Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0391OH-1 for Ohio Virtual Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio Virtual Academy (OHVA) sets forth a reform vision to improve the individualized educational services it already provides with specific goals to increase high school graduation rates by 10% each academic year and prepare all of its students to be college or career ready.

Their goal to meet or exceed state value added growth measures as well as improve student achievement scores minimally by 5% per academic year for four years is ambitious. Ohio Virtual Academy's school mission aligns very well with RTT's goals and consequently they already have in place processes and practices such as real time data driven decision making to determine student support and curriculum remediation and a teacher evaluation system that figures student success into performance reviews. Having received previous RTT funding, OHVA implemented this compatible vision for several years and has identified several areas or issues that need improvement such as:

- A consistent instructional improvement system needs to be developed. *Internal pre-post assessments and formative assessments indicate that students are learning the material, but these assessment systems are inadequate in predicting performance on state"*
- *Internal pre-post assessments and formative assessments indicate that students are learning the material, but these assessment systems are inadequate in predicting performance on State assessments. Ohio has adopted Common Core Standards, and better alignment is needed.*
- *The passing rate performance of OHVA's grade 3-8 students on the Ohio Achievement Assessments have plateaued at levels below the annual AYP targets.*

The Applicant adequately has articulated a coherent reform vision to build on previous work. It addresses the need to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning through personalized student support. The plan is strong but did not adequately explain how their plan increases equity or how teachers may individualize assignments to support student interests.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

100% of the students enrolled at OHVA will participate in the RTT initiative. Therefore, a description of the process that the applicant used to select schools was not relevant. For A2, the applicant adequately presented a table showing the number of high need, low income, and total number of student participants and educators, and reported that 100% will be served. OHVA serves students throughout Ohio, and it would have been helpful to see how students are distributed throughout the State and what districts they reside in, in lieu of listing schools. The table showing school demographics states that 100% of the students are from low income familes, but the number of students form low income families is much less than 100%. (8,143 of 13,700)

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	0

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A3 was not addressed in proposal and there was no explanation for why it was not addressed. OHVA may have seen it as irrelevant since they are one entity, but they could have suggested how them might scale best practices to support school improvement beyond their own LEA.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant appears to have set forth ambitious yet achievable annual goals as directed for each of the four areas specified in easy to read tables. The major goals are to improve student achievement scores in reading, math, and science, and decrease achievement gap between LEA students and statewide benchmarks in math, and to increase high school graduation rates by 10% each year: Specific goals in third through eighth grade include increasing annual mathematics, reading, and science achievement scores minimally 5% per academic year every year which would put them on target to meet or exceed all OAA benchmark goals within the lifetime of the RttT-D grant award.

To facilitate increased graduation rates, OHVA has implemented a Freshman Academy with a dedicated principal, a Senior Success Academy, and vigorous credit recovery programming, all aimed at identifying and serving credit deficient students. They hope to raise graduation rates 10% this year and 5% each of the followign two years, and then 10% the last year (when current freshman will be seniors).

The applicant scores high on this criterion.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA student enrollment has been steadily growing, but it is not clear that they are iimproving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. With gaps at every grade level between the LEA's achievment scores and State benchmark targets, and only 34% of seniors graduating, OVHA has not demonstrated a a record of success in the past four years to improve student learning outcomes and increase equity by improving high school graduation rates and college enrollment. The number of students attending college was noted, but college enrollment was not calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating cohort. An indication of OHVA's performance in 2011-2012 is presented as baseline data in A4. OHVA gets high marks for making student performance data available to all stakeholders and providing personnel to help understand the data and build relationships with families that help advance educational goals. There is evidence throughout the proposal that suggests OHVA has been working this past year to undertake reforms to improve outcomes for low achieving students.   For example,

- Professional development will be offered on value added reports and data analysis to facilitate individualized remediation and support for students with demonstrated areas of deficiency
- OHVA has implemented a Freshman Academy with a dedicated principal, a Senior Success Academy, and vigorous credit recovery programming,

Despite having good intentions to reform their practices, the applicant received a moderately low score for this criterion because they do not have a clear record of success to improve outcomes or to achieve significant reforms. They received points for making student performance available and their current effort to undertake reform.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA has a variety of evidence throughout the proposal to success that it is committed to a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments.   Annual reports, including school-wide data, and open board meetings (except for executive times) are presented as evidence.   The applicant does not make personnel salaries available to the reader, but notes that this data is available online through the State of Ohio's Treasurer's office.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA claims they have successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments. Tailoring individual learning paths for every student is core to their mission.   The only evidence they provided was the following:

"As a public school in the state of Ohio, OHVA has the legal, statutory, and regulatory autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments

described in this RttT-D proposal. "

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

 OHVA implements regular planning meetings with administrative staff, lead teachers, a steering committee, and their corporate curriculum partner to provide opportunities for stakeholders to voice their opinions, plan, and assess implementation progress. No description was provided as to how students and teachers were engaged in the specific development of this proposal and its revisions based upon their feedback. No evidence was provided to show that at least 70% of teacher support this proposal.   A letter was included from the OHVA parent advisory Council reporting that they "received the text and that the administration was good at considering their suggestions"   but more letters from a variety of stakeholders would have helped support this criterion. The applicant has not provided strong evidence that they have broad,meaningful stakeholder engagement.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Since OHVA's mission is tightly tied to tailoring educational paths for each student, their normal operating procedures depend upon implementing personalized learning environments. Throughout their proposal, the applicant identifies challenges and areas for improvement which they have begun to initate or want to initiate. Two examples of areas in which they have begun to address issues include:

1. The passing rate performance of OHVA's grade 3-8 students on the Ohio Achievement Assessments have plateaued at levels below the annual AYP targets, particularly in math. Adequately completing open-ended questions has been identified as a weakness.. While OHVA's curriculum is adequately aligned to the existing standards, continuing development is needed to align with the new standards.
2. In response to the demonstrated need in 3rd Grade Reading they are requesting RttT- D funding support for Reading Recovery specialists to support and differentiate reading instruction for elementary students in Tier I.

It is commendable that needs and gaps are recognized by OHVAand they have plans to implement improvements. These gaps were not clearly tied to the logic behind the proposal and were not presented as a coherent piece in this section, resulting in a slightly reduced score.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA's approach to learning creates an Individual learning Plan for each student that meets them where they are and assigns higher or lower level school work based on their areas of need and strength, with the goal to graduate high school and be college ready. OHVA gets high marks for personalizing the learning environment and using RTT-D funds to provide additional supports to students. Below are strengths and concerns regarding <u>student learning</u>:

- High needs students receive an extra layer of support through previously RTT funded Family Success Liaisons. Reading Recovery specialists are included in this proposal to improve services to students in Tier 1.
- Students are able to log into classrooms that include children from throughout Ohio and thus exposed to a more diverse group of students than likely at their local school. The proposal suggests that through synchronous and asynchronous learning experiences and standards-based assessments, students are able to develop the traits including goal setting, teamwork, and perseverance listed in the proposal. No specific evidence is provided.
- While the pace and teaching strategies of the standards based curriculum is individualized, it is not clear how many students are able to do deep learning in areas of academic interest, how much time is spent on team projects involving diverse groups of students, and the extent to which students are encouraged to graduate on time and are college and/or career ready.
- RTT-D funding will permit OHVA to have multiple guidance counselors to support to facilitate educational and career planning.
- High School students with credit deficiencies can be supported by the credit recovery team, Freshman Academy, and/or Cohort Academy.

- The proposal notes students receive ongoing and regular feedback but the online student access to data is restricted to lesson and grade marks. It is not clear whether this data is tied to mastery of standards
- Additional Student Engagement Teachers (SET) are requested to facilitate more face to face, in home support and follow up.
- Sessions in which students share their work are recorded and libraries are built by subject/grade level/topic which are then made available for all students to access.
- Teacher supplies include additional interactive support tools such as Bamboo writing tablets for mathematics and ELA teachers and calculators for low income students.

There are no goals, activities, or timelines attached to this section that show how their plan for improving the quality of access to high quality online curriculum and support from effective teachers to improve student learning will be implemented.

