Even worse, in 2014, only 23% of African American students and 29% of Hispanic students met college readiness benchmarks in math. As a result, four out of every 10 new college students took remedial courses (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). These low readiness levels correspond with the mediocre levels of postsecondary
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completion across the country. Just 30% of students enrolled in an Associate’s Degree program graduate within three years, and just over 55% of students enrolled in a Bachelor’s Degree program graduate within five years (IPEDS, 2010). Whereas the United States formerly led the world in postsecondary completion rates. It currently ranks 19th out of 28 countries studied (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2014).

More troubling is the persistent completion gap between low-income and wealthier students. Not only is there a 15% gap between high school graduation rates of low-income students and graduation rates of non-low-income students, there is a significant college completion gap (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). In 2013, 77% of adults from families in the top income quartile earned at least bachelor’s degrees by the time they turned 24, up from 40% in 1970. However, only 9% of people from the lowest income bracket did the same in 2013, up from 6% in 1970 (University of Pennsylvania, 2014). Further, many high school students lack exposure to career experiences that will prepare them for the world of work—especially in critically important STEM fields. Only 11 percent of business leaders "strongly agree" that students have the requisite skills for the workforce (Gallup, February 25, 2014).

Many states, including Ohio, have begun implementing Common Core and aligned assessments to address these college and career readiness gaps. But simply adopting higher standards will not support students and families, teachers and schools, or our communities to improve achievement for all students, and especially for underserved students. The ECHS design is a scalable approach that combines high academic and college and career readiness standards with student supports and a school climate that support students to obtain college credit while still in high school. As a result, early colleges increase the number of high-need students who succeed in college-preparatory courses and are on-track for graduation (see Appendix D).
B. STRATEGY TO SCALE

(1) Unmet Demand.

Implementation of the ECHS model through a coordinated regional approach anchored by CSCC addresses a need that is felt across Ohio and elsewhere, but that is particularly acute in the Central Ohio region – the need for a cost-efficient and scalable approach that provides the structures and supports to improve achievement for all students, especially high-need students, as Common Core and aligned assessments are being implemented.

As part of Ohio’s efforts to boost college and career readiness, the state legislature passed legislation authorizing and appropriating funding for College Credit Plus, a dual credit initiative to provide students in grades 7-12 the opportunity to earn transcribed college credits. College Credit Plus is a powerful vehicle for expanding accelerated learning opportunities, but it can only achieve its potential for promoting a variety of rigorous postsecondary academic pursuits and options to high school students if they are college-ready. A key challenge is the large number of students in CCRE partner districts who, because of lack of academic preparedness, are not able to access college level coursework now available to them through College Credit Plus.

The table below provides 2014 profile information about the Central Ohio region to be served by CCRE. In 2014, 70% of students in CCRE districts were low income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted School District (SD) Partners</th>
<th>Target High Schools</th>
<th>Total District Enrollment</th>
<th>Limited English Proficiency</th>
<th>% that complete HS</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus City SD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49,602</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport Madison SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Local SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licking Heights Local SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg City SD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Western City SD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19,734</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With such significant high-need populations in the region, together with statewide implementation of dual enrollment through the College Credit Plus legislation, interest in participating in dual enrollment coursework has grown exponentially, as has interest among regional LEAs in high school redesign that will make this new opportunity within reach of all their students. Accordingly, as reflected in our CCRE partnership, there is wide unmet demand among school districts in the region for an integrated high school and college program of study delivered through the ECHS model – with its unique combination of a rigorous academic program and comprehensive supports that ensures that the vast majority of students can access and succeed in college level coursework while still in high school.

(2) Addressing Barriers to Scale.

While CSCC has worked to develop college and career guided pathways across the region, the CCRE project will address key barriers that have prevented achieving secondary-postsecondary integration and expansion, including expanded dual enrollment efforts, on a wide scale. This project will develop focused resources, materials, and infrastructure to facilitate greater student access to college-level coursework, dramatically increased diversity among participating students, and improved efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of dual credit opportunities.

In particular, during the first year of College Credit Plus implementation in our region, several barriers surfaced that limited scaling of dual enrollment as part of integrated secondary-postsecondary program of study. Districts and high schools have struggled with implementing approaches to align their academic program with state standards as well the CSCC’s standards for college course completion. To address this barrier, CCRE will develop coordinated and extensive professional development and coaching, which will include support for using formative assessments aligned with college-ready standards, and translating college-ready
standards and aligned assessments into classroom practices that meet the needs of every student. A second barrier – student support services that focus more on discipline issues and less on college and career planning – will be addressed through substantial professional development offerings for high school counselors and developing effective student support services addressing career awareness and college exploration and access.

