



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2



Ohio Application #5160OH-1

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	65	50	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	35	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	10	

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

All four areas of educational reform that make up Rtt are addressed comprehensively. A clear set of goals related to working statewide are articulated. These goals are highly ambitious with very high expectations in many sectors --all seem achievable. The LEA commitment to the Rtt plan is substantive with 479 schools representing 53% of all schools and 70% of lowest achieving schools. The MOU with the districts directly commits them to participating in all aspects of the plan. All signatures were obtained from participating LEAs. There is substantial evidence provided in letters of support from a wide array of public and private partners in the state. This support is identifiable and to some degree beyond just indicating general support for the initiative. The reform timeline is aggressive and is congruent with previous reform activities that have implemented standards, applied accountability related to student achievement and generated efforts to support educators and turnaround failing schools.

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

It became clearer during the question and answer session that since the state is a "bargaining unit" state, professional union participation is presently only contemplated in many LEA's and formal participation will need to be negotiated. It was further clarified that LEA's that do not sign on to the MOU will not be allowed to participate. These circumstance could negatively effect statewide implementation and impact.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	30	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The proposal provides detailed aspects of the management and implementation plan that allows an understanding of what goals are to be achieved and how they will be achieved with roles for all participants. Rtt will reside in the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) with a designated Deputy Assistant Secretary and a Program Director assigned leadership and management responsibilities. This is a clear leadership responsibility in an office that oversees all state education programs—a distinct positive for integration of all state programs with Rtt. The effort will be guided by specially constructed State Reform Steering Team representing P-20 stakeholders. ODE has efficient financial reporting system that can track expenditures by goal and program/project. ODE will create an Office of Strategic Initiatives that will coordinate Rtt and other state reform efforts—this linkage is likely to produce positive communication and interfaces. Six LEA

support teams working with state regional centers will deploy support statewide. A Business Coalition will support a system of supports regarding leadership and program implementation statewide at no cost to the states—this could be an important logistical support mechanism for success of Rtt. It is possible to determine budget allocations as they are tied to specific goals and objectives. In an positive attempt to integrate other state reform initiatives with Rtt, other state units/activities, such as the state compensation system, already addressing areas of reform will provide their resources to the Rtt effort. Support from a broad array of stake holders is evident in the appendix, particularly for private sector partners, other non-K/12 education sectors (higher education and early childhood).

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	10	12
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	5	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has a clear record of legislative education policy reform in all areas specified related to Rtt. It has described in the proposal the establishment of high standards, student assessments and data systems development/implementation. The student data appendix presented in the proposal was comprehensive and indicates that there is little evidence of significant progress for subgroups in NAEP or state assessment—in some areas there are decreases in performance. There is little evidence of achievement gap reduction with regard to the subgroups. Graduation rates for the state were not provided as well as data regarding postsecondary participation.

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Clarifications regarding graduation rates were addressed during the session, with indications of gains overall, but gaps existent for some subgroups.

Total	125	105	92
--------------	------------	------------	-----------

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is participating in the "Common Core" standards development effort with a large number of states and will adopt the standards by June, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is working with international colleagues to develop world class assessments aligned with international standards. In addition, it is a member of several state consortia to develop high level assessments that can be adapted to particular state, regional or local circumstances to asses student growth and guide instruction. These efforts greatly enhance the state goals under Rtt to develop and utilize more reliable and valid student assessments in support of reform.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20	20	
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The state describes in the proposal a solid history in articulating standards and related assessment systems and moving those to implementation at LEAs and schools through targeted professional development. Some of these same efforts will be the base for transitioning LEAs and schools to the use of new standards and assessments. Of special note is the effort to address professional development in STEM-- an area of targeted need identified by the state. The implementation plan and related professional development support goals are clear, significant to the reform effort and achievable.				
Total	70	70	70	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init.
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The state now has a data system that includes 9 of the 12 elements of the COMPETES Act. These 9 reform prerequisites are well articulated and aligned with the specific elements of the Act.				
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4	3	
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The state has developed a comprehensive system that allows access of data broadly to parents, teachers, principals and the general public. New efforts will be launched to make this system more user friendly for all levels of the education workforce and the public. This is a well designed effort to make available education data in the state to all, at least electronically. It is not clear how this data can be accessed by those populations that may not be able or comfortable accessing electronic information or may need access in a different language.				
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)				
During the session, it was made clear that accessibility to student progress data in non-digital modes and in languages other than English are left to the LEA's. This may provide non-uniform access by parents to student achievement information.				
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12	12	
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
A specific plan is described that will provide comprehensive educator access to the data. The state plan calls for the creation of an Education Research Center which will collect and analyze data comprehensively and make the link between research and practice, working with LEAs to do so. A state Instructional Improvement System will also be launched that has specific information related to instructional opportunity enhancements—this would be available on line. In addition, there will be specific and designated efforts in the Rtt office to provide support for training on data access and use by educators through the STEM Learning network and the Battelle for Kids project—a project aimed at linking student performance measures to instruction. The augmentation of these endeavors is a positive, unfortunately important details as to how they will interface are unavailable.				
Total	47	34	33	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	15	15	

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Legal pathways regarding alternative preparation are available. Less than 5% of educators are prepared in these available venues. The process to track teacher shortages is quite comprehensive using various data tracks and instruments. There is no description of how this data is used statewide to address shortages identified.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	45	45	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10	10	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20	20	

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The plan for improving teacher and principal effectiveness is well articulated, highly ambitious, with a timetable that identifies the overall implementation schedule. Evaluation of educators will be anchored by expansion of the Value Added Data System that will include a wide variety of student performance information--state, LEA and school data. Yearly evaluations with a newly developed tool for teachers will be implemented in 2010, after approval of the system by the Educators Standards Board--this step may delay policy implementation. An already existent Principal Evaluation System, piloted in 140 schools, will be expanded statewide--evidence from this pilot were not made available in the proposal. The evaluations will incorporate a 50% weighting for student growth. A Peer Assistance and Review System will also be developed and will use yearly evaluations to support educators. Start-up training will be provided by the state for this new support effort. The state plan calls for the implementation of a new tenure review process and establishes a Teacher Incentive Fund that addresses issues of compensation, promotion, and full certification. The "Peer Assistance Review System" will be in place to identify and support professional development of educators. Goals and timetables are clear as are identification of the systems, however, there is little detail on how the systems will work to meet the goals. Processes to remove ineffective educators are not provided.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	15	15	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5	

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state will utilize and update the 2006 Teacher Equity Plan moving from "highly qualified" to "effective" categories, using the educator evaluation system to identify equal distribution of effective educators. LEAs will report this localized analyses to the state. This reporting mechanism is important--not evident is how this data will be utilized to address shortages. With regard to responding to shortage areas such as STEM,

etc, the state will develop with LEAs the "Teach Ohio" programs to train mid-level professional in the hard-to-staff instructional areas. Overall, this plan has important components included but lacks specificity.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	8	8	
---	-----------	----------	----------	--

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A component of the state Rtt plan calls for the state to link and report on the effectiveness of educator preparation programs as it relates to student achievement. The state Rtt plan calls for expanding the more effective preparation programs. There are few details on how these efforts will achieve the high goals stipulated and no indication in the plan related to assisting programs that may be identified as "ineffective."

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	15	15	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state will utilize the public data system to identifying needed areas of educator support and is committed to providing support through the Peer Assistance Review System. In addition a new Teacher Residency Requirement will be instituted providing for the support of new teachers during their first four years of service, with evaluations of effectiveness tied to credentialing. The plan calls for ongoing evaluations. Details regarding these supports and evaluation of the systems are not provided.

Total	138	98	98	
--------------	------------	-----------	-----------	--

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The legal authority exists.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The present and expanded data system can identify the lowest performing schools. The state will target and support the 20 least achieving schools through a new School Innovation Support Network. This network will provide targeted school improvement grants to these schools and will create a network of assistance. A new School Turnaround Leaders Program will be created and implemented to support and assist principals in these schools. The overall effort will utilize other state programs that focus on strengthening the communities in which these schools reside--this is a very comprehensive yet targeted approach to turnaround efforts.

Total	50	50	50	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

F. General

Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
State education revenues increased by 1% and policies exist to address issues of equitable distribution of state education resources.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	32	32	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
There are no limits on charters--152 are operational. State policies exist to initiate and evaluate charters with funding equalized. Resources from non-state fiscal pools for material and capital expenditures are available--this may limit material and capital resource access to charters. A 2009 state law allows LEAs to operate innovative autonomous schools other than charters.				
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The state has described in its application a solid history of reform and ongoing state level efforts including extensive articulation of standards, implementation of accountability and professional development support activities aimed at teachers and principals.				
Total	55	47	47	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The state makes a very clear effort to prioritize STEM efforts in all its proposed activities addressing high standards, new assessments, and augmented professional development and augmenting sources for STEM educator preparation.				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
These proposed Rtt efforts build directly on the state's history and comprehensive plan for reform. The application addresses all areas with well defined high goals and an implementation agenda directly related to achieving those goals with details available in some areas but not in all.				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	419	405	
--------------------	------------	------------	------------	--



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #5160OH-2



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	57	54	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40	37	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	12	

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application discusses the process of informing and involving LEAs as well as clear conditions of signing on – their description of that process models transparency and a strong local/state respect. With 53% of LEAs signed on and a "disproportionate share of Ohio's economically disadvantaged, minority, low English performer, and disabled student populations..." there is an opportunity for impact. More detail about how LEA participation strengthens impact would raise the score in (iii).