Overall, the applicant has been placed in the top of the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

> **Teaching and Leading:** The proposal describes many impressive ways in which educators will be supported to increase their capacity to support individualized instruction to meet each student's academic needs. OHVA has systems and training in place to refine best practices and continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps. Following are examples of evidence to s support this criteron:

- Weekly professional development opportunities are offered on topics ranging from data collection and analysis, teaching strategies, technical assistance sessions, and student engagement strategies
- TBT teachers meet weekly to discuss subject specific grade level student data which drives individualized learning paths.
- Entire teaching staff participates in vertically aligned Professional Learning Communities in face-to-face venues around Ohio. These PLC teams have a specific data driven focus.
- Teachers model discussion strategies and encourage collaborative work through project-based learning and work groups.
- Individual Learning Plan (ILP) are developed collaboratively with the student, Learning Coach, teacher, and Intervention Specialist (as needed).
- OHVA is committed to improving teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems, and providing supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.
- RttT-D proposed funding will support extended learning opportunities for teaching staff such as college coursework related to best practices, online education, and core curriculum development.
- All OHVA staff is HQT as defined by ODE.

OHVA is currently implemeting several techniques that have the potential to be useful and strengthen teaching, but their track record for demonstrating teacher effectiveness is not good.A major weakness in addressing this criterion is the lack of specific goals, activities, and timelines attached to this section that show how their plan for improving the quality of teaching to support personalized learning environments will be ensured.

The applicant was placed in the middle range for this criterion. .

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA has established policies and practices that facilitate personalized learning, The following practices align with this criterion:

- The central office provides support to the entire LEA which will benefit from this grant.
- Teachers develop their own teaching/remediation schedules within their grade level teams.
- K-8 OHVA uses a totally mastery-based curriculum andstudents are able to work through curriculum at their own pace.

- ELL and ESL students are assigned a bilingual staff member and special education students are assigned an Intervention specialist to work with them. Details about modifications that are made for these students was not described.
- Students and teachers have immediate access to real time student data through their online school.
- All learning resources and instructional practices are accessible to all students attending OHVA.

Concerns: It is unclear whether students have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the same standard in multiple ways. OHVA's Instructional Improvement System is in development and details were not described, nor was there a timeline for it's completion.

D1 and D2 were not presented separately, so the reviewer had to determine which evidence was useful for each section to develop comments and scoring.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA's school infrastructure supports personalized learning in the following ways.

- All OHVA student, regardless of income are provided online resources including desktop computers, printers, and internet service reimbursement, as well as textbooks and workbooks.
- All stakeholders have access to high quality technical support, provided in a range of ways.
- Open data format was not directly addressed and therefore, the reviewer could not judge whether it met the sub-criteria. The reviewer has concerns about whether student data, so instrumental to implementing personalized education and can be widely shared.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA is committed to improvement and presented the goals of its improvement plan in the proposal. It is clear from the following evidence that they have and are taking steps to improve their program for the benefit of students. The proposal makes transparent several issues that are currently being addressed to improve student achievement and graduation rates, including (but not limited to)

- Improve student engagement through attention to the school culture
- Hire additional staff to work with those at risk of not graduating in their cohort.
- Replace principals at all levels of the school.
- Short assessment cycles with immediate interventions.
- A PD plan to increase students' ability to problem-solve and answer open ended questions.
- Increased data collection and analysis at every level.
- A new teacher evaluation instrument
- 14 performance measures are presented that will be utilized to monitor OHVA's progress toward it's stated RTT-D goals and objectives.. Each one includes its purpose, who is responsible, and action steps. It is noted that they can be modified if they are not producing useful data.

There is no mention of how the applicant will monitor and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by RTT-D. It appears that much of this important work is in process and will happen regardless of receiving the grant or not.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is acknowledged in this section that structures are in place to ensure a frequent flow of information between Learning coaches and teachers on behalf of students. The section notes that PD sessions for teachers will be driven by data. E1 and E2 were reported together, and communication among different stakeholders as part of a continuous improvement process

was not discussed. Other sections discussed varous communication channels that are built into their normal operating procedures to support their individualized student program.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant used the templates provided in the application template to present an adequate number of performance measures.   The measures appear ambitious, yet achievable. Requirements described in the guidelines (a: rationale, b: connection to theory of action and c: review and improvement over time) were not provided. The text is section E was well over the recommended limit, but did not include narrative around these performance meansure. In general, the tables look useful, but several questions remain (e.g., why the % of highly effective teachers remains at 50% for five years, why only student engagement was used as an indicator for health or socio-emotional learning at all levels, why the growth in percentage of students who complete the FAFSA is so minimal, etc.),