A third and significant barrier to scale, and one that is directly addressed through a coordinated regional approach, are inefficiencies and the lack of resources inherent in supporting an expanded dual enrollment program through local resources alone. Over the past year, school districts have worked on an individual basis to implement College Credit Plus with mixed results, reflecting both a lack of capacity in individual districts, and at CSCC itself, to meet the growing demand for dual credit. Through CCRE, we will promote regional collaboration across districts to scale the ECHS model in a cost effective manner. This includes expanding the number of skilled faculty delivering dual credit courses through regional training of both high school teachers (who will serve as adjunct college faculty), training for college faculty in ECHS instructional strategies, and further expanding capacity by creating distance delivery courses for online and hybrid delivery of dual credit courses.

(3) Dissemination Mechanisms.
The CCRE is fully committed to informing the field about best practices and lessons learned so as to support replication in other settings. As mentioned under Competitive Preference Priority 2, the CCRE will produce a deployment manual and various digital tools and resources to enable and facilitate adoption of the model. Through multiple networks and means, the CCRE will disseminate best practices, project activities, publications, and research findings to targeted audiences locally, statewide, and nationally, including via information booths and presentations.
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at eTech Ohio, a state-wide educational technology conference that attracts more than 5,000 P-20 educators and administrators each year; events held by the Ohio Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships; the CSCC website and that of our partners; JFF’s networks, including the ECHS and Pathways to Prosperity networks; and the Central Ohio Compact, a regional partnership between secondary and postsecondary education and industry. In addition, the project leadership team will educate those outside the region about the design of the model and provide opportunities for interested parties to see it in action, such as through hosting teams from outside institutions on site at CSCC. The team also plans to present at conferences held by national organizations leading the field in dual enrollment practice, policy and research, such as JFF, EdWorks, and the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships.

C. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Project Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes.

Leveraging the expertise of proposed CCRE partners and the efficacy of the ECHS design, CCRE will accomplish the following ambitious outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected outcomes of student achievement are ambitious yet attainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5% Increase in students will take and satisfactorily pass college preparatory courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Reduction in dropout rates as an indicator of a higher graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Students will graduate with some earned college credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To achieve these outcomes, CCRE has organized its activities under three goals with associated objectives and deliverables.

Goal 1: Increase college credit achievement and college entry for high school students in targeted school districts serving a large percentage of low-income and minority students.
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**Objective 1.1:** To create the infrastructure to offer ECHS to large numbers of students who are enrolled in at least seven different school districts.

**Objective 1.2:** To scale Early College High School designs in at least seven different districts.

**Objective 1.3:** To offer wrap around supportive services to ECHS students.

To achieve these objectives, CSCC and its partners will provide technical assistance to district partners and schools on implementation of evidence-based ECHS design elements, including:

*Secondary-Postsecondary Bridging* through which academic standards align to college-readiness and focus on other aspects of college knowledge, which embed college academic expectations, norms, and counseling into high school (Conley, 2009; Rosenbaum, 2011); a *Common Instructional Framework* that prepares students for college-level work through implementation of six evidence-based strategies: collaborative group work, writing to learn, literacy groups, questioning, classroom talk, and scaffolding (Langer, 2000; Newmann, et. al., 2009); and *Wraparound Student Support Services*, including career coaching and academic advising.

CSCC, JFF, and ESC will facilitate implementation of these design features through up-front design consultation and ongoing assistance focused on developing college and community/business partnerships, alignment of secondary and postsecondary course sequence and pathways, implementing student supports, curriculum development, data sharing, and budget development. Schools will also implement an early alert system, through which they will use student-level data to identify students who may need additional supports in order to become ready for college-level courses. CCRE partners will assist schools with developing strategies for effective use of data to inform instruction and instructional supports, track student progress to college readiness, and support continuous improvement.

A key advantage of CSCC driving this effort will be improved college and high school
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faculty collaboration, which will increase the content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge of both high school and college teachers, and produce rigorous curriculum rubrics that align with college-readiness standards and college-level work. CCRE will utilize the “i3 Cabinet” – a central coordinating body comprised of representatives from all the CCRE project partners (more fully described in the Management Plan below) to ensure alignment and coherence with district priorities and goals as well as build leadership capacity in districts and schools to enhance sustainability. CCRE partners will use district-wide institutes, school-based curriculum planning sessions, and college-school faculty curriculum meetings to build knowledge of college-readiness standards and pedagogy, and bring coherence to secondary school-to-college curriculum and instruction.

Finally, CCRE will create a community of practice (COP) for schools, districts, colleges, and partners that will facilitate knowledge sharing within and across districts and create a platform for disseminating resources that spur and support further expansion nationally. Cross-district peer-learning will be a part of the COP through occasional in-person and more frequent sessions using technology, including webinars and an extranet.

Goal 1 Deliverables will include: 1) Early College High School implementation in seven districts with consultation and technical assistance to districts on implementation of core ECHS design elements; and 2) implementation of a standards-based early college high school curricula with guided pathways to postsecondary studies and careers, reinforced by wraparound student support services.

Goal 2: Position Early College High School designs for sustainability in the seven school districts and establish them as exemplars for further scale-up within the Central Ohio Region, across Ohio, and nationally.
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Objective 2.1: To strengthen school and district capacity to sustain and expand ECHS implementation through professional development of principals, teachers, and staff.

