Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #3800OH-5

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**	**63**	**65**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	43	45	[redacted]
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

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

(i) The reform agenda set forth by Ohio is comprehensive, coherent, is described clearly, and includes legislative strength. New reform legislation, House Bill 1, sets forth and aligns with the RTTT goals in the four areas described in the ARRA and more including:
• An Ohio Evidence-Based Model (OEBM) to fund public education in Ohio.
• Spending and Reporting Requirements for LEAs
• Ohio Department of Education (ODE)Standards and Curriculum Models development
• Assessments that align with curriculum
• Local Curriculum Requirements that align with the State's
• Minimum Operating Standards that specify that the operating standards override any conflicting provisions of a collective bargaining agreement.
• Higher education educator programs requirements
• Extension of a continuing contract (tenure) from three to seven years
• Community/charter schools expansion plans
• Creation of an Early Childhood Advisory Council to serve as the federally mandated state advisory council for early childhood education and care, and advise the state regarding the creation and duties of the Center for Early Childhood Development in ODE.
• Changes the purpose of the state education technology plan from "promoting the use of technological advancements in educational settings" to "creating an aligned educational technology system that spans preschool to postsecondary education and complies with federal mandates.

(ii) Memorandum Of Understanding and new State legislation contain strong supportive language. Schools and unions must negotiate an agreement that is consistent with RTTT and State legislation within 3 years. While this is the majority of the time that the grant will be in place, the support for the majority of the plan of work can be accomplished as indicated by MOU signatures. The MOU is strong and:

- lays out terms and conditions with signatures indicating a strong commitment on the part of each participating LEA,
- identifies the scope of work, and
- again, has all necessary signatures.

(iii) LEAs agreeing to participate include 66% of the districts. This would be of concern if it weren't for the new legislation which will, in essence, include all districts in the same school reform. There is broad support from numerous Community-based Organizations ((CBO), higher education, labor, and industry organizations. Again, the new legislation is a critical piece supporting this application.

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

(ii) The State's presentation provided clarification of House Bill I. The State explained that ALL districts, participating in the RTTT grant or not, are required to meet the RTTT components. This will culminate in statewide commitment.

(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)

(i) Strong leadership has been identified to administer this grant and the accompanying plan and activities. It appears Ohio should be able to meet the ambitious and achievable requirements. Plans to support participating LEAs to improve in the four education reform areas is well articulated and strong. Previous experience with grant management and implementation is documented and appears adequate. Coordination of many grants to leverage reform is well explained. The "fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State" have been at work in a collaborative and coordinated manner prior to, and in development of, this grant application and written support to continue has been widely given.

The budget narrative does not adequately explain the responsibilities of contracted personnel as opposed to ODE personnel. There appears to be multiple overlapping areas. This may cause confusion when trying to achieve the goals which have been set forth. There needs to be a clear delineation of responsibilities and accountability.

(ii) Formidable, collective support has been given by an extensive group of stakeholder organizations as evidenced by 222 letters of support from education, labor, business, higher education, parent groups, community based organizations, for profit and non-profit groups, and legislative support.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**24**	**24**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	20	20	

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

(i) Good articulation of reform and improvement initiatives in the State that already exist. There was no mention of how the State has used its ARRA funds to support any of these initiatives.

(ii) Ohio's NAEP results have increased by more than the national average from 2003-2007, and are especially noteworthy in mathematics whose scores have increased by 10.1% in fourth grade and 5% in eighth grade. Gaps are closing, but still persist. Many Ohio Achievement Test (OAT) data show steady and slow increases, again with persistent achievement gaps. There is no reflection on why gaps in various areas are persisting. Increase of high school graduation rates is presently being studied with promising improvement shown in the Akron schools. This initiative is required of all schools with less than 80% graduation rates, therefore an increase is expected to occur.

Total	125	115	117	

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)

(i) Stakeholders from ODE are actively involved with a consortium of 51 states and territories to develop both common core standards and assessments. Involved in the development are representatives from the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, Achieve, ACT, and the College Board.

(ii) Legislation is in place for adoption of the common core standards and assessments. Under Ohio law, the State Board of Education has the authority to adopt content standards without approval by the General Assembly. Adoption was complete June 2010. After review of the entire application, it is clear that well-planned implementation initiatives are ambitious and achievable.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(i) Ohio has joined the SMARTER Balanced Consortium, coordinated by WestEd which has 33 states involved, and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, coordinated by Achieve, Inc. which includes 26 states. A Memorandum of Understanding has been submitted with each group and provided as evidence.

(ii) The same legislation cited above is, again, applicable here. Under Ohio law, the State Board of Education has the authority to adopt content standards and assessments without approval by the General Assembly. In addition to traditional testing, development is underway of on-line assessments that include a balance of various assessments to differentiate assessments for different learners.

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

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

Not only does there appear to be an ambitious and achievable plan for the transition to the new standards and assessments, but there are many collaborators who have successfully supported educational reform models in the past and stand ready to assist yet again. The plan includes:

• Sixteen already-established regional Support Networks will build upon their existing partnerships with districts and charter schools to provide technical assistance, coaching, and professional development to support the implementation of new standards and assessments. These centers have had success in the past.
• An impressive number (56) of Education Service Centers will provide a range of services to districts and charter schools, including curriculum alignment, professional development, and student services which will provide support for the reform efforts.
• The Ohio Resource Center for Mathematics, Science, and Reading (ORC) at the Ohio State University which offers a pre-existing model for development of instructional supports and uses a peer-review process to select best-and-promising practice lessons, correlates them to Ohio's standards, and makes them available electronically to all educators statewide should equalize implementation efforts.

• The Ohio STEM Learning Network (OSLN) is intentionally designed for educators' continuous growth and instructional enhancement. It will partner with established networks and new networks to support the roll out of new standards, curriculum supports and assessments. OSLN's expertise will strengthen teachers' understanding of STEM through each of the four core content areas and provide strong professional development during the core standards rollout.
•The Cleveland Municipal School District was chosen as one of six urban districts nationwide to implement the rollout of the Common Core across a large system. This early adopter program is facilitated by the Council of Great City Schools, the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the American Federation of Teachers. By participating in the program, Cleveland will develop a system of supports, including professional development, to successfully implement the new Common Core standards; evaluate the implementation of the common core standards; share lessons learned from their implementation with other districts and charter schools; and build models of collaboration between states, districts, and charter schools as well as management and labor. This national initiative will provide information that is very necessary as districts struggle to implement reform.

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**	**16**	**16**	

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

America Competes Act elements in place by Ohio are:

(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system

(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information

(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P–16 education programs

(5) A State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability

(6) Yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under Section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b))

(7) Information on students not tested by grade and subject

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores

While the State states that #9 and #11 are in place, it appears from the narrative and through comparison to the criterion that they do not presently exist. In the chart #9 shows that student grades will be included during the 2011-12 school year. According to the narrative the P-12 and higher education data systems are not currently linked which is required under element # 11. The State acknowledges that #4 and #12 are not in place.

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

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

The result of the work proposed in this section will enable Ohio to provide the right data to the right people at the right time, including diagnostic reports on individual students, early warning system reports to identify at-risk students, and readiness reports on students' preparedness at each transitional stage as they progress through the educational system from early childhood all the way through college and into the workforce. The infrastructure presently in place includes:

- Recently enacted House Bill 290 which removes the legal barriers that previously prohibited Ohio from linking its SLDS to the State's higher education system will provide a comprehensive data infrastructure.
- Ohio ensures that student data can be shared electronically in an efficient and secure manner to inform instruction and decisionmaking by education and other stakeholders, such as the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services.
- Data from Ohio's system goes beyond student achievement to provide financial decisionmaking information, as well. ODE and the Governor's Office have partnered on a financial data pilot project to explore how district-by-district comparison data can be used to inform budgetary decisions and encourage the efficient and effective use of taxpayer resources.
- The College and Career Readiness Policy Institute (CCRPI) Initiative has formed a cross agency workgroup as part of the College and Career Readiness Policy Institute (CCRPI) initiative. The Longitudinal Data Working Group addresses policy issues around longitudinal data systems and identifies key college and career readiness goals and identify what data is necessary to support the measurement of those goals. This group is an important compliment to the entire human infrastructure.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	2	2	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	1	1	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

(i) As given in the Performance Measures chart only 20% of districts have an instructional improvement system (IIS) in place. A description of multiple activities that are occurring exists but there doesn't seem to be any coordination of activities. It is unclear how ODE plans to make the described robust and improved IIS available to the other 80% of the districts.

(ii) The partnership with Nationwide Insurance to develop the All-School Improvement Plan (ASIP) system to inform school improvement decisions has been successful. The application states that Columbus teachers plan to share their expertise, but there is no plan provided for when or how this will occur. It could not be determined when professional development will occur or who is responsible for it. The Performance Measures and the Timelines, Milestones, and Responsibilities tables do not match in two areas, when IIS will be implemented and when professional development will be provided..

(iii) Research is occurring and HB 290 has removed barriers to access so that researchers are assured access to all student data necessary to continue research projects and answer research questions.

Total	47	30	30	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**11**	**11**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2	2	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	2	2	

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

(i) House Bill 1 strengthens previous legislation that allows alternative routes to certification through non-profits and regional service centers.

(ii) Since the Credential Review Board "facilitates the licensing and review for alternative pathways," a discussion of who the members are, how this board operates, and how often they meet would have been helpful. Without this information, it cannot be determined to what extent this Board's services are utilized or whether they are a barrier. Since "TEACH Grant recipients and Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship" appear to be alternative routes to licensing, an explanation of these programs and how many use these alternative routes is needed.

(iii) It cannot be determined how the "Ohio Teacher Supply and Demand Report" data used for monitoring is gathered, by who it is gathered, nor what is done with the information once it has been gathered. More information on the ASPIRE program is needed to determine success in filling shortage areas. Data show that the shortages continue to persist. There needed to be a discussion of principals similar to what was set forth for teacher data.

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

(iii) During the State's presentation, the Office of Educator Equity was explained which is responsible for work with the Office of Civil Rights and the Board of Regents to identify need, provide mentoring and feedback, and work with Turn Around Leaders in clinically-based situations.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**38**	**51**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2	2	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	4	15	[redacted]
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	4	6	[redacted]
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	28	28	

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

(i) While it is clear that student growth can be identified through the States testing program, it is unclear how growth will be measured in untested grades.

(ii) The evaluation system design is promising; however, part of the criteria is the requirement of involvement of teachers and principals in the development. It is unclear how, or if, teachers and principals were involved in design and implementation plans of an evaluation system.

(iii) A plan to annually evaluate teachers and principals is in place; however, how student growth indicators will be used is not discussed. Since the criteria requires this data feedback at the time of evaluations of teachers and principals, it is important to know how those data will be determined.

(iv) There are extensive plans in place that will ensure that the effectiveness data from annual teacher and principal evaluations drives decisions in the areas of: (a) develop teachers and principals, (b) compensate, promote, and retain teachers and principals, (c) grant tenure, and (d) remove ineffective teachers and principals. Exactly how the evaluation system correlates to each however is unclear.

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

(ii) During the State's presentation, the make-up of the Educator Standards Board was clarified. The Board includes a majority of teachers, principals, and superintendents. This Board is responsible for recommendations of not only the evaluation system; but, also education policy and other education recommendations to the State Board.

(iii) During the State's presentation, it was clarified that the Learning Point Associates, a national research organization recognized for work in the area of teacher evaluation, partnered with Ohio this year to lead a group of educators (teachers, teacher unions, principals, superintendents, higher education, regional providers) in the design of a model teacher evaluation system.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**14**	**21**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	5	12	[redacted]
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	9	9	

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

The State's plan to ensure equitable distribution of teachers and principals relies mainly on bonuses and incentives. How these incentives will be funded after RTTT grant finishes is of concern.

(i) How it will be determined that ineffective teachers and principals are not employed at higher rates in high-minority and/or high-poverty schools is not clear.

(ii) The plan to provide scholarships, incentive pay, educational technology and additional technology to entice teachers to teach in high-minority and/or high-poverty schools could increase the number of effective teachers and principals in hard to staff areas.

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

(i) During the State's presentation, it was clarified that the Office of Educator Equity at ODE monitors this issue as part of its responsibilities.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	2	2	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

(i) In this section the application states that student performance data will be linked to teachers and principals through the longitudinal data system and reported to the public. However there is no discussion of how this will occur. Without this information the high quality plan cannot be determined. It appears that all discussion in this section addresses expanson or improvement of identified programs. How these programs are identified is not clear.

(ii) In the past teacher preparation institutes have been funded using the standard of numbers of students prepared. The shift to outcome measurement as a funding determinant made under the new HB 1 legislation should drive preparation programs to consider student achievement as the greatest long-term success factor. Ohio has had success with the Urban Principal program since 2009. This program demonstrates that their principal candidates, when assigned in the field, are exceptional and effective as

measured by student achievement data and State report card results in districts and schools where they are assigned. Expansion of this program meets the criteria for expansion of successful principal preparation programs. Ohio plans to use $2.2 million in funding from the State share of the RTTT funds to jump-start the expansion of teacher and principal preparation programs whose graduates effectively impact student achievement in K-12 settings. Invitations to expand programming will be strategically extended to high performing programs that produce and support teacher and principal preparation in demonstrated areas and subjects of need only. This differentiating of funding for teacher/principal preparation institutions should drive change. There was no discussion of how there would be expansion of successful alternative programs.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**8**	**20**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	5	10	[redacted]
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	3	10	[redacted]

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

(i) The described plan appears ambitious and achievable. It is unclear how Ohio will sustain the support activities funded with RTTT funds when the grant ends. Expansion of the job-embedded professional development and findings gathered from the Stanford University initiative are uncertain. The Ohio Resident Educator Program's initiative sustainability is not included. The Peer Assistance Review program description did not include student achievement as a factor for the design of the new teacher support system. There are no PD activities included in the Timing and Milestones chart beyond 2012. Criteria specify ongoing professional development.

(ii) Districts will be required to provide evidence of effective PD activities. There is no discussion of how this will be accomplished. Also, evaluation needs to be expanded beyond the Appalachian Collaboration.

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

(i) During the State's presentation, it was clarified that each LEA has an ODE approved School Improvement Plan that includes the local intent for professional development based on student achievement data. In addition:

- the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program will assist local districts,
- the Network for Innovation Partnership will work with local union representatives, and
- the Regional Service Centers will support and provide PD to LEAs.

(ii) During the State's presentation, it was clarified that the ODE is charged with measuring, evaluating, and continually improving the effectiveness of the supportive PD provided to continually improve its effectiveness and, ultimately, student achievement. Additionally, many districts will have instructional coaches under RTTT whose sole job is providing job-embedded PD.

Total	138	80	112	

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)

Two key provisions in Ohio law authorize the Department of Education to directly intervene with the State's persistently lowest-achieving districts and schools and reconstitute, turn-over or close the schools: (1) Ohio Revised Code (ORC) Section 3302.041, which establishes Ohio's Model of Differentiated Accountability; and (2) ORC 3302.10, which establishes Academic Distress Commissions.

(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)

(i) The ODE has met the criteria for identification of the persistently lowest achieving schools. The State used only two measures to identify persistently low achieving schools (PLAS): (1) the school's current performance in reading and mathematics (2008-2009 school year), and (2) the school's progress on reading and mathematics over a five year period. Each school's current performance and its measure of progress over time were weighted equally at 50% each and combined into a single measure. The lowest 5% of schools in each category were identified as PLAS. The lowest 5%, any secondary school that had a graduation rate lower than 60% over a number of years was also identified as a PLAS.

(ii) It appears a great deal of thought and planning has gone into the decisions made concerning support, evaluation, and monitoring of the persistently low achieving schools (PLAS). Most of the PLAS have identified an intervention model that complies with the Race to the Top criteria and are on their way toward implementation. Intensive support from staff assigned to these schools will provide a strong accountability system. The plan meets the standard for high-quality and is ambitious and achievable.

Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

(i) An increase of 2.1% in education funding by the state from fiscal year (FY) 2008 to 2009 is impressive given the economic pressures.

(ii) House Bill 1 is a trend setting in its approach to school funding and equitability. Ohio has used a foundation funding methodology as a primary equity tool for nearly 30 years. Ohio provides, on average, $1,780 more per pupil in State funding to high-need LEAs than those that are not high-need. School districts with high concentrations of poverty and economic disadvantage, low overall levels of educational attainment, and a limited local resource base receive additional funding to meet the needs of the students. Rule 3301-35-06(J)(2) of the Ohio Administrative Code requires: "In addition to its regular budget process, the school district shall work with key stakeholders to review the school district's allocation of educational resources. This evaluation shall be conducted at least once every three years to ensure that the school district's resources are allocated in an effective and equitable manner. Allocation and expenditure of school district resources must be aligned with the school district's strategic plan and reflect best practices in financial management"

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**24**	**29**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	3	3	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	2	2	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	3	8	[redacted]

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

(i) It appears that there are no barriers to high performing charter school development.

(ii) State laws regarding charter school authorization, monitoring, and operation are explained; however, how the State holds authorizers accountability is unclear or if any charter schools have been closed.

(iii) Charter schools receive funding from the State that is equitable to other public schools.

(iv) Charters are not allowed to raise funds for facilities as public schools are; however, no additional requirements beyond those required of other public school facilities exist..

(v) Innovative schools exist and are showing student success; however, autonomy is not apparent.

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

(v) During the State's presentation, it was clarified that autonomy in all areas (flexibility and authority to define instructional models and associated curriculum, select and replace staff, implement new structures and formats for the school day or year, and control their budgets) is present and being implemented by districts.

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

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

Throughout the application multiple creative solutions to poor student achievement have been discussed and evidence given for them both through data and legislation.

Total	55	39	44	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**15**	**15**	[redacted]

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

STEM appears to be currently focused in specialized "STEM schools." Preparation for entrance into these schools does not appear to connect across grades in a rigorous course of study at lower grades. Beyond these two areas of weakness, Ohio appears to be focusing efforts to increase STEM offerings and expand course offerings in traditional schools and to a wider population including traditionally underserved.

Collaboration with stakeholder groups is strong. Plans for professional development and recruitment of non -traditional teachers is strong. The plan is ambitious and achievable.

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Clarification during the Q & A portion of the State's presentation was useful. To encourage females in STEM initiatives at local districts, some districts have implemented single gender classrooms and some single gender schools. The National Society of Black Engineers is involved in collaborative efforts to recruit minority students into STEM initiatives and courses. STEM schools are primarily in large urban districts with smaller districts involved with teacher training and teacher recruitment efforts.

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)

The State has a comprehensive, ambitious and achievable plan to address all four education reform areas. In addition there has been substantial foundational work and research in LEAs, schools, and higher ed institutions to inform decisions abut what works and what does not in Ohio classrooms. Together HB 1 legislation and sufficient LEA participation in the RTTT plan will generate statewide reform. 222 stakeholder groups have given letters of support and are ready to take part in the work of reform. The RTTT funds used to support Ohio's plan should increase student achievement, decrease achievement gaps, increase graduation rates, and prepare student graduates for college and careers.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	399	438	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #3800OH-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**	**45**	**45**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3	3	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	33	33	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	9	9	

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

(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda

Ohio has provided a comprehensive reform agenda with clear goals in the four educational areas. Ohio is attempting to achieve big results by making changes where educational attainment is the lowest—among minority students, Appalachian students, disabled students, English language learners (ELL), and for all students in Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). By attracting high quality teachers and leaders to schools where these populations are concentrated; providing support through mentoring and professional development; collecting data on administrator, teacher, and student performance, growth, and outcomes; and providing improvement tools in the form of model programs with a track record of success somewhere in the state; Ohio believes it will achieve significant progress. It is not completely clear how these various intervention programs will add up to a whole, achieving significant overall impact expected in the four areas of RttT. On the other hand, plans for data collection, assessment systems, and data sharing are well aligned and thoughtful.

(ii) Securing LEA commitment

Crafted similarly to the RttT model MOU, Ohio's MOU is positive and strongly worded. Specifically, the terms and conditions require a significant commitment to the scope of work from participating LEAs. All 196 charter and almost all STEM schools give full support to the MOU. Three hundred twenty-three of the 536 participating LEAs, including seven of the eight largest districts, where over 50 percent of the high-minority, high-poverty students are educated, give conditional support to parts of the MOU that require evaluating or compensating teachers and principals, in part, based on student growth and performance. A final commitment is due from these LEAs 90 days after the award is made. How negotiations will be resolved to align Ohio's work plan with bargaining agreements, LEA policy, and other rules is uncertain and could cause some LEAs to drop out of the reform effort. The significant number of letters of support, including a strongly-worded and postive letter from the Ohio Education Association; a letter from the Ohio Federation of Teachers; signatures from local union presidents in all participating LEAs; provisions in the MOU requiring significant participation from teachers in evaluation and compensation issues; and the components of House Bill 1 that legally support much of the scope of work referenced in the MOU; indicate that all parties are working in good faith and will try their best to stay engaged. That said, a timetable for implementing the most contentious parts of the proposed reform may need to be modified to allow time to make changes to contractual agreements. For participating districts in which a career lattice or peer assistance and review program is not already in place, specific plans will need to be worked out between

district and teachers union officials. Reaching agreement on details will take time and could delay full implementation of some parts of Ohio's plan, the new teacher evaluation system, for example.