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The team attending the state's presentation included the Governor and key players in the design and implementation of the grant. There was a strong showing to demonstrate the state's commitment and their presentation articulated a comprehensive, coherent reform agenda consistent with the narrative in the grant application.

The Deputy Superintendent identified a number of structures to translate LEA participation to impact across the state, including the Ohio 8 (comprised of the largest 8 districts), the regional infrastructure to work with more remote districts and "mechanisms for local participation." The score here decreased because translating the systems to school-level change and influence on student achievement remains un-addressed and the issues with the inclusion of several provisions in the MOU were not addressed in a satisfactory way. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) doesn't include "including equitable distribution of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects" and only half of the LEAs committed to using evaluations to inform compensation and promotions. The team spoke to questions about "readiness" for teachers to shift to "incentive pay," as the state calls it, but was not able to clearly articulate the criteria for readiness and how they would move teachers in that direction during the course of the grant.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	29	27	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	19	17	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The proposal details a high-quality overall plan covering (a) to (e). It would strengthen this section to indicate more fully how the Office of Strategic Initiatives will integrate with and connect to other offices and

Initiatives and serve the state's interests through this grant and beyond. Detailing what has been missing in this area and why this is the right answer would be useful. There is strong evidence of stakeholder support.

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The team spoke extensively to the offices and their confidence in the state's capacity to implement this grant. There was not, however, a more clear articulation of potential barriers to ensuring their capacity to implement and/or how these offices and initiatives fit together with the needs and interests of the districts and schools in mind. The score was reduced for these reasons.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22	20	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17	15	

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The proposal presents evidence of progress in each reform area. Overall, the record of progress in raising achievement and closing gaps is notably mixed. In improving student outcomes, they identify significant reforms in human capital development and turnaround schools – building on these with RTTT funds. They link professional development to strong NAEP outcomes, but this connection is not well developed. More on how those scores were achieved would support this section. In addition, they have increased graduation rates significantly – 32% from 02 to 08 - but these rates actually dropped for Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students. So, while the state is making overall gains showing progress, those within sub-groups are not indicating the same. The application states that these achievement gaps are "unacceptable," but doesn't sufficiently explain the connections between the data and actions that have contributed to those outcomes.

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

When asked about achievement gaps in scores and in the rates of graduation, the panel members acknowledged that they are disappointed in their results around these efforts. There is no score reduction for being forthright here. The score was lowered slightly because, beyond distributing best practices, they couldn't speak with greater clarity to a strategy that would elevate all sub-groups. They provided some Columbus examples, but scaling these to the state remained uncertain as a result.

Total	125	108	101	
--------------	-----	-----	-----	--

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is part of the Common Core Standards Initiative and plans to announce its intent to adopt the standards by April 2010. It indicates further that their OH standards will be completed in June and that they will be integrated with the Common Core and adopted on June 8, 2010 when the State Board of Education meets.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10	
--	----	----	----	--

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) OH is part of the multi-state consortia to develop and implement high-quality standards: Balanced Assessments, MOSAIC, and Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers.				
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20	20	
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) With a goal of three years to have all educators on board, the state has a high-quality plan to support key partners in schools and districts to make necessary shifts in knowledge and practice, founded upon strong new systems to move forward. Their time line is ambitious and realistic.				
Total	70	70	70	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The OH plan meets nine of the America COMPETES Act elements and plans to meet the remaining three by 2012. The chart included here clearly outlines their existing systems and plans to support new elements.				
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4	4	
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The state has removed legal barriers and is building on a strong Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS). "What evidence do we have that practices are changing as a result of increased access to student data?" is the "Management's Top Execution Question." It is a powerful inquiry to hold in the implementation of this data system and their multi-element approach to making data accessible to key constituencies. The application does not indicate how it will ensure access for those without internet access/skills and for non-English speakers.				
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	16	16	
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The plan to use data to improve instruction is comprehensive, with efforts to address (i) to (iii) in partnership with LEAs and their Information Technology Centers. The narrative offers a number of activities to support this new "State-level web-based instructional improvement system" and identifies a center for the initiative in The Education Research Center (ERC.) The ERC is a focused hub for data collection and research to support "data-based decisions." This section could be strengthened with more detail about how the ERC links to the Office of Strategic Initiatives and to the state's broader initiatives for reform. The lack of this detail raises questions about the state's ability to credibly implement its plan for (i)-(iii).				
Total	47	38	38	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	17	17	
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
There are state regulations supporting alternative routes and OH has four programs outside of IHEs to support different pathways to teaching. Data on how many principals and teachers have been certified through these routes would strengthen this section. The D(1)(I) chart shows some of that, but not summary numbers. More detail on section (iii) concerning processes for identifying and addressing shortage areas would also strengthen this section.				
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	53	50	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	23	20	
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
Ohio offers two projects to improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance. The first is to design and implement a "rigorous transparent and fair evaluation system." The second is to use those results in support of educators. They outline a clear trajectory and time line for each and address (i) to (iv) with detail on what they have been and will be doing in future. Evaluation is used for both developmental and accountability purposes. More detail on how evaluation will be used in this new compensation system would strengthen this section.				
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)				
The score for (D)(2)(iv) was reduced in response to the panel's articulation of the "readiness" of the teaching force to be evaluated and compensated based on student growth. The panel first indicated that they believe about half their LEAs are not ready to use such evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention of teachers and did not clearly articulate what readiness would look like or how they plan to get their teachers to this stage, either over the course of the grant or beyond. This gap would impact decisions about tenure and removal of principals and teachers, reflected in sub-parts (c) and (d) of romanette (iv).				
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	13	13	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	3	3	
(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The plan offers interventions at several levels. First, it addresses the sacred cow of seniority, and says it will remove state-level barriers to releasing non-performing teachers and recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers. More detail on how they plan to do that in partnership with teachers' unions would strengthen this section. LEAs are called on to have "districts-specific equity plans" if that is an issue in their areas. What remains unclear is how they identify and target these areas well (some detail, but more is needed) and there is no narrative on staffing hard-to-teach subject areas. (A chart on (D)(3)(ii) gives performance measures, but with no accompanying narrative.)				

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9	9	
(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) To improve the effectiveness of preparation programs, OH outlines its plans to link student data to teachers and principals and to link that to their institutions of learning, and then to make that data public. RTTT funding will support each step of that plan. The time line for (D)(3)(i) looks ambitious and realistic. There is no evidence, however, of a high-quality plan for expanding preparation and credentialing options and programs.				
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	10	10	
(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The main project to provide support is "Support Educators to Increase Student Growth." This project offers a range of approaches and interventions. This section does not offer a plan to measure, evaluate and continuously improve these supports over time. Such a plan would raise the score for (D)(5)(ii) and thus the overall score for (D)(5). (D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2) The panel did effectively address its plan to implement (D)(5)(i). They did not, however, present a coherent plan to measure, evaluate and continuously improve these support. They responded that they were going to use their support networks, but did not offer additional approaches or plans.				
Total	138	102	99	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The application states the the Ohio Revised Code grants them the authority to intervene with LEAs and to require them to take action with respect to the lowest-achieving schools.				
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	29	29	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25	25	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The state has not, until now, tracked performance on school turnaround. The application indicates that the state has plans to do so, to identify the turnaround model the school selects and to post the "Title I improvement and change model analyses on the ODE Web site." Identifying possible barriers and their ideas for overcoming those barriers would strengthen the credibility of this plan to be implemented effectively and well. The application offers interventions in three categories: increasing use of data, establishing a "collaborative infrastructure" and providing "directed supports." In the eight elements of this plan, a number show strong support for teachers and principals and are both tested and innovative. These include launching leadership teams, piloting portfolio assessments and offering parent leadership training.				

The connection of the eight elements to the four turnaround models is, however, unclear and more detail on this point would raise this score.

Total	50	39	39	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9	9	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Revenues increased from \$11 billion in 2008 to \$11.4 in 2009. There are both state-level and LEA-level interventions to ensure equitable funding. The application indicates that the state's funding formula works to ensure that poor districts get more funds. In addition to the funding formula, the application identifies a number of funding supplements. The state's operating standards also require LEAs to "regularly review resource allocation in the District" and to align them with their strategic plans. It is unclear, if funding were disputed, who has the authority (and has used it past situations) to challenge their assessments if they are not funding equitably at the District level.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools

40	28	28	
----	----	----	--

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

There is no cap on "bricks and mortar" charter schools and no other restrictions. OH is the 5th largest charter school state in the country, according to this narrative. Given the number of students in charters and the "mixed performance" following expansion, there are a number of standards specifically for charters and the accountability system for all schools also applies. In the past five years, 65 schools closed or were closed, 38 for "unspecified" reasons. Understanding why more than half of these schools closed would, perhaps, strengthen earlier interventions and certainly inform an understanding of early warnings, even as early as chartering them. More detail about tracking this would strengthen this narrative. It states that charter schools apply directly to sponsors. It would support the state's plan to know if the state will monitor and/or work with sponsors differently using RTTT funds. Charters get federal and competitive funding, but "do not receive a share of locally generated funds." The impact of this is unclear from the narrative. It is also unclear if the application is indicating that they are satisfied with funding as it is. The state does not offer funding for facilities. There are numerous examples of innovative schools, supported at the state level allowing districts to apply for exemptions and to get credit flexibility, and to have more real-world experiences. Early College HS and STEM schools are two examples.