Objective 2.2: To document implementation and create a demonstration site to support strategies for scale-up in Central Ohio, statewide, and nationally.

To achieve Goal 2 and associated objectives, the CCRE partners will provide a comprehensive professional development program that becomes embedded into everyday practice and enables teachers and school leaders to sustain a coherent and research-based approach to instruction that accelerates students to a college-ready standard (Neuman, S.B. and Cunnigham, 2009, Joyce and Showers, 1982; Neufield and Roper, 2001; Poglinco et al, 2003).

CSCC, JFF, and ESC will provide leadership coaches who will build the capacity of district instructional coaches and teacher leaders in schools. Coaches will model and institutionalize collaborative professional development strategies and transition facilitation to teachers identified by each school. School planning teams comprising school leadership, district staff, and higher education faculty will provide a structure for continuing collaboration, including assessment of progress and continuous improvement training and professional development.

CCRE partners will also help central office administrators align resources and activities around an early college for all approach. Multiple studies provide evidence of this approach’s impact on improving instruction. The Learning First Alliance has identified a coherent district-wide set of instructional strategies as a key factor in improving instruction (Togneri, 2003).

Harvard University researchers have found that a coherent strategy and a focus on implementing that strategy can improve student achievement (Childress et. al., 2007). JFF will use its national ECHS experience to build capacity within the central office, among the instructional superintendents and coaches in each of the five networks, and at each of the early college
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schools, to sustain the design and expand it beyond the grant to other secondary schools within the region. CCRE will also create a demonstration site in the region to support sustainability and expansion to additional districts. JFF (drawing on its experience creating ECHS demonstration sites in Massachusetts, Ohio, North Carolina, Texas, and Colorado), CSCC, and ESC will work together to prepare Metro Early College High School to become a demonstration site for other districts in the region and state, where they can observe and understand how to replicate the ECHS Design Elements. This demonstration site will serve as a learning lab for new schools and districts to see the model in action and bring learnings and lessons home.

**Goal 2 Deliverable:** A comprehensive professional development and coaching program to improve the effectiveness of high school and college teachers through activities that build pedagogical content knowledge and understanding of core ECHS design elements.

**Goal 3: Provide evidence of the successfulness in community college leadership of the ECHS model through comprehensive evaluation plan.**

**Objective 3.1:** To evaluate the implementation of the ECHS model and measure the results of participants for higher rates of achievement among students.

**Objective 3.2:** To disseminate the lessons learned and best practices to national audiences.

As described in Section D, CCRE includes a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the ECHS model in improving student outcomes and to identify the advantages of having a community college drive the regional expansion efforts. Further, to document strategies and lessons across the region to inform future district-wide scale-up efforts, CCRE will develop design briefs and case studies focused on critical topics of implementation and sustainability such as district-wide early college financing models for covering college course costs and the use of data to support instructional improvement. CCRE will also develop a deployment manual, or technical guide, to
enable replication of the model in other sites. JFF will leverage its current projects and future initiatives to reach national networks of LEA leaders and state policymakers and will target this audience to disseminate outcomes and best practices from the project.

**Goal 3 Deliverables** include: 1) An evaluation report of the ECHS model, implementation and outcomes; and 2) dissemination documents and presentations including best practice case studies.

The following logic model summarizes CCRE’s key components and activities, associated deliverables, design elements, and projected student outcomes.
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Columbus State Community College
U.S. Department of Education Investing in Innovation Project Logic Model

TARGET POPULATIONS:
Students: predominantly low-income, urban/suburban high school students taking dual credit courses
Faculty: community college faculty and high school teachers in urban/suburban districts serving disadvantaged students

KEY COMPONENTS
- i3 Cabinet
  - Indicator: Formation of i3 cabinet with key partners to provide leadership and guidance for project implementation and delivery
- Curriculum development and alignment
  - Indicator: Development of integrated 9-14 guided pathways
  - Indicator: Development of credit-bearing college readiness/success course
- Professional development for college faculty
  - Indicator: Faculty teaching classes at early college high school have participated in professional development
- Professional development and coaching for high school staff/faculty
  - Indicator: Instructional coaching days per school
  - Indicator: Leadership coaching days per school
  - Indicator: Participation in professional development
- Student support
  - Indicator: Implementation of student support structures in place (career coaching/advising/tutoring)
  - Indicator: Integration of early alert system into ECHS

DELIVERABLES
- Deliverable 1: Early College High School implementation in seven districts with consultation and technical assistance to districts on implementation of core ECHS design elements.
- Deliverable 2: Implementation of a standards-based early college high school curriculum with guided pathway to postsecondary studies and career success reinforced by wraparound student support services.
- Deliverable 3: A comprehensive professional development and coaching program to improve the effectiveness of high school and college teachers through activities that build pedagogical content knowledge and understanding of core ECHS design elements.
- Deliverable 4: An evaluation report of the ECHS model implementation and outcomes; dissemination documents and presentations including best practice case studies.