(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact

With participation from approximately 60 percent of the state's LEAs and charter schools that enroll 66 percent of children in poverty, 73 percent of Hispanic students, 81 percent of African American students, 71 percent of English language learners and 63 percent of students with disabilities, Ohio has the opportunity to significantly improve educational effectiveness for many of its neediest students. A critical mass of urban districts is participating in this effort. A number of rural Appalachian districts are also participating along with higher education and research institutions that serve the area. Lessons learned can be disseminated to similar districts that choose not to participate in RttT. Goals for increasing reading and mathematics achievement and reducing achievement gaps for all subgroups of students are ambitious but achievable, despite the downward trend in scores for some subgroups in reading or mathematics on the 2008 or 2009 Ohio Achievement Test. For example, scores on the mathematics state test decreased for third grade Hispanic students from 71.8 percent in 2007 to 63.3 percent in 2008 and for sixth grade students with disabilities from 45.8 percent in 2008 to 40.4 percent in 2009. Despite these specific decreases, the overall and the subgroup trends on both NAEP and state achievement tests has been positive since 2003.

Meeting achievement goals for English language learners, African-American students, and students with disabilities will be particularly challenging. So will increasing high school graduation rates for Hispanic students by 50 percent to 82.3 percent in four years and college matriculation rates (without the need for remediation) for all minorities. To reach these goals will require that every part of this plan work quickly and well, especially those provisions to train, attract, and retain highly effective teachers and principals in schools with large numbers of low-performing students. The Ohio budget prioritizes the use of funds for those RttT criteria that focus on closing achievement gaps and improving low performing schools. Ohio has an ambitious plan with a substantial chance to have a broad statewide impact. Whether the goals are met and sustained depends largely on the capacity and effectiveness of the state's educational service centers, consultants, universities, and others who provide professional development to the participating LEAs and schools.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**21**	**23**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14	14	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7	9	[redacted]

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

(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement

Ohio proposes a governance system for its RttT plan that: 1) builds on existing structures within the department; 2) has a direct line to the top leaders of the SEA; 3) includes processes for interacting with various constituencies to insure that state decision-makers, civic leaders, and the business community remain informed; and 4) outlines a management structure that strikes the right balance between assistance to LEAs and schools and compliance with grant requirements. The new state law, HB 1, is compatible with RttT, supporting adoption of new standards, strengthening state data systems to track students from kindergarten through college and link teacher preparation information to student performance, tying assessment to teacher and principal licensure, and increasing graduation requirements.

Ohio will provide comprehensive, timely assessment data to its participating LEAs to guide their decision-making. As described in the plan, it is not clear that LEAs will have sufficient benefit from of a continuum of standards-based subject-matter professional development, curriculum, instructional materials, and well aligned assessment data to meet all goals, however. The plan relies on the skill and capacity of the 56

Educational Service Centers. These centers have been Ohio's primary vehicle for providing professional development to local districts, which pay for their services. The plan does not address in any depth how the capacity of Education Service Centers will be increased to provide the high-quality professional assistance needed by participating LEAs to successfully implement more demanding standards, especially in rural areas or for those centers that serve large concentrations of underperforming schools.

While it is clear that the plan provides participating LEAs with assistance in identifying promising practices, there is not much description included on how the state will assist districts in stopping ineffective practices, short of drastic measures.

The plan describes efficient grants management and tracking procedures and leverages other state, federal, and philanthropic resources. The budget for the state's efforts to transform failing schools and close achievement gaps relies on a combination of consultants and the work of the Ohio Network for Education Transformation partnership that appear dependent on grant funds and are unlikely to continue after the grant period in resource-challenged districts. The way in which Ohio has allocated resources in the budget for RttT aligns with program goals. The state also leverages other federal and philanthropic funding (e.g., School Improvement Grant, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) to serve the goals of this program.

(ii) Using broad stakeholder support

Ohio has support from diverse and relevant stakeholders. The conditional support for the MOU from the local teachers unions increases the chance that some districts may decide not to participate, which could have an impact on the number of total students served and the percentage of subgroups participating. HB 1 requires that districts engage parents and the community, but the plan does not describe the kind of professional development that will be provided to participating LEAs for challenging actions such as engaging poor or minority families in the process of reconstituting or closing low-performing schools.

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

(ii) Using broad stakeholder support

All parties in participating districts completed and signed the MOU with full support. The conditional designation was added later by state officials to indicate elements of the memorandum that are subject to negotiated agreements.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**21**	**24**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17	20	[redacted]

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

(i) Making progress in each reform area

With the 2009 passage of HB 1, Ohio has made progress on updating its academic content standards, developing assessments and data systems, providing for the preparation and continuous professional growth of teachers and leaders, and improving low-performing schools. Ohio's plan reports significant past progress in most areas of closing achievement gaps and has used its federal, state, and philanthropic funds toward that end. The state adopted new college readiness standards, participated in the American Diploma Project and the Common Core standards consortium to increase standards; adopted end of course examinations; and worked with the Stanford University School Redesign Network on a Performance Assessment pilot. During the past decade, Ohio has steadily improved it longitudinal data collection and now complies with nine of 10 elements of Data Quality Campaign.

(ii) Improving student outcomes

The state has had a mixed, but overall positive record on improving student outcomes. Since 2003 Ohio has improved NAEP and Ohio Achievement Test scores in reading and mathematics overall. There are some exceptions. State-tested reading achievement declined in 2007-2008 for fifth and tenth grade and graduation test scores declined in 2006-2008. Reading achievement scores are projected to decline in 2008-2009 for seventh, eighth, and tenth grade. Mathematics scores on the state test declined at the third, fourth, and seventh grades in 2008 and are projected to decline in 2009 for the sixth and eighth grades. From 2006-2009, the annual pattern state test scores was similar for subgroups. In some years the rates of change differed for particular subgroups causing a decline or increase the in gap for that group.

Since 2003, Ohio students have made overall improvement in NAEP scores and on the Ohio Achievement Test in reading and mathematics. There were some exceptions. NAEP scores for eighth grade mathematics proficiency from 2003-2007 decreased by .8 percent. The progress on closing achievement gaps between subgroups (e.g., African American, Hispanic, English language learners, disabled, economically disadvantaged) and all students has moved forward as measured by state achievement tests. From 2003–2009, the gap between poor and more advantaged students passing the fourth grade state reading test decreased 6.6 points. The reading achievement gap between fourth grade African American and white students narrowed 2.5 points. Gaps have not narrowed consistently for all subgroups and large differences in achievement remain. For example, there is a 25 point gap in the passing rate on the fourth grade reading test between students with disabilities and advantaged students and nearly a 15 point disadvantage for Hispanics.

Ohio's overall graduation rate has risen since 1997 when it was 79.8 percent. More recently, the rate decreased from its high in 2007 (86.9 percent) to 84.6 percent in 2008. The gaps for subgroups have met with mixed progress. At 64.3 percent in 2008, the graduation gap for African Americans has increased 1.4 points since 2003. At 64.5 percent, the gap for Hispanics has decreased 7.1 points since 2003. The gap in graduation between white students (89.4 percent) and all subgroups (ranging between 72.7 and 64.3 percent) is a wide.

Some districts have tried various interventions to close achievement gaps that have been met with success. One example is Ohio's nine early college high schools, supported with federal, state, local and philanthropic funds. In these schools the graduation-test pass rate for African-American students approaches or exceeds overall graduation rates. STEM schools have also been successful in helping their high-poverty students to close achievement gaps. These state-supported efforts are quite limited in scale.

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

Ohio clarified their plans to improve student outcomes and reduce achievement gaps. The state's center for education reform coordinates efforts to raise graduation rates and reduce achievement gaps by identifying promising practices and scaling them up in all schools with a graduation rate under 80 percent. Specific focus is given to interventions at the kindergarten, middle, and tenth grade levels. The state is also supporting systemic efforts to implement initiatives for improvement such as adding Advanced Placement courses.

Total	125	87	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)

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards

Ohio has been a participant in the development of the National Governers Association/Council of Chief State School Officers (NGA/CCSSO) "Common Core" Standards. These jointly developed standards are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. The collaboration involves 51 states and territories.

(ii) Adopting standards

The Ohio State Board of Education expects to adopt the "Common Core" standards in June 2010.

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

Ohio provided evidence that it adopted the Common Core standards statewide before August 2, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments

Ohio is developing formative, summative, value-added, and performance assessments. Ohio will align its assessments with Common Core Standards as a member of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium (WestEd), as well as the Partnership for College Readiness and Career (Achieve).

(ii) Including a significant number of States

Ohio is a part of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium (WestEd) with 32 other states and the Partnership for College Readiness and Career (Achieve) with 25 additional states.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**15**	**15**	

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

Ohio's plan for supporting the transition to new standards and assessments is comprehensive. The clearly stated goal is to provide the necessary support that will enable all educators to successfully implement the new standards. The rollout plan includes development of supporting curriculum and instructional materials, alignment between high school exit and college entrance, and alignment between preservice education and expected standards-based classroom instruction.

Although the proposal states that Ohio's Standards for Professional Development will guide the professional development conducted to rollout the new standards, many of the strategies seem to be practices that are not supported by those standards. The state's plan is to develop professional development modules, which will be available to teachers and principals through the state's online network. The modules will be developed with input from selected teachers who are a part of development networks and other educators, e.g. staff from the 56 Education Service Centers. As the professional

development modules are field tested, assessed, and revised in an iterative process, they will become a part the web-based Instructional Improvement System. The modules will be delivered to teachers through some combination of face-to-face training from the Education Service Centers' instructional coaches and online subject-matter based professional learning communities.

The record of effectiveness for this approach to professional development for changing teachers' practice and deepening standards-based teaching and learning is mixed. Schools and districts with robust local capacity—instructional coaches with a deep knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy and skilled in adult education practices, who have time work with groups and individual teachers in frequent professional learning sessions, supported by a school culture of collegiality—are most likely to succeed. In the rollout plan as proposed it is likely that the many educators who are not a part of the development teams or early adopters will not have much if any role in developing the professional development materials they are expected to use. Although Ohio requires schools to establish teams of teachers and principals to engage in professional learning communities, these communities do not exist in all schools. For those in operation, how well they function is unclear. The state's plans to develop a portfolio of curricular and instructional supports aligned to the new standards will be helpful as long as the supports are deeply understood by teachers, who can adapt them to their particular students.

Although ambitious, Ohio's plan for this goal may face limited feasibility. It is not clear that districts and charter schools that are challenged with high teacher turnover, limited collegiality, novice instructional leadership, and unreliable technology will experience a system of "continuous [professional growth through] planning, implementation, reflection, and revision" as specified in Ohio's Standards for Professional Development. Beyond the early adopters, it is not clear how the specific roll out schedule will be determined and whether there are expectations for preconditions to be met that will facilitate high-quality professional development. A few innovative elements are intriguing— the development of formative evaluation instruments collaboratively with teachers as professional development, and the development of an international database of evidence-based resources.

Total	70	65	65	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**20**	**20**	

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

Ohio's data system meets 10 of the 12 criteria. The America Competes Act element to have the capacity of cross communication between K–12 and higher education data systems has not yet been met but is planned and is legally permitted through House Bill 290. That legislation also permits Ohio to create a data system as a single repository for pre-kindergarten through post-secondary information tracked by student. This upgrade to the state's Student Longitudinal Data System is planned for 2011.

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

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

Ohio's collects and analyzes value-added, student achievement, and other performance data. With RttT funds, the state plans to expand value-added fourth-through-eighth-grade data collection and make those data accessible to all LEAs. The state is adding formative assessment to its portfolio and will train adopting LEAs in its use. Ohio makes its longitudinal data available to many stakeholders and provides training to educators for use in making instructional and budgetary decisions. The state is revising formats for sharing data with parents and families so they are easier to interpret. The planned uses for the longitudinal data

system will assist all the aforementioned stakeholders in efforts to make continuous improvement to Ohio's systemic functioning, instruction, fiscal management, and student achievement. This is a high-quality plan with achievable goals and identified sources for financial support.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**12**	**14**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5	5	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3	5	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4	4	

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

(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems

Ohio has a solid plan to make data for improving instructional decision-making available to teachers, principals, and administrators. The increased availability of value-added data is the major strategy for accomplishing this goal, but innovative pilots, such as assistance with formative evaluation through Classroom Assessment Modules, are promising as well. It is not clear whether the districts affiliated with the regional Information Technology Centers piloting a Classroom Assessment Module, a tool that enables teachers to create summative assessments tied to content standards, serve a population distribution that is similar to the demographic targeted in the RttT application.

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems

Ohio relies on Battelle for Kids, an organization that works in the Appalachian region of Ohio to help educators use data to improve education, and regional information technology centers to provide professional development to teachers, administrators, families, and students on understanding and making informed decisions with the assessment data. To understand and use such data effectively is a tremendous undertaking requiring long term, embedded, personalized professional development. Although the qualifications of the professional development providers are not in question, their capacity to achieve the monumental task of enabling educators and families statewide to understand and use the data has not been adequately addressed in Ohio's plan. Furthermore, the plan relies to some degree on a technology infrastructure that is not completely in place throughout the state.

iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers

Ohio has a feasible plan to make data from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and the instructional improvement systems available to researchers. To achieve this goal, Ohio will create an educational research center, as no such institution currently exists. It will invite the state university system and other research institutions to become partners in the center. The center will have three priorities to start and add additional issues as appropriate:

- the effectiveness of instructional materials and resource with specific subgroups of students
- STEM and college and career readiness issues
- frequent obstacles to school improvement, i.e., identifying practices that work in turning around failing schools.

Although the educational research center will be a new effort, substantial components of the data systems that will form the backbone of the center's information already exist. Moreover, Ohio will establish an oversight group to: 1) engage a wide range of stakeholders while establishing a clear identity for the center; 2) keep the long term focus on aligning school improvement efforts with their effectiveness in increasing college and career readiness; and 3) ensure that research findings are available to education policymakers and other stakeholders in a timely, usable fashion.

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

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems

Ohio clarified that the technology based professional development tools have a track record of popularity and effectiveness with Ohio teachers. In addition to the web-based system, school-based instructional coaches will provide ongoing, embedded professional development.

Total	47	37	39	

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**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6	6	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	6	6	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5	5	

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

(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification

Ohio allows an alternative route to certification for teachers that: 1) do not require going through a higher education institution, 2) are selective in accepting candidates, 3) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support, 4) significantly limit coursework requirements, and 5) award a full certificate, and several additional routes for teachers and principals meet all but the first condition. The one route to receive a full license without taking at least six semester hours of educational coursework through a higher education institution is limited, however. It requires a waiver from the Credential Review Board, which has the authority to grant full licensure to candidates with degrees and or work related experience in content fields. It is not clear how often such waivers are granted. The alternative route to receive a full principal's license requires coursework in school law, school supervision and evaluation that can be provided outside of higher education institutions, by "state approved providers." This route is not used very often. Alternative routes include providers outside of higher education, including non-profit organizations and the state's education service centers. The route are selective, favoring work experience, technical license, or extensive subject matter education. Ohio's alternative routes can lead to full licensing with approved professional development, and evidence of successful practice.

(ii) Using alternative routes to certification

Teachers and principals have used the four routes to alternative certification in 2008–2009. The *Alternative Educator License* has been used most frequently. Three hundred ninety-five people have successfully completed this route. Eighty principals have received the *Alternative Principal License*. The *Provisional STEM License* was not issued. This path is intended to allow Ohio's STEM schools to attract industry professionals. To date, these schools have been able to fill their openings with traditionally certified teachers. The *Route B Career-Technical* licensure path has been used successfully by 1072 candidates to obtain a two to four year license while completing educational coursework and an induction program that lead to full licensure.

(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage

A system is in place to monitor teacher and principal shortages. The system has been improved and upgraded recently and should yield more complete data, for example tracking the placement and movement of highly effective teachers and principals. The additional data should enable Ohio to know specific shortages in hard to staff schools and the effectiveness of various recruiting methods. Ohio's plan

does not address how it uses information that the web-based recruiting system generate on principal shortages to fill vacancies or how well the system works for that purpose. It is unclear how many principal candidates participate in Ohio's initiatives to fill shortages, such as loan forgiveness and Apprenticeships Supported by Partnerships for Innovation and Reform in Education.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**51**	**51**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3	3	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	14	14	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	8	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	26	26	

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

(i) Measuring student growth

Not all parts of Ohio's approach to measuring individual student growth are clear. Student growth in grades four through eight will be measured for each student in reading and mathematics. It is not clear how student growth will be measured in other grade levels and subjects. It is also not clear that the growth data are rigorous, clear, and consistent; how will professional development be provided to measure growth in art and physical education; or how collective bargaining agreements will affect the measurement of growth data in subjects and grade levels that are not included in the plan.

In the areas proposed for data collection, student growth data is only as rigorous as its underlying achievement tests. Ohio is revising its assessments to reflect the new, internationally benchmarked standards. The transition to new assessments could possibly complicate or delay the implementation schedule of the plan to use growth data.

(ii) Developing evaluation systems

Ohio has plans to extensively redesign principal and teacher evaluation in ways that are consistent with the requirements of RttT, including differentiating effectiveness. The redesign of procedures for evaluating principals is already underway. The new process requires extensively trained administrators to conduct multiple formative and an annual summative assessment that includes consideration of student value-added data as one of the criteria for effectiveness. It uses assessment criteria and a rubric that has been thoughtfully designed by expert principals, administrators, researchers and others. Training for evaluators and audits of results will help to ensure that the evaluation process is fair. Evaluations are linked to Ohio's human capital management system, which is being piloted. The teacher evaluation process will follow these same lines. The teachers unions will be invited into every step of the process. Peer assistance and review will be one of the models for teacher evaluation. Without seeing the evaluation instruments scored it is impossible to tell exactly rigorous they are, but the evaluation system described seems promising.

(iii) Conducting annual evaluations

Ohio plans to conduct an annual evaluation of teachers and principals preceded by three formative assessments for which the evaluator will provide timely feedback. Part of the evaluation will include value-added data for the school or classroom. It is a bit unclear how student performance will be assessed in the grades for which student growth data are not available.

(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions

Ohio has a high-quality plan for informing decisions on teacher and principal professional development and personnel matters. The state plans to use the new teacher and principal evaluations to provide professional development. The teacher licensure process will include a four year residency program that

embeds professional development along the way. Residents will have mentors and participate in a multiple year induction program. HB1 extends the tenure period to seven years. Ohio's teacher and principal evaluation plans include differentiated compensation, increased skills and knowledge pay, and performance pay. Tenured teachers and principals in need of assistance will receive peer assistance. According to the plans, non-performing teachers and principals in participating LEAs can be fired. Each year, the number of effective and ineffective teachers and principals will be reported publicly.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**12**	**12**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	7	7	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5	

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

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools

Ohio's plan for ensuring equitable distribution of teachers and principals is cautious and achievable, but not ambitious. It is yet to be determined whether one of Ohio's main strategies for equitably distributing teachers, attracting and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders in low-performing urban and rural schools, is sustainable and scalable. Ohio will try a number of strategies to attract and retain effective and highly effective teachers and principals to hard to staff school, where it is hoped that the teachers will teach in hard to staff subjects areas. Some approaches try to improve routine parts of education employment, for example, the hiring experience. This is a smart strategy since sought-after educators often have multiple options for employment.

Others are specialized programs to meet specific goals of Ohio's RttT plan, such as identifying and training 68 sets of principals and teacher leaders as turn-around specialists and providing bonuses, differentiated pay, small classes and other incentives to attract these teams to the 68 lowest performing LEAs. Some of these ideas may work, but the obstacles are legion. Many teachers are not disposed to choose to work with students who have challenges that accompany poverty or in schools that are poorly led and lack resources. Bonuses not withstanding, salaries in poor districts are often not competitive with those in suburban districts. As suburban districts adopt their own career lattices, financial incentives may become moot. Some barriers are outside of the normal scope of education. For example, rural areas often lack opportunities for spousal employment or adequate housing. These conditions may create serious challenges for achieving equitable distribution that are outside of the control of the applicant.

While the elements to a successful human capital management system are necessary—preparation, recruitment, hiring and equitable distribution, induction, professional development, and performance management—they are not sufficient. Even for those strategies that prove successful, scale-up will be challenging. It is not clear where the emphasis lies in Ohio's approach. It is also unclear, whether participating LEAs will assign or reassign teachers and principals involuntarily. The plan does not indicate whether the emphasis will be on a "grow your own" or "import" approach to staffing challenges. Overall, Ohio's plan for this goal although ambitious will be a challenge to implement successfully.

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas

Ohio's primary strategies for addressing this criterion are to increase the Woodrow Wilson STEM program and develop Teach Ohio. These programs provide paths to alternative certification or support teachers to switch fields to one of the hard to staff subjects. As an additional inducement, financial incentives are added for those who actually commit to a target school and perform at an effective or highly effective level.

These efforts may be successful, but may not be sustainable in financially distressed districts and hard economic times.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**13**	**13**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	6	6	

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

(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly

Ohio plans to use student achievement and student growth data to assess the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs at the colleges and universities in Ohio. These data will be reported publicly. Whether Ohio's goals can be met is dependent on access to new or expanded data systems, including the statewide roll-out of value-added performance data. This is a high-quality approach that is likely to succeed.