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT funded activities were not specifically discussed, It is not clear that their plan will result in enabling many more participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards , so adjustments may be needed. It is good that there are plans for continual communication among and between stakeholders, but it should explicitly include evaluating theeffectiveness of the RTT investments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget tables are clearly presented and appear reasonable and sufficient to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal. The narrative notes that initiatives and positions funded through the RTT- D grant will function in collaboration with multiple additional funding sources. Three sources of additional funding (SIG, RttT, and Title 1) are noted in the Budget Narrative table. It is not clear when the SIG and RttT funding ends and which line items these funds support. The final total budget at the bottom of the project narrative table is $1,000 more than the total budget in the Overall Budget Summary table, which appears to be an error.   The budgets did not include raises for the personnel costs, the largest line item during the four years of the grant, which seems unrealistic.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environment at OHVA is likely since it is an integral part of their instructional program and school culture. It is noted that enrollment has been rising and will soon cap, "being able to increase the rate that enrolled students return to the school each year by approximately 3% would provide enough additional funding to sustain all new positions included the grant." Also, "as goals stated for RttT-D are realized - increased student achievement, engagement, and retention – revenue sources from traditional state and federal allocations will help sustain RttT-D proposals, initiatives, and personnel."

OHVA's proposal includes a significant investment in professional development. Once communities develop and mature, it is likely that they will be integrated into normal operations, but actual stipends for professional development may not exist and should be acknowledged.   No budget was included to suggest how future funds might be appropriated was included.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

OHVA notes several partnerships with public organizations in this section, but is not very specific about how they augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports. They seem to have a useful partnership with State Support Team at the Educational Services Center to provide guidance around leadership. It was noted that they are currently talking to Comcast about providing low cost internet access.   Much of the narrative in this section included information about partnerships, such as with the K12Inc. and a high school lab, that are key components to their instructional program, but did not show how the partnerships build the capacity of their staff or address the behavioral and emotional needs of the students. In their virtual learning environment, the Learning Coach that reaches out to each student and their family is instrumental in supporting student needs. These people are key in implementing family partnerships that support individual student needs and appear to be integral part of OHVA's regular program. Perhaps they could be used as a vehicle to create additional student and family supports. The table presents performance measures that seem integral to the proposal goals, and not about partnerships. Overall, a weak response to the Competitive Preference Priority in terms of meaningful partnerships to support the socio-emotional and educational needs of students and their families beyond what the school provides.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The The Ohio Virtual Academy has adequately articulated a reform vision to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning through personalized student support.   OVA plans to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards

Total	210	124

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0391OH-2 for Ohio Virtual Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has outlined an ambitious vision including elements to improved student achievement, enhance engagement and improve graduation rates. Evidence of this includes:

- implementation of robust data systems to track student progress
- recruiting and rewarding HQ teachers and administrators
- incentive bonuses for staff

- improved evaluation instruments and improvement plans when needed
- online professional development and face to face trainings for staff
- shared use of data with students, teachers and families
- increased academic performance with targeted coursework

Weaknesses:

The lack of a clear delineation between what the applicant already has in place and what is to be added through the addition of grant funds. Gaps and needs between current practice and the intended vision are not clearly delineated.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant has provided data on current student performance and reasonable growth targets for annual improvement appropriate for improving overall performance and closing gaps between sub-groups.

Applicant has set ambitious goals to target increases in the graduation rate of population and college enrollment rate of students.

Weaknesses:

The lack of clarity as to which populations are targeted for services raises questions about how the reform proposal would be implemented.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant plan includes specific goals for 3rd through 8th grade to increase performance in math, reading, and science achievement by 5% per year.

Weaknesses:

No discussion about how the plan would be scaled up was presented in the application.

The applicant did not present a logic model or theory of change regarding how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the project.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant has set ambitious goal targets to increase performance on summative assessments in math, science, and reading.

Ambitious goal targets have also be established to increase the high school graduation rate and improve college enrollment rates.

Weaknesses:

The lack of a thorough discussion of how the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning as a result of these ambitious targets and goals.

The applicant does not discuss how gaps between subgroup performances will be decreased, nor describe any goals for decreasing any gaps between the various student populations attending the school.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant provides clear evidence that student performance data both formative as well as summative is available to students, educators and parents on an easily accessible basis and that student evaluation occurs on a regular basis.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide clear evidence of success in the past 4 years in advancing student learning and achievement nor increasing equity in learning and teaching. No historical narrative, graphs, charts or raw student data has been presented to demonstrate evidence of prior success.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant releases annual reports which include school wide student performance data to all parents and posts this information for public review on their corporate website.