EARLY COLLEGE DESIGN
- College-ready Academic Program
  - A coherent instructional framework aligned to college-ready standards
  - Engaging instructional practices
  - Rigorous ungraded academic program
  - Strong postsecondary partnership
  - Aligned sequence of college courses and support into pathways

- College Head Start
  - Exposure to college culture
  - College courses lead to 15 credits

- Wraparound Student Supports
  - Comprehensive academic support
  - Strong social and emotional programming and support
  - Explicit instruction on successful academic and social college behaviors
  - Inclusive application and financial aid advising and assistance

- Organizational Practices
  - Structures that promote personalized relationships
  - College-going culture
  - Ongoing job-embedded and integrated teacher professional development
  - Use of student data to inform decision and evaluation efforts
  - Set time and support for teacher collaboration

OUTCOMES
- Intermediate Student Outcomes
  - At least 10,000 students participating in an early college high school model
  - 5% increase in students will take and satisfactorily pass college preparatory courses
  - 5% reduction in dropout rates as an indicator of a higher graduation rate
  - 90% of students will graduate with some earned college credit

- Long-term Student Outcomes
  - Increased enrollment and success in postsecondary education
  - Increased probability of earning family-sustaining wages

- Long-term Implementation Outcomes
  - Low unit cost to implement Early College High School model
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(2) Adequacy of the Management Plan.

Proposed Project Director Stephen Dackin is a former superintendent with decades of experience in dual enrollment programs. For CCRE, Mr. Dackin will convene an i3 Cabinet—a central coordinating body comprised of representatives from all project partners—to serve as the board of directors for the project and have responsibility for project implementation and accountability. Members of the i3 Cabinet will be charged with overseeing the work in their district; mobilizing others to implement changes in curriculum, develop rubrics, align and coordinate wrap-around services; and reporting back to the project director and Cabinet members on their progress. The i3 Cabinet will convene monthly or as needed via conference call to review activities, accomplishments, upcoming milestones, potential challenges, and possible solutions. This will ensure the objectives and milestones are achieved on time and within budget. Further, each high school partner will assign a lead contact with accountability and responsibility for implementing activities and integration with ongoing school operations. CSCC staff will manage engagement of college faculty and administer the outreach and dissemination activities in collaboration with the school districts. Administered by ESC, CCRE will assign coordinators to work in each high school, and ESC and CSCC will identify staff members to deliver supportive services to students. JFF, with ESC, will design and deliver professional development and coaching to school and district staff and manage alignment and dissemination efforts (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities and activities of each partner in the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Community College (CSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Responsibilities and activities of each partner in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Local Educational Agency (LEA) districts**<br>Columbus City, Groveport-Madison, Hamilton, Licking Heights, Reynoldsburg, South-Western, Whitehall | • Promote participation within district  
• Implement the integrated 9-14 guided pathways  
• Align wrap-around student services with CSCC  
• Collaborate for teacher professional development  
• Work to develop an annual plan, schedule  
• Identify barriers that may impede  
• Collaborate with evaluator for project evaluation |
| **Metro Early College High School** | • Participate in i3 Cabinet and committees  
• Provide best practices and serve as training site for ECHS implementation  
• Serve as a demonstration/training site |
| **Education Service Center of Central Ohio** | • Participate in i3 Cabinet and committees  
• Convene high school faculty and administrators for professional development  
• Coordinate services for LEA districts working with LEA leads  
• Using deep knowledge of each district, the board, and the union, help districts served to navigate policy  
• Assist in the implementation of the College and Career Readiness model and professional development  
• Collaborate with disability services  
• Identify implementation issues and troubleshoot barriers  
• Coordinate services with counselors, advisors, and coaches  
• Report regularly on status for respective area |
| **Jobs for the Future (JFF)** | • Participate in i3 Cabinet and committees  
• Implement Professional Development Institute  
• Provide administrators with leadership coaching  
• Promote alignment and coherence of goals, vision, and strategy between partners  
• Support tools and product development  
• Disseminate learnings to national audience |

Mr. Dackin and the i3 Cabinet will track the work plan using Amplifund, a collaborative online project management system. Amplifund is a cloud database that includes a repository of key project files and can enable the assignment of tasks related to grant goals to make sure programs stay on course and meet objectives. Supporting effective and efficient management of the project will be the financial management capacity and expertise of Columbus State Community College. CSCC has extensive experience in managing large grants, including multi-million dollar projects.
from the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor. In accordance with OMB
Circulars, expenditures are audited annually. With its considerable experience in federal grant
compliance, the College is a low risk grantee.