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The "unspecified" reasons remain unspecified after the panel, due to the local nature of the chartering authorities and the collection of data. The relationship of the state and these local agencies - currently - makes more data about school closures and statewide accountability difficult to glean. The panel did indicate that House Bill 1 changes this reality in future. Given the criteria, this score remains unchanged.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5	5	5	
---	---	---	--

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

This section shows thoughtful analyses of reform conditions and identification in more expansive ways, largely not through law, but through policy and culture, such as "pulls" toward college and jobs. Innovative Learning Environments are also compelling in creating such conditions.

Total	55	42	42	
-------	----	----	----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
This narrative pulls together STEM Initiatives from all four reform areas and outlines goals for STEM. It is a solid proposal to address integration at the levels of curriculum, human capital and student achievement.				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
Ohio's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors. It also demonstrates sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. The application's distinctions of the state's efforts to accelerate, innovate and reinforce provided a strong framework for reform efforts. The application describes and substantiates a strong history of reform and offers a clear and actionable plan to move it forward through RTTT. The grant connects initiative across sections and shows a commitment to and capacity for integrating complex systems. The management's top execution questions in each section show an inquiry-based approach and learning through action research. It is a simple, but indicative illustration of supporting learning and mastery. The supporting infrastructure - with The Office of Strategic Initiatives and the Education Research Center as hubs for activity - requires more attention in this narrative. The application leaves a number of unanswered questions about how the state will (1) undertake new and intricately designed data collection and local/state coordination never attempted previously and (2) anticipate and address the challenges of new learning and expansion to be faced by State offices, LEAs and others. Even with these questions still unanswered, this application clearly meets this priority.				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	414	404	
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	--



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2



Ohio Application #5160OH-3

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	65	65	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Section i-OH presents a comprehensive reform agenda that is built upon the twenty year history of reform initiatives that the state describes in the application narrative. The current proposed agenda incorporates the four ARRA forum areas and establishes a mega system of integrated and coherent reform work. The reform agenda, while multilayered and designed to be accomplished in a compressed timeframe, is undergirded by the human, structural, and organizational capacity needed to be successfully implemented. The OH legislature recently enacted a reform bill that is aligned with the four assurance areas, giving the state the legal authority and support to implement its proposed reforms. Additionally, the state provided evidence and letters of support for the proposed reform agenda from a wide range of stakeholder groups, described its extensive experience in administering and managing grant funds, and provided numerous examples of its successful educational reform and innovation work, including the state's Education Week Quality Counts rating as fifth in the nation. The centerpiece of the OH reform agenda is increased student performance. The reform agenda is structured around four specific performance goals: 1)increase the graduation rate to 88%; 2)reduce graduation rate gaps by 50% among underrepresented and majority students in the participating LEAs; 3)reduce performance gaps by 50% on national and statewide assessments; and 4)reduce the gap by 50% between Ohio and the nation's highest performing states in reading and math. OH plans to operationalize the agenda by implementing internationally benchmarked standards and instructional assessments, conducting curriculum alignment, using data driven decision making, cultivating transformational leadership at the school level, and using student growth as a measure of teacher and principal preparation. The state plans to implement a series of projects related to each of the reform agenda areas. In addition to its focus on increased student performance, OH plans to implement reform initiatives targeted to low performing schools. To accomplish the goals in this area, OH plans to implement direct intervention by both the SEA and participating LEAs. Across both reform areas, the state plans to accelerate its existing efforts in low performing schools and implement innovative and promising practices that will take schools to the next level of performance. In this section of the application, the state describes a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four ARRA education areas and improving student outcomes statewide, and establishes a path to achieving these goals that is consistent with the specific reform plans that are proposed throughout the application. Section ii-OH has 479 of its 614 districts (LEAs) participating in the RtT proposal. The participating LEAs represent each geographical area of the state and include five of the state's largest districts. The range of LEAs cover 53% of the schools in OH and include 70% of the state's persistently low performing schools and 50% of the students enrolled in the state system. Each participating LEA executed a common MOU that states the terms and conditions for participating in the OH reform plan. The signed MOUs include the requirement to appoint a key contact person and a district wide transformation team, and

to implement 19 of the required 23 elements of the reform agenda. For LEAs with a three year graduation rate of less than 80%, the LEA is required to implement 20 of the reform agenda elements. Each MOU was signed by the governing body chair, LEA chief executive and head of the local teacher's union. The application contained documents to show that each participating LEA MOU was signed by all three specified individuals. Detailed data charts and copies of MOUs were included to verify the level of participation and commitment to the state's reform plan. In this section of the application, the state demonstrates strong LEA commitment to the state's reform agenda. The state provides documentation to show that each MOU was signed by the LEA superintendent, the president of the local school board, and the head of the local teachers' union. The signed MOUs contain the commitments to the elements of the state's reform plan and outline the terms and conditions for participating LEAs. Participating LEAs serve 50% of the enrolled K-12 students, including 57% of the state's students in poverty, 68% of the Hispanic, and 69% of the African American students in the OH school system. The state intends to use the planned reform agenda to reduce achievement gaps between subgroups in reading and math and plans to leverage the wide geographic distribution of participating LEAs into statewide implementation and scaling up of the successful reform initiatives. The state provided data to show that improved performance in the participating LEAs will result in statewide gains in achievement and high school graduation rates. In this section of the application, the state provided data on the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, minorities, and students in poverty. The state established its intent to increase student achievement in reading and mathematics, and to decrease achievement gaps between subgroups. Additionally, the state provided data on the proposed increased academic gains and high school graduation rates.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	28	28	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	18	18	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Section i-The OH application features an overarching goal to ensure that leaders and staff have the capacity to implement, scale up and sustain the reform initiatives. The goal is underpinned by three strategies designed to sustain the strong political and administrative leadership that guide the state's system, to manage a robust organizational and management approach to implementing the reform, and to establish a comprehensive and differentiated approach to supporting individual districts. Together, the strategies and goal provide the unifying framework for more than 20 key elements of the state's proposed reform agenda. The state's leadership elements include establishing a State Reform Steering Team, assigning the Deputy Superintendent as Executive Manager, and creating an office of Strategic Initiatives. These elements are integrated into a detailed management model that is designed to ensure that the leadership, accountability and management functions are fully implemented. Support to participating LEAs include the allocation of resources, using a RttT liaison to collaborate with other LEAs and the state, and the formation of six LEA support teams. A Coalition for Educational System Improvement will also be created to provide executive coaching and assistance for the implementation teams. The state plans to partner with the Education Research Center to provide LEAs with information on promising practices and the district and school performance on established milestones will be tracked and monitored. For each element outlined in the OH plan, the state has established a detailed support, intervention and accountability plan that should provide the needed resources and guidance to successfully implement the state's ambitious improvement initiatives. Additionally, the state has strategically decided to implement scale up efforts and plans to work with partnerships and to leverage additional sources of funding to sustain the work initiated in this plan. The state also plans to make its budget expenditures and reform activities transparent and to be accountable for meeting the established performance expectations. The only question that arises is whether the state will have sufficient funds to sustain the extensive array of interventions across the large number of targeted districts or if the state should consider a smaller version of the reform agenda in the event that supplemental resources are not available beyond the four year targeted expenditure window. Notwithstanding the potential variability in funding sources, the state's history of initiating and implementing successful

educational innovations and its demonstrated ability to conceptualize a detailed reform agenda should be an indicator of its commitment and ability to implement the current comprehensive agenda. It is particularly noteworthy that in the application, the state describes not only a history of educational innovations, but that in the previous work, as well as in the current application, the state has concentrated considerable effort to build human capacity to do the work and the structural capacity to implement the essential companion processes that will enable the work to get accomplished. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has the current and historical capacity required to implement its proposed plan. The state demonstrated how it proposes to provide strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans; support participating LEAs in implementing the proposed reforms. Additionally, the state demonstrated that it could provide effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing the grant and that it could use the funds for this grant to accomplish the state's plans and meet its targets. The state verified that it intends to use the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the state to continue proposed reforms. The number of points awarded for this section of the application is due to the concern that the state is relying on the continued flow of external dollars into the state to sustain the extensive array of interventions across the large number of targeted districts. Section ii-OH was able to garner support for the proposed reform agenda from a wide variety of stakeholders. The state provided documentation to demonstrate support from political leaders, educational institutions, private and public organizations, teacher unions, parent organizations, and administrative associations and boards. In addition to supporting the state's proposed reform plan, various organizations committed time and resources to collaborate in achieving the reform objectives. Beyond the array of commitments and support from external agencies, the state was able to cultivate and capture commitments from a large number of LEAs throughout the state who were willing to implement the designated reform initiatives. The duality of internal and external support for the state's plan should indicate that the intended reform work is viewed as appropriate and educationally sound. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it was able to gain support from a broad group of stakeholders to implement its reform agenda. The state provided letters of support from a variety of organizations and individuals, including the teacher's union.