(ii) Expanding effective programs

Ohio has innovative plans to fund teacher and principal preparation programs at its public colleges and universities according to the performance of their graduates in high need schools and subjects. A few minor concerns include the difficulty the state may encounter in reducing funding to those institutions whose graduates' are not successful or do not seek to work in high need areas and perverse incentives that arise as the plan is implemented.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**10**	**16**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	5	8	[redacted]
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	5	8	[redacted]

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

(i) Providing effective support

Ohio has assembled several programs to address specific parts of educators' professional development needs. Ohio will expand model programs to support beginning teachers, struggling teachers, urban principals, English language learners instruction, school leaders, etc. Although many of these pilot programs are well regarded, it is difficult to see how they all fit together to make a coherent system of professional development that meets the needs of all of Ohio's educators. In the lowest performing LEAs and charter schools, the various programs may make overwhelming demands on a small pool of potential mentors. In some schools, there may not be access to enough content-specific expert teachers to make on-going, embedded professional development possible. All of these issues lead to questions about the ability to scale-up the proposed piloted interventions to produce the expected results. It is also unclear whether formative evaluation will be conducted on all aspects of these programs to help the state and districts analyze the effectiveness of implementation and make appropriate adjustments.

(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support

Ohio will require all participating districts to submit an annual professional development plan that meets Ohio's Professional Development Standards. After the first year, professional development providers must incorporate impact data in their plans. Those data are not specified in the plan. This provision is weak and favors incumbent providers who are experienced in writing professional development plans that align with Ohio's professional development standards.

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

Ohio will require all districts to craft and submit a professional development plan to meet specific school improvement goals. The state will review the plans and ensure that they comply with Ohio's Professional Development Standards. District plans will emphasize school-based face-to-face professional study groups, instructional coaching and other practices that support collaborative examination of teaching, learning and leadership. With assistance from universities and model program providers, the state will also improve its own capacity to engage in high-quality professional development and that of its 56 regional service centers.

Total	138	103	109	

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 has legal authority to intervene in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts. That authority is consistent with provisions for intervention in No Child Left Behind. Ohio has exercised the authority to intervene in the lowest performing schools with professional development, incentives to attract highly qualified teachers and principals, the offer of supplemental services to students, and other measures.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**25**	**25**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	20	20	

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

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools

Ohio has identified persistently lowest achieving schools according to the RttT criteria. The state participates in the U.S. Department of Education's Differentiated Accountability Pilot. Instead of categorizing by the number of years schools and districts do not meet adequate yearly progress, Ohio reviews the aggregate percentage of students that do not make adequate yearly progress on the Ohio Achievement Test in reading and mathematics. If districts and schools have no more than 20 percent or less of their adequate yearly progress indicators unmet, Ohio classifies them as in need of *low support*. Districts and schools with unmet indicators of 20–30 percent are classed, *medium support*. Those with unmet adequate yearly progress indicators of 30 percent or more are categorized as in need of *high support*.

The differentiated accountability model permits the state to intervene directly in high support districts and schools if they do not take corrective action or if the actions taken are ineffective. The state has many options including, removing personnel, appointing a receiver, providing high quality professional development, deferring funds and changing curriculum. Districts and schools that spend four years in need of high support are subject to review by an Academic Distress Commission, which takes further action such as, closing schools to reopen as charters, bringing in an education management organization, hiring a new principal and staff, operating under the oversight of a state support team and other actions that comport with the four intervention models specified for RttT.

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools

Under Ohio's differentiated accountability plan, high support schools and districts must participate in the Ohio Improvement Process, which requires work toward a specific and limited set of goals for improvement, based upon the Academic Distress Team's data analysis and recommendations. Schools that make no progress or do not implement the improvement plan are subject to turnaround, closure, restart or transformation.

Most persistently-low performing schools are engaged in the turnaround (68) or transformation (51) models. Under both models, the state takes a major role. Ohio has established specific goals for reducing graduation, reading, and mathematics gaps between white students, statewide, and minority students in the persistently lowest-performing schools. The state's approach is to hire outside consultants to begin immediate work on improving target schools, while it builds internal capacity to take over the transformation work. Within state set limits, the districts may select their turnaround model. The state's Office of Transformation helps low performing schools develop improvement plans, provides funding through a competitive grant process, and monitors schools to ensure compliance with state regulations. Under RttT, Ohio will create the Ohio Network for Education Transformation in partnership with selected non-profit organizations that have expertise in school transformation. The RttT Transformation Team that works with the low-performing schools and communities to engage families, civic organizations, and local businesses in the improvement process will serve as an additional resource. Although all partners will have some responsibility for professional assistance, monitoring, and accountability, the transformation office's primary role will be compliance with state law. The Transformation Network will take the lead in planning the details of the change process and providing schools with the know-how to succeed. The transformation team will engage local stakeholders. Added to this mix will be several model programs with successful results in Ohio schools, including Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) and early college high schools.

This is a complicated model with overlapping roles and bifurcated responsibilities. It might invite inaction due to confusion or disagreement over lines of authority. With the best intentions, the very complexity of this intervention system could lead to delayed action and contradictory advice about improvement strategies. It is difficult to understand how the proposed system will work seamlessly and lead to the quality of timely assistance Ohio strives to offer its struggling students, teachers, administrators and families. It is also unclear how portions of these efforts in further need of consultant assistance will be sustained after grant funding ends.

Total	50	35	35	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4	4	

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

(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education

Ohio increased its education budget from FY 2008 to FY 2009 by $400 million. This increase represented 2 percent rise in the percentage of the total state revenues devoted to education.

(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools

Ohio uses a weighted student formula to achieve equitable funding for schools. On average, Ohio provides $1780 more per pupil in high-need LEAs than in those that are not high need. Under HB 1 supplemental

funding is provided to support districts in which students have low college attainment. Since this change in the funding formula, a portion is based upon concentration of wealth or poverty. Despite this effort, at the individual classroom level, schools that serve high need students generally have more emergency certified personnel and higher turnover, which can lower actual per-pupil expenditure substantially. Ohio may be no exception. Within districts, Ohio operating standards require that schools receive equitable funding and that a group of local stakeholders review at least every three years how equitably funds are distributed.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**27**	**27**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	6	6	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	3	3	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5	5	

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

(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"

Ohio has 322 charter schools. It allows unlimited new charter school start-ups in eight urban districts, any district on academic watch/emergency, and any conversion from a traditional public school to a charter school. Online charters are capped.

(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes

In Ohio, charter schools must be sponsored. Charter schools began in 1997 and rapidly increased in number. Limited oversight of charter schools led to uneven quality, with too many in academic or fiscal emergency. Ohio has strengthened its oversight of charters and now has the authority to revoke a sponsor's approval and prevent the sponsor from opening a new charter if its existing schools are in academic emergency. Generally, charter schools in academic emergency for two or more years can be closed. It is unclear when Ohio will use its enhanced authority to close existing low performing charter schools. Ohio permits unlimited charter schools in eight large urban districts, but limits exist for other places unless a district is in academic emergency or watch. The extent to which charter schools serve populations similar to the local district population is unknown. Because of the concentration of charters in urban school districts that contain a large percentage of the state's high-need students and at least some of those districts serve relatively few low-need students, it may follow that at least some, if not most of charter schools in those cities serve high-need students.

(iii) Equitably funding charter schools

Charter schools' funding is based upon a student's public district of residence. Funding includes a base allocation, base supplements, and applicable special education, kindergarten, transportation, and other supplements. Ohio disburses federal charter grant funds on a competitive basis for new charters. The state allocated funding formula is equitable for charter schools. Charter schools receive a commensurate share of local, state, and federal revenues.

(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities

Ohio regulations minimally assist charters with access to unused public school facilities. When LEAs dispose of suitable classroom property, districts must offer it to start-up charter schools at fair market value. When LEAs decommission school facilities with no plans for reuse within three years, they must offer new charters first right of refusal before offering the property for general sale. The evidence required of school districts that have plans for their empty space is not clear. Ohio leaves zoning, health, safety, and other restrictions to local jurisdictions. There is little assistance for charter schools to lease or purchase property,

unless they are located in an area with a dwindling public school population and a surplus of school buildings. This may well apply to the urban charter schools, most of Ohio's charters, but not to those in other locations. Even so, with no assistance for renovation, charter schools may not find the available spaces feasible.

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools

Ohio has innovative public schools, most notably its Early College High Schools and STEM schools. Under HB 1 the chief state school officer and state board of education can encourage innovative, autonomous schools. Some restrictions apply based on funding, the teachers contract, and special education regulations, and it is unclear how autonomous these schools may be.

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

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

With the passage of HB 1, Ohio has created a strong legal base for school reform. This law and its related regulations and policies provide a focus on closing achievement gaps, funds for innovation, and a wealth of assessment data for instructional decision-making.

Among other things HB 1:

- Sets funding formulas for charter and autonomous schools
- Encourages collaboration between public and charter schools
- Provide funding and decision-making flexibility to high performing schools
- Requires the state board of education to adopt new standards every five years and revise standards for teachers to reflect the updated content standards
- Requires the development of model curricula and other resources for new standards
- Requires new rigorous high school assessments
- Changes teacher licensure to a seven-year process
- Changes the review and approval process for teacher preparation programs to permit the coming links to student and teacher performance and transfers authority to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents
- Strengthens automatic triggers for closing academically failing charter schools
- Supports STEM education
- Provides for a model peer assistance and review program.

Total	55	40	40	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**	**0**	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Ohio has a network that focuses on STEM, which includes 10 STEM focused high schools, 28 K-8 schools of excellence, seven regional hubs, and many business partners. To graduate, Ohio requires four mathematics credits, including one in Algebra II, and three science credits. Ohio is transforming science education to be inquiry-based and revising curriculum to reflect the more rigorous Common Core standards. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Fellowship program will prepare new teachers in mathematics and science and offer more Advanced Placement courses in STEM. The program will also offer incentives to participants who choose to teach in high-poverty or high-minority schools. Turnaround schools that choose a focus on STEM will receive assistance for Ohio's STEM support network. The Appalachian Collaborative will involve 20 rural high schools in STEM. Ohio is working with other states to incorporate

21st century skills into standards for students. All of these efforts are positive, but few will affect all Ohio students. There is no discussion of what measures will be taken to ensure that girls are equitably represented in high level science and mathematics courses. No doubt that increasing the number of STEM schools—the major strategy Ohio proposes to use—will serve students with an interest and aptitude for STEM, but whether this approach will significantly strengthen science and mathematics education for hundreds of thousands of Ohio students is not clear.

Total	15	0	0	

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 addresses the four education reform areas and demonstrates that the state and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The applicant has crafted a high-quality plan that is ambitious and achieveable. There appears to be sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve many of the goals in the plan and ensure that the results have statewide impact. The plan to ensure that teachers are effectively adopting the new Common Core standards in daily practice in each classroom is supported through a comprehensive data system that provides online professional development resources. The state will develop a structure to monitor the ongoing needs of participating LEAs and provide additional support as necessary.

Ohio has described how, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, it will use RttT and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. Ohio's plans for developing assessments and data systems to support instruction are particularly comprehensive, innovative, and positioned to achieve the intended results.

Strategies for transforming persistently lowest performing schools will receive necessary close attention from the state through its network for school transformation. Ohio has identified several model programs that have been implemented in the state. These include district transformation teams, residential charter schools, alternative principal preparation, early college high schools, performance compensation, Schools of Promise, peer assistance and review, and other discrete programs that have been tried with a limited number of students, teachers, or leaders. While some of these initiatives have proven their merit,e.g., STEM schools, it is not clear that they are scalable with quality. Some of these initiatives have not been tried together and may even work at cross purposes. It also remains to be seen whether the applicant can stop well-embedded ineffective practices or programs with existing constituencies that prove not to work in synergy with the interventions that the state proposes.

It is helpful that Ohio has proposed to be reflective as it implements RttT. On the whole, the applicant has made a convincing case that the proposed interventions can work together and be transformative on a large scale.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	367	380	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #3800OH-8

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**	**46**	**65**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	34	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	7	15	

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

(i) Ohio has provided a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda with clearly articulated goals. The proposal provides substantial evidence for an approach that addresses the four education areas described in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The state has set finite goals for each of the four ARRA areas including increasing the high school graduation rates to roughly 88%; reducing the graduation rate gaps by 50% between under-represented and majority groups; reducing the performance gaps by 50% between under-represented and majority groups; and more than doubling the increase in college enrollment. Adding credence to the reform agenda is a detailed budget for the reform agenda that supports all projected activities and innovative plans such as the value-added assessment of students and student-teacher linkage data systems and a principal-teacher evaluation framework. These plans are clearly articulated, provide ample evidence of a path leading toward achieving the plan's goals. This section is consistent with the reform plans proposed throughout the entire application.

(ii) The terms and conditions reflect a strong commitment by the participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to the state's reform plans. Participating LEAs in this instance must commit to all portions of the State's Race to the Top plans. Signatures have been obtained from the Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education President and, where applicable, the local teachers' union leader. The MOUs cover all of the four education areas and include the terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment by the participating LEAs to the state's plan. While 536 LEAs have signed on as participants, this is not as strong a commitment as desirable for the plan.

(iii) The proposal reform plans will have a strong impact on those participating school districts and charter schools that have signed on. The proposal states that 536 LEAs have signed on as participants. This represents slightly over 50% of the LEAs in the state. The data indicates that 2,586 schools will be served, but omits the fact that 1,586 will not be served. This leaves out a substantial number of students (667,197), 239,205 who have been identified as students in poverty. This appears to be a limited not broad statewide impact.

While the goals and plans for this proposal strongly support an increase in student achievement, a decrease in the achievement gaps between subgroups, an increase in high school graduation rates and an increase in college enrollment under Race to the Top (RTTT), the impact is limited to the participating schools presently and the conditional approval of some 60% of the unions to some major aspects of the plan weakens this response.

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

(ii) The state presentation provided information regarding the MOUs. The state requires all three signatures, superintendent, Board President, union representative for participation in Race to the Top. Thus, the lack of one or more signatures on an MOU would eliminate districts that are willing to participate but unable to muster one of the three signatures and gives the appearance of an unwillingness to participate which may or may not be the case.

(iii) Given the stricter MOU requirements mentioned above for participants in Race to the Top, the proposal has the potential for a greater statewide impact than originally suggested by the Tier I comments.

(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)

(i) (a) Ohio has put together a strong leadership team that utilizes key Ohio Education Department(OED) personnel experienced in the areas covered by the plan as well as calling upon businesses and organizations to support the plan's implementation. The plan identifies key individuals and their qualifications to manage the program, their responsibilities and a timeline for completing the tasks assigned to them. This is repeated in the budget, providing a comprehensive plan for carrying out the reform agenda. In terms of state support for the agenda, the plan involves the highest levels of the OED and utilizes several OED Divisions with experience in carrying out plans such as that described throughout this proposal.

(i) (b) The proposal presents an abundance of support to LEAs in carrying out these reform plans. Ohio has outlined plans to include the six resource teams formed at OED and Ohio's Education Service Centers, the Business Coalition for Education System Improvement, and Education Resource Centers in this plan. These teams and agencies reach out to every part of the state.

(i) (c) The applicant has provided strong and detailed evidence of a history of successful practices in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting and fund disbursement. This information includes existing centers that are aligned to the work of four RTTT assurance areas, the structures and process for effective and efficient implementation and will be called upon in the execution of the plan. The detailed information provided in this area gives every indication of a successful implementation of RTTT plans.

(i) (d) The funds to be allocated for the purposes of the grant includes segregating percentages of the funds for specific purposes (reinforcing, accelerating, innovating), setting aside a substantial portion of funds for LEAs and reallocating current funding from federal, state and local funds in support of this program. As with other sections of the proposal, the applicant provides detailed evidence in support of using these funds for RTTT.

(i) (e) The sustainability of the reform program is repeated throughout the proposal. The OED's use of the fiscal, political and human capital once the RTTT funding has ended provides evidence of the probable successful continuation of these reforms. Among the strengths of this section are the establishment of a clear post-RTTT future, the incorporation of improvements into current state-supported functions and redirecting resources from ineffective and less effective programs.

(ii) The applicant has gathered together a wide range of letters of support from political, education and business leaders as well as institutions of higher education, community and technical colleges, Family and Children First Councils and ODE parent advisory members. In total, they provide 222 letters of support for their reform efforts and most notably from the Ohio Educator's Association and the Ohio Federation of Teachers. The support is not limited to rhetoric, but in many cases actual assistance with the reform effort. This is a very strong endorsement of their plans.

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

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

(i) The applicant has made progress in the four American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) reform areas over the past several years. Especially relevant has been the introduction of a number of legislative reform acts (House Bill1) and the adoption of programs directly affecting the reform areas in ARRA. Several progressive reforms have been in effect:

- Content Standards (2010);
- Statewide Testing (2007);
- Requirements for Graduation (2007);
- Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (2005);
- Ohio Standards for Principals (2005)
- Ohio Standards for Professional Development (2005); and
- Standards for Superintendents (2007).

The introduction of these new standards are having a profound effect on education in Ohio. Changes to what is taught, how it is taught and who teaches it have created a significant foundation on which to build the changes proposed under RTTT. The changes listed above provide strong evidence of the progress that has been made in recent years.

(ii) The proposal provides detailed information pertaining to the increase in mathematics and reading on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) tests. These results indicate that the reform area work that the state has undertaken *has had a positive effect on student achievement*. Between 2003 and 2007, student scores on the NAEP test for math in grades 4 and 8 illustrate a large increase as compared to students scoring nationally on these same tests. In reading, student scores for these same grades exceed the national average but the gains are not as impressive as those in math. Likewise, the achievement gap between white and other students remains substantial, but Hispanic and Black student results show a slow progress upward. The district has piloted several projects aimed at further closing the gap and maintains partnerships with organizations dedicated to closing the achievement gap. Although the graduation rate has met with a recent decline, the results had been steadily upward until the previous reporting year. Ohio attributes the success in increasing achievement to highly regarded content standards and aligned assessments, implementation of a robust value-added data system, implementation of a data based approach to systemic school improvement and various successful pilots of teacher compensation models. The upward trend toward closing the achievement gap is a positive indicator of progress, although the slowness of this progress raises concerns about the ability of the plan to make the performance gains/goals toward closing the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students.

Total	125	101	120	

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)

(i) Ohio is part of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers consortium involved in the development of the Common Core Standards. This includes 51 states and territories. We have been presented with a draft of the high-quality standards provided by this consortium.

(ii) The Common Core Standards are scheduled to be presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) for adoption on June 8, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(i) Ohio is a member of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium that has been developed with the intent to implement high-quality assessments aligned with a common set of K-12 standards.

(ii) This consortium involves 33 member states.

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

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

The state provides an extensive and high-quality plan to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Evidence contained within this section demonstrates the means, through partnerships and collaborations with Regional Centers, Institutions of Higher Learning and other organizations, to provide for professional development to ensure the transition to the standards and student assessments that show promise of building toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. The applicant provides a very complete picture of their key activities, including:

- Creation of a state-level web-based instructional improvement system;
- Delivery of high-quality professional development with attendant resources;
- Creation of professional development modules;
- Rollout of professional development through face-to-face and online delivery as well as using instructional coaches;
- Provision of curriculum resources to support teachers in LEAs and charter schools;
- Alignment of high school exit requirements with college entry requirements;
- Aligning appropriate sets of formative assessments supporting personalized instruction of students;
- Assessment of kindergarten readiness; and
- Value-added data expansion beyond mathematics and reading.

This response meets all of the conditions required by this section and includes providing key goals and activities, a timeline for implementing the activities and the party or parties responsible for implementing the activities. This section is especially well-developed. Most important to the success of this effort is the foundation that has been laid through legislation which has been referred to earlier in the reviewer comments on (A) (3) regarding House Bill 1. This legislation is an important support for the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. This is a very strong plan.

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**	**20**	**20**	

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

The applicant has not completed the America COMPETES Act elements for:

1. The capacity to communicate with higher-education data systems, and
2. Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in post secondary education.

Although these are planned, only 10 of the 12 Act elements may be counted for a total of 20 points.

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

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

The state has provided a high-quality plan to ensure that the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) is used to inform key stakeholders. The plan is built on a strong foundation of previous actions that connect to the goals of RTTT and that will identify the needs of the stakeholders in developing a system that addresses the academic and non-academic needs of students. The plan provides for connections to P-12 higher education data integration and is tied to past and current progress in developing a state teacher-student data system. Key goals within this section are the focus on improving access to student data and the expansion of value-added statewide. To accomplish both access to data and its usability, the state has been developing and expanding a series of web portals that will allow the placement of accurate and credible student growth into teachers' hands to provide for instructional improvement. This is a comprehensive and complete plan leading to data support for decision makers in the areas of policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation and overall effectiveness.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

Ohio presents a compelling high-quality plan in this section that addresses all aspects of (i), (ii) and iii). Information and a description of how they will provide teachers, principals and administrators with information needed to inform their instructional practices, decision making and overall effectiveness is quite complete. Ohio has a strong foundation of current activities that will be expanded with RTTT assistance to increase the availability and access to data. These initiatives include:

- Early adoption of Instructional Improvement Systems (ITS) and data analytical tools;
- An established SLDS with accompanying data tools and electronic content repository;
- A regional technology support system;
- A linkage with Battelle for Kids leading to high-quality professional development currently is use in in 41 Ohio school districts; and
- A STEM Learning Network Partnership (OSLN).

Likewise, they have laid out a support system designed to provide effective professional development on how to utilize these systems and data to provide continuous instructional improvement. Most noteworthy is the applicant's attention to research using the SLDS to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials and strategies for a diverse group of students. Likewise, the launching of an Education Resource Center (ERC) to conduct research on promising practices and communicate this to stakeholders is a positive move.

In the area of support for teachers, the state will provide 56 professional development modules and provide support for Information Technology Centers, districts and charter schools in rolling out the state standard instructional improvement system and associated professional development. The development and activation of a new Education Research Center (ERC) with a research agenda geared to focusing on data and accessibility will provide a means of evaluating the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, resources and approaches to educating different subgroups of students.