Further, each proposed deliverable will have a designated lead with accountability for
completion (see resumes for key personnel in Appendix F). LEA leads will be responsible for
ensuring implementation of the ECHS design within their districts: Marcy Drafts/Ed O’Reilly,
Columbus City SD; Monique Hamilton, Groveport SD; Mike Morbitzer, Hamilton Local SD; Dr.
Philip Wagner, Licking Heights Local SD; Tricia Moore, Reynoldsburg SD; Dave Stewart,
South-Western SD; and Dr. Kristin Barker, Whitehall SD. Working with the LEA leads, Teddi
Lewis-Hotopp, Director of Student Academic Support Services and Sherry Minton, Director of
Academic Affairs at CSCC will be responsible for facilitating the development and
implementation of the standards-based ECHS curriculum with comprehensive wraparound
student supports for all students. Working together, Dr. Joel Vargas and Dr. LaVonne Sheffield
of JFF, the ESC, and Kelly Hogan, Executive Director of Academic Affairs at CSCC will
support each LEA lead to implement the ECHS professional development program. Finally, Dr.
Julie Edmonds of the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro will lead
the third-party evaluation, and Dr. Stacia Edwards, Associate Vice President at CSCC will
manage the development of products and tools to support dissemination and replication.

The organizational chart below demonstrates the lines of communication and management
structure to ensure project success.
The following organizational chart indicates the key personnel and their role in the project.
**Operating Model and Plan; Timelines and Milestones.** Using the management structure, work plan monitoring, partner communications, and continuous improvement processes defined in this proposal, the CCRE project will achieve the milestones shown in the timeline below.

Legend: **CCRE** – Central Ohio Partnership for College and Career Readiness Expansion; **CSCC**—Columbus State Community College; **ESC**—Educational Service Center of Central Ohio; **JFF**—Jobs for the Future; **LEA**—Local Educational Agency; **SERVE**—The SERVE center at UNC-Greensboro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 Milestones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed agreements</td>
<td>CSCC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>MOU, data agreements</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load milestone, budget, and timelines into Amplifund; train partners</td>
<td>CSCC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement/outcome metrics and data indicators/timelines</td>
<td>CSCC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff hiring plans set</td>
<td>CSCC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Q1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD planning for school leadership, high school/college faculty</td>
<td>CSCC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Management plan, MOU</td>
<td>Q2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional coaches identified/hired</td>
<td>ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College Professional Development (PD) for coaches launched</td>
<td>ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD institutes for high school/college faculty</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and dissemination plan completed</td>
<td>CSCC, ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based leadership coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based instructional coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School planning teams formed</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA/School kick-off meetings, establish district coordination structure,</td>
<td>CSCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, meeting materials, meeting and reporting schedule</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management and reporting protocols (e.g., i3 cabinet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for course pathways/supports established at schools</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Academic plan, scope and sequence,</td>
<td>Q2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review school baseline data, establish plan for data collection for</td>
<td>CSCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Data dashboard, data analysis report template</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring, continuous improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 2 Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collect baseline data and identify comparison schools, collect implementation data</td>
<td>SERVE</td>
<td>Revised evaluation plan and schedule</td>
<td>Q2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of practice extranet launched</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Planning agendas, written descriptions, content outlines</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Early College gap analyses completed</td>
<td>SCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Q1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based leadership coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based instructional coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Planning Teams continue implementation planning (curriculum, pathways, courses, school design, internships, work experience)</td>
<td>SCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs, Employers</td>
<td>Coach reports Academic plan, scope and sequence, syllabi</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College High School PD for coaches</td>
<td>SCC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development institutes for high school/college faculty</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College High School designs, courses, pathways, student supports, internships, work experience)</td>
<td>SCC, LEAs</td>
<td>Academic plan, scope and sequence, syllabi</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning webinars &amp; regional meetings begun</td>
<td>SCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agendas, evaluations, copies of materials used</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site PD &amp; observational rounds begun</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach report, Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation site visits &amp; surveys launched</td>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>Meeting/visit agenda, survey</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data use professional development for schools and district to identify progress revision and improvements needs</td>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>Creation of reports and analyses by CCRE</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, SCB</td>
<td>Collect updated administrative data</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish datasets for outcome analyses, collect implementation data</td>
<td>SCC, SCB</td>
<td>Interim evaluation report</td>
<td>Q2 and 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 3 Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted on-site PD &amp; rounds</td>
<td>SCC, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports, agendas</td>
<td>Q1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based leadership coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based instructional coaching</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement and assess Early College</td>
<td>SCC, ESC, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School designs, courses, pathways, student supports, internships, work experience</td>
<td>JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Academic plan, scope and sequence, syllabi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD institutes for high school/college faculty</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site PD</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning webinars &amp; regional meetings</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agendas, evaluations, copies of materials used</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data use professional development for schools and district to identify progress and need revision/improvement needs</td>
<td>CSCC, ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Creation of reports and analyses by CCRE</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document enabling conditions/barriers and startup process</td>
<td>CCRE</td>
<td>Coaching reports, LEA report</td>
<td>Q-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct initial outcome analyses, collect and analyze implementation data</td>
<td>SERVE</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Q2 and 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 4 Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD institutes for high school/college faculty</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agenda, PD materials</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning webinars &amp; regional meetings</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Agendas, copies of materials, evaluations</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based leadership coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based instructional coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement and assess Early College High School designs, courses, pathways, student supports, internships, work experience)</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, LEAs,</td>
<td>Coach reports Academic plan, scope and sequence, syllabi</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, SERVE</td>
<td>Collect updated administrative data</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data use professional development conducted for schools and district to identify progress and need for revisions and improvements</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Creation of reports and analyses by ESC</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct outcome analyses, collect and analyze implementation data</td>
<td>SERVE</td>
<td>Interim evaluation report</td>
<td>Q 2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of progress outcomes through presentations, publications</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Publications, case studies, reports, web content</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 5 Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning webinars &amp; regional meetings</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, LEA</td>
<td>Agendas, evaluations, copies of materials used</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based leadership coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Parties Involved*</th>
<th>Indicator of Accomplishment</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School based instructional coaching</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement and assess Early College High School designs, courses, pathways, student supports, internships, work experience)</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Coach reports</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>ESC, JFF, SERVE</td>
<td>Collect updated administrative data</td>
<td>Q1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data use professional development for schools and district to identify progress and revision and improvement needs</td>
<td>ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Creation of reports and analyses by ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation findings</td>
<td>SERVE</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Q2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling Planning</td>
<td>CCRE, ESC, JFF, LEAs</td>
<td>Marketing and descriptive materials</td>
<td>Q2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate progress outcomes through presentations and publications</td>
<td>CSCC, ESC, JFF</td>
<td>Web content, presentations, case studies, publications</td>
<td>Q3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 10,000 new early college students enrolled by end of year 5