Applicant releases personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff and teachers through the State of Ohio Treasurer's office website and on the nces.ed website.

Weaknesses:

The LEA's level of transparency is unclear given the lack of clarity as to what information was shared with parents in the annual report.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant is a viable, established public school within the state of Ohio with legal, statutory, and regulatory autonomy to provide instruction with the state.

Applicant is an experienced provider of online learning in the state and has sufficient structures in place technologically to support an online learning environment.

Weaknesses:

The LEA's idea of successful conditions that help the organization meet student, teacher and family needs through their online learning capabilities was largely unexplored.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant included many stakeholders in the planning process of the grant. Evidence includes:

- school administrators met weekly to review student data and identify needs in many areas
- lead teachers and department chairpersons held regular planning meetings
- a parent Steering Committee provided input and feedback to the admin team

Applicant provided letters of support from the Parent Advisory Council and state government.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not discuss the level of teacher support represented in the organization for the proposal nor were any letters of support from teachers or a teacher organization provided to express support for the proposal.

The exclusion of letters of support from key stakeholder groups such as students, local business community, civic or community groups, a wider array of teacher leaders and possibly institutions of higher education reflects limited stakeholder engagement and commitment to the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant has processes in place to ensure a smooth entry into the online environment. Evidence includes:

- evaluation upon enrollment
- pairings with highly qualified teachers
- educational supports such as ELL/ESL programming and special education services
- placement into appropriate levels of curriculum as needs require (above or below grade level)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not offer a clear explanation of the services the applicant already provides and the reform being proposed including identified needs and gaps. It is unclear what needs or gaps still are unfilled and how the plan would fill these gaps or needs.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**6**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant has procedures in place to provide a personalized learning environment for all students. Evidence includes:

- students can receive higher or lower grade level coursework as needs determine
- minimum progress and attendance guidelines are communicated to learning coaches and students on a weekly basis
- students receive a collaboratively developed Individual Learning Plan (ILP) to guide learning
- Learning coaches have access to real time student performance and attendance data.
- system warehouses performance data throughout the school year
- frequent feedback to students and families throughout the school year

Applicant provides a plan to add multiple counselors and Reading Recover Specialists to assist students with career planning and support struggling students for more success.

Weaknesses:

The application did not address plans to assist students with more targeted goal setting nor did it discuss career-focused activities that might take place in the online environment. The plan did not include a methodology to have students measure their own progress toward meeting goals. The applicant also did not include any focused plan to build skills such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, problem solving and creativity.

The applicant did not discuss a plan to provide access to and expose students to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that might motivate and deepen student learning.

The applicant did not provide a detailed plan to improve course content and align content with college and career ready standards.

The applicant did not provide a detailed plan to help students meet graduation requirements and ensure that students graduate on time.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has a large number of approaches in place to support teaching and leading. Evidence includes:

- teachers actively participate in vertically aligned Professional Learning Communities in face to face venues around the state
- OLAC online training modules and collaborative discussions occur on a regular basis
- Support and training from state training teams and weekly professional development opportunities
- weekly meetings to discuss specific grade level student data and specific student's ILP documents
- teachers have demonstrated proficiency in adapting content and instruction to meet student academic needs, interests and provide optimal learning approaches
- district and administrator commitment to improving teacher and administrative practice
- mentor teachers for additional teacher support when needed

Weaknesses:

The appliant's response provides a limited discussion of how programs, coursework and teacher practice would be changed based on student needs, interests or learning approaches.

The applicant did not provide a thorough plan to identify optimal learning approaches, identify more high quality learning resources that are aligned with college and career-ready standards, or enable more students to meet graduation requirements and college-readiness.

The applicant did not provide a thorough plan for increasing teacher and principal effectiveness and nor did they address securing highly qualified teachers in hard to staff and specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has sufficient practices, policies and rules in place that facilitate personalized learning as evidenced by:

- Central office staff includes a special ed manager, an enrollment team, an At Risk administrator, principals, a Head of School, support staff, and school staff.
- roles and responsibilities are well defined and employees have been operating in their current roles as a state online public school entity.
- students have the ability to progress and earn credit based on mastery and can access performance data at any time.
- learning resources and supports are provided for academic and non-academic challenges including students with disabilities and English learners.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a thorough discussion about how the organization uses a leadership model or makes leadership decisions regarding organizational structures such as schedules and calendars.