This is a strong, comprehensive and intelligent approach regarding the delivery of services to all students.

Total	47	43	43	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4	4	

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

(i) & (ii) The applicant provides legal and statutory provisions regarding their alternative pathways and identifies four pathways to licensure and a Credential Review Board (CRB). These pathways include the Alternative Educators License, Alternative Principal License, Provisional STEM License and Route B Career Technical Licensure. The Credential Review Board provides one or more avenues for individuals to pursue an alternative pathway. Its principal function is to determine an applicant's expertise in meeting alternative licensing requirements. These alternatives may be provided by Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) or other institutions independent of IHEs. During 2008-2009, 395 teachers and 80 principals took advantage of the alternative pathways. Teachers and principals receive the same licensing as teachers following traditional certification. This information provides a strong statement of the state's commitment to alternative routes to certification that are currently in effect. This has resulted in an increase in the number of certified teachers and principals in the state. Thus, the criteria surrounding alternative pathways has been met by providing various types of qualified providers, indicating a selective criteria for including candidates, providing supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support for effective monitoring and coaching, limiting the amount of coursework required and having options to test out of courses and award the same level of certification that traditional preparation preparation programs award upon completion.

(iii) The state has a process to monitor, evaluate and identify areas of teacher shortages. This section provides the number and percentages of teacher shortages that have been identified through the yearly Ohio Teacher and Supply Demand Report. This report identifies the following areas of shortages: Special Education, Mathematics, Science, English as a Second Language and Foreign Languages. To overcome these deficiencies the state has taken measures to:

- Train mid-career professionals;
- Provide signing bonuses;
- Loan forgiveness programs;
- Build teacher capacity through the Ohio Core Program; and
- Support teacher recruitment through the Apprenticeships Supported by Partnerships for Innovation and Reform in Education.

The presentation omits information concerning principal shortages. Although the sub-headings indicate information regarding teachers and principals, the information deals exclusively with teachers. This is a weakness of an otherwise strong section.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**58**	**58**	
(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	28	28	

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

(i) The plan provides every teacher and principal with value added-data specific to his/her classroom. For subjects other than mathematics and reading and in non-tested grades the state will introduce testing using other measures of student progress including growth in literacy levels, grade gains on supplemental tests, end-of-course exams and performance-based assessments. These measures will be developed in collaboration with districts, charter schools, teacher unions and state administrator's associations. This is a very clear approach to putting appropriate data into the hands of principals and teachers to improve instruction for each individual student in his/her school or classroom.

(ii) & (iii) The state has set forth three important targets for designing a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation for both teachers and principals. These targets are:

- Implement and scale the measures of student growth to principals and individual teachers;
- Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals; and
- Increase the reliability of the model evaluation systems through training and credentialing evaluators

The influence of House Bill 1 (HB1) in this instance can not be overestimated. It requires the State Board of Education to adopt credible, comprehensive evaluation models for teachers and principals that include multiple measures of effectiveness including a method for measuring student growth. As a result, the state has developed an effective means of evaluating both teachers and principals after input by both groups. This includes annual evaluations of teachers and principals of which 50% of the evaluation is based upon student performance and the other 50% consisting of demonstrated knowledge and skills. In regard to principals, formative feedback is provided twice a year from supervisors who provide timely and constructive feedback supporting their development. Data is planned to be collected and publicly reported on baseline data yearly that includes effectiveness ratings.

Teacher evaluations will be based on student growth and multiple measures in evaluations with timely feedback to assist new and under performing teachers. This evaluation rates teachers as ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, accomplished/highly effective and distinguished. The state will implement a software system for teacher and principal evaluation to inform decisions about continued employment, dismissal, promotion, tenure and compensation. A separate set of requirements deals with new teachers who are required to be rated as proficient/effective or above by year four of their employment for continuing to teach.

(iv) The plan provides information regarding using the evaluation data to inform their decisions for (1) supporting and developing teachers and principals, (2) removing ineffective principals and teachers and ineffective non-tenured and tenured teachers, (3) implementing a newly legislated teacher licensure system that includes student growth and (4) compensating, promoting and retaining effective educators.

This is another strong presentation. One of the reasons behind this is the foundation that Ohio has laid in advance that places them in an excellent position to implement this plan with RTTT funding. Already in effect is a four tiered licensure system for teachers based upon multiple measures of student growth, a four year residency program for new teachers with a tenure review period extending to seven years that is standards based. This foundation also includes the creation of an Education Standards Board responsible for a comprehensive review process that will be rolled out statewide, a yearly principal evaluation system with multiple rating categories incorporating student growth now in effect for 140 schools, and the development of a model teacher evaluation system requiring yearly evaluations using student growth as a significant factor.

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

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

(i) & (ii) Ohio has a credible plan and innovative practices that are targeted toward ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers and principals to high-poverty or high-minority schools. The Ohio Teacher Equity Plan drives much of this effort as does the Office of Educator Equity which is used for developing a tool for districts to conduct their own school-by-school analysis of teacher distribution. Ohio's plan includes the following elements:

1. Establish programs to increase the supply of effective teachers and principals through three targeted programs: Teach Ohio, Woodrow Wilson Foundation STEM Teacher Fellowship Program and the Turnaround Principal and Teacher Leader Programs;

2. Implement effective practices for recruiting, hiring and strategically placing effective educators;

3. Improve teaching and learning conditions in high-minority and high-poverty Schools;

4. Provide intensive and differentiated high quality mentoring and induction support to new teachers in low-achieving schools; and

5. Refine the state's monitoring system to determine the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals annually.

This plan will have the effect of increasing the knowledge of what is actually needed in the distribution of teachers and increasing the overall pool of effective and highly effective teachers and principals whose work can boost student achievement especially for under achieving students and in high need subjects while building district capacity to effectively recruit, match and place teachers and principals according to their preparation, knowledge and skill set to meet student needs in hard-to-staff schools and subject areas. This is a strong plan that lays out a reasonable and workable approach. Most important to this approach is the recognition that teaching and learning conditions play a critical role in attracting teachers to a school and what happens to learning in a school. Addressing that is a major step forward.

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

(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

(i) & (ii) The state presents a credible plan for improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs. Elements of this plan include:

- Enhancing licensure rules and align program standards for teacher and principal preparation programs.
- Linking evidence of teacher and principal effectiveness as reflected by specific metrics that include measures of student growth, to preparation programs in Ohio and annually and publicly report these data.
- Developing and implementing a rigorous process of review and approval of teacher and principal preparation programs. Use this process to ensure the improvement or removal of ineffective programs.
- Expanding preparation options and programs at higher education institutions that are consistently producing effective teachers and principals.
- Utilizing annual review of the unit and program data to incentivize expansion of preparation programs at higher education institutions (private and public) that consistently produce effective teachers and principals.

This plan provides an avenue to increase teacher and principal development and effectiveness. The expansion of effective programs that prepare teachers and principals is a particularly important move, since it will have the effect in increasing the supply of effective teachers and principals. This program recognizes that urban teaching is different than non-urban and provides effective steps to create urban educators who are prepared to deal with students with special needs. Likewise, the emphasis on promoting content areas with an undersupply of teachers is critical to meeting state teacher shortages while monitoring these programs is necessary for quality assurance over time.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**20**	**20**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	10	10	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	10	10	

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

(i) & (ii) Ohio's plan provides for effective support of teachers and principals in several areas. Much of this has been presented previously, especially in the area of professional development targeted toward improving instruction and enhancing the skills of principals and teachers. Their plan adds superintendents to the mix and continues by addressing beginning teachers and principals and core curriculum and assessment support. The plan sets goals to provide regional professional development coaches, quality leadership, support for career technical teachers and a credentialing system for professional development.

Most important to this plan is the training of teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction. This gives these professionals timely tools to meet the demands of designing effective instruction. Principals will have a strong instrument to design professional development programs for individual teachers as well as overall staff needs. Support for teachers and principals, new and veteran, gives recognition to the fact that all teachers must be provided with the tools to ensure a successful professional career. The inclusion of a common planning and collaboration time recognizes the need for teachers to form professional learning communities, a major step forward in improving instruction and providing the teamwork necessary for successful schools, principals and teachers.

Two hundred and fifty school districts are currently receiving Poverty Based Assistance (PBA) and are required to submit annually their comprehensive professional development plans and activities to the Ohio Standards for Professional Development for approval. Unapproved plans may not spend dollars allocated for this purpose under PBA. This lays a strong foundation for the system designed for the RTTT grant. While the proposal includes students in urban schools, the emphasis on rural schools through the Appalachian Collaborative is evidenced of the state's concern for reaching out to other needy school districts. The elements in this plan, including specifying the activities, a timeline and the parties responsible, presents a strong picture of an effective program to provide effective support to teachers and principals.

Total	138	135	135	

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 applicant has identified the legal, statutory and regulatory framework for intervening directly in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts. This authority is found in both the Ohio Revised Code (ORC), Section 3302.041 which establishes Ohio's Model of Differentiated Accountability and ORC 3302.10, which establishes Academic Distress Commissions.

(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)

(i) Ohio's plan will identify and report on Ohio's lowest achieving schools and significantly improve student performance. These goals seek the decrease in graduation rates by 50% between minority and white students in 34 of the lowest performing schools and closing the performance gap between minority and white students by 50% in 68 of the lowest performing schools. In moving toward these targets by the end of 2014, the state has identified these lowest performing schools by taking into account the schools current performance in reading and mathematics and the schools progress in reading and mathematics over a five year period. These schools consist of the lowest 5% of Title 1 schools and Title 1 eligible secondary schools. It also includes a less than 60% graduation rate for high schools. The state has provided a list of the 68 lowest achieving schools for school year 2009-2010. Ohio points to several initiatives (Ohio High School Transformation Initiative, Ohio Early College High Schools and Schools of Promise) and their success in improving graduation rates and academic improvement as evidence of their ability to successfully turnaround schools.

(ii) The strategy/plan for turning around schools includes the direct targeting of resources to these schools, providing technical assistance and interventions. To accomplish this major task, reorganization has taken place at the Ohio Department of Education in creating a new Office of Transforming Schools to manage the process. The Ohio Network for Education Transformation (ONET), provides links with non-profits with successful turnaround efforts in the past. The plan provides information regarding six non-profit agencies and institutes of higher education that are allied with this group as a result of past successes. Support includes that of the Governor's Office, local education organizations and business partners directly involved in ONET. This organization will provide support through sharing research on low performing schools and supporting turnaround work by staff in low-achieving schools. The narrative provides successful charter

school turnaround models as a means of tying LEAs and charter schools together. The addition of a future Early Warning System for schools-at-risk for all K-12 schools is a positive step forward to ensure that schools do not get overlooked. Ohio identifies 10 schools selecting the Turnaround Model, 51 utilizing the Transformation Model and 5 School Closures. Twelve schools have not selected a model. This is a very comprehensive rendering of their efforts to turn around schools, 113 of which are targeted by the end of school year 2013-2014. The organization of support for this effort is exceptional and quite inclusive.

Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

(i) Ohio's budget for education for FY 2009 was $11.4 billion. The FY 2008 budget was $11.0 billion. This represents a 2.1% increase of the total statewide revenue dedicated to education.

(ii) The Equity-Based Model is a recent change from the Poverty-Based Assistance and Parity Aid used in the past and relies more heavily on the cost of education for a district as opposed to the wealth of a district. The policy, described as a legislative change under HB1, is consistent with the need for additional assistance to high-need school districts and provides a more equitable distribution of funds. This change and prior actions reflect the need for equitable funding between schools within a district as required by Ohio's Operating Standards.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**28**	**28**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	4	4	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	6	6	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	2	2	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	

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

(i) Ohio has a cap (the exact cap is not specified) for on-line charter schools. There is no cap on new charter schools that can open in low-performing school districts or in Ohio's eight urban districts. There is no cap on conversion charter schools. It is not clear if the narrative is referring to conversion charter schools when it says: "Currently, there are 29 bricks-and-mortar charter schools and 27 online charter schools. Collectively, these schools represent 9% of all public schools and 5% of all public school students." This requires an explanation. It is clear from the narrative that the law (although no law is presented in the Appendix) permits new start-up and conversion charter schools and does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of bricks-and-mortar charter schools in identified regions and districts. However, the narrative is confusing in seeming to limit new charters to the 8 large urban districts

and schools that are identified as Academic Emergency or Watch schools. The types of charter schools have been omitted from the narrative.

(ii) The state does have a process in place for authorizers to approve new charter schools. The continuation of charter schools is based principally upon student achievement. Guidelines are in place for elementary and secondary renewal and termination. Authority is given to the ODE for revocation of a sponsoring organization's approval of a charter school. Thus, although school authorizers may approve a charter, the state may not approve a sponsor who has not met with success in operating charter schools. Additional information surrounding this law and its operation, especially when it comes to monitoring the programs, turnaround efforts and closings is required for a more complete understanding by the reviewer.

(iii) Charter schools receive equitable funding commensurate with that of traditional public schools.

(iv) There is no evidence that the state provides charter schools with funding for facilities. State law does govern access to existing facilities. No state-level facility requirements are imposed on charter schools. These facilities are locally approved through the zoning, health and fire departments. Facilities approval would seem to be more appropriate if done by the State Education Department. It is not clear if the approval takes into consideration state requirements for school facilities rather than local code requirements for building in general.

(v) Examples of innovative schools (e.g. Early College High School, STEM) are offered in response to this section. Of these schools, the STEM schools are indicated as being autonomous. The information provided here states that STEM schools have the authority to define their instructional models and associated curriculum. In addition, the STEM governing bodies have the authority to hire administrative officers, teachers and other personnel. Providing the statutory minimums are met in terms of length of the school year, these schools have the discretion to define their school day and year as well as control their budget.

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

The state presentation has indicated that Ohio has placed a cap on E-Charter Schools. New charters schools may open in other areas of the state than the 8 urban school districts.

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

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

Ohio has provided considerable evidence of establishing reform conditions throughout this proposal, many of which originated within the last decade and with the passage of HB1. HB1 has been instrumental in accelerating the pace of building a P-20 system, development of a state technology plan, implementing college readiness exams statewide, turning around low achieving schools developing data systems and providing more rigorous graduation requirements. Other reform measures during the last decade include a teacher and principal development support and accountability system and a public and private collaborative approach to STEM education. Most important has been the effort to involve stakeholders in the process of reform and the drawing together of organizations in support of the education reform agenda.

Total	55	43	43	

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)

Throughout this application, Ohio has presented credible evidence of the state's involvement in STEM and its inclusion in curriculum. Among the goals of this section is an emphasis on increasing the number of students from under represented populations with STEM majors in college and providing for a STEM emphasis in turnaround schools. Ohio has a history of promoting the development of STEM schools/programs that are inquiry-based with applied learning opportunities. The proposal shows an alignment of STEM with the major RTTT goals and blends current funding with that of the grant. The collaboration with other groups within the state that are STEM-oriented is a positive indication of support for the future leading to the implementation of future STEM schools and programs.

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)

This proposal is a remarkably complete presentation of the state's reform plan under Race to the Top. It provides ample evidence of a successful plan leading to an increase in student achievement. There are multiple reasons for this:

1. A history of implementing reform that is progressive in nature;
2. A strong SLDS in place that will be expanded;
3. The development of a strong support system for educators;
4. The use of value-added assessments rather than academic scores coupled with a plan for achievement for each student;
5. Partnerships for the infusion of STEM;
6. A strong reliance on research to inform decisions;
7. Engagement of partnerships and most importantly IHE teacher preparation institutions;
8. A system of support for new principals and teachers;
9. Professional development initiatives designed to increase teacher strengths;
10. Reaching out to a diverse group of learners including students with disabilities, ELL, student in poverty, rural and urban students and students in low-achieving schools;
11. Provisions for evidence-based practices;
12. Innovative programs to fill hard-to-staff subject areas;
13. Recognition that teaching and learning conditions are an important component to instruction;
14. Reliance on proven educational models; and
15. A concern for fiscal responsibility and the sustainability of these efforts beyond the grant period.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	457	476	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #3800OH-7

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**	**53**	**53**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	39	39	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	9	9	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range with (A)(1)(iii) rated in the medium range.

The application lays out a comprehensive reform agenda that is clearly aligned with ARRA's four education areas and includes a set of goals for improving student outcomes related to achievement, closing achievement gaps, raising high school graduation and college attendance rates, and increasing the number of Ohioans prepared to work in new technologies and industries Ohio sees in its future. It is helpful that Ohio's own new education reform statute (House Bill 1) complements the ARRA areas. The path to achieving the goals is coherently presented in the sections of the application, i.e., Standards & Assessments, Data Systems to Support Instruction, Great Teachers and Leaders, and Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools, and the 15 specific project plans. Ohio's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) reflects the language in the U.S. Department of Education (ED) model and signals strong commitments by participating local educational agencies (LEAs); it is noteworthy that only LEAs and charter schools that provided all three signatures (if applicable) were allowed to become participating LEAs. The provisions in the scope of work are very detailed as to what LEAs are expected to do. Ohio did receive only conditional agreement from a large number of LEAs related to several requirements regarding new teacher evaluation systems and how those evaluations would be used. This could lead to some LEAs dropping out because it is clear that participating LEAs must take part in every aspect of the RTTT work. Mitigating this possibility is MOU language that parties will work collaboratively on any RTTT activities not congruent with current collective bargaining agreements and Ohio's evidence of successful past collaborative efforts. Broad participation of LEAs (n=536), serving 66% of the state's economically disadvantaged students, 73% of all Hispanic students, and 81% of African American students is sufficient to have broad statewide impact. While the goals for high school graduation are ambitious (i.e., 88 percent by the end of the grant period), it appears that goals related to student achievement and closing gaps are fairly minimal, given the recent trends in rates of improvement documented in the application on both the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state assessments. In addition, the expected increase in the number of minority students enrolling in college appears to be quite modest as does the goal of increasing overall enrollment in college to 14.5 percent by the end of the grant period.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**25**	**28**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15	18	

(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range.

Ohio has assembled a strong team to implement the proposed reforms that consists of State Educational Agency (SEA) offices and staff, its 56 Education Service Centers and a large number of external partners. Its Business Coalition brings expertise in such areas as managing change, coaching, and effective management principles to bear on changing school cultures and operations. This effort has strong support from the state government, as well as from education associations across the State, teacher and parent groups, and business and community organizations. The application provides evidence of Ohio's ability to administer the proposed work, including the functions of financial management, monitoring and performance measure tracking. Ohio has proposed a robust set of supports for its participating LEAs, using its Education Service Centers as well as six Resource Teams created especially for RTTT work. In addition, Ohio proposes to set up communication links among the participating LEAs to share promising practices and to help each other problem solve. Where the plan is weak is in regard to how Ohio will support replication of practices statewide and what actions it will undertake when performance benchmarks are not met.

The application includes references to funding sources other than RTTT funds that will be coordinated as appropriate, including a number of Federal programs. Ohio's plan for continuing reforms after the RTTT funding period has a serious weakness. Much of the support provided to LEAs in the RTTT application is delivered by outside contractors and the application does not credibly address how the capacity of the SEA or participating LEAs (that may become assistance providers in the second wave of reform) will be built. On a more positive note, a number of the proposed RTTT projects will fund development that is a non-recurring cost and Ohio has been able to secure State support to continue pilot efforts in the past.

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

The presentation clarified activities within the RTTT plan to use promising practices as models and enlist participation from Education Service Centers and other technical assistance organizations, as well as local educators, to replicate such practices statewide. Clarification was also provided regarding how contractors will be building the capacity of Ohio's regular support networks to continue support services.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**15**	**25**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	10	20	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the medium range with (A)(3)(i) rated in the strong range.

Generally speaking, Ohio has made substantial progress in each of the reform areas based on evidence presented, with more progress expected in light of the passage of HB 1, a major reform bill. Ohio's standards have been updated over time and now higher education has adopted college readiness standards aligned with those of K-12 at the same time that high school graduation standards have been raised. Ohio's data system is quite robust, meeting 9 of the 10 Data Quality Campaign elements. For example, student achievement and growth data are subject to analyses designed to provide actionable information to schools and teachers. Recognizing in its application that teacher retention is an important issue for improving teacher effectiveness, Ohio has a very strong induction program. It also has performance-related standards for teachers and principals that are a good starting place for standards that

will include student performance as a criterion. Previous pilot programs to transform schools (particularly high schools) provide road maps for elements in the RTTT application.

The application provides information on past performance of students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and statewide assessments, as well as graduation rates. While there were improvements in the past, it appears that recently both performance on statewide assessments as well graduation rates have stalled. NAEP results, especially for 8th graders, are likewise not improving. The performance of minority students continues to be very low. The application does not provide an explanation for the recent results, including what supports to LEAs have been operating. Without such an explanation, it is difficult to assess to what extent supports proposed in the RTTT application are likely to result in improved student performance.

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

The presentation clarified the nature of current efforts related to improving student achievement and pointed out that the RTTT plan is putting additional emphasis on the need to scale up promising practices and Ohio's new strong focus on closing achievement gaps that are expected to produce higher student achievement results.

Total	125	93	106	

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 quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range.

Ohio presented evidence of its membership in the National Governors Association(NGA)-Council of the Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) led consortium of states developing Common Core standards that are to be internationally-benchmarked and reflective of readiness for college or career. It is noteworthy also that Ohio is using these standards and their development process as a template for working on its own science and social studies standards. Fifty-one states and territories are participating in the Common Core effort. Evidence is also presented that Ohio's State Board of Education will adopt these standards in June 2010.