(3) Multi-year Financial and Operating Model.

The work plan and timeline above reflect a multi-year financial and operating model that will successfully bring the project to scale in the Central Ohio Region and institutionalize effective and sustainable structures and practices by the conclusion of the grant period. In Year 1, work in districts will launch quickly, emphasizing intensive planning, goal setting, district/school design work, and initial leadership and instructional coaching and professional development. Years 2-3 will be the period of most intensive engagement by CSCC, ESC, and, JFF with the Early College High Schools (as reflected by the milestones for those years above), addressing implementation, professional development, peer learning, conferences, policy work, and data and evaluation. By the beginning of Year 4, new structures, partnerships, and pedagogical and curriculum approaches will be established at all schools, and emphasis will gradually shift to refinement, continuous improvement, and dissemination of progress. In year 5, these emphases will continue,
as the entire CCRE project team and partners continue to assess and refine implementation and work together to ensure sustainability. CSCC, ESC, and JFF will engage in a range of dissemination efforts as well as planning for further scaling. The accompanying project budget mirrors this implementation arc, with the highest cost periods being Years 2 and 3, and a ramping down of the project budget in beginning in Year 4 and continuing through Year 5.

(4) Procedures for Ensuring Feedback and Continuous Improvement.

The CCRE project integrates with the Columbus State Community College overall institutional assessment plan, which provides a framework for continuous improvement.

This five-stage continuous improvement cycle, shown in the illustration on the right involves:

1. **Plan**—to identify intending learning outcomes and benchmarks
2. **Approaches**—to measure selected program and general education outcomes
3. **Data**—to document outcomes through a mixed methods approach.
4. **Share**—to review and discuss the data.
5. **Close the loop**—to identify changes in teaching strategies and curriculum.
6. **The cycle continues.**

D. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION

(1) Evaluation Methods.

Two lottery-based Randomized Control Trials show that Early College High Schools have a positive impact on relevant student outcomes. The Central Ohio College and Career Readiness Partnership is taking the effective practices of the early college and implementing it in seven districts in Ohio.

To assess the impact of the program, the study will use a school-level quasi-experimental
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design designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse Standards with reservations. The 16 schools that served by the project will be each matched to two to three schools that are equivalent on core baseline outcomes.

The evaluation team is familiar with What Works Clearinghouse standards, having designed a longitudinal study that met the standards without reservations. The team is also conducting evaluations for four other i3 projects that will meet standards without reservations as well as quasi-experimental designs to meet the standards with reservations.

(2) Key Evaluation Questions.

The evaluation will answer the core questions on the impact and implementation of ECHS.

**Impact Study.** The following specific questions drive the impact study:

1. Do CCRE high schools have a higher percentage of students enrolling in and receiving credit for college preparatory courses in 9th and 10th grades as compared to comparison schools?
2. Do CCRE high schools have a higher percentage of students enrolling in and receiving credit for college courses by the end of 11th and 12th grades as compared to comparison schools?
3. Do CCRE high schools in their third year of implementation have fewer students dropping out than the comparison schools?
4. How does the impact vary by student sub-group, including low-income students, English language learners, and members of racial and ethnic groups under-represented in college?

To answer these research questions, the study will utilize a quasi-experimental design that matches treatment schools to comparison schools. This experimental design will meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. The treatment schools will receive all of the services identified in the logic model and described in this grant application. The control condition will experience “business as usual,” which will include the normal level of dual
enrollment services provided by the community college.