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the Tier 2 presentation, the state indicated that it plans to use public and private partnerships to support the reform plan. While the application indicates that supplemental funds will be used to scale up and sustain the work, presenters stated that they plan to embed the proposed initiatives into the work of teachers and schools and to continue the initiatives even without supplemental funding.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	23	23	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18	

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application cites the state's progress over the past ten years in each of the four reform areas. The state's culminating recognition occurred when Education Week ranked Ohio as fifth in the nation on its annual performance rating. Since 2001, the state established new standards in seven content areas and has been among the leading states to adopt internationally benchmarked standards. Additionally the state plans to adopt common core standards and has already increased high school graduation requirements. The state implemented an accountability system and invested in a statewide data system that grants teachers access to longitudinal student data. The state created an Educator Standards Board and adopted standards for teachers, principals and professional development. Additionally, the state legislature made changes to tenure and licensing, and instituted a career ladder for teachers. The state partnered with Education Trust to conduct a two year study on the equitable distribution of teachers. The state also described its five year efforts to turn around the lowest achieving schools. In 2005, the state established the Educational Choice program, provided vouchers to students in underperforming schools, implemented a data driven needs assessment process, and received approval to use differentiated accountability. The net result of the state's efforts yielded increases in the overall graduation rate, improvements in the state's

NAEP and Ohio Achievement test scores. Further, the state provided data showing that the implementation of job embedded professional development along with the adoption of rigorous standards resulted in the increased achievement on NAEP reading and math scores as well as increased graduation rates. While the state indicated that progress has been made in overall student achievement, the achievement gap persists among student subgroups. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated its ability to improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup. In the application, the state provided data to show increased student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, decreased gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and state assessments, and increased high school graduation rates.

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the Tier 2 presentation, the state indicated that it plans to use dissemination of best practices, access to data, statewide benchmarks, and formative assessment to close the achievement gaps. Additionally, the state plans to use teacher networking to provide teachers with specialized knowledge and skills.

Total	125	116	116	
-------	-----	-----	-----	--

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH is part of a 51 state consortium that is developing internationally benchmarked standards in math and English language arts. The state plans to adopt the final Common Core standards by June 2010 and submitted a MOU to verify its commitment to this work. In addition to the adoption of new standards, the state plans to adopt new rigorous, internationally benchmarked college and career readiness standards in science and social studies and contribute them to the standards consortia. The state plans to finalize the standards by May 2010, conduct a series of regional meetings to obtain public input before adopting the standards in June. The state then plans to develop and implement new assessments and resources that are aligned with the new standards. The work on new standards was initiated under a bill enacted by the OH legislature and will be continued under the work proposed in the current application.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10	
--	----	----	----	--

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH entered into three multi-state consortia that are in the process of jointly developing common assessments aligned to the Common Core standards. The state submitted a copy of the MOU that verifies the state's commitment to this work. The first consortia, led by CCSSO, involves a 36 state effort to develop rubrics and curriculum embedded assessments, the second consortia, MOSAIC, involves a 27 state effort to create formative assessments and content area learning progressions, and the third consortia, involving 23 states, is working on assessment resources and innovative item design. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated a commitment to improving the quality of its assessments as evidenced by the state's participation in a consortium that is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments that are with a common set of K-12 standards. The state's commitment and work

with three assessment consortia is commendable. The number of points awarded for this section is due to the fact that the state is participating in a consortium that has a significant number of states.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19	19	
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>OH plans to implement a two part transition plan for implementing the new standards and assessments. In the plan, the state proposes to establish a technologically based state level instructional improvement system. This system will be used to disseminate the new standards, store and distribute formative assessment items, lesson plans and curriculum related resources. The state plans to contract with external organizations to develop supplementary curriculum resources and to use the management system to distribute newly developed and peer reviewed materials. In addition to the management system, the state plans to conduct professional development that will be customized at the LEA level and plans to work with the OH Board of Regents to align teacher training to the new standards. Detailed projects in formative instruction, curriculum alignment, and aligned formative and performance based assessments are planned to ensure successful implementation of the new standards and assessments. The state also submitted a timeline and set of milestones that describe the steps that will be taken to implement the transition plan. The state plans to develop the professional development that is to be delivered throughout the state, and to give ownership to LEAs and schools by allowing the training to be customized at the local level. The state proposes that the customization will address the particular needs in the wide range of participating LEAs. However, to do the customized work, the state will have to rely on existing expertise at the regional and local level to understand and effectively explain the new standards and assessments. Additionally, the state may need to implement oversight procedures to ensure that the training is not customized or condensed to allow an abbreviated or amalgamated version of the standards to be implemented. In this section of the plan, the state demonstrates that it intends to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. The state has a plan to develop and implement a statewide instructional improvement system, conduct curriculum and assessment alignment, and provide customized training at the local level. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the question as to whether the state has sufficient local or regional expertise to conduct the training and has procedures to ensure that the customization does not permit ineffective variability in the professional development that will be offered.</p>				
Total	70	69	69	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>OH has a statewide longitudinal data system that contains 9 of the 12 America COMPETES elements. The state's SLDS has a unique statewide student identifier, student enrollment, transcript, demographic, transfer, and dropout data. Additionally the SLDS has a data audit system, maintains student test records and has the ability to match teachers to students. The state submitted funding proposals and developed a plan to expand its current data system and implement the remaining three required elements by 2012. The state legislature enacted a bill that will enable the ODE to connect the data system to the higher education system, thus permitting the state to create a P-20 data repository.</p>				
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5	5	
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				

The state indicates that its effort to provide data access to key stakeholders is based on the intent to use data to personalize instruction, elevate the understanding and implementation of effective instructional practice, and ensure accountability for student performance. To that end, OH outlined a set of planned projects and activities that will be implemented to provide data access to the key stakeholders. Projects include creating P-20 data linkages, creating annual value added student growth reports, and tracking student achievement data according to teacher-student linkages. The state cites its successful implementation of the current SLDS as an essential prerequisite for expanding the system to P-20. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has a plan to ensure that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage appropriate key stakeholders. The state demonstrated that it intends to make the data available to decision-makers who are working on continuous improvement initiatives and to school staff who will use the data to construct personalized learning plans and monitor student performance.

(C)(3) Using data to Improve Instruction	18	18	18	
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>OH plans to implement the Personalize Learning through Formative Instruction project as its centerpiece for using data to improve instruction. The project will provide an instructional improvement system and related professional development to both participating and nonparticipating LEAs throughout the state. Using data from formative assessments, teachers will be able to monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on student needs. The instructional improvement system will be used to identify and prioritize the needs of low performing schools, identify best practices in instruction and formative assessment, provide access to electronic curriculum and resources aligned to the new standards, and link the work being conducted by the OH STEM Learning Network in personalizing instruction through data and technology. The state also plans to work with Information Technology Centers and develop a new Education Research Center to give researchers access to the state's data. The proposed projects and related activities will increase the number of LEAs with instructional improvement systems from the current 30% to 100% of the districts within the state. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has a plan to develop and implement an instructional improvement system that will provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. The state plans to provide professional development on the instructional improvement system and how to use data to support continuous instructional improvement. Additionally, the state plans to make the data from instructional improvement systems accessible to researchers.</p>				
Total	47	41	41	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	16	16	

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's analysis of high demand areas shows a need for additional teachers in mathematics, science, special education, foreign language, and ELL. This need is especially apparent in the low performing schools. To meet the need of high demand areas and provide an ample supply of qualified teachers and principals, OH has four approved alternative pathways for licensure. In the application, the state cites relevant statutes and rules that permit IHEs and organizations other than IHEs to be approved and provide alternate licensure. The state provided data on the number of teachers and principals that were approved through alternate licensure routes in 2008-09. In addition to monitoring the licensure pathways, the state prepares reports and analyzes data on teacher shortage, recruitment, and distribution. In the current application, the state proposes to use data from the SLDS to extract and analyze data on the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. In this section of the application, the state

demonstrated that it has statutes that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals. Additionally, the state demonstrated that the four alternative routes to certification are in use and provided data to show the number of teachers and principals that have been approved through alternative routes. The state has a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher shortage, and uses a Teacher Shortage Index. The number of points awarded for this section is due to the absence of a similar index and shortage analysis for principals. In section C of this application, the state indicated that it continuously monitors teacher and principal shortages through a suite of analytics; however, the data charts provided in section C describe data on teachers. Additionally, data on principal shortage and analysis was not given in either section C or D of the application.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	50	50	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11	11	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	26	26	

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH indicates in the application that it is a collective bargaining state and that it will negotiate the proposed teacher and principal evaluations with the union. As a result, the concern arises as to whether the negotiations will prevent or delay the state's ability to fully implement the planned evaluations. To implement an enhanced performance system, the state plans to implement two projects – one to redesign the educator performance system and another to use evaluation results to support educators. The two projects will create a four tier career ladder licensure system, establish a differentiated compensation system, implement a growth based teacher and principal evaluation system, provide induction, coaching and professional development programs, and establish procedures for removing ineffective teachers. In the application, the state describes the proposed evaluation criteria for teachers and principals and plans to implement new licensure requirements for obtaining and renewing advanced licenses for teachers and principals. Under the two projects, the state has proposed a four year resident induction program that will require teachers to receive a minimum effective rating to advance to a five year professional license. To determine levels of effectiveness, the state plans to use value-added data and develop other measures of student growth such as performance based assessments and content specific assessments in order to provide multiple data points for determining effectiveness. OH also plans to implement an evaluator training and credentialing program and use an electronic evaluation system that will capture evaluation data and analyze the data for levels of effectiveness. Additionally, the state plans to implement the statewide peer assistance and review model, institute a teacher residency program, develop guidelines for tenure review, and implement a new compensation system. In the application, the state outlined several precursor initiatives that lay the groundwork for successful implementation of the proposed teacher and principal effectiveness projects. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has a plan to work with participating LEAs to measure student growth, implement an evaluation system for teachers and principals that has multiple rating categories, including student growth, conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals, and use the evaluations to inform professional development and personnel decisions such as compensation, tenure, and retention. The number of points for this section of the plan is due to the concern that the state's negotiation with the teacher union may result in delays or modifications to the state's plan to design and implement the planned initiatives in each of the subcategories of this section.