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

Evidence was presented in an amendment of Ohio's adoption of the Common Core standards on June 7, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range.

Ohio is working on the development of common high-quality assessments aligned with the common K-12 standards. The application included evidence of membership in two multi-state consortia formed for this purpose: the SMARTER Balanced Consortium under the leadership of West Ed that has 33 participating states, and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers led by Achieve, Inc that has 26 participating states. Ohio is serving on the Assessment Design Committees of each. Both consortia intend to develop summative and formative tests to provide data to teachers on achievement and actual growth, as well as projected growth.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**15**	**15**	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the lower portion of the strong range. The application contains a plan for implementing the new standards that will use existing networks for dissemination (e.g., 56 Education Service Centers able to assist with curricular alignment and professional development; 16 regional support networks that can provide coaching and professional development related to the standards). Also included in the plan are efforts to develop a variety of tools and materials related to assessment, lesson plans, and educational resources. The plan proposes to identify field-based practices vetted through a peer review process that could be of high interest and value to teachers. In addition to in-person support, a set of 56 online professional development modules will make training related to implementation of the standards and assessments available on-demand and result in cost savings in the rollout effort over time.

There are several questions and/or concerns regarding the application's approach. Although the rollout of standards begins in year one, some of the planned activities to support that rollout (e.g., the online professional development as well as the instructional improvement system cited as a major delivery vehicle of support) are not scheduled to occur until year 3 or 4 . The application refers to the customization of professional development related to instructional practices but the application fails to present a persuasive need for customization given Ohio's statewide adoption of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards. Finally, higher education's role in aligning high school exit criteria with college entrance requirements appears to be under-emphasized in the plan.

Total	70	65	65	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**	**16**	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the medium range.

The application states that Ohio's current longitudinal data system includes 10 of the 12 America COMPETES Act elements. However, the evidence indicated that, for element #9 about student transcript information, Ohio will not include data on course grades earned until 2011-2012. In addition, the application described upcoming work under RTTT to link K-12 and higher education data systems; it

appears unlikely, then, that element #11 about documenting transitions from high school to postsecondary education can be in place. Therefore, only points for 8 of the 12 elements were awarded.

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

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range.

Ohio's plan for accessing and using State data by key stakeholders pays attention to the array of potential customers, including teachers, principals, district administrators, higher education, parents and the community. A strength lies in the creation of a stakeholder committee to advise. The plan to create a series of web portals for specific constituent groups has the potential of increasing the use of the statewide longitudinal data system and improving its transparency. The plan for the use of data by teachers, in particular, is very strong as is the commitment to ensure that all teachers receive value-added reports by the end of the RTTT grant to be used in their instructional planning as well as in parent-teacher conferencing. The activity to ensure that student reports are provided in home languages reflects well on an understanding of the needs of language minority families. The plan also reflects a commitment to provide districts, especially those in turnaround school situations, with data that can be used in decisionmaking. In generating fiscal benchmark reports, school districts will have information to improve areas of operations and resource allocation.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**12**	**12**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4	4	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3	3	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5	5	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the lower portion of the strong range with (C)(3)(ii) rated in the medium range.

The application provides a definition of instructional improvement system that conforms to the RTTT definition. Ohio is working with Florida to identify best practices related to such systems as well as professional development related to them. Performance measure goals for access to instructional improvement systems by participating teachers and schools are impressively ambitious (i.e., 90% of teachers by 2014). Given the goal of implementing such systems statewide, the plan provides inadequate funding. The plan includes professional development activities for teachers and administrators related to the implementation of the instructional improvement system; however, some activities, such as having Columbus OH teachers conduct training, may not be a feasible mechanism. It is not clear whether the plan has devoted sufficient resources to in-person professional development. However that deficiency is mitigated by the plan to provide significant on-line professional development with an example being 56 professional development modules (one per grade per subject area) that combine content and formative assessment training for teachers. Improving teachers' ability to use formative assessment to differentiate instruction will contribute to improving teaching and learning. Finally, using the to-be-created Education Research Center as the contact point for access to data by researchers may be beneficial as long as research is not limited to the Center's own agenda; such limitations are incongruent with the language of the RTTT criterion regarding access to data. As long as this does not occur researchers will have the basic data needed regarding students, teachers, instruction, and performance to conduct research around questions of what are effective approaches and curricular materials for helping different subgroups of students achieve academic success.

Total	47	33	33	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**13**	**13**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6	6	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3	3	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4	4	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the medium range with (D)(1)(i) rated in the strong range. The application includes descriptions of the following four alternative certification programs (three for teachers and one for principals): Alternative Educator License, Alternative Principal License, Provisional STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) License and Route 3 Career-Technical Licensure Pathway. These programs embody the following features that are included in the RTTT definition of alternative certification: (1) provided by a variety of providers, (2) selective in admissions, (3) provide supervised school-based experiences and continuing support, (4) limited coursework, and (5) able to award the same licensure as traditional preparation programs. The application includes statistics on the use of alternative pathways; it does not appear that much use is made of these except in the case of certifying career technical education teachers.

It appears that Ohio does have a process for monitoring areas of staff shortages (e.g., Ohio Teacher Supply & Demand Report), as well as a web-based system to match applicants with LEA vacancies. Various incentives (e.g., extra pay, loan forgiveness) will be offered to fill critical teacher shortage areas, but the application fails to provide evidence as to past or probable success of this approach in addressing shortages. In addition, the application does not appear to offer evidence about filling principal shortages.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**52**	**52**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3	3	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	25	25	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range with (D)(2)(i) rated in the medium range.

Although there is a statement of Ohio's intention to measure student growth backed up by a HB 1 requirement to the State Board of Education; it is unclear what resources are being devoted to this effort

and how growth can be measured for those grade levels and courses for which there is no state testing. Ohio has provided evidence of the use of student growth in several pilot efforts in the state, including the work of the Battelle for Kids organization that has been working with a small number of Ohio LEAs to validate and use student growth metrics for teachers. This prior activity is the starting point for an RTTT project to design an evaluation system for teachers that features multiple rating categories and uses student growth as a significant factor. The current model Principal Evaluation System that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories and requires annual evaluations that include measures of student growth as a significant factor will also provide a useful template for the new teacher evaluation system. It is important that the pilot efforts referred to previously did have significant involvement by teachers and principals, and that this collaboration will continue in the larger effort. A weakness in the discussion of the design of the teacher evaluation system is a lack of specificity on how important the measure of student growth is expected to be. There is also the issue of the large number of participating LEAs that indicated conditional approval of such an evaluation system and its use in their MOUs.

The Principal Evaluation System (mentioned previously) provides formative (at least twice annually) and summative feedback from the direct supervisor. The Teacher Evaluation Process will be developed using this model. The system is designed to provide feedback on student growth, as well as additional feedback to foster continuous improvement in performance.

There is evidence of a quality plan to use the evaluation system to inform decisions related to retention, compensation, career advancement, and targeted professional development to address performance weaknesses in a state model to be developed. Here again, though, participating LEAs may develop their own forms of assistance, raising issues of quality and comparability. Ohio's HB 1 reform law reflects the type of evaluation system required under RTTT as well as most of the decisions to be informed by its implementation, with the exception being decisions regarding compensation. Having this statute strengthens the proposed plan and its sustainability.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**20**	**20**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	13	13	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7	7	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the lower end of the strong range with (D)(3)(ii) rated in the medium range.

Ohio's previous work to address the question of equitable distribution has been to almost eliminate differences in the percentage of highly qualified (as defined under NCLB) teachers in high poverty schools compared with other schools. Ohio now plans to focus on equitable distribution of highly effective teachers and principals. The application includes a plan to collect data on teacher effectiveness and require LEAs showing an imbalance in teachers' placements to develop a plan (to be approved by the state) to address the equity issue. A weakness in this provision is the overly long timeline allowed (i.e., six months) to develop the plan. Another weakness is the lack of ambitious goals to eliminate equity issues. The performance measure goal of having 25% of teachers and principals highly effective is only a small increase from the estimated current situation. The more impressive goal is to reduce the percentage of ineffective educators to less than five percent. Through a combination of special programs to recruit effective teachers for hard-to-staff subjects, the provision of high quality mentoring and induction programs in low-achieving schools and the development of effective leaders who are placed in challenging schools, the plan adequately addresses the challenge of ensuring that high-poverty, high-minority schools have a teaching force as effective as other schools. Ohio's attention to the need to improve poor teaching and learning conditions in high-minority and high-poverty schools and its intention to conduct related annual

surveys and follow up with indicated assistance can contribute positively to establishing school conditions more likely to attract and retain highly effective teachers and principals

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4	4	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	5	5	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the higher portion of the medium range with (D)(4)(ii) rated in the strong range.

Ohio's plan includes a small project related to linking data on teacher and principal effectiveness back to the institutions that provided the training and using those results to expand the more successful programs. Of concern is the weight that will be given to effectiveness data in assessing the preparation programs and this level of detail is missing in the application. The annual Teacher Education Report Card, issued by the State, will publicly report teacher and principal effectiveness data and link these data to teacher and principal preparation programs; the State website will include aggregate effectiveness ratings of graduates from Ohio programs and institutions. Ohio's mechanisms for disseminating this type of information will help focus public attention on the effectiveness of current preparation programs.

The expansion effort appears to be limited to a funding mechanism that will provide additional support to more effective programs and withdraw funding from those documented as less effective.
Specific information regarding the expected results of such an approach are lacking. In addition to this strategy of increasing funding to programs deemed more effective, the assessment of preparation programs using student achievement as an indicator of success will cause positive changes in the perspective of preparation programs and make them more accountable for the outcomes of the K-12 educational system.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**15**	**17**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	8	10	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7	7	

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

The overall quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the higher portion of the medium range with (D)(5)(i) rated in the strong range. The plan to provide high quality professional development and coaching to teachers and principals in the participating LEAs is comprehensive and has the benefit of prior successful experience with a number of pilot programs (e.g., Peer Assistance and Review, Harvard's ExEL initiative). HB1's establishment of a career ladder for teachers willing to assume additional responsibilities should contribute to improvements in job-embedded assistance (including induction) and increases in school-based collaborative efforts to improve performance. Ohio's intention to identify and share national models and proven practices to its LEAs to inform their professional development efforts appears to be a useful contribution. The major weakness of this criterion is the degree to which Ohio is depending on its LEAs to implement effective, data-informed professional development; its own activity appears to be limited to placing a regional professional development coach in the 16 regional education service centers and this approach may not yield improvement over current efforts. The other weakness is that efforts to evaluate the professional development supports appear to be confined to the 20 rural LEAs in the Appalachia

Collaborative which, while informative, will not alone provide findings that are helpful to continuously improve those supports across the State. Other LEAs have reporting requirements related to the delivery of professional development but the plan does not address how or whether these reports will be analyzed and used to support improvement efforts.

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

The presentation clarified that the State's involvement in providing effective support through professional development to teachers and principals is significant through the use of electronic resources, as well as the services of its Education Service Centers and in partnerships with institutions of higher education. This addresses the possible weakness of relying almost solely on LEAs themselves to implement effective, data-informed professional development.

Total	138	109	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)

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range. Evidence is presented documenting Ohio's authority to intervene directly and require corrective actions under its approved Model of Differentiated Accountability. That authority applies to both districts and schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**30**	**35**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25	30	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the lower portion of the strong range with (E)(2)(ii) rated in the upper portion of the medium range.

Ohio has identified its persistently low performing Title 1 or Title 1 eligible secondary schools using approved criteria for a total of 68 schools that will be involved in the Turn Around component of the RTTT grant. Because the application lacks an explanation of the method for identifying the five percent of schools deemed to be persistently low performing, it is not possible to evaluate whether the total number of 68 schools actually represents five percent.

Evidence is presented regarding the use of all four of the school intervention models referenced in the RTTT grant announcement, although transformation is the most dominant one. The proposed plan has a number of notable strengths. The plan includes the creation of an Office of Transforming Schools in the SEA that will have ongoing contacts with these schools and will help connect the schools to resources. The Office will bring necessary attention to the Turn Around effort and will coordinate the work of a number of other SEA offices having responsibility. The plan draws upon some pilot programs for the restructuring of schools that have proven to be successful (e.g., Early College High School, Elementary Schools of Promise) in terms of increased student achievement as well as reducing achievement gaps. The plan's recognition of the importance of the student motivation factor is noteworthy. In addition to the work with the 68 schools, Ohio has proposed an Early Warning System using its longitudinal data system to identify and intervene in schools before conditions worsen. In general, the plan relies on schools securing assistance from external providers and Ohio is planning to spend a significant amount of RTTT dollars on

contracts for services. It also includes an activity to create a pipeline of principals who will be turnaround specialists. Having district Transformation Teams to provide oversight will helpfully supplement the state's monitoring and accountability processes. There is an initiative on building LEAs' capacity to support and sustain school turnaround for some rural districts but the majority of turnaround schools are located in urban centers and this is a deficiency in terms of Ohio's support of its LEAs. The major weakness of relying so heavily on contracted services relates to the issue of being able to sustain the infrastructure to assist persistently low performing schools after the RTTT grant ends. Although Ohio's plan discusses the development of model schools that others might wish to replicate, the plan does not address how such an effort could be supported. Finally, the discussion of past reform efforts only appears to include previously successful ones; since it is possible that some efforts have been less than successful, it would be useful to have information on what those efforts were and what lessons were learned from them as well.

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

The presentation helped to highlight services the RTTT plan will be providing to urban districts to support the turn around initiative. It also clarified, as noted in section A3, how contractors working on RTTT will be engaged in building the capacity of others within Ohio's support networks to carry on the assistance work.

Total	50	40	45	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range. Evidence is provided that both the amount and percentage of funds available for education increased from FY2008 to FY2009. Current State policies support equitable funding between high-need LEAs and others, as well as between high-poverty schools and others within an LEA. As an example of specifically designated funding sources, Ohio's use of an Education Challenge Factor to determine state funding allotments to LEAs as well as a number of revenue supplements to help equalize funding results in high poverty schools receiving more per pupil funding than other schools.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**30**	**36**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4	4	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	2	8	

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the lower portion of the strong range with (F)(2)(iv) rated in the medium range and (F)(2)(v) rated in the low range.

Ohio's charter school law places no limits on the number of such schools (known as community schools) and there are currently 322 of them; while there is a limit on the number of virtual schools, that number is not provided in the application and does not appear to effectively inhibit increasing the number of charter schools. Evidence is presented regarding the strength of state oversight of schools as well as the closure of schools in the past. Charter schools have sponsors and these entities are overseen by the state to ensure that sponsors exercise proper oversight (e.g., monitoring performance and operations, reauthorizing the schools periodically using student achievement as a key factor in that determination); all accountability provisions required of LEAs are also required of charter schools. Only sponsors with evidence of success can open new charter schools. There are statutory requirements that a charter school must explain how its student population will reflect that of the community it serves. Charter schools are considered to be LEAs and receive comparable shares of state as well as relevant federal funding, including supplemental funding based on special student categories (e.g., special education, economically disadvantaged). Charter schools do not share in traditional school district bond or mill levies and are not provided funding for facilities, although charter schools receive priority for the use of unused LEA facilities. Ohio does not impose the same facility requirements on charter schools that it does on regular public schools. It is unclear whether LEAs have the discretion to operate innovative, autonomous public schools where flexibility is provided in exchange for accountability for results. The alternatives described appear to be part of the regular educational program, not housed in autonomous schools.

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

The presentation clarified provisions for accountability that innovative, autonomous public schools are subject to based on State laws and policies as well as, in some instances, district policy. With that clarification it is clear that LEAs have the discretion to operate such schools and are actually doing so.

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

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

The quality of the response to this criterion is rated in the strong range.

The application provides evidence of other conditions contributing to education reform. A notable example is the implementation of several innovative high school programs that have increased graduation rates, particularly for at-risk students. Another is Ohio's investment in early childhood education, reflective of its P -20 system approach. Efforts to provide high-performing districts with fiscal flexibility is an example of a powerful incentive. Finally, reaching out to the business and philanthropic communities to help realize Ohio's Third Frontier Initiative that sees quality education as a critical component to establishing Ohio in the forefront of new, technology-based industries appears to be a strong policy statement supporting innovation and reform.

Total	55	44	50	

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's RTTT proposal addresses the competitive preference priority emphasizing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics with respect to all four component areas and merits the priority points. Ohio has put a heavy, and commendable, emphasis on career technical training; it is considered in efforts to ensure effective teachers and in efforts to turnaround schools, especially with regard to raising graduation rates and preparing students for career and college. Ohio expects that some of the persistently low performing schools will adopt models emphasizing STEM subjects (e.g., Early College High School). Standards will be strengthened in the areas of math and science, among others. Ohio's new education reform act has raised course requirements for graduation in math and science. It is also working to expand the availability of Advanced Placement courses, particularly in schools where few courses are offered through professional development activities and staff recruitment efforts.

Ohio will continue and expand its STEM Learning Network to improve instruction in the STEM areas. In addition, there are at least two postsecondary education programs (Wilson Foundation Fellowship Program and Ohio First Scholarship Program) intended to fill hard-to-fill positions (in STEM) in hard-to-staff schools and generally increase the number of effective math and science teachers across the state. This broad array of efforts (e.g., offering more rigorous courses in the STEM subjects, preparing teachers to deliver STEM content, and preparing more students for further study and careers in STEM fields) will benefit all students in Ohio, including those currently underrepresented in STEM fields.

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 RTTT application meets the requirements of the absolute priority. The application addresses all of the four specified areas and proposes projects in each of them. Each project's description includes a list of milestones and the period of completion as well as the responsible party. Each project has a detailed budget and budget narrative that links the use of resources to the established purpose. The narrative contains information on the use of other funds as well that will contribute to the goals of increased student achievement, reduced achievement gaps, increased graduation rates, and improved performance by teachers and principals.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	399	425	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

Ohio Application #3800OH-6

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**	**65**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	15	

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

(A)(1)(i) - Prior to RttT, on July 17, 2009, Ohio's Governor signed into law HB 1, summarized in Appendix A.1.3, which contained a bipartisan comprehensive reform agenda for primary and secondary education. This vision for a student-centered 21st Century Personalized Learning Environment, contained in both HB 1 and RttT, is comprised of the following mutually supporting elements, including standards, assessments, and graduation requirements reflecting high expectations for students, engaging them in real-world applications and supporting creativity and innovation, data systems that drive decisions, inform instruction and document improvement of student success, Great teachers and leaders who work collaboratively, seek professional excellence and help all students graduate with a sense of purpose and be well equipped to thrive in a highly competitive global society, turning around low-achieving schools so that all students attend excellent schools with enhanced teaching and learning environments, partnerships that leverage community and stakeholder involvement and foster a P-20 seamless system of education in support of student achievement, STEM initiatives that provide students with high powered learning experiences and position Ohio for economic competitiveness. The state's 4-year goals are increasing high school graduation rates by 0.5% per year statewide (to roughly 88%) as measured by 3-year rolling averages translating into 600 more students graduating per year, reducing the graduation rate gaps by 50% between under-represented and majority students in RttT participating LEAs and charter schools translating into 2,900 more African American students graduating per year, reducing the performance gaps by 50% on national and state-wide assessments between underrepresented and majority students in RttT participating LEAs and charter schools translating into 24,000 more African American students in seven grade levels achieving proficiency annually in math, reducing the gap between Ohio and the best-performing states in the nation by 50% on reading and mathematics proficiency as measured by national assessments and more than doubling the increase in college enrollment of students age 19 and below from a projected 7.2% to 14.5% by fall 2013; and more than doubling the rate of increase in college persistence of such students from a projected 5.1% to 10.35%, translating into more than 4,700 more students annually enrolling in college. The Ohio reform agenda in State law is directly aligned with the four RttT assurances, and for each of these areas, Ohio has developed an integrated plan that incorporates specific, high-leverage RttT funded projects. Ohio's reform agenda, as described in HB 1, completely aligns with the proposed RttT goals, key activities, and programs. This alignment guarantees that transformation will occur in all of Ohio's schools whether they have chosen to actively participate in RttT or not. The state's application proposes 15 RttT projects, fully integrated into and aligned with the Ohio reform agenda (HB 1). These 15 projects are designed to accelerate reforms already underway in Ohio, innovate new efforts that push the boundaries of the system and achieve better results, and reinforce the infrastructure required to sustain fundamental reform. This balanced and integrated portfolio of actions will drive radical change in a compressed timeframe at the district, building, and classroom levels, thereby producing dramatic gains in student outcomes. Ohio has presented a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student

outcomes statewide, and has established a clear and credible path to achieving these goals that is consistent with the specific reform plans that the state has proposed throughout its application.

(A)(1)(ii)(a) The participating LEAs are strongly committed to the state's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that include the terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs to the state's plans. All participating districts and charter schools executed a common MOU that contains terms and conditions that strongly and unambiguously commit the districts and charter schools to full participation in the Ohio RttT plan and similarly commit ODE to vigorous, effective support of the participating districts and charter schools. There are no variations among the executed MOUs. Highlights include commitments by each district and charter school to appoint a key contact responsible for RttT implementation and communication, develop a district-wide transformation team engaging appropriate stakeholders with at least 50% being teachers, participate and openly communicate RttT coordination, planning, information, reporting and other functions, make available all non-proprietary products developed using RttT funds, together address collective bargaining agreements through the appropriate process when the RttT program differs from the existing agreement with the corresponding bargaining unit, and assume responsibility for following their local plans. The MOUs provide comprehensive and tiered State recourse for LEA non-performance or lack of progress. The MOUs contain scope-of-work descriptions that demonstrate the commitment of districts and charter schools to implement all of Ohio's RttT plans. The scope of work contains 23 elements, each directly aligned with RttT application requirements and Ohio's RttT plan, as presented in this application. Of these 23 elements, all are required of all participating LEAs.