The project staff is responsible for identifying schools that are interested in participating. The external evaluators will identify comparison schools located in the same geographical area.

**Implementation Study.** The implementation evaluation will focus on two aspects of Early College:

1. Delivery of and participation in program services conceptualized as “structural implementation” (Century, Rudnick, & Freeman, 2010).

2. Implementation of the Early College Design Principles (see Logic Model above) at the school level (this is similar to what has been conceptualized as “instructional implementation” and “represent[s] the actions, behaviors, and interactions that the user is expected to engage in when enacting the intervention” (Century, et al., 2010). The implementation of the Design Principles can also be seen as proximal outcomes and thus will not be considered as measures of fidelity of implementation (fidelity of implementation will only be assessed for the program’s Key Components as articulated below). Because this project is unique in that a community college partner is the lead, the project will also collect qualitative data relative to the community college.

The specific questions driving the implementation evaluation include:

1. To what extent have the project’s key components been implemented with fidelity?

2. To what extent are schools implementing the Early College Design Principles?

3. What are the advantages/challenges of having the ECHS work led by a community college?

The project will use mixed methods to answer these implementation questions. To assess fidelity of implementation relative to the Key Components (see discussion below), the evaluation will use project records and original data to examine the levels of implementation. Fidelity of
implementation will be assessed relative to each Key Component.

To collect data on implementation of the Early College Design Principles in the schools, the evaluation will administer surveys to the staff of treatment and control schools. Each school will receive an incentive of $1,000 to have their staff complete the survey annually. The surveys will include information relative to the implementation of the Design Principles and will be based on surveys used in other early college studies. The scales in these surveys have good reliability and have been shown to distinguish between the early college model and other high school experiences (Arshavsky, Edmunds, Miller, & Corritore, 2011; Edmunds, Willse, Arshavsky, & Dallas, 2013)

To answer the third question, the evaluation will conduct interviews with district, school, and postsecondary staff. These interviews will provide insights into strengths the community college brings to the work and challenges that they might face because they are not part of the K-12 public school system and compared with work in other schools by the evaluator. The evaluation team will also conduct site visits in Years 2, 3, and 4 to explore implementation in more depth at the school and college levels.

(3) Study of the Project at Proposed Level of Scale.

The evaluation will examine the impact of and implementation in all high schools participating in the CCRE. These schools will be in urban and suburban districts in the Columbus area.

The early college initiative is targeted at students who are under-represented in college. As a result, one of the research questions concerns the impact of the model on those target population in particular students who are members of the following sub-groups:

- *Low-income students*. These are students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch.

- *English language learners*. These are students for whom English is not their first language
and are identified as Limited English Proficient or English Language Learner (ELL).

- **Members of under-represented minority groups.** These include students who are members of racial or ethnic groups that are under-represented in postsecondary education and include students who identify as African-American, Native American, or Hispanic/Latino.

The study will examine the impacts for these specific sub-groups (see analysis plan).

**(4) Evaluation Analysis Plan.**

**Impact Study.** The sample size for the impact study is an estimated 64 schools, with 16 treatment schools matched to three comparison schools each. A power analysis in Optimal Design indicates that this would be sufficient to measure effects of .15 standard deviations or less. Assumptions include 400 students per school, \( p \leq 0.05 \), an intra-class correlation of .1 and an \( r \)-squared of .55 (Unlu, Fesler, Edmunds, & Glennie, 2014).

A hierarchical linear modeling approach (HLM) (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) will be used as the general analytic framework within which we will examine impacts of interest to account for the nested structure of the data. In most cases, where student-level data is available, students will be nested within schools.

In general, these models seek to answer the question, “Is there an overall treatment effect of the early college intervention on relevant student outcomes for schools who implement the model relative to their control school counterparts?” Consequently, models will include a fixed treatment effect at level 2, which is the primary effect of interest. This treatment effect will be adjusted for a school level “pretest” measure (either the same measure from the baseline period or a highly correlated baseline measure) as well as other theoretically relevant student-level characteristics (under-represented minority status, poverty status, ELL status, first-generation college-going status, and 8th grade reading and math performance) that have been shown to add
additional precision by explaining a portion of student-level variance.

To answer the research question about the impact on specific sub-groups, we will use the same analytic approach but for the sub-group of interest. Following the recommendations of Bloom and Michalopoulos (2010), we will also test the difference between impacts for students of members of the sub-group (e.g., low-income students) and compare it to the impact for students who are not members of that sub-group (e.g., not low-income students) to see if any gaps in outcomes are widening or narrowing as a result of the project.

**Implementation Study.** The implementation study will collect and analyze data to assess fidelity of implementation using approaches that have been validated with the four other i3 grants with which the evaluation team is working. In partnership with the project staff, the evaluation team will finalize threshold levels of implementation for each Key Component and their indicators (see below). Starting in Year 2 of the project, each indicator will be assessed as meeting fidelity of implementation or not. These indicators will then be rolled up to measure implementation of each Key Component and to measure implementation of the whole project.