The applicant did not address how it establishes staffing models nor did it discuss how it determines course needs and course improvements to ensure that learning resources are adaptable and of high quality.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has a high quality plan and demonstrates ability to provide every student and educator with support and the resources they need, when and where they are needed. Evidence includes:

- ability to communicate with teachers via kmail and telephone conferences
- K-12 technology support teams
- Family success Liaison staff
- OLS help line for parents who need live support
- SOS website of frequently asked problems and solutions
- Social media peer support groups on Facebook and Yahoo
- access to online real time student performance data and Total View tool
- enrollment of all students regardless of income

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a detailed discussion about whether data is provided to students and families in an open data format and made accessible across operating systems in the home.

The application does not include a detailed explanation of how the project would specifically strengthen existing learning supports, enhance data systems, improve curriculum software, or how it will build more interoperable data systems within the organization.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has stated goals of increasing graduation rates and student achievement through the use of ongoing assessment of student learning and demonstrated mastery of learning objectives.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a plan for how it would implement a rigorous continuous improvement process to provide timely and regular feedback on progress made toward projects goals nor provide opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

No information on how the applicant will monitor, measure and publically share information on the quality of its investments funded by RTTT-D was presented.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has the ability to communicate with parents via the LEA online learning website and has a large variety of stakeholders and partnerships in place.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not discuss strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with both internal and external stakeholders to continuously improve its plan during the course of the grant period.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant has chosen ambitious yet achievable performance measures for students in grades K-8 as evidenced by the following performance measures:

- number of highly effective teachers and highly effective principals disaggregated by sub-groups number of effective teachers and effective principals disaggregated by sub-groups
- student engagement levels (engaged or highly engaged determination)
- number of students proficient or better on state OAA
- number and percent of students on track to college or career-readiness (on-track indicator)
- engagement levels logged by OHVA teaching staff for homeroom students
- increased student re-enrollment status reports
- number of students completing FAFSA form
- on-time graduation rates

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not provided narrative information on the rationale for selecting each performance measure, discussed how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information, nor provided a plan for how it will review and improve the selected measures over time if it is insufficient to gage implementation progress.

Some tables in the application contain incomplete baseline data on sub-group performance in the measure. Tables not provided in the application in the order of the stated criteria.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has productive tools in place to monitor the impact of professional development on organization teachers and to measure ongoing student learning for all sub-groups.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provided a detailed plan for organizational improvement but does not outline a clear and detailed plan about how the new grant activities stemming from professional development, improved technology, additional student support or student learning progress will be factored into existing practice.

The applicant does not discuss how it will monitor, evaluate, or improve the organization's performance on an ongoing basis.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a budget for the overall project and narrative detail of each budget component.

Weaknesses:

The application is missing a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities in the project including identifying elements that are ongoing project expenses and one-time expenses.

The applicant did not identify strategies that will ensure long-term sustainability for the elements provided in the grant if it were funded.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

No plan for sustainability, support from state and government leaders or additional financial support has been presented in the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant cites support and partnerships with many agencies and organizations. Evidence includes:

- Ohio Department of Mental Health for mental services
- Ohio feed pantries to meet family needs
- Ohio Public Transit to transport students to required events or testing
- a potential partnership with Comcast to provide low cost high speed internet access for families at reduced rates.

Weaknesses:

The application is missing a thorough description of how the services integrate with education, socio-emotional needs, behavioral needs, or acculturation for immigrants and refugees for participating students

The applicant does not describe how the partnership would improve results over time.

The application is missing a thorough description of how the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to select, implement and evaluate supports, engage parents and the families of participating students in decision making about solutions to improve results and address needs.

No population-level desired results for students in the LEA and partners have been identified.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Applicant is a fully functioning, online public school which has been actively providing personalized learning in their home state. Applicant provides evidence of the following elements already in place and functioning appropriately in the organization:

- An established student enrollment who are currently engaged in an online, personalized learning environment
- an organizational structure including central office, administrators, teachers and support staff
- online learning managements systems delivering content to students in the program
- ongoing collaborative structures for teacher and professional development programs
- alignment with Common Core and College and career-ready standards
- supports to meet students academic and socio-emotional needs
- evaluation instruments to determine teacher and principal quality
- curriculum differentiation to meet student needs in an online environment

Weaknesses:

The application is missing a clear description of the gaps to learning or barriers to success that the organization experiences, the elements that the applicant already has in place and how these services would be expanded or enhanced under the RTTT plan.