(A)(1)(ii)(b) The MOUs provide comprehensive and tiered State recourse for LEA non-performance or lack of progress. The MOUs contain scope-of-work descriptions that demonstrate the commitment of districts and charter schools to implement all of Ohio's RttT plans. (See Appendix A.1.10 for Work Plan sample.) The scope of work contains 23 elements, each directly aligned with RttT application requirements and Ohio's RttT plan, as presented in this application. Of these 23 elements, all are required of all participating LEAs. Because Ohio believes that partnerships among the districts and charter schools' governing body, administration, and teachers is essential for successful implementation of meaningful reform, Ohio required signatures from the governing body chair, chief executive, and head of the local teachers' union (if applicable) as a condition of participation. Ohio has obtained 100% of the signatures in each category from each participating LEA.

(A)(1)(ii)(c)
Because Ohio believes that partnerships among the districts and charter schools' governing body, administration, and teachers is essential for successful implementation of meaningful reform, Ohio required signatures from the governing body chair, chief executive, and head of the local teachers' union (if applicable) as a condition of participation. Ohio has obtained 100% of the signatures in each category from each participating LEA. Ohio also provided the required signatures from LEA superintendents, the president of the local school boards, and the teachers union.

(A)(1)(iii)- Ohio and its 536 participating districts and charter schools will deliver broad state-wide impact in three ways: By improving student achievement, reducing achievement gaps, and improving graduation and college enrollment rates. By developing, validating and sharing successful practices statewide that will, over time, be adopted by non-participating districts and charter schools. By modeling the rollout of components of HB 1 which RttT helps to accelerate. The participating districts include seven of Ohio's eight largest districts and encompass 2,586 of Ohio's public schools, including 49 of 68 (72%) of Ohio's persistently low-achieving schools. Participating districts and schools serve 61.6% of Ohio's 1.8 million K-12 students. This student population also includes a significant share of Ohio's economically disadvantaged, minority, limited English proficient, and disabled student populations, including 66.3% of Ohio's students in poverty, 73% of Ohio's Hispanic and 81.5% of Ohio's African American students. Achieving our specific goals for improving achievement and reducing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading and mathematics for participating LEAs translates into significant gains for statewide metrics. For example, reducing achievement gaps by 50% between African American and Hispanic students and white students in participating districts and charter schools translates into state-wide reductions of almost 30% in these measures, even if gaps remain constant in nonparticipating districts. A 2% increase in the high school graduation rate for either Hispanic or African American students in participating districts and charter schools

yields nearly 1.4% improvement in statewide graduation rates for those populations (not including progress in non-participating districts and charter schools). Similarly, the fact that 72% of Ohio's persistently low-achieving schools are in participating districts and charter schools assures that successful achievement of Ohio's goal in this area will impact a sizeable majority of this population of schools.

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

The state presentation provided clarification on stricter MOU requirements for participating LEAs. Ohio required 3 signatures and voluntary participation resulting in 50% of participating LEAs. The State clarified that House Bill I (HB 1) defines that all LEAs will be required to carry out the goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA improving student outcomes statewide. The State established a clear and credible path to achieving these goals that is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application. There is great potential for statewide impact and successful implementation.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**26**	**30**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16	20	[redacted]
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

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

A)(2)(i) (a)- With a clear commitment from the Office of the Governor, the State Board of Education, Chancellor of the Board of Regents, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ohio presents a detailed management and implementation plan reflecting their goals, strategies for achieving them, the roles and responsibilities of participants, and budget allocations that are clearly tied to the goals. Ohio meets the criteria of providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) will house RTTT, with leadership provided through the Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, allowing for a single point of accountability. From this office an appointed RTTT Program Manager, who directly reports to the Deputy Superintendent will assist with the administration of the grant and coordinate the day to day operations, resource facilitation, and serve as a liaison to the four centers tied to assurance areas, including standards and assessments (Associate Superintendent), great teachers and Leaders (Associate Superintendent), Data Systems (Chief Information Officer), and school turn around (Associate Superintendent). By leveraging the ODE management infrastructure to support the successful implementation of RTTT, Ohio provides a positive mechanism for integrating and streamlining all of its state programs with RTTT. These offices will provide budget, reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and tracking and reporting, as well as fund disbursement. Also, the State's plan appears to provide effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant. For grant administration and oversight, the Ohio State Reform Steering Team (SRST), chaired by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and representing key stakeholders will guide the reform initiatives. The Office of Strategic Initiatives will work in concert with the ODE leadership structure to further align and coordinate RTTT, providing a linkage to other reform initiatives. In addition, six resource teams, five operating in regions and one dedicated to serve the seven largest urban centers, will provide systems of regional support. The state meets the criteria of supporting participating LEAs in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through the regional teams and centers. The teams will conduct frequent site visits, provide on-going professional development; conduct evaluations and provide feedback; and assure accountability for progress and performance, intervening where necessary. Also, the Business Coalition for Education System Improvement will provide in-kind assistance with executive coaching and will bring tools for facilitation and best practices to assist with the RTTT reforms. There is substantial evidence of stakeholder alignment as evidenced by the 222 letters of support from national, state and local educational organizations, colleges and universities, numerous for profit and non-profit organizations, and the business community. Ohio's plan include committing available human capital and financial resources (including state funds, grants, and partnerships) to implement and sustain its reform initiative, even if the RTTT grant is not awarded.

(A)(2)(i) (b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary; Ohio is committed to providing ongoing support to participating LEAs in implementing the state's reform plans. Recognizing that the RttT strategy is complex work that will stimulate difficult discussions and require difficult decisions, it is the Ohio Department of Education's (ODE's) responsibility to ensure that the participating districts and charter schools have the necessary supports and resources to be successful. Most importantly, it is the absolute duty of ODE to ensure that all participating districts and charter schools focus on and are accountable for student success as the key driver of their work. Several steps will be incorporated into this process including, building state, district and charter school capacity to engage productively in transformation through targeted professional development, coaching and technical assistance; developing a series of protocols, such as individual work plans advancing a system of continuous monitoring including an outcome -based structure to detail progress of RttT plans; disseminating effective practices that heighten student success; connecting participating districts and charter schools statewide and regionally to share, problem solve and learn from one another. Also, Ohio will establish six resource teams, to ensure essential coordination and knowledge transfer. The resource teams will be divided between the five geographical regions of the state and one resource team will be solely dedicated to the seven largest urban centers. The teams will be comprised of ODE staff, local business executives, dedicated field staff, domain experts, and other public/private partners. ODE already has an established network of field representatives who assist school districts and charter schools with fiscal matters as well as state support teams which assist with the Ohio improvement process. These systems of regional support are highly valued by school districts and will serve as a strong prototype for the RttT resource teams. Ohio's Education Service Centers will receive resources to increase the support they provide to LEAs. These centers currently provide outreach, advocacy, and assistance to LEAs across the state. This existing network further underscores Ohio's strong framework to sustain large scale reform initiatives. RttT funds enable a strategic focus on the projects outlined in this proposal, and will provide targeted assistance to districts and charter schools in determining how their RttT funds can best be leveraged to accomplish district and regional reform and innovation. Letters of support for RttT have been received from the Ohio Education Service Center Association and 37 Education Service Centers, who all stand ready to partner in the implementation of RttT reforms. All participating districts and charter schools are committed to supporting a RttT liaison, who will be responsible for the execution of the local plan and to facilitate collaboration with other districts and charter schools. Districts and charter schools will develop a district/school-wide transformation team to oversee the RttT strategy. This team must have, at a minimum, an equal number of teachers and administrators, with teacher members appointed by the teachers' union. Teams are responsible for developing local implementation strategies including the final scope of work. The Business Coalition for Education System Improvement is a unique support for district and school leaders to help them manage challenging reform elements; employ state of the art business practices that have applicability in public education; and hone their communication, negotiation and change management skills.

(A)(2)(i) (c) Ohio's existing grant administration platforms incorporate its proven infrastructure for administration of grants to districts and charter schools, including the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP), a tool empowering school districts to manage RttT grants in conjunction with other reform efforts and funds, such as Title I, and providing transparent capabilities for performance and financial reporting fully integrated with ODE. Articulated goals, activities, and four-year budgets will exist for every participating district and charter school, through the Local Work Plan, and will provide an essential mechanism for monitoring progress and adjusting strategies as results unfold. ODE has developed guidelines, work plans and timelines specific to RttT so that districts and charter schools are fully aware of expectations and requirements. Because the CCIP is already fully integrated into all of Ohio's LEAs, there will not be any transition time required for participating districts and charter schools in the budgeting and reporting of RttR funds. ODE has existing centers that are already aligned to the work of the four RttT assurance areas, the structures and processes for effective and efficient implementation are in place and will be leveraged in the execution of this plan. Domain expertise is resident within the organization and with established partners, performance-driven relationships exist with the field, and the means of communication

and coordinating with partners are well established. Letters of support for RttT have been received from the Ohio Education Service Center Association and 37 Education Service Centers, who all stand ready to partner in the implementation of RttT reforms.

(A)(2)(i) (d) Ohio's request is for RttT funding for 15 high-leverage projects to be directly aligned and fully integrated with Ohio's student success agenda and the RttT priorities. Ohio's approach for development of the proposed RttT budget is based on a set of principles, designed to give the greatest possible assurance that the projects funded under this grant accomplish our goals of significantly improving student achievement and enable Ohio to meet its specific performance targets. Ohio will utilize other sources of funding to magnify the impact of its RttT investments. For example, 1003(g) funds will be closely aligned with the turnaround work in RttT. Teacher Incentive Fund resources will be used to extend compensation reform initiatives and State Longitudinal Data System grant funds will be used to make improvements to the State's longitudinal data systems. School Improvement Grant funds will deepen the turnaround schools strategy and action steps. As the years of the grant unfold, state funds will support many of the initiatives as required through HB 1. This will ensure sustainability. RttT investments are focused on a carefully selected set of projects that accelerate requirements codified in Ohio law, scale promising practices with identified results, promote high performance innovations, and reinforce system capabilities to improve student achievement and ensure college and career readiness. Ohio will continue to leverage project management and grant administration capacities for whole system transformation. RttT funds are not used to duplicate existing functionality nor will RttT funds support tasks to which other resources can be readily redirected. Ohio has an established network of non-profit, foundation and community partners with considerable expertise and assets. Foundations have contributed $200 million annually to education improvement strategies to Ohio schools over the past decade. Accordingly, Ohio's plan incorporates substantial efforts to develop cross-cutting relationships. For example, the creation of the Ohio Network for Education Transformation will connect State, districts, charter schools, non-profits, higher education, business, and other stakeholders for the purposes of supporting reform. Strong partnerships with the Ohio Grantmakers Forum will leverage local philanthropic dollars in support of this important work. Partnerships with local business and civic organizations are also committed to improved student success. Recognizing that RttT grants are a "one-time investment" in significant reform, Ohio has selected RttT projects that accelerate the implementation of reforms required in House Bill 1, demonstrate innovative solutions to major education challenges, and reinforce capacity. Ohio's RttT strategy aligns the work required of Ohio's schools in House Bill 1 and also with the administration's blueprint for the reauthorization of ESEA. Ohio will monitor its work to identify and discontinue less effective practices at both the State and local levels. Adoption and sustainability of successful practices and elimination of ineffective practices are critical to maintaining the momentum of this work and ensuring the ongoing support of Ohio's citizens. . Ohio has developed a tool for tracking individual district and charter school compliance with Federal grant requirements. This system, known as the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP), assures that State and local expenditures, as well as progress, are tracked and reported against targeted outcomes. Every district and charter school receiving Federal funds is familiar with this system. The State Reform Steering Team, in concert with ODE and the Education Research Center, will publicly report progress and outcomes of the RttT effort on a regular basis.

(A)(2)(ii) (a) Ohio's education community often interacts with a variety of stakeholders—from those directly involved in schools to those not actively engaged—in reform agendas, foundation- initiated programs, and education forums. Regular meetings are held with teacher union leaders and the State Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent. Throughout the past several months, these groups and others worked jointly through the development of the RttT MOU. Additionally, they partnered on technical assistance calls to answer questions about the RttT plan and its corresponding MOU. Both of Ohio's teacher unions provided letters of support for the State's proposal which are provided. A joint letter was sent to all district superintendents, school board presidents, and union leaders, conveying the importance of Ohio's RttT strategy. The letter was signed by the Governor, State Superintendent, and the leadership from the Ohio Education Association, Ohio Federation of Teachers, Ohio School Boards Association, and Buckeye Association of School Administrators. In addition, the Ohio Association for Public Charter Schools reached out to its members to encourage participation in RttT with great success. Meetings with legislators also provided additional dialogue on Ohio's RttT strategy. A successful implementation of Ohio's reforms at the

local level will require that all parties have systems in place so that quality collaboration and planning occur. Through the use of a wide-reaching communications strategy, including focused presentations, teleconferences, conference calls, a dedicated Website, independent analysis, publications, and electronic updates, Ohio has been able to establish a strong foundation for stakeholder understanding of the proposed reform initiatives. Ohio and its partners appear committed to transparent processes and deepened engagement as RttT rolls out across the state.

(A)(2)(ii)(b) Ohio's school administrators are strongly committed to this application. Ohio includes letters of support from the State Board of Education, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators, the Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators, the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, the Ohio School Boards Association, and the Ohio Association of School Business Officials. Similarly, the Ohio Alliance for Public Charter
Schools and the Ohio PTA have committed their support. The Ohio Grantmakers Forum and KidsOhio.org also committed their ongoing support to ensure the success of the RttT work on behalf of Ohio's schoolchildren. Critical support for enhancing teacher preparation is provided by 48 public and private institutions of higher education and their colleges or departments of education. Ohio's institutions of higher education overwhelmingly support the strengthening of the teaching profession that RttT requires, as well as enhancing the preparedness of students for life after high school. The state also included letters of support from teacher preparation programs and university presidents as well as nonprofit organizations focused on education. Ohio's application is supported by commitments from Battelle for Kids, KnowledgeWorks, and the Ohio STEM Learning Network, three organizations nationally recognized for value-added measurement, school turnarounds, and STEM school development, respectively. Battelle for Kids will continue its work to improve educator's use of effective data to improve teaching and learning. The Ohio STEM Learning Network is committed to increasing student engagement in STEM fields. Ohio also includes robust commitments for support and action from key political leaders in Ohio, including the Governor, both Ohio Senators, members of the Congressional delegation, and leaders from the Ohio General Assembly.

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

The State presentation clarified that even though only 50% of the LEAs were listed in the original application; the stricter requirement for 3 signatures on the MOUs does not lessen participation and does not hinder statewide impact. Through House Bill I (HB 1) 100% participation of every district is required. The State explained that HB 1 describes what is required and the RTTT proposal describes how reform will be implemented. With broad stakeholder support, including support from both unions, Ohio demonstrates great potential for statewide impact and successful implementation.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**17**	**25**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	12	20	[redacted]

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

(A) (3) (i) Although Ohio shared its extensive record of a decade of legislative education policy reform in the RTTT assurance areas, including standards, assessments and graduation requirements; longitudinal data system; great teachers and leaders, and turn around schools, the state continues to struggle in the area of student performance. Ohio provided convincing evidence that the state has been using ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue the four reforms. For example, in the area of standards, assessments and graduation requirements, Ohio adopted content standards in 1990, implemented statewide testing in 1994 and in 2007 implemented a new assessment structure as an outcome of its involvement with the American Diploma Project (sponsored by Achieve, Inc.). Ohio's higher education system adopted college readiness standards that align with the state's K-12 content standards, Senate Bill (SB) 55 created an accountability system for school districts in 1997, and SB 1 expanded its scope to include schools in 2001.

Also, Ohio made significant strides in the ARRA area of great teachers and leaders when in 2004, the state created the Educator Standards Board (ESB) which includes a majority of teachers, and its work led to the adoption of three important standards in 2005: the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession, the Ohio Standards for Principals, and the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. In 2009 the state also developed a set of standards for superintendents, and collectively, these standards provide a cohesive framework for improving educator quality. For turning around low performing schools with a focus on improving student success, Ohio implemented the following: the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning (CCIP), which is an electronic system that requires districts and charter schools to create integrated plans across multiple funding streams, including federal grants such as Title I and ARRA, to align to mutually complementary goals designed to increase student achievement and provide a systematic method for benchmarking programs to determine their effectiveness; the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP), which focuses on the process of continuous improvement including a decision framework component that allows school staff, assisted by independent reviewers, to diagnose weaknesses in a school's operations and learning activities; the Ohio Differentiated Accountability System (DAS), which is a system of interventions that address a school's lack of improvement; and School Improvement Grants (SIG), for which the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) recently received $132 million in federal funds to help struggling schools implement turnaround strategies, including the use of all four Federal models.

(A)(3)(ii) The state's comprehensive data reports indicate relative gains for Ohio and their overall National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) results are above the national average; but sub group analyses reveal that gaps remain and there is little evidence of significant progress for sub groups. Also, the state reports a disappointing graduation rate of approximately 85%, representing a recent dip in the graduation rate; and graduation rates among sub groups, including African American, Hispanic, disabled and economically disadvantaged students show that these students graduate at lower rates compared to white students. In the area of post secondary participation, Ohio reports that the Early College High School (ECHS) currently in nine sites serving students underrepresented in higher education has demonstrated success. This program works with first-generation students who attend college for the first time and low income and predominantly African-American youth. Students in these schools have scored at accelerated or advanced levels at much higher rates than their home districts, and their 2008 passage rates on the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT) outperformed the state average. Although Ohio has demonstrated potential in some areas for raising student achievement and address the achievement gap and progress has been made, closing the achievement gap and improving student outcomes continues to be a challenge.

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

During their presentation, the State explained that while there are pockets of excellence where closing the achievement gaps are addressed, the extent of the impact on student achievement extends beyond these pockets. The State reports that scaling up student performance is a priority across districts. House Bill I provides the vehicle for the success of programs such as AVID (i. e. A college program for first generation students) for enhancing performance of middle school students, expanding AP courses in high schools and for redesigning the Center for Education Reform. The Ohio Network for Education Transformation links Schools of Promise and Priority Schools to share strategies that address closing the achievement gap. An example of success shared was that more than 40% of students in transition from 9th to 10 grade successfully transitioned on time. There is a strong focus on rural and urban achievement, emphasizing value added assessment, building highly effective teachers and harvesting and spreading best practices across all districts.

Total	125	100	120	

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)

As evidenced by its MOU, Ohio is participating in the Common Core standards process with a large number of states, with plans to adopt rigorous, internationally benchmarked academic content standards and establish college- and career-ready standards on June 8, 2010. Ohio has joined the consortium of 51 states and territories participating in the Common Core Standards development. These states and territories are partnering with the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, Achieve, ACT, and the College Board to engage in a vital, comprehensive strategy to develop Common Core standards.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

Ohio is working with international colleagues to develop world class assessments aligned with international standards. Ohio is a member of several state consortia with a majority of the states in the country to develop high level assessments that can be adapted to a particular state, region or local circumstances to assess student growth and guide instruction. To collectively develop and implement common, high-quality assessments aligned with a common set of K-12 standards, Ohio joined two consortia that are developing common assessments aligned with the Common Core K-12 standards in English and language arts and mathematics. These include the SMARTER Balanced Consortium, coordinated by WestEd, and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, coordinated by Achieve, Inc. Ohio has joined both multi-state consortia by entering into a Memorandum of Understanding as a Member State with each group. Ohio submitted the Memorandum of Understanding to WestEd on May 17, 2010, and the Memoranda of Understanding to Achieve, Inc., on May 10, 2010. Each of these consortiums support current state work to provide more rigor for curriculum standards and to create a more balanced assessment system that is available to teachers in schools. These efforts augment the state goals under RTTT to develop, expand, integrate and use 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)

Ohio depicts a strong history of leadership in developing, adopting and implementing standards and assessments. The state's strategy includes connecting and implementing standards at the LEA and school levels through targeted professional development, support networks and an ambitious roll out plan for delivery of services. The implementation plan, including professional development in STEM, supports achievable goals and is detailed and clearly explained reflecting its significance to the overall reform effort.

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)

Ohio's longitudinal data system includes 9 of the 12 required elements of the America COMPETES Act (ACA); and each of these 9 reform initiatives are well explained and clearly aligned with the specific elements of the ACA. Exceptions include the state's admission of not including element 4 and although the state has planned to incorporate element 11, currently the state does not have element 11 fully implemented.

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

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

Ohio has a solid foundation of a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) in place and has clearly listed the state's plans that will provide expanded and necessary data access to inform and engage all key stakeholders. The state's comprehensive system allows stakeholder access to data and the state plans to expand system capabilities to enhance ease of use and to include key components to enable better reporting and explore new linkages.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

(C) (3)Ohio presents a detailed plan for providing comprehensive educator access to data that includes clearly stated goals and specific activities that, if successfully implemented, will allow LEAs to drill down to the classroom and student levels and to provide schools and teachers with real-time instructional support and administrative leaders with vital information for school improvement. The state's plan includes the establishment of an Education Research Center charged with collecting and analyzing data and providing linkages to LEAs that will include research and best practices to inform instruction. Ohio plans to make the data from instructional improvement systems together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students. In addition the plan calls for a state instructional improvement system that includes online instructional enhancement opportunities; ODE and RTTT Office support and training on data systems; access and usage through the STEM Learning network; and linking instruction to student performance. Although the state discusses key pieces of this plan, the full implementation of a complex and well integrated longitudinal data system by the projected target of September 2011 is truly ambitious but appears achievable.