To assess implementation of the Design Principles at the school-level, the evaluation will compare scores on scales and specific questions from the surveys administered to treatment and control schools. The expectation is that treatment schools will improve scores on scales related to the Design Principles compared with baseline scores and control schools.

Qualitative data will use inductive and deductive coding to identify core themes from interviews.

**Reporting and Feedback.** The evaluation team will provide ongoing feedback to the project staff. This will include monthly meetings, annual reports that summarize results to date, recommendations for improvement, and follow-up presentations to debrief the annual reports.

The evaluation team will produce at least two reports that will be posted on the CCRE and
SERVE websites. One report will focus on implementation and at least one report will include the project impact estimates. These reports will be supplemented by presentations at national conferences and articles submitted to researcher-oriented and practitioner-oriented journals.

**Examining Cost Effectiveness.** To examine the cost effectiveness of the project, the evaluation team will follow the approach described by Levin & McEwan (2000). The team will work with the project staff to delineate the specific program components and the costs for each of those components. The team will then assess the cost of the intervention relative to each of the core outcomes attained. This will then be compared to cost estimate for other projects with similar goals to examine the possible cost-effectiveness of the project.

**Articulation of Key Components and Outcomes in the Evaluation Plan.**

**Impact Study.** The study will examine three core domains as the primary outcomes of the study:

1. *Enrollment and success in a college preparatory course of study.* For 9th graders, this includes Algebra I or higher and a college preparatory English course. For 10th graders, this involves at least two college preparatory math courses and two English courses. Students will earn credit if they pass the course. The expected impact is 5 percentage points.

2. *Enrollment and success in college-level courses.* One of the goals is to increase the number of students earning college credits while in high school. Two related outcomes will be examined. The first will be the percentage of students receiving at least one college credit by the end of 11th and 12th grade; this is a measure of access students have to college credits. The second will be the average number of college credits earned by the end of 11th and 12th grade. College credits include dual enrollment and Advanced Placement courses. The goal is to have 90 percent of the student population have at least one college credit bearing course.

3. *Graduating from high school.* Because graduation rates are a longer-term goal, the project
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will use dropout rates as a proxy. The outcome will be the percentage of students who dropped from schools in at least their third year of implementation. The goal is to reduce dropout rates by five percentage points.

The analyses will use de-identified data from the Ohio Department of Education.

**Implementation Study.** The following shows the project’s Key Components with indicators and thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Threshold Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i3 Cabinet</td>
<td>Formation of i3 cabinet with district/postsecondary participants</td>
<td>i3 Cabinet in place=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in place=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development and alignment</td>
<td>Development of integrated 9-14 guided pathways</td>
<td>At least four pathways developed=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than four pathways developed=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop credit-bearing college readiness student success course</td>
<td>Course developed=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course not developed=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for college faculty</td>
<td>75% of college faculty teaching early college classes have participated in professional development</td>
<td>At least 90% of college faculty participated=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 90% of college faculty participated=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development/Coaching for School staff</td>
<td>Teacher professional development days</td>
<td>At least 90% of teachers in treatment schools attend professional development=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 90% of attend PD sessions=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership professional development for administrators days</td>
<td>At least 90% of administers attend professional development days/school=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 90% of attend PD sessions=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselor/advisor professional development days</td>
<td>At least 90% of counselors/advisors attend professional development=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 90% of attend PD sessions=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Support structures in place (career coaching/advising tutoring) for participating students</td>
<td>Support structures in place=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support structures not in place=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of early alert system for participating students</td>
<td>School receives data from early alert =1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School does not receive data from early alert =0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SERVE Center at University of North Carolina at Greensboro will lead the scale-up evaluation. SERVE has studied early colleges for eight years, leading the first large-scale experimental study of the impact of early colleges. They have received three competitive grants from the Institute of Education Sciences to study early colleges. They also have substantial experience with the i3 requirements and are conducting evaluations for four i3 grants, including three Validation grants and one Scale Up. They have the expertise to design and conduct an evaluation to meet i3 requirements. They are cooperating with the Department of Education’s technical assistance for the i3 and find the process very valuable. The evaluators will participate in a community of practice to exchange ideas with other i3 evaluators. Dr. Julie Edmunds at the SERVE Center at University of North Carolina - Greensboro, will lead the evaluation. Dr. Edmunds has been Principal Investigator for three IES grants for a longitudinal experimental study of the impact of the ECHS model in North Carolina. She has studied early colleges for eight years and has an in-depth knowledge of the design of the model and the issues with measuring its impact and implementation. Dr. Edmunds is leading the evaluation of other i3 projects that seek to implement the early college design in comprehensive high schools. She will use insights from these evaluations to inform the evaluation of this scale-up project.

The $1.37 million that is budgeted for the evaluation will be sufficient to complete the evaluation as articulated. In addition, SERVE will draw on the substantial resources of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for data collection and analysis work.