The applicant does not clearly identify how the plan would be improved, expanded or strengthened and why these supports and enhancements are necessary for deeper learning and increased student success.

The applicant did not make a clear delineation of the sections to which the applicant is responding.

Applicable charts, graphs and tables have not been placed into the appropriate section of the narrative.

The application lacks clear letters of teacher commitment to the project and letters of support from a greater variety of community organizations, institutions, businesses and other stakeholders as may apply.

Total	210	79

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0391OH-3 for Ohio Virtual Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Vision is not coherent; several initiatives listed, but how OHVA will work towards a vision that builds on these is unclear. Some existing efforts include:

- Implementing K-12 extended learning Skill Academies, individualized & online;

- Increasing grad rates 10% ea yr;

- Real-time data for teachers plus staff development in use of data;

- Rewarding teachers based on continuous student-centered feedback;

- Aligning curriculum with new standards

These efforts are not tied together into a comprehensive vision of reform. This section fails to address recruiting teachers and principals, especially to serve the highest needs students, and doesn't address the issue of low achieving schools. OHVA doesn't provide a picture of what they intend to do to deepen student learning or improve equity through personalized student support. They fail to address how student support will be grounded in individual academic interests. What's missing in this section is a clear sense of where this applicant intends to go with this grant.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA is virtual and proposes to serve entire enrolled population; asserts 13,700 students without specifying simultaneous enrollment, length of enrollment, or potential simultaneous enrollment in other LEAs.

Only 2,000 (15%) are high needs, while 40% are eligible for F/RL. The process for determining 100% participation was not addressed.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

While OHVA plans to include all of its students, it provides no information a logic model or theory of change that will help OHVA reach its outcome goals. Applicant does not address (A)(3), perhaps due to its plan to serve all students as an LEA in which all enrolled students will also be RttT-D participants.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA defines subgroups as grade levels (3rd – 12th) rather than those subgroups defined in section

1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA. No information at all on ethnic, race, income, or language groups, making determination of increased equity impossible. No percentages for college enrollment rates. This entire section is addressed only through charts without narrative explanation. Low Score for failure to address subgroups or college enrollment rates.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

No data is provided for any year on student outcomes, achievement gaps, student achievement, high school graduation, or college enrollment rates. OHVA addresses in narrative form how it provides student data online for students. educators, and parents, available 24/7. Lack of any actual data on a track record of success merits a low score in this section.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA refers to public board meetings as well as data via NCES and instructional salaries available through the State Treasurer's office, but does not address distinctions between instructional staff and teachers or non-personnel expenditures. While annual reports are mentioned, no evidence or attachment is mentioned or included. This merits a low medium score.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA asserts that it has sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environment, but provides no examples or evidence. OHVA describes existing highly individualized approaches, without addressing personalized learning environments to be developed in the grant program.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA describes an on-going general collaboration among teachers, administrators, parents, and the community, without indicating clearly how that process addressed this grant proposal or informed any revisions of the proposal. Engagement of students in collaboration or developing this proposal was not mentioned. No reference was made to collective bargaining or to any percent of teachers supporting this proposal. Rather, OHVA described a general commitment to continuous improvement. The only letter of support is from a 12-member parent advisory council which stated that it had ten days to comment on the proposal, but did not refer to any involvement in its development or actual support for the proposal or any of its initiatives. This merits a low medium score.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA provides a global discussion of its individualized instructional efforts without providing components of a high-quality plan. No goals, activities, rationale, deliverables, or responsible parties are identified. No plan is provided for analyzing gaps, nor are any identified needs or gaps mentioned. This merits a low score.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA provides a narrative discussion of how they currently individualize instruction and engage students and families, and mention areas within which they plan to increase support with RttT-D funding. They do not address components of high-quality plans, such as key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities. Nothing directly addresses college/career ready standards or graduation requirements. Deep learning experiences or multi-cultural diversity in learning experiences are not addressed. Digital learning and feedback are addressed, and comprise the majority of the learning experience. Lack of a clear plan merits a medium score for this section.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	11