(C)(3) (i) Ohio is committed to personalizing instruction for every child in every classroom every day. In order to accomplish this aggressive goal, it is imperative to design a system upon which educators rely for accurate data to plan for the needs of their students. A greater reliance on value-added data will ensure that decisions about school improvement strategies and student learning are guided by accuracy. As schools seek ways to firmly entrench teacher collaboration into daily routines, a greater reliance on value-added data will become the norm. Principals will be better able to engage in deeper conversations about

student progress with teachers and all can challenge assumptions about student learning and explore promising practices that meet needs as evidenced by disaggregated data. Professional learning communities will become stronger as educators discuss student work, student progress and coach one another to enhance instruction. This network is especially critical for educators in Ohio's low-performing schools as they tackle the challenges of turnaround. Ohio has a long history of using student academic performance data to inform decision making at the teacher, principal, administrator, and stakeholder levels regarding targeted instruction and resource allocation. The current systems in place and number of districts using student data provide a solid foundation for expanded efforts and greater impact on students statewide.

(C)(3)(ii) – Ohio has a comprehensive plan for improving instruction through the use of quality data systems. IISs are technology-based tools and other strategies that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with meaningful support and actionable data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement. Roughly 30% of Ohio's school districts and charter schools have an instructional improvement system or elements of an instructional improvement system in place and more than 2,300 teachers are engaged in high-quality, formative assessment professional development. Best-practice tools and professional development exist in the State today, but they are not accessed equitably across the State. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) is committed to leveraging these best practices so that every district and charter school has ready access to them. The largest district in the State, Columbus City Schools, has worked in partnership with Nationwide Insurance to develop the All-School Improvement Plan (ASIP) system that enables the use of academic achievement data at the district, school and teacher levels. These data are organized in a manner that facilitates the identification of priority areas for improvement and is especially critical for schools in turnaround status. Once the school personnel identify and articulate their high priority challenges, the system allows the user to select specific evidence-based strategies to address each challenge. The school personnel then develop an implementation plan for the strategies selected and track the implementation of those plans. The process is complete when new achievement scores populate the system and school personnel are able to see if the strategies employed led to improved academic performance. Nationwide Insurance has invested over $3 million since May 2005 on the tool for Columbus City Schools. Nationwide Insurance will continue to maintain an annual operating budget of about $700,000 for the next 3 years to sustain the tool. This program will be shared with other districts to demonstrate the power of data use in classroom and instructional improvement systems to improve student achievement. Columbus teachers will share their expertise in the effective use of data with teachers in low-performing schools.

(C)(3)(iii) With an established SLDS already in place, leadership in value-added data usage at the teacher and principal levels, and a best-practice formative instruction model, Ohio is well positioned to expand the use of the SLDS. Using RttT funds and building from work that has been accomplished and continues to deepen. Ohio plans for every teacher and administrator to be equipped with the technology to make informed instructional decisions at the student, building, and district levels and to provide formative educational analytics in every classroom. As part of Ohio's D3A2 tool, a repository of electronic educational content resources aligned to the academic content standards is available. Teachers can analyze longitudinal student performance data and then, with a click of a button, be directed to the appropriate online resources based upon the student needs reflected in the analyzed data. Educational entities in Ohio are partnering in a 10-state effort to apply for an i3 validation grant, K12 Creative Collections, to develop and centralize a collection of rich digital media assets created by educators for educators and students to support 21st century learning. The powerful network created across states in this initiative will redefine teacher collaboration and create a powerful professional learning community. Ohio will develop 56 professional development modules (one module per grade per subject area) that combine content and formative assessment training for teachers. Each module will focus on one important concept per grade to model for teachers how to (1) engage students deeply in the content they are to learn; (2) infuse formative assessments throughout instruction to probe for student thinking and knowledge acquisition; and (3) modify instruction based on the information gleaned from the formative probes. The professional development will be delivered to teachers in a blended face-to-face and online system. In addition, the online components will be accessible for just-in-time professional development by individual teachers or groups. Ohio teacher preparation programs will be engaged in this work so that they can better prepare future teachers and ensure they gain a better understanding of using data to craft instruction. Ohio will contract with an external

evaluator to provide formative and summative feedback on the effectiveness of the modules.Ohio will develop and make available formative instruction professional development. This will be made available to all teachers in the State. In concert with practicing educators, Ohio will develop 56 professional development modules (one module per grade per subject area) that combine content and formative assessment training for teachers. Each module will focus on one important concept per grade to model for teachers how to (1) engage students deeply in the content they are to learn; (2) infuse formative assessments throughout instruction to probe for student thinking and knowledge acquisition; and (3) modify instruction based on the information gleaned from the formative probes. The professional development will be delivered to teachers in a blended face-to-face and online system. In addition, the online components will be accessible for just-in-time professional development by individual teachers or groups. Ohio teacher preparation programs will be engaged in this work so that they can better prepare future teachers and ensure they gain a better understanding of using data to craft instruction. Ohio will contract with an external evaluator to provide formative and summative feedback on the effectiveness of the modules.

The ERC in partnership with a state university or other partners will ensure that data from instructional improvement systems, together with data from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, are available and accessible to researchers, in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The ERC will be managed by a third-party partner with the capacity to connect and develop key data and research audiences and experts around issues of data collection, reporting, analysis, and instructional design. The primary research agenda of the ERC will be on data and accessibility related to the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, resources and approaches for educating different subgroups of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, rural and urban students, and students in persistently low achieving schools). College and career readiness and STEM capability will also be important research themes for the Center. The ERC will amplify, accelerate, and incentivize research on high-leverage problems embedded in everyday practices. It will encourage researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to work in close and open collaboration on data systems tied to specific improvement problems. For example, knowing and applying what works in turning around struggling schools will be considered a priority problem of practice that demands focused and timely research. ODE has a variety of mechanisms in place that allow various appropriate data audiences access to student-level data to conduct more granular analysis including analysis down to the item levels of the state tests. The
ERC will facilitate ease of access to such usable data by various stakeholders—and for purposes of policy development and evaluation to drive improvement of practice. Ohio will establish an oversight group for the ERC to ensure alignment between state-wide achievement and college and career readiness goals, RttT priorities and projects, STEM, and the research agenda. This research agenda will be refined with input from a broad range of stakeholders and data users, including school districts and charter schools, institutions of higher education, educators,philanthropic groups, professional associations, policymakers, and legislators. ODE, OBR, and the College and Career Ready Policy Institute (CCRPI) have already developed a set of key
research questions aligned to student progress and achievement from preschool through college that will serve to inform the research agenda Additionally, the ERC will help Ohio remain connected to research being conducted by other states, as well as pertinent national and international research. The ERC has the potential for creating networks of professional learning communities across states. By the third year of the RttT grant period, ODE will convene
a group of potential partners through its connections with the Council of Chief State School Officers to explore multi-state research initiatives and opportunities for collaboration.

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**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4	4	

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

(D)(1)(i) House Bill 1 provides Ohio with the instituted legal, statutory, and regulatory provisions that expand alternative pathways, as long as they meet rigorous standards. Also, House Bill 1 established the Credential Review Board (CRB), which facilitates the licensing and review process for alternative pathways. Of the alternative pathways to lincensure the PSL pathway allows providers in addition to institutions of higher education to provide alternative pathways to licensure. The PSL pathway is designed for professionals in STEM fields who seek to enter the teaching profession. A central component of the PSL is the structured apprenticeship program that is provided by either an education service center or teacher preparation institution in partnership with the employing STEM school established under Chapter 3326 of the Ohio Revised Code. Ohio's current alternative pathways to licensure—AEL, APL, PSL, RBCL and CRB—align with the five components of the federal definition for alternative routes.

(D)(1)(ii) Ohio's current alternative pathways to licensure, include Alternative Educator License (AEL), Alternative Principal License (APL), Provisional STEM License (PSL), Route B Career-Technical Licensure Pathway (RBCL), and Credential Review Board (CRB), all of which are supported by statue and/or rule. Of the alternative pathways to lincensure, the PSL pathway allows providers in addition to institutions of higher education to provide alternative pathways to licensure.

D)(1)(iii) Ohio has a well-organzed and multi-faceted process in place to monitor, evaluate, and identify areas of teacher and principal shortages. This process includes the use of data from the following reports: the Ohio Teacher Supply and Demand Report which captures data for the State's teacher supply and retirement projections, and also highlights teacher mobility and attrition data by subject area; Ohio's Web-Based Recruiting System (WBRS) Summative Data which is an interactive tool that matches prospective applicants with school district vacancies in the state, creating a link between market needs and available talent; and Ohio's Teacher Shortage Index (TSI) identifies—through an index score based on three years of Teacher Licensure, Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT), and Properly Certified Teacher data—the subject areas in which Ohio is facing shortages.

Ohio has used targeted data from their system to specifically address teacher and principal shortages in hard-to-staff schools and high-need subjects. For example, in 2007, the state provided funding for alternative programs that focused on increasing the number of STEM teachers; through this effort, partnerships with the state's colleges, universities, and Education Service Centers were established to train mid-career professionals to become teachers in the high-need subjects. In addition, the state funded a $4-million signing bonus program and a $2. 5-million loan forgiveness program that provided incentives for up to 400 new teachers to teach high-need subjects in hard-to-staff schools, programs which were instrumental in addressing student achievement gap issues and school turnaround reforms. In FY 2008-2009, the legislature appropriated $1.5 million to support initiatives to build teacher capacity in the Ohio Core program. Seven Education Service Centers (ESCs) were awarded the funds and prepared approximately 150 high-quality educators and mid-career professionals to meet the increased demand for teachers as a result of the rigorous Ohio core curriculum. Ohio's Project ASPIRE (Apprenticeships Supported by Partnerships for Innovation and Reform in Education), a federally funded Teacher Quality Partnership, empowers teachers with deep content knowledge and skills to support the learning of all children, with an emphasis on children in urban and rural areas, children with special needs, and English Language Learners (ELL). The project engages innovative partners at the Ohio State University, Columbus City Schools, and the Columbus community to create guided apprenticeships that support the preparation

of new and prospective teachers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and continuing support across the critical first three years of a teacher's career.

Ohio has a comprehensive plan for providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers, including alternative routes that permit providers who operate independently of institutions of higher education (IHEs), and include at least 4 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification. However, comparable systems are not provided for preparing new principals. Ohio also has implemented an effective system for preparing educators to fill critical shortage areas that will place highy qualified and effective teachers in classrooms with the greatest challenges for improving student achievement.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**58**	**58**	
(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	28	28	

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

(D)(2)(i) Ohio has established clearly articulated and achievable goals for measuring student growth and measuring it for each individual student. Ohio is successful in measuring student growth through value-added assessments. To date, nearly 50 districts have participated in TCAP voluntarily and with cost-sharing. In addition, Ohio differentiates school and district performance using student growth measures as part of the existing accountability system. This important feature demonstrates a level of teacher awareness and use of school-wide growth data that is an important foundation for moving to student-level growth data. Ohio will maximize this success by scaling effective practices across the state. For teachers of students in non-tested grades or subject areas, Ohio will introduce and test the validity of using other measures of student progress such as growth in literacy levels, grade gains on supplemental tests, end-of-course exams, and performance-based assessments during years two and three of the grant. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) will collaborate with districts, charter schools, teacher unions and state administrators' associations to develop these measures with guidance from national experts.

(D)(2)(ii) Ohio has a comprehensive and well developed plan to design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. Ohio clearly demonstrates its commitment to designing and implementing a teacher and principal evaluation system that involves multiple measures, observation, feedback and a laser-like focus on student achievement. In large urban settings, Ohio has experience through the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund project in the successful implementation of performance-based human capital systems that define and connect teacher and principal effectiveness with student growth. The Appalachian Collaborative project identified in Ohio's RttT plan addresses this same issue in a rural context involving 20 school districts in the redesign of human capital development systems. Both initiatives involve teachers and principals significantly in the design and development process. The Appalachian Collaborative, in particular, is a collaborative regional effort to redesign evaluation systems with student growth as a significant component. Ohio is committed to taking both of these initiatives to a broader and deeper scale. The RttT State Reform Steering Team will closely monitor the progress of both these two initiatives in order to identify and recommend changes to teacher and principal evaluations based on targeted RttT investments. Ohio's project, Redesign Educator Performance Management System,

focuses on designing and implementing rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals. Three key activities comprise the state's plan through RttT to improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance. First, the state will implement and scale the linkage of measures of student growth to principals and individual teachers. Secondly, participating districts and charter schools will conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals in accordance with recently revised state regulations, utilizing an evaluation system that is validated as being aligned to the state model and RttT criteria. Thirdly, participating districts, charter schools, and the state will increase the reliability of the model evaluation systems for teachers and principals by training and credentialing evaluators. Legislators in Ohio made clear through House Bill 1 that teacher and principal effectiveness is the primary strategy to ensure increased student achievement. House Bill 1 emphasizes dramatic change and requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt credible, comprehensive evaluation models for teachers and principals that include multiple measures of effectiveness including a method for measuring student growth. Reliable measures of student growth that are accepted as legitimate by educators are a fundamental precondition for achieving the long-term, structural changes to licensure and evaluation systems that Ohio is adopting. Ohio annually analyzes and publicly reports school and district performance using student growth measures as part of the existing accountability system. Ohio has a history of work in linking student growth measures to teachers and principals as a method of determining effectiveness. Through the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), Ohio's four largest districts (Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo) are implementing performance-based compensation systems that define and connect teacher and principal effectiveness with student learning and achievement. Over $8 million has been paid out to teachers and principals as part of Ohio's Teacher Incentive Fund to reward educators for increased student achievement, and some participating schools have moved from a rating of academic watch to a rating of effective. Ohio will take these practices to scale and is well positioned to do so. The state's longitudinal data system, its success in utilizing value-added data to measure student growth, and models of success in a significant number of Ohio districts and schools will all serve as springboards for scalability. RttT will accelerate scalability as networks of teachers, principals, and external partners lift up the work of the Educator Standards Board.

(D)(2)(iii) Ohio has an effective system for conducting annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback, and as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools. Through RttT, all participating districts and charter schools will conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals in accordance with recently revised regulations and using a system of evaluation credentialed by the State.

Principal Evaluation- Ohio has already developed and implemented the Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) with widespread input and participation from teachers and administrators. The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) meets RttT criteria for designing and conducting annual principal evaluations. It is rigorous, transparent, fair, standards-based (Ohio Standards for Principals, Interstate School Leadership License Consortium), and incorporates reflection as a key strategy to inform actions and improve practices. Fifty percent of the OPES is based on performance data, including impact on student indicators as demonstrated through value-added scores, student attendance, graduation rates, numbers of suspensions and expulsions, and percent of students in advanced placement classes. The other 50% is based on demonstrated knowledge and skills, based on the Ohio standards for principals and includes indicators that delineate observable behaviors for each of the five standards. The rubric includes the multiple rating categories of ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, accomplished/highly effective, and distinguished. Principals receive formative feedback at least twice annually, coupled with coaching sessions with their direct supervisors to provide timely and constructive feedback in support of ongoing development. An annual summative evaluation rates their effectiveness and includes areas of strength that are reinforced as well as documenting opportunities for improvement that inform professional growth plans. The OPES has been fully implemented in 19 districts and 140 schools across the state. This year 23 of 56 Regional Education Service Centers have undergone training and credentialing and are working with districts to scale the OPES to additional districts and schools. Through RttT, participating districts and charter schools will adopt the OPES or ensure that their system of principal evaluation is fully aligned with OPES. Beginning in 2010-11, Ohio will collect and publicly report baseline data that includes effectiveness ratings resulting from annual evaluations of principals. It is the goal of RttT that by 2013-14, all participating

districts and charter schools will have fully credentialed principal evaluation systems and 90% of principals will be rated as effective, highly effective, or distinguished.

Teacher Evaluation- House Bill 1 requires the State Board of Education to adopt a model for teacher evaluation that includes the use of student growth as one of multiple measures to determine teacher effectiveness. Learning Point Associates, a national research organization recognized for work in the area of teacher evaluation, partnered with Ohio this year to lead a group of educators (teachers, teacher unions, principals, superintendents, higher education, re gional providers) in the design of a model teacher evaluation system. The writing team has worked with Ohio's Educator Standards Board to design system components, elements and features. As is the case with Ohio's model principal evaluation, the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) meets RttT criteria for designing and conducting annual evaluations. OTES is standards-based (Ohio Standards for Teachers, Interstate New Teacher Assessment a Support Consortium), requires annual evaluations that include student growth as a significant factor, and differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories (ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, accomplished/highly effective, distinguished). OTES also requires timely and constructive feedback that informs assistance to struggling and under performing teachers through intensive professional development to propel teachers to higher levels; and summative data that informs decisions related to retention, dismissal, tenure, and compensation. For each of the seven Ohio teaching standards, there is a performance rubric that has been developed with indicators that describes measurable, observable behaviors (ineffective, satisfactory, proficient/effective, accomplished/highly effective and distinguished performance). In addition to student growth measures, this rubric will rate teacher performance based on evidence collected through structured observations conducted multiple times annually. Ohio's Model Teacher Evaluation System includes the definition of effective teacher that includes multiple measures and is evaluated in significant part by acceptable rates of student growth (i.e., one grade level in an academic year), definition of highly effective teacher that includes multiple measures and is evaluated in significant part by high rates of student growth (i.e., more than one grade level in an academic year);annual goal setting process that is data-driven (based on school, grade level, and student data indicators as well as areas of improvement in skills and knowledge) and requires a limited set of clear, focused, measurable objectives; formative assessment (minimum of three formative assessments including observation) that captures evidence of teacher performance and impact on student learning and provides timely and constructive feedback, as well as an annual summative evaluation that rates effectiveness across a system of five categories. The Educator Standards Board will recommend the teacher evaluation system to the State Board of Education in September 2010 for adoption. During 2010–2011, Ohio will conduct validity and reliability studies of the OTES with a range of Ohio districts and charter schools and support a phased-in approach to implementation by identifying early adopter school districts (from RttT participating districts and schools) that will serve to inform statewide impact, scale and sustainability strategies. RttT will accelerate the use of this performance measure and standard. Ohio also will implement a software system for teacher and principal evaluations which will facilitate educator performance analysis and inform recommendations around continued employment, dismissal, promotion, tenure, and compensation of educators and to capture data for state-level analysis. In most districts, evaluations are currently completed in paper format. An electronic system will allow schools and districts to maintain complete and accurate records of educator performance and track their growth and development over time. As required in the state Fiscal Stabilization Fund II application, Ohio will require the submission of educator evaluation data aggregated by school, will provide technical assistance to help participating districts and charter schools implement the system, and will provide additional funding for training. Additionally, the state will report the number of highly effective and effective teachers in each district on their respective state report card. This additional information on the state report card will provide parents with additional district data to be better informed about their schools and districts.

(D)(2)(iv)-Each component of Ohio's comprehensive and achievable plan is clearly depicted and detailed explanations demonstrate how data from teacher and principal evaluations (effectiveness ratings) will be used by the state, districts and charter schools to inform a range of human capital decisions. The state provides a detailed graphic and supporting discussion of how these two projects will be used to implement a comprehensive human capital management system, along with the performance metrics that will be monitored as the system is implemented. Ohio also plans for 100% of participating school districts and charter schools to use multiple measures to determine teacher and principal effectiveness through Ohio's

Evaluation System to inform tenure, retention, promotion, transfer, and compensation decisions.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**21**	**21**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	11	11	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	10	10	

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

(D)(3)-To ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to effective teachers and principals, Ohio's solid and achievable RTTT plan will require teacher and principal preparation institutions, districts, and schools to employ evidence-based practices that increase the attraction, preparation, recruitment, hiring, placement, support, and retention of educators in low-performing, hard-to-staff schools. Ohio's two RTTT projects, *Expand Effective Educator Preparation Programs* and *Ensure Equitable Distribution of Highly Effective Teachers*, encompasses five key actions that the state comprehensively developed and clearly articulated, including ensuring students in high poverty and/or high minority have equitable access to effective teachers, implement effective practices that include the use of differentiated incentive packages to recruit and retain effective educators to high-poverty/high-minority schools, improve teaching and learning conditions to support effective teaching and learning to impact student success in high-minority and high-poverty schools, provide intensive and high quality mentoring and induction support to new teachers and principals in low achieving schools. RTTT funds will support the Co-Teacher Model in the 68 turnaround schools, refine the state's reporting system to determine and publish annually the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals based on annual evaluations that include student achievement data as a significant factor, and consistent, focused professional development based on specific areas of improvement as identified through the comprehensive evaluation systems.

(D) (3) (i)- Ohio's focused efforts to improve the distribution of highly effective educators have produced very positive results. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) created the Office of Educator Equity (OEE) in 2006 to implement the Ohio Teacher Equity Plan. This office is charged with developing a tool for districts to conduct their own school-by-school analysis of teacher distribution. The Office must also publicly report teacher equity concerns. Models and experiences from these and other districts will be shared with participating RTTT districts and charters to inform the plans they must develop for their districts and schools. Ohio also ended the temporary licensing of teachers and developed a method to provide stipends to teachers for teaching hard-to-staff subject areas in high-needs schools, and created alternative licensure pathways to secure additional educators for hard-to-staff schools and subjects. These are important steps in ensuring that all of Ohio's students have highly effective teachers and principals. Since 2007, data show that there has been significant progress in reducing the gaps in the distribution of highly qualified teachers (HQTs). As of 2009, 98% of teachers in high-poverty and low-poverty elementary schools are highly qualified. The gap in the number of HQTs in high-poverty and low-poverty secondary schools has been reduced to 5%. Clearly, Ohio's plans include ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students. Although the state's plans include successful strategies to increase highly qualified teachers for high needs schools, there continues to be a significant shortage of effective teachers to staff high needs LEAs.