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the Tier 2 presentation, the state included a representative of Battelle for Kids; however, the representative did not discuss how the organization would assist the state to use value-added data and develop other measures of student growth. During the presentation, SEA staff also responded to a question regarding the potential impact of teacher union negotiation on the implementation of the reform agenda, particularly around teacher evaluation and differential pay. SEA staff indicated that the proposed reform

agenda would not be modified; if teacher unions did not agree with the planned work, the LEA would not participate in the RtT initiatives. Additionally, the state explained that the bargaining agreement would be revisited. The information provided during Tier 2 did not change the points awarded for this section of the application.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	15	15	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5	

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state plans to institute a number of activities to ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, including removing seniority barriers, addressing teaching and learning conditions, and providing supports and incentives for effective teachers to work in high poverty and high minority schools. The state plans to update its 2006 teacher equity plan and distribute the data to LEAs. Additionally, the state plans to incorporate and use multiple levels of educator effectiveness when analyzing the data, and request that LEAs use the multiple levels to identify patterns of inequity among its schools. The plan includes the use of recruitment tools and the implementation of three programs to recruit effective educators: the Woodrow Wilson STEM teacher fellowship program, a Teach Ohio program, and a statewide turnaround leader program. The data provided in this section, along with descriptions of research studies and prior work in major school districts, support the state's intention to implement a plan to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in high poverty and high minority schools; however, the state does not describe how it plans to ensure equitable distribution of educators in hard to staff subjects and specialty areas.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	12	12	
---	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH plans to annually link K-12 student data to teachers and principals, link this information to OH higher education institutions, and publicly report the data. To accomplish this goal, the state plans to develop metrics for professional preparation programs, provide student growth data to educator preparation programs, and use the metrics and data to make resource allocations based on the level of preparation program effectiveness. As a culminating activity, the state plans to work with the Board of Regents to create centers of distinction within the preparation programs that demonstrate superior outcomes and to provide financial incentives to programs to expand/replicate. The application in this area does not explain what the state means to achieve through the financial incentives – whether the state will actually increase the number of approved preparation programs, expand the locations available across the state operated by the same approved program, or increase the types of licenses offered by individual programs. Additionally, the application does not discuss whether the state is permitted to subsidize the start up or operation of credentialing programs that may be seeking a market share of the work conducted by other agencies and IHEs. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has a plan to link student achievement and student growth data to the students' teachers and principals, link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program. Additionally, the state plans to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals. The number of points awarded for this section is due to the need for additional information on the state's plan for expansion and replication of preparation programs and because it is unclear how RtT funds will be used for this purpose.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	18	18	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state plans to implement a Support Educators to Increase Student Growth professional development project. The project is designed to transform the state's professional development program into one that features data driven professional development, Induction programs for new teachers and principals, coaching for teachers who need assistance, and job embedded professional development through common planning and collaboration time. The plan additionally targets intensive professional development support for teachers working in low achieving schools. The effort to transform the state's professional development plan will be guided by a series of activities that include collaborative professional development planning, evaluation of professional development offerings, mentorship, coaching and professional development for teachers in the residency program, peer assistance for all teachers, co-teaching support for teachers in low performing schools; two year mentorships for new principals, leadership training for district staff and topic focused professional development in areas such as formative instruction. The state plans to evaluate all the professional development programs; however, the plan does not give detailed information about how it plans to evaluate the other planned support structures such as coaching and mentoring. In the application, the state cited examples of foundational work that should support the proposed expanded professional development initiatives and cross referenced other reform agenda initiatives that would be supported by the new proposed professional development program. In this section of the application, the state demonstrates that it has a plan to provide data-informed professional development, coaching, and mentoring to teachers. The number of points awarded for this section is due to the need for information on how the state plans to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of supports other than professional development.

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the Tier 2 presentation, the state explained that the Support Network will be looking at data on the support structures such as coaching and mentoring.

Total	138	111	111	
--------------	------------	------------	------------	--

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH has four enacted statutes that grant the state the legal authority to intervene directly in low achieving schools. State code grants the SEA authority to intervene directly in the lowest achieving LEAs. In addition, the state board of education is authorized to issue and revoke the charter of any district or school that do not meet the standards set by the board, and under separate enacted code, the state is authorized to implement a differentiated accountability model that requires districts and schools identified for improvement to institute corrective actions. The state is also authorized by code to require schools to implement an improvement process and to impose sanctions for any school or district that does not implement the improvement process or show improvement under an approved plan.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	35	35	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH plans to implement a three part plan that focuses on using student achievement data to turn around struggling schools, using a collaborative infrastructure to apply expertise to the turnaround strategies, and providing support for implementing promising practices. The state plans to identify the persistently lowest performing schools and provide instructional support first to these schools. This support will include the initiatives described elsewhere in this application and include formative instruction tools, professional development, value added reports and STEM education. In addition to instructional support, the state plans to use the differentiated model of accountability, state system of support, and Ohio improvement process in the identified schools. OH also plans to select at least 20 persistently low performing schools that will use an innovative management structure (School Innovation Support Network) to achieve higher performance targets. Additionally, the state plans to use the School Turnaround Leader program to annually organize and produce at least 20 prepared leadership teams to work in the persistently low performing schools. The state also plans to implement specific improvement strategies in the participating LEAs. Under this portion of the plan, the state will select two large LEAs to develop a portfolio approach to alternative school models. The state's Closing the Achievement Gap program will be extended to 2000 educators who will participate in professional development on cultural competency and an emerging innovation program will be implemented to identify and demonstrate promising practices that have been successful in turn around settings. In the application, OH cites examples of gubernatorial support and third party partnerships that have successfully improved student achievement and high school graduation rates, including one initiative that combined successful improvement strategies with a rigorous course of study in STEM. In the application, the state indicated that it historically has not tracked performance on school turnaround, but plans to collect this data and produce publicly disclosed documents as part of the current proposal. In addition to reporting data on progress made, the state will identify the lowest achieving schools in the state and identify which model was implemented in the school – turnaround, restart, close, or transformation. While the state plans to use the four approved improvement models, the application does not include an assurance that the state will not permit an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools to use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools.

Total	50	45	45	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Int
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>In the application, the state indicated that the percentage of statewide revenue funds allocated to education increased in 2009. In addition to increasing the percentage of funds for education, the state legislature enacted a comprehensive funding reform bill that will make higher education more affordable to Ohio residents. The state's funding formula grants more per pupil to high need LEAs and provides weighted funding for districts with reduced capacity to raise local revenue or property valuations. In addition to weighted formula allocations, the state provides supplemental funding for all-day kindergarten, reducing class size in primary grades, dropout recovery, ELL programs, academic intervention, professional development, and closing the achievement gap. Additionally, the state enacted Parity Aid to reduce the disparities in local property wealth and implements adjustments to per pupil funding based on EBM calculations. Ohio Administrative Code regulations require LEAs to regularly review resource allocations within the district and ensure that the resources are distributed effectively and equitably. In addition to the LEA analysis, the state used data from studying Schools of Promise that have high performing students in poverty and from the Schools of Distinction that have high performing special education students to determine the kinds of technical assistance that the state needs to provide to schools.</p>				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	40	40	

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH does not impose a cap on the number of charter schools and ranks fifth in the nation for the number of charter schools in operation throughout the state. Currently, more than 90,000 students are enrolled in the state's 324 charter schools. In addition to 206 charter school facilities, the state operates 27 online charter schools. By law, the state permits both start-up and conversion charter schools and allows any school district, education center, or joint vocational school to convert part of a building to a charter school. Additionally, state law does not prohibit an LEA from converting its schools into charter schools. New start-up charter schools have been allowed in eight large urban districts and state law does not limit the size of student enrollment in the approved schools. The state implements the National Alliance for Public Charter School standards and uses these standards to approve, monitor, and close underperforming charter schools. Under state law, the SEA has full authority to revoke a school charter. State law establishes requirements for charter school operations and annual reporting, and the charter school contract requires the school to indicate the way it will achieve racial and ethnic balance consistent with its local community. The state accountability system and school accreditation ratings are equally applied to all public schools, including approved charter schools. Since charter school applications are made through a sponsor, the state does not have data on the number of applications approved and denied; however, the state has maintained data on the number of charter school closures and indicates that over the past 5 years, 65 charter schools have closed. OH provides funding for charter schools using equitable formula calculations used for other public schools in the district. In addition to formula funds, charter schools are eligible for a share of federal entitlement and competitive grant funds, and receive transportation funds if transportation services are provided. OH receives federal Charter School Program grant funds to support implementation and start up grants to new and developing charter schools. Additionally, OH code requires the LEA to offer unused and closed facilities first to charter schools within the district, and while the state imposes facility requirements on traditional public schools, the regulations do not apply to charter schools. Instead, charter school facilities are approved through zoning, health and fire department regulations. The state has an Innovative Education Pilot program waiver available to traditional public schools who wish to apply for exemptions from statutory provisions or rules; however, the waiver option is not available to charter schools. The state permits credit flexibility for students who can demonstrate subject competency through alternate procedures such as testing out. The state has nine early college high schools and grants authority to STEM schools to determine their own curriculum, instructional model, school year, length of day, and operating budget.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
---	---	---	---	--

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

OH cites several additional statewide reforms that have been initiated in recent years. The state implemented all day kindergarten and created the Center for Early Childhood Development that allows various state agencies to focus on early childhood issues. The state's Third Frontler Initiative offers internships and employment assistance to students, the Seniors-to-Sophomores is a dual enrollment program, and the Postsecondary Enrollment Options encourages high school students to take college courses. Additionally, the state operates the Ohio College Access Network and the Ohio STEM Learning Network. State statutes have been enacted regarding the number of calamity days permitted in the school calendar, flexibility on spending rules for districts rated as excellent, and interventions required for students at risk of not passing the OH Achievement or Graduation tests. The state also implemented the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative and participates in an international program to investigate how students learn.