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA provides a narrative discussion of how they currently implement personalized instruction for students and teachers, and mention areas within which they plan to increase support with RttT-D funding. They do not address components of high-quality plans, such as key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities. They do address an approach that focuses on personalized assistance to faculty that helps them adapt instructional tools based on individual student needs. OHVA describes significant current reliance on student measurement and feedback, formative performance feedback for teachers, and improvement of teaching practices. OHVA does not make their plan for improvement clear, and does not address responsibilities of timelines for use of items for which they're seeking RttT-D funds. OHVA addresses the content of the scoring elements without providing a clear plan for improving teaching and learning. This merits a medium score.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA does not address components of high-quality plans, such as key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities. It's unclear what the project implementation would be, and thus difficult to determine how OHVA would provide the support needed to implement the project. For example, "All central office staff are available to all teachers via telephone or email as needed." School leadership (online schools) appear to have significant autonomy with instructional supervision while also being subject to highly centralized curriculum, policies, human resource and fiscal management. The entire process is mastery-based and data-driven, with substantial assistance to students and families. This section makes it clear that OHVA supports personalized learning, while not clarifying their plan, and merits a medium score.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA describes a clear current plan for providing tools and learning resources across all income levels, living circumstances, and home languages. This also applies to technical support and information

technology. It appears that data is available for export in an open data format. What's not clear are key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities in this proposal. As far as can be determined, the data between the LEA and its online schools is fully interoperable, as all is virtual. The failure to demonstrate a clear plan, while clearly providing multiple strategies to ensure access to technology support and information systems, makes this section merit a medium score.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Components of a high-quality plan are not provided. OHVA discusses multiple continuous improvement strategies at multiple levels with little mention of RttT-D investments. Lengthy narrative addresses timely and regular feedback as an element of daily operations as well as multiple opportunities for corrections and improvement both during and after the term of the grant. OHVA describes a wide variety of strategies for monitoring and measuring, but the lack of the components of a high-quality plan make it difficult to determine how these will inform grant implementation. There is almost no discussion of how these processes will enable publicly shared information about the quality of these investments with the public. This section earns a medium score.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Components of a high-quality plan are not provided. OHVA describes the ways that they already communicate and engage with stakeholders, but does not address ways that they will communicate grant implementation progress.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Components of a high-quality plan are not fully provided; no rationale's provided. Measures in the narrative are not expressed in terms of student performance, and the date described are already past. These appear to have been extracted from another grant proposal.

The chart of performance measures does not specify the baseline year and does not disaggregate the data by race or ethnicity. No increase is expected in percent of students with highly effective teachers and principals over the four grant years. Student engagement is not disaggregated by subgroup, even for the baseline year (not specified). Further, the methodology for calculating this measure is not clear. Going from 58.7 3rd graders proficient in 2011-12 to 90% by 2016-17 seems unrealistically ambitious. Again, no subgroup data. Grades 4-8 chart is inaccurate with % of students on track for college/career readiness. No variation in goals by subgroups, despite their differing baselines. The percent completing the FAFSA, from 23% to 31%, does not seem ambitious. There are inconsistencies in expected readiness for 9-12 graders, with a lower percent of total who are ready by 2016 than for each subgroup. No subgroup data for on-time graduation.

Inconsistencies and omissions in these performance measures merit a low score on this section.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This does not appear to be addressed, and thus merits a low score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA does not identify revenue amounts from any external sources; the only funds identified are from the RttT-D grant, although they mention soliciting other grant funds. Because no actual plan for implementing the proposed expenditures is provided, it's difficult to assess whether the budget is reasonable and sufficient. No one-time investments are indicated, and all costs in all categories are level across all years of the grant. This lack of any differentiation of funding across the years of implementation indicate a lack of thoughtful rationale for these investments. The budget figures are inconsistent in fringe benefits. Overall, this section merits a medium score.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

OHVA does not provide a sustainability plan, but rather asserts that the systemic nature of the grant's activities plus a projected increase in enrollment will sustain all grant-funded positions (without including the instructional faculty that such an enrollment increase would require). Components of a high-quality plan (key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, & parties responsible for implementing the activities) are missing.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

OHVA describes a multi-faceted partnership, but fails to show that it is coherent or sustainable. The extent to which these partnerships place a priority on serving OHVA's high-needs students is unclear. No results are focused on targeting resources for students facing greater challenges. OHVA does address partnership integration of multiple services for students. This section falls short of fully describing how staff capacity would be increased. This section merits a medium score.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

OHVA threads reference to personalized learning environments throughout its proposal.

Total	210	83

Technical Review Form