Total	55	55	55	
--------------	----	----	----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The state operates a STEM learning network that helps implement a rigorous course of study in STEM, supports teachers with inquiry based instruction, and helps build student interest in pursuing STEM courses and careers. The state's STEM targets include having the STEM and SIIN schools serve as innovation platforms, ensuring that science and math teachers as well as specialist in all the turnaround schools engage students in inquiry based activities, doubling the number of students pursuing STEM careers in college, and quadrupling the number of students from underrepresented populations who pursue STEM careers. The OH STEM Learning Network has been successfully implemented as demonstrated by the evidence included in this application. The STEM Network includes 10 STEM platform schools, 28 K-8 programs of excellence, more than 300 partners, and has attracted more than \$100 million in funding. Additionally, the application demonstrates the integration of STEM initiatives across all the four required reform areas addressed in the state plan.</p>				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The OH application addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. The application demonstrates sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in the plan.</p>				
Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	452	452	



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2



Ohio Application #5160OH-4

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	50	50	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	6	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35	35	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact1	5	10	10	

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In its application, Ohio detailed a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda addressing all four key areas of the Race to the Top program. Ohio provided goals and an array of projects aligned with the four assurance areas. Ohio secured participation from 479 of its 947 school districts or 51%. This included 53% of the schools, 50% of the K-12 students, 57% of students in poverty, and 70% of persistently low achieving schools in the state. Ohio allowed districts to opt out of only a few of the Race to the Top provisions. No districts will be taking on ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals for hard to staff subjects or specialty areas and only about half will be using evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention. These are two rather significant reform elements within Race to the Top. Ohio required participating districts to obtain signatures from the district superintendent, local school board president, and the local teachers union as applicable. Ohio obtained 100% of the signatures as applicable showing strong buy in for the program as a whole. Evidence of commitment would have been even stronger if there were more participating districts and if all of the participating districts bought into all of the MOU elements.

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

At the Q&A session, Ohio presenters were asked to explain why no LEAs bought into the MOU provision "(D)(3) (ii) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals: Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas." The presenters reported that they thought that work in that area was the responsibility of the state rather than the LEA and that a variety of things were being done at the state level to address equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. They also reported that they would approach this issue differently if restarting the application process today. There is much that LEAs could potentially do to address equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals so no change was made in the scoring allocation.

At the Q&A session, Ohio presenters were asked to explain why only half of the LEAs bought into the MOU provision "D(2)(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention decisions." The presenters reported that some districts were actively engaged in these reforms and others were not yet ready. No change was made in the scoring allocation.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	30	30	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided evidence of strong support from top leadership in the state including the Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Chancellor of the Board of Regents. Ohio has designed a project specifically aimed at sustaining capacity to execute the Race to the Top program and has modified its state department of education administrative structure to directly align with the four key reform areas of Race to the Top. Ohio organized and budgeted for 15 projects systematically aligned to address reforms in each of the four key areas of Race to the Top. Each project is classified as reinforcing work already undertaken, accelerating work, or innovating to create new approaches and strategies. Ohio will provide support to local school districts through six regional support teams. Ohio has also obtained support from the business community and plans to use business leaders as executive coaches for school administrators. The strong buy-in from teachers' unions for the participating districts will help significantly with the state's capacity to implement. As part of the budget volume included in the appendices, Ohio presented project level budget tables, narrative, goals, activities, responsible parties, detailed cost descriptions, and timelines which constitute the elements of high-quality plans. This tightly integrated information is highly coherent and generally shows very clear thinking and systematic, detailed, and strategic planning for implementation of the Race to the Top Reforms. Ohio devoted the first of its 15 projects to directly assessing the issue of state capacity to implement the program in the second project to the engagement of stakeholders. Ohio's success in constructively engaging teachers unions is remarkable.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	13	13	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	8	8	

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided documentation regarding extensive efforts undertaken in the past several years in all four key reform areas. As an external independent corroboration of its progress, Ohio pointed to the Quality Counts state rankings in which Ohio has risen from middle of the pack to number five in the last 10 years. Ohio provided data showing a nearly five point improvement in graduation rate from 2000 to 2003 followed by very small improvement from 2003 to 2008. During this latter period, Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students' graduation rates dropped 7 to 8 percentage points which is a concern. Ohio's NAEP reading data shows very slight progress at the fourth-grade level but is flat at the eighth-grade level. NAEP mathematics for Ohio showed very slight progress from 2000 to 2007 but dropped off slightly for 2009 at the eighth-grade level. Ohio's NAEP mathematics data showed improvements of about five percentage points from 2000-2009 but the improvement from 2007 to 2009 was negligible. The proficiency rates for traditionally underrepresented groups lag substantially for mathematics and reading. The historical pattern of achievement on the Ohio Achievement Test is that at some grade levels there has been slight progress, at some grade levels there has been a slight drop, and at some grade levels there has been no change, leaving the overall impression of no change for reading proficiency for Ohio students. On the Ohio Achievement Test mathematics assessments, the picture is a bit more positive. At every grade level, slight to modest improvements have been reported over the past five years. The Ohio Achievement Test data also shows persistent problems with performance of subgroups for both mathematics and reading. The application did not provide any insights as to why Ohio's substantial reform efforts have not been more productive in improving student achievement other than mentioning that Race to the Top funds would "accelerate student outcomes by addressing challenges in human capital in turnaround schools."

Total	125	93	93	
--------------	------------	-----------	-----------	--

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided evidence that it has become a part of the National Governors Association Consortium for the Development of Common Core Standards which they indicate includes 51 states and territories. Ohio provided details concerning the process by which it will adopt the standards and provided assurances that they will be adopted by June 8, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9	9	
--	----	---	---	--

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided MOUs as evidence that it has joined three consortia for developing and implementing common high-quality assessments. These consortia include the Balanced Assessments Consortium, Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction (MOSAIC), and Summative Multistate Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers Consortium. These consortia involve respectively 36, 27, and 23 states. One point was withheld because Ohio could have been a player in creating an even larger consortium.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20	20	
--	----	----	----	--

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for transitioning to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Three of its fifteen funded project proposals support this area including the Personalizing Education through Formative Instruction Project, the Align Curriculum to Support Teachers Project, and the Continue Assessment Leadership Project. These projects are presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones cutting across the projects and performance measures which were not required for this section.

Total	70	69	69	
--------------	----	----	----	--

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided evidence that it currently has nine of the twelve required elements for a statewide longitudinal data system. The three elements that are missing include the capacity to communicate with higher education data systems, information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to post secondary education, and other information determined necessary to address alignment and inadequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5	5	
--	---	---	---	--

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for accessing and using state data. Two of its fifteen project proposals support this area including the Improve Access to Student Data Project and the Expand Value Added Statewide Project. These projects are presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones cutting across the projects and performance measures which were not required for this section.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	18	18	
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
Ohio presented a high-quality plan for using data to improve instruction. The Personalized Learning through Formative Instruction Project proposal supports this area. This project is presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones and performance measures which were not required for this section. Ohio's plan will make an instructional improvement system available to every school district in the state. Ohio has set a goal to support participating LEAs by providing professional development on the use of the systems to 75% of teachers in the state by 2014 using regional trainers and 56 web-based professional development modules. Ohio described plans to create an Educational Research Center to broker access to state data for use in evaluating effectiveness of the instructional material strategies and approaches.				
Total	47	41	41	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	19	19	
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
Ohio provided evidence that it has in place alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals. Ohio described four different alternate certification pathways all of which meet the set of five pathway elements listed in the definition of alternate routes to certification including the ability to operate independently of institutions of higher education. Ohio also described six different reports used to monitor teacher and principal shortages and how the reports are used. Ohio did not provide information on the processes for using these reports to make changes to better address identified areas of need.				
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)				
During the Q& A session, Ohio provided some new information regarding processes for using teacher and principal shortage reports to make changes to address identified areas of need but this was new information, not in the application, and cannot be used in the review.				
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	54	54	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	24	24	

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In measuring student growth, Ohio plans to build upon and expand the application of a value added system which is already in place though not at all grade levels. Ohio presented a high-quality plan for improving teacher and principal effectiveness. Two of its fifteen project proposals support this area including the Redesign Educator Performance Management Systems Project and the Utilize Evaluation Results to Support Educators Project. These projects are presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones cutting across the projects and performance measures which are likely to be challenging but should be attainable. Ohio described a plan for extending its system of value added growth to apply to all teachers and reported the intent to use literacy levels, supplemental tests, and performance-based assessments to ensure that measures are widely available. Ohio reported that it has already begun to work with stakeholders to develop teacher and principal evaluation processes to differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories and include student growth as a significant factor. Ohio included a 2013-2014 performance measure target of 100% for the percentage of participating LEAs using the evaluation system to compensate teachers and principals but only 55% of participating LEAs bought in to that element on their MOUs suggesting a much lower level of implementation will occur. Similarly, the MOU summary table showed 95% of LEAs pledged to use student growth and 93% of LEAs pledged to use evaluations to inform tenure or certification decisions improving teacher and principal effectiveness but the performance measure targets for both were set at 100%. Ohio described an impressive career ladder system where teachers would begin their career with a four year residency and would be given a full professional license only if demonstrating a wide range of competencies including high level of student performance. Ohio also plans to identify master teachers.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	14	14	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12	12	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2	2	

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for ensuring an equitable distribution of teachers and principals. Two of its fifteen project proposals support this area including the Ensure Equitable Distribution of Educators Project and the Expand Effective Educator Preparation Programs Project. These projects are presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones cutting across the projects and performance measures which appear to be minimally challenging and should be highly attainable. There was no discussion of these performance targets in the narrative. Ohio ranks schools by percent minority and considers those in the top quartile to be high minority schools. Ohio created an office of educator equity in 2006 and submitted a copy of its teacher equity plan with this application. Ohio's participating districts have agreed to work with unions to develop and use a variety of LEA specific strategies including alternatives to seniority-based placement, differentiated incentives, professional development, and working conditions improvements to improve equitable distribution of teachers. Ohio has two major programs, the Woodrow Wilson STEM Teacher Fellowship Program and the Teach Ohio program, which provide alternate certification pathways for recruiting and training prospective teachers to work in hard to staff subject areas such as STEM, foreign language, special education, and TESOL. In its MOU summary table, Ohio reported that no school districts opted to participate in RTTT efforts concerning equitable distribution of hard to place staff which would appear to seriously undermine its efforts. There was no explanation in the application for this outcome.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	12	12	
---	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs. This area is supported by Ohio's proposed RTTT Increase Higher Education Accountability Project. This project is presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio also provided a consolidated timeline with milestones and performance measures which are minimally challenging and top out at 80% in 2014. Ohio gave no explanation for why the ultimate target would not be 100%. The Ohio system does link student achievement and growth to state higher education programs and will use the state's value-added growth model. Ohio plans to provide funds for expansion or replication of superior higher education programs.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	12	12	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for improving teacher and principal effectiveness. This area is supported by Ohio's RTTT Support Educators to Increase Student Growth Project. This project is presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Although not required for this section, Ohio submitted performance measures consisting of the percentage of LEAs with professional development plans meeting high-quality professional development standards and the percentage of LEAs that have implemented common planning time. These performance targets start at 25% and end in 2014 with 100%. These targets are likely to be challenging but should be attainable. The project supporting this area represents 2% of Ohio's requested funds which seems minimal considering the strategic importance of professional development for supporting teacher growth. Ohio minimally addressed monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of support to teachers and principals in the narrative section and had nothing about it in the detailed budget narrative with activities and time lines.

Total	138	111	111	
--------------	------------	------------	------------	--

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided evidence that it does have authority to intervene in schools and districts. All schools and districts are required to participate in the Ohio improvement process and Ohio has broad authority to turn over or close chronically underachieving schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	23	23	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	3	3	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	20	20	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan for turning around its lowest achieving schools. This area is supported by Ohio's RTTT Turn Around Ohio's Lowest Achieving Schools Project. This project is presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio submitted a performance measure target for the number of schools to implement intervention models with the number peaking out at 20 per year. In the

appendices, Ohio provided its identification methodology for persistently low-achieving schools and reported that it had determined that 69 schools meet the definition. It would seem that if 69 schools meet the definition, more than 20 per year should be required to implement turnaround models. The performance measure target was only nine schools for 2010-2011. The performance targets Ohio presented are certainly attainable but are not challenging considering the level of need that has been shown. Ohio did not provide information on the number of schools closed since 2004-2005 along with results and lessons learned and provided an unconvincing rationale for not doing so. While it clearly has a substantial number of charter schools, Ohio appears to have limited experience with the array of turnaround strategies described in the Race to the Top application. Ohio's turnaround project makes up 19% of the overall RTTT funds request. More points would have been given if Ohio implemented turnaround interventions with more schools early on. Ohio dedicated 19% of its fund request to this area which should be enough to support such a deeper, faster implementation.

Total	50	33	33
-------	----	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided evidence that the percentage of revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2009 by about 2%. Ohio also described its funding policies which assure equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs. High-needs LEAs get, on average, an additional \$1780 per pupil in state funding.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	32	32	
---	----	----	----	--

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio reported that 9% of all of its public schools are charter schools. There are currently 296 brick and mortar charter schools and 27 online charter schools and there is no cap on the number of brick and mortar schools. Ohio reports having a law that governs charter authorization and provides accountability standards for charter schools including full authority to revoke the sponsoring organizations approval. Student achievement is a key factor in the renewal of charter schools in Ohio. Ohio reports that its accountability system applies equally to public schools and charter schools in the state. Ohio charter schools report directly to sponsoring entities such as local boards of education and the state does not gather information on approvals and denials. A total of 65 charter schools reportedly closed from 2004-2005 to 2008-2009 with 20 being ordered by the state to do so. Ohio does require each charter school contract to address how the school will achieve racial and ethnic balance reflective of its community. Charter schools in Ohio are funded on the same basis as regular schools. Funds initially flow to the school district of the student's residence and then are transferred to the receiving charter school. Ohio also provides startup grant funds to charter school programs on a competitive basis. Ohio law provides that when school districts dispose of real property they must make it available at fair market value to charter schools. It appears that Ohio does not provide any direct funding for facilities acquisition, maintenance, or improvement. Ohio reports that it has broad authority under the Innovative Education Pilot program to operate innovative and autonomous public schools but provided very sketchy information regarding the extent to which such programs are in place. Ohio has a track record of not tracking charter schools very well which is not a helpful condition for promoting their success in general.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4	4	
---	---	---	---	--

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio provided information on the other significant reform conditions present in the state but did not address the extent to which they have increased student achievement, impacted graduation rates, or narrowed achievement gaps.

Total	55	46	46	
-------	----	----	----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio presented a high-quality plan addressing STEM. This area is supported by Ohio's RTTT Amplify STEM Leadership Project which will use 2% of the total funds requested through this grant. This project is presented in considerable detail in the budget narrative including line item expenditures, project goals, activities, persons responsible, and a timeline for implementation. Ohio's RTTT STEM implementation will build on prior work including the creation of the STEM learning network involving over 300 K-12, higher education, and business partners. Ohio has put in place high school graduation requirements including four credits in mathematics, at least one of which must be Algebra II, and three credits of science, all of which must be inquiry-based or laboratory experienced. Ohio plans to offer the STEM model to persistently low achieving schools and equip five STEM schools as STEM training centers for replicating the model.

Total	15	15	15	
-------	----	----	----	--

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio's application presented a comprehensive approach to supporting the four key education reform areas of RTTT proposing to use RTTT funds to build upon and integrate a wide range of processes and support resources already in place. Ohio organized and budgeted for 15 projects systematically aligned to address reforms in each of the four key areas of Race to the Top. Each project is classified as reinforcing work already undertaken, accelerating work, or innovating to create new approaches and strategies. Ohio will provide support to local school districts through six regional support teams. Ohio has also obtained support from the business community and plans to use business leaders as executive coaches for school administrators. The strong buy-in from teachers' unions for the participating districts will help significantly with the state's capacity to implement. As part of the budget volume included in the appendices, Ohio presented project level budget tables, narrative, goals, activities, responsible parties, detailed cost descriptions, and timelines which constitute the elements of high-quality plans. This tightly integrated information is highly coherent and generally shows very clear thinking and systematic, detailed, and strategic planning for implementation of the Race to the Top Reforms. Ohio devoted the first of its 15 projects to directly assessing the issue of state capacity to implement the program in the second project to the engagement of stakeholders. Ohio's success in constructively engaging teachers unions is remarkable.

Total		0	0	
-------	--	---	---	--

Grand Total

500

408

408



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Ohio Application #5160OH-5



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	55
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	41
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio has outlined a clear plan with specific goals that addresses all four of the reform areas. The overriding framework of the projects – projects that accelerate current successful efforts, projects that innovate new approaches, and projects that reinforce the support structure in place to ensure all the projects can scale – is a clear, effective approach to a plan. The MOU is very close to the model MOU in the application, and thus a strong commitment. The scope of work closely matches all aspects of the four assurances. The criterion “Using evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention” was optional in the MOU and signed by 55% of the participating districts. Optional status for this aspect of the MOU and only 55% support weakens somewhat an otherwise very strong commitment. Not using evaluations for critical decisions in teachers careers and lives devalues the evaluation, both in the eyes of the teachers and others participating in the process. Overall, teachers unions signed on for all districts and schools where it was applicable. Fifty-one percent of Ohio's LEAs and 53% of its schools serving 50% of its students and 57% of its students in poverty are participating. Data to address the specific impact as measured by NAEP, ESEA and other measures is very minimal, so it is difficult to determine the full impact on student achievement.</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: The proposal describes a strong leadership team. Of special note is the Business Coalition for Educational System Improvement whereby CEOs and CFOs of Ohio businesses have committed to mentoring and supporting leadership in specific LEAs. Support for LEAs will occur in a variety of ways, including service centers, regional or special focuses support teams, and the Business Coalition. This is strong strategic mix of approaches. Operations and processes will build upon those in place, and funding is aligned and coordinated. Foundations have invested approximately \$300 million in education in Ohio and committed to the goals of RttT. The assurances are clearly identifiable in the structure of the Department and the RttT team is as well. All state education groups are solidly on board with the proposal and the letters from the unions do not equivocate in their support. Other stakeholders are strongly represented as well.</p>		
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	20

(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	16
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: Ohio has made progress in each of the reform areas and in some of them has been a leader. Increases in student achievement have been greater than the national average on NAEP, a positive sign of progress. Closing the achievement gap, however, remains a problem. While strides have been made with graduation rates for white students, the graduation rate for Hispanics and Economically Disadvantaged have gone down significantly since 2003. This is consistent with the problem in closing the achievement gap and underscores the level of work that needs to be accomplished in this area.		
Total	125	105

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio is a member of the Common Core State Standards initiative. Ohio is required by state law to adopt the standards by June 30, 2010 and has plans to adopt them on June 8. The Common Core is concerned with reading/language arts and math, but Ohio is developing science and social studies at the same time and emulating the Common Core approach with those subjects.		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: Ohio is a member of the Balanced Assessments Consortia of 36 states, MOSAIC of 27 states, and SMARTER of 23 states.		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Ohio has developed a robust and holistically interlinked program to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Using both online and face to face outreach strategies as a part of both roll out and professional development, Ohio will be able to reach more educators faster. Ohio also will build upon current efforts in both formative assessment development and curriculum development and then expand to include 21st century skills such as creativity and innovation not currently measured and tap international efforts as well through the Innovative Learning Environments sponsored by OECD. The only section of this effort that is at all lacking is the detail regarding alignment of high school exit and higher education entry requirements. There are task forces envisioned to do the work, but implementation of the work is defined only by "The Ohio Board of Regents will work with the University System of Ohio to support this effort." It is unclear how the Board of Regents will work to support this effort and the extent to which that support will be sufficient.		
Total	70	69

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio meets nine of the twelve elements of the America COMPETES Act and has plans and legislative authority to meet the other three by 2012.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: Ohio's data are already accessible to stakeholders. Plans focus on improving the delivery and making data easier to use, as well as expanding linkages to higher education. Creation and distribution of value-added student growth reports and training on how to use them is a strong plus. With a growing Hispanic population in Ohio, there is a concern that there was no provision for addressing these parents' needs.		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	18
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: Ohio is planning a unique and potentially very effective way to identify and define best practice improvement systems by using current student growth measures – the data – to identify LEAs that are using instructional improvement systems and formative instruction in the classroom. They also will build on current professional development programs and adapt them as appropriate. The plan calls for Ohio to create a state standard instructional improvement system. The capability to support research is well-thought out and should pay dividends.		
Total	47	40

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	14
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio does provide alternative pathways to licensure for both teachers and principals, and these pathways meet all 5 of the definition as defined in the application. The selectivity component is hazy, but all others of the definition are fulfilled. Various pathways have been available only since 2004 and two since 2008. The programs were active and did produce a reasonable number teachers and principals in 2008-2009. Ohio does provide two reports on areas of teacher and principal shortage and an educator supply and demand. However, other than make the reports public, there is no description about how the state or LEAs or educators use these reports (if at all), nor is there a description in this section of how they prepare teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage or how they plan to in the future.		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	51
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	24

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Ohio currently uses student growth measures as part of its existing accountability system and they have plans to expand this to value-added reporting to all educators in Ohio. The value-added aspect is very positive. Also positive is the plan to develop other measures of student growth in non-tested subjects. Ohio has developed and is piloting a principal evaluation system that meets the standards of section D (2) of the application. Ohio is developing, with input from LEAs and unions, a model evaluation system that is scheduled for adoption in Fall 2010. It contemplates multiple ratings systems, and uses data on student growth as a significant factor. It also plans to establish multiple methods of support for teachers. Of particular note is the plan to implement a software system for teacher and principal evaluations which will provide opportunities for many types of analysis for users at the LEA level as well as policy makers at the state level. This is highly commendable. Ohio plans to use evaluations to move beginning teachers through peer assistance and professional development using a variety of methods including mentors and coaches. If beginning teachers continue to be unsuccessful, they will be removed. Tenure review period has been extended from 3 to 7 years and the state plans to create a model, with input from unions. While compensation is determined at the local level as noted in the application by stating, "LEAs opting to pursue compensation reform," the state proposes strong support for compensation tied to evaluation by proposing to work with a variety of stakeholders "to assess existing compensation structures, explore other practices, and develop a plan and budget to implement a new compensation system. RttT funds will cover these development expenses. ODE will provide assistance in finding appropriate funders to support implementation of the new compensation system, and will pursue a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant in partnership with LEAs." In addition, four of the major urban districts are creating evaluation and compensation systems that incorporate student growth. As a state with locally controlled negotiations, Ohio does not have much control over the use of the evaluation systems for compensation, but its recent history with the large four urban districts and the proposed incentives hold promise for this element.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	10
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	7
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	3

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ohio will rely very heavily on LEAs to ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. Ohio will provide data and enhanced data analysis tools to identify patterns of inequity. LEAs have committed to developing multi-faceted plans and the state will provide technical support and recruitment tools and training. This is a minimal plan at best. However, Ohio does have a very strong teacher equity plan in place and major districts have created systems to provide incentives to effective teachers to work in challenging schools. These efforts will be shared. The performance measures provided raise concerns. According to the measures, there is no difference in the percentage of teachers in high-poverty, high-minority schools who are highly effective compared with the number of teachers in low-poverty, low-minority schools. The same is true for ineffective teachers and for principals who are highly effective. There is a 10 percent difference for ineffective principals. In addition, the change rate is projected to be the same, no matter what type of school. This does not seem realistic. To increase the number and effectiveness of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects, Ohio plans to expand the Woodrow Wilson STEM Teacher Fellowship Program to 4 to 8 sites and to create an alternative teacher certification program for these areas. Together these programs do not seem to be sufficient to fill the identified gaps.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	5
---	-----------	----------

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Ohio says that it will improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs in a manner consistent with all the descriptors in the D (4) section of the application, but there is little description of how other than the Ohio Board of Regents will develop the system and then provide financial incentives to programs to expand and replicate their programs.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	15
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: Ohio's plan to provide effective support to teachers and principals is multi-faceted and very strong. Changing the law to extend tenure consideration from 3 to 7 years and providing a four-year "teacher residency" program with strong mentoring, coaching and professional development holds great promise for new teachers in particular. Other programs such as the Peer Assistance and Review program and the leadership training for district staff, among others, help to make supporting teachers, principals and district staff a powerful component of Ohio's application. The state did not directly address the extent to which it was going to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of the supports in order to improve student achievement.</p>		
Total	138	95

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio has statutory authority to intervene in the lowest achieving schools.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	37
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	33
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Ohio's plan to turn around the lowest achieving schools is robust and contains a mix of existing efforts as well as innovative programs. Ohio can identify the lowest performing schools now and will create teams to help the schools. The schools and teams will be able to tap into a new structure, the School Innovation and Support Network. They also envision a program to create new leaders and the state will actively work to ensure that the community organizations and agencies in the areas surrounding the lowest performing schools are brought into the mix. Many of the activities are strongly supported in Ohio law. In addition, Ohio has had considerable success in similar efforts, most notably they have raised the graduation rates for high schools involved in the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative by 32% over the past year. These activities are all very strong and combined create great potential for success. The proposal suffers slightly by the fact that "The State has not historically tracked performance on school turnaround." Ohio has a strong plan to track turnarounds in the future.</p>		
Total	50	47

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Ohio has increased its percentage of education funding as a percentage of total state revenue from 50.4% to 52.5% and has attempted to reduce the burden on local districts by increasing the state share of funding. This is admirable in tough economic times. Ohio has taken numerous steps over the past decade in particular to ensure equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs and</p>		

within LEAs. The new model for funding focuses on funding components of a successful education system, instead of just piling on additional money for high-poverty schools. This is a very positive step.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	38
---	-----------	-----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 There is no cap on the number of charter schools allowed in Ohio, no inhibitors, nor a limit on the number of students allowed to be enrolled in charters. Ohio has clear guidelines governing all aspects of charter schools from approving to closing, and they rely on sponsors of charters to administer the schools. Sponsors are held accountable and they have closed numerous charter schools for various reasons, the most common of which is financial. Funding for charters is equitable. Funding for facilities relies upon LEAs not using space. In that case, LEAs are required to offer the space to charters. Charters cannot share in bond or mill levies, which thus far, has not seemed to be a problem, but could inhibit new charters. Ohio has a number of innovative, autonomous schools and provides alternative approaches for students to receive credits. All the efforts in the charter school area are exemplary and laudatory.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
---	----------	----------

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Ohio has a number of additional initiatives underway that support school reform. Possibly most important is an early childhood initiative that includes not only a requirement for full day kindergarten, but also the establishment of a cross-agency center for early childhood issues which includes the Departments of Health and Family Services in addition to education.

Total	55	53
--------------	-----------	-----------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15

Competitive Reviewer Comments:
 Beyond the expected high school graduation requirements and Woodrow Wilson STEM Fellow Programs, Ohio has a substantial STEM effort underway in the Ohio STEM Learning Network (OSLN). In addition to \$20 million of state funds, \$80 million has been applied from higher education and business and foundation communities to create 10 STEM platform schools, 28 programs of excellent at K-8 schools, and numerous K-12, higher education and business partnerships. Leveraging this effort with RttT funding should result in significant growth and support to STEM throughout the state.

Total	15	15
--------------	-----------	-----------

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes

Absolute Reviewer Comments:
 Ohio has fully and comprehensively addressed all four of the education reform areas, as well as other requirements of the application. The three different types of projects that create the structure for the plan - accelerate, innovate and reinforce - demonstrate strong planning and deep strategic thinking. In all aspects, Ohio has made a strong, coherent and cohesive case for how it is now addressing school reform and how it will in the future if funded through RttT. The involvement of the foundation and

business communities as well as commitment from the Legislature and Governor bode well for school reform in Ohio.

Total		0
-------	--	---

Grand Total	500	424
-------------	-----	-----