(D) (3) (ii) - Ohio has a clearly articulated and comprehensive plan to establish programs to increase the supply of effective teachers and principals which includes implementing targeted initiatives. In order to meet its goal of having effective teachers and principals in every school, with the support of RTTT, by the end of school year 2013–2014, Ohio plans to have strategically produced and/or put in place (with a priority on

high needs schools) the following: 450 Woodrow Wilson Foundation STEM Teacher Fellows; 675 Teach Ohio mathematics, science, special education, foreign language, and English language learner (ELL) effective and highly effective teachers; 68 Turnaround Principal and Teacher Leader teams in the turnaround schools; and 1,200 recipients of Ohio's Comprehensive Incentive System. Based on differentiated recruitment and retention needs, districts will customize an incentive package for highly effective teachers based on a menu of options including relocation bonuses, retention bonuses, reduced class size or teaching loads, pay above the base rate in subject shortage areas, mileage subsidies for rural teachers, loan forgiveness, differentiated pay for effective teachers to assume leadership roles, and hiring effective subject area shortage teachers on a higher salary schedule step. Differentiated incentive packages will ensure that participating school districts and charter schools have implemented strategies to improve school teaching and learning conditions and support collaboration, excellent leadership, and empowerment in decision-making.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

(D) (4) (i) Ohio's high quality plan for improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation includes ambitious yet achievable annual targets and meets the RTTT requirements for this component. The Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) plans to hold all educator preparation programs accountable for the impact their graduates have on student growth. To accomplish this goal, Ohio plans to link teacher and principal effectiveness data to teacher and principal preparation programs of Ohio institutions of higher education (IHE) and alternative providers. This appears to be an effective strategy because creating these linkages will enhance the success of Ohio's plan and will provide an important avenue through which Ohio can establish credibility for its plan. As these programs are funded with state dollars and program approval rests with the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), the Chancellor's office facilitates linking program approval and expansion at Ohio institutions of higher education to these performance outcomes. In addition, a legislative proposal to link funding for colleges of education to these performance outcomes is being designed, with further planning underway to lay the groundwork for this funding approach. The Increase Higher Education Accountability project includes five tasks that comprise Ohio's RTTT plan to ensure that teacher and principal preparation programs in Ohio are held accountable for the success of their graduates through the following reform plans: enhancing high-quality program standards by enhancing licensure rules and aligning program standards for teacher and principal preparation programs; creating a system of metrics for educator preparation programs by linking evidence of teacher and principal effectiveness as reflected by specific metrics that include measures of student growth, to preparation programs in Ohio and annually and publicly reporting these data; providing rigorous program review and approval by developing and implementing a rigorous process of review and approval of teacher and principal preparation programs and using this process to ensure the improvement or removal of ineffective programs; creating performance-based funding for public colleges of education by expanding preparation options and programs at higher education institutions that are consistently producing effective teachers and principals; and expanding excellence by utilizing the annual review of the unit and program data to incentivize expansion of preparation programs at higher education institutions (private and public) that consistently produce effective teachers and principals. Each of these important elements along with their regulatory provisions contribute positively to the state's effectiveness in providing high quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals to obtain alternative certification that includes supportive alliances with institutions of higher education.

(D) (4) (ii)- Ohio's plan is solid and calls for a triangulated process (Chancellor's office; the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), and key stake holders) for planning, implementation, execution, monitoring, evaluation, and review. The Chancellor's office is responsible for annually reviewing the unit and program data to

expand educator preparation programs at higher education institutions that consistently produce effective teachers and principals and that distinguish themselves at the program level (e.g., STEM, middle school mathematics teachers) in areas that are critical to meeting Ohio's needs. As part of the RTTT grant, $2.2 million in funding from the state share will jump-start the expansion of teacher and principal preparation programs whose graduates effectively impact student achievement in K-12 settings. The state's initial funding to jump start this initiative is adequate and reflects the state's commitment to providing sufficient fiscal resources to ensure a successful launch of Ohio's plan. The goal of expanding the initiative through strategically extended invitations to high performing programs that produce and support teacher and principal preparation in demonstrated areas and subjects of need provides the state with additional success factors. Monitoring and accountability are important and the state has provided for this process through the requirement for each program to submit a detailed plan of action to the Chancellor's office which includes clear goals, a detailed set of activities and timelines, strategies for recruitment and marketing, a comprehensive evaluation system that collects and reports short and long term indicators of success, and a detailed budget for the use of funds prior to award. The review process is another anchoring strategy that the state intends to implement and it will include input from a Chancellor's office and an appointed panel of stakeholders who will review expansion proposals and make recommendations. Likewise, the State will expand the successful STEM teacher preparation programs that will be based on the Woodrow Wilson Foundation STEM Teacher preparation program model. Presently four Ohio institutions have received these grants. However, to meet the anticipated need for STEM teachers, the State will use RTTT funds to expand the Woodrow Wilson model to three additional successful Ohio teacher preparation programs. The state's comprehensive accountability system for principal and teacher preparation will hold preparation programs accountable for graduate success based on teacher and principal effectiveness ratings that include measures of student achievement, growth and achievement gaps. To accomplish this ambitious goal, Ohio plans to annually link K-12 student data to teacher and principal preparation programs at Ohio institutions of higher education (IHE) and alternative providers. Ohio cautiously adopted a 3 year timeline; wisely set milestones; and assigned key personnel at all levels. Ohio plans to establish high quality program standards; create a system of metrics for educator preparation programs; provide rigorous program review and approval; and expand excellence. The process of implementation is planned to begin 2011, phasing in establishing high standards and full implementation is planned for 2014.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**20**	**20**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	10	10	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	10	10	

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

(D) (5) (i) – Ohio's plan to provide effective support to teachers and principals in collaboration with its participating LEAs is comprehensive, is clearly explained and appears to be achievable. Beginning with high expectations for educator effectiveness Ohio is planning for ongoing strategic, effective and continuous professional growth opportunities for teachers, principals and superintendents by incorporating student growth into an accountability system and by providing educators with the tools, resources, and support they need to amplify their practices and their skills. With a vision of considerably increasing numbers of students who will be college-ready and life-prepared by consistently interacting with effective teachers and principals, Ohio's plans for RTTT will enable partnering organizations and districts to provide data-informed professional development, induction support for new principals and teachers, coaching for veteran teachers who need assistance and advanced training to propel all educators to higher levels of effectiveness. Ohio's well organized plan engages effective practicing teachers and leaders as partners in designing professional development experiences and supports at every level. Therefore, the plan provides for a seamless delivery model for all professional development funded through RTTT, and also streamlines evaluation processes that measure the extent to which it adheres to quality standards and influences positive change in educator practice and student learning. In addition, Ohio's investments in teacher and principal effectiveness will be aligned with the individual needs of educators. Through collaboration with

districts and charter schools, teacher unions, administrators' associations, and statewide networks (e.g., Ohio STEM Learning Network), Ohio can successfully implement its RTTT project. The following strategies are part of this project: implement a comprehensive model for professional development that uses data to improve instruction and focuses on enhancing the skills of teachers, principals and superintendents; provide intensive support to beginning teachers and principals; provide regional professional development coaches; provide core curriculum and assessment support; provide professional development for Advanced Placement Teachers; enhance quality of leadership; provide support to career technical teachers; implement a credentialing system for professional development; and establish the Appalachian Collaborative. Clearly, Ohio has a solid plan that meets the RTTT requirements of providing effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded.

(D) (5) (ii)- In order to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of supports to improve student achievement Ohio plans to build on its previous experience of using a review and approval process to ensure that districts' professional development is standards-based, high quality, and effective. The state reports that over the past five years, school districts have worked to align their professional development with Ohio's Standards for Professional Development. These standards appear consistent with those articulated in RTTT, including data-informed, job-embedded; ongoing; focused on instructional improvement. For the past three years, over 250 districts receiving Poverty-Based Assistance (PBA) funds for professional development were required to annually submit comprehensive plans documenting the alignment of their district's professional development program and activities to the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. To further assure compliance to RTTT standards and to assure internal accountability, Ohio plans to use a scoring rubric developed by Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to review and score district plans, only permitting approved plans to spend allocated dollars. With RTTT funds, the state plans to establish a similar system to ensure that professional development offerings are of high quality, incorporate promising practices that yield high impact and are effectively delivered, requiring districts to annually submit a comprehensive plan that meets the Ohio Professional Development Standards for all RTTT-funded professional development. Districts will also be required to provide evidence of impact on participants and student outcomes, including documentation of participant learning (new knowledge and skills), impact on the organization (organizational climate, development of professional learning communities, collaborative time during the school day, etc.), participants' use of new knowledge and skill, and student learning outcomes. After the first year, districts will be required to demonstrate that the providers incorporate data within their plans to demonstrate that they meet the requirements outlined for quality, content and impact. All of these compliance processes strengthen Ohio's plan and support the strategic use of RTTT resources. Ohio's goal of providing effective data informed professional development; coaching; induction; and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals are ongoing and job-embedded. The state's ambitious and comprehensive reform initiative appears achievable and provides a positive, ongoing collaboration with LEAs, partners, and stakeholders to increase student achievement.

Total	138	131	131	

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 has prioritized turning around low achieving schools in its reform agenda as a catalysts for improving student performance; and the state clearly possesses a strong legal, statutory and regulatory environment that allows for direct intervention in the State' persistently lowest achieving schools, as well as in in districts

that are in improvement or corrective action status. There are two provisions in Ohio law that authorize the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to directly intervene with he state's persistently lowest achieving LEA's and schools, which empowers the ODE to reconstitute, turn over, or close chronically lowest achieving schools. In addition, Ohio's Revised Code (ORC) Section 3302.041 establishes Ohio's Model of Differentiated Accountability and ORC 3302.10 establishes the Academic Distress Commissions. Under the Model of Differentiated Accountability, Ohio can now categorize schools and districts based on the aggregate percentage of student groups that do not meet AYP in reading and mathematics. Districts and schools are labeled low support if fewer than 20% of their AYP indicators were not met; medium support if 20 to 29% of their AYP indicator were not met, and high support if 30% or more of their AYP indicators were not met. Schools and districts in all improvement categories are required to use the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) to develop their district and school continuous improvement plans; and failure to do so will result in the appropriate sanctions. Also the ODE is empowered to implement a plethora of interventions for high support districts that fail to provide consistent oversight of school improvement efforts and /or fail to demonstrate significant district improvement. The state clearly explains its options for sanctions and support.

(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)

Ohio has a clearly articulated plan. The state reports a decade of successful turnaround initiatives at the high school and elementary school levels and over a seven year period Ohio reports leveraging $100 million federal, state, local and primarily philanthropic investments to launch 73 redesigned high schools across 11 urban districts and nine Early College High Schools (ECHS) in eight districts. The state reports significantly narrowing the achievement gap in some of the poorest and most academically challenged high schools; and through its Ohio High School Transformation Initiative (OHSTI) the state converts low performing, traditional comprehensive high schools into multiple small schools or small learning communities, yielding remarkable results. For example, the state reports that nearly 8 of 10 African American students in OHSTI sites are graduating, making this a 29% increase since 2008; and the graduation gap between OHSTI high schools and all Ohio high schools closed by more than 73%, with 38% of sites now exceeding the State average graduation rate. These impressive statistics reflect the state's commitment to successfully turning around low performing schools. Also, Ohio's Early College High Schools encourage and enable students who may not be considered college ready to attend high school and college simultaneously, providing support and opportunities that allow students to earn an Associates of Arts (AA) degree upon graduating from high school. Ohio, success rate for turning around lowest achieving elementary Schools of Promise has also yielded astonishing results, including closing the Black/White achievement gap in mathematics proficiency by 12.4% in Schools of Promise and by 4.3%in the state. The state benefited from its history of successful turnaround efforts by incorporating lessons learned from these successful programs and integrating the resulting best practices to develop a strong turnaround plan which includes publicly reporting Ohio's lowest achieving schools and significantly improving their performance aligned to the overall goals of the state's reform plan.

The selection criteria used by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to identify the persistently lowest achieving schools is aligned with RTTT requirements and includes two categories: Title I schools that are in school improvement status or Title I eligible secondary schools that did not receive Title I Funding, regardless of school improvement status.

Ohio's includes a detailed, clearly described and graphically depicted Transformational Model for turning around persistently low achieving schools. Each stage of the plan is strategically aligned with RTTT requirements and includes the coordinated alignment of human, fiscal, and programmatic resources, providing a laser focus of success. The foundation for the success of the state's Transformational Model is the Ohio Model of Differentiated Accountability, which accelerates the direct targeting of resources,

technical assistance and interventions to low-achieving schools and districts. The state provided a detailed description of the process that districts and their schools move through together, using data to target improvement efforts by identifying the greatest needs and aligning work around a limited number of focused goals. The ODE reorganization for rapid school improvement has established the Office of Transforming Schools that will employ staff with expertise in school turnaround, maintain regular coordination and communication with Ohio's 68 lowest achieving schools; and in addition, the Office of Transforming Schools will intervene if LEA or school improvement is unsuccessful, will help prevent low achieving schools, and will lead school improvement efforts. Direct services to LEAs and schools will be provided through routine site visits, regional meetings, conference calls, video conferences, and overall ensuring that the systems of support are provided for successful school turnarounds. The state will establish the Ohio Network for Education Transformation (ONET), which is an innovative public and private management structure, including a series of partnerships that directly link to a specific Ohio RTTT reform goal.

The state provided comprehensive descriptions and clearly depicted graphic representations of the strategies, roles and responsibilities for Ohio's transformation plan, including focused goals, each tied to a specific area in the reform model, identifies key components of the model and a description of Ohio's reform plans for RTTT. The plan addresses some state and local school intervention and support systems, District Transformation Teams, extended community supports to all 68 school turn around communities, a School Turnaround Leaders Program, School Core Planning Team, and expanded work in transformation and innovation through quality, sustainability, and evaluation. Despite its well articulated plans and history of generously funded early implementation of turnaround initiatives the state continues to have significant numbers of low performing schools and districts.

Total	50	45	45	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

(F)(1) Ohio reports that the percentage of revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased between FY 2008 and FY 2009. In FY 2009, Ohio spent $11.4 billion to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education. This represented an increase to 52.5% of total state-wide revenue, up from $11 billion, and 50.4% of state-wide revenue in FY 2008. The increase is 2.1%, and considering today's economic challenges the state is to be commended. In July 2009, the Ohio legislature passed House Bill 1 (FY 2010-2011 biennial budget), which includes comprehensive education funding reform. The comprehensive education reform package included a new school funding method, the Ohio Evidence-Based Model (EBM). House Bill 1 calculates funding on more student-specific components of a successful educational system and EBM funding components are directly focused on economically disadvantaged students.

(F) (1) (ii)- Ohio supports and has implemented solid policies that lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs and has a number of successful mechanisms to provide high-need LEAs with additional funding. Ohio's foundation funding formula supports the concept of a financial partnership between the state and local school districts. The state determines the level of adequate funding for districts and the state's share of that funding, based upon the capacity of the district to raise local revenue or property valuations. Through this approach, *high-wealth districts receive less funding* from the state for their adequate funding level *and less-wealthy districts receive more*. Ohio provides, on average, $1,780 more

per pupil in state funding to high-need LEAs than those that are not high-need. Ohio has used a foundation funding methodology as a primary equity tool for nearly 30 years. To address disparities caused by school districts raising local revenue above the adequate funding level determined by the state, a number of additional state supplements have been used historically to help equalize funding. Before the adoption of House Bill 1, Ohio provided high-poverty districts with a series of funding supplements through Poverty-Based Assistance (PBA), which is set forth in statue. The funding supplements included efforts to fund all day kindergarten, reduce class sizes in kindergarten through third grade, provide academic intervention, dropout recovery programs, and community outreach, and address limited English proficiency, closing the achievement gap, and professional development. To address disparities in local property tax wealth, Parity Aid was enacted in 2001 to provide less-wealthy school districts with additional state revenue on a formula basis. Parity Aid lessens the difference between revenue generated by districts with greater local property wealth and districts with low to moderate local property wealth. Parity Aid is set forth in statue and the EBM, adopted as part of House Bill 1. Whereas the previous funding model based allocations on a minimum per-pupil funding amount and then added supplemental funding to address particular student or district needs, the Ohio Evidence-Based Model (EBM) calculates funding on more student-specific components of a successful educational system. Some of the EBM funding components are directly focused on economically disadvantaged students (e.g., supplemental teachers, family and community liaisons, summer remediation and many components are adjusted by the the Educational Challenge Factor (ECF). The ECF is an index that accounts for differences that exist among school districts in terms of college attainment, wealth, and concentration of poverty. The ECF is adjusted so that school districts with high concentrations of poverty and economic disadvantage, low overall levels of educational attainment, and a limited local resource base receive additional funding to meet the needs of the students. Ohio has a history of studying the resource allocation and practices of schools that better prepare challenged students for academic success. In fact, Ohio's Operating Standards require LEAs to regularly review resource allocations within the district. House Bill 1 requires that a School Funding Advisory Council, whose members are appointed by the Governor and legislature, study the new funding model. This provision of law provides a monitoring system and feedback loop for the EBM. The knowledge gained from studying Schools of Promise (schools with high-performing economically disadvantaged students) and Schools of Distinction (schools with high-performing special education students) has formed the basis for technical assistance from Ohio Department of Education (ODE) that is provided to schools that do not meet performance standards established by the State.

This process highlights practices that are effective for students in poverty and creates a comprehensive and streamlined mechanism for districts' allocation of additional funds to high-poverty schools. Ohio's philosophy of financial data transparency is evidenced by its long history of making expenditure and revenue data for school districts publicly available on its web site. As a continuation of this philosophy, House Bill 1 includes requirements for districts to provide more school-specific financial information. These budgets will be made available to the public and will allow the state, districts, and the general public to review the resource allocations among schools within districts in order to more effectively manage the alignment of public resources to student needs.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**33**	**33**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	6	6	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7	7	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4	4	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	

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

(F)(2)(i) -Ohio's long history of support and ensuring successful conditions for charter schools has led to the state's recognition as having the fifth largest charter school enrollment in the nation, with more than 93,000 students enrolled in 322 charter schools statewide. Ohio does not cap the number of "bricks and mortar" charter schools that may open in low performing districts or in Ohio's eight largest urban districts. In addition, the state reports that there is no cap on conversion charter schools, which are formerly traditional public schools converted into charter schools. **However, the state does have a cap on the number of online charter schools.** Currently there are 29 bricks and mortar charter schools, and 27 online charter schools. Together these schools represent 9% of all public schools and 5% of all public school students. The emergence and expansion of charter schools in Ohio is significant; in fact there are 42 times as many charter school students today as there were in 1998- 1999, when Ohio opened its first 15 charter schools.

(F)(2)(ii)- Ohio states that student achievement is an important factor in the renewal of charter schools, and provides a critical component to the process of authoring and holding charters accountable for outcomes. The Ohio system of charter authorization places an intermediary or sponsor between ODE and individual charter schools. House Bill 1 includes a provision that establishes the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) management over all sponsors who have responsibility for schools. ODE has full authority to revoke the sponsoring organization's approval; and only sponsors with evidence of success can open new charter schools. Ohio has authorized and encouraged a number of charters that serve student populations similar to local district student populations, especially to high-need students. The state's zeal for the authorization of numerous charter schools is dampened by the fact that during the past five years, 65 charter schools closed, suggesting that perhaps student achievement standards were not adequately met and it appears that the state accountability system for charter authorization, tracking, monitoring, support and compliance should be strengthened.

(F)(2)(iii)Since charter schools are LEAs in Ohio, the state established funding levels for all charter schools that are equitable with those for traditional public schools. Students attending charter schools are included in the number of funded students for the traditional school district where the student resides. State per pupil funding is transferred from the traditional district to the charter school by the state, including the proportionate share of state funding provided to the district for traditional public education students. Transportation services for charter schools are provided by the district of residence of attending students; however, charter schools may receive transportation funds directly if they provide transportation services to students. The Ohio Federal Public Charter School Program grand awarded to Ohio for three years provided implementation and start-up grants to new and developing charter schools on a competitive basis, with an average award of $500,000 over a three year period.

(F)(2)(iv)- Ohio does not provide funding for facilities for charter schools. When an existing facility is available, charter schools may bid and purchase the facility. Ohio law governs access to existing facilities. When a traditional school district disposes of real property that is suitable for classroom space, it must first offer that property to new, start-up charter schools located in its district at a price that is not higher than the appraised fair market value. Charter schools have 60 days in which to decide to make the purchase. On the other hand traditional schools receive specific funding from part 1 of the schools budget specifically for facilities. Clearly, charter schools do not receive equitable state funding for facilities.

(F)(2)(v)-The state offers an impressive variety of schools other than charter schools, which are possible under the Innovative Education Pilot Program, including nine Early College High School (ECHS) sites in eight school districts, Ohio's STEM schools, and Ohio's Credit Flexibility Plan. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) does require that student achievement be a significant factor in authorization/renewal, and the state has the statutory power to close non-compliant or under performing schools where student achievement fails to meet acceptable standards. the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) encourages charters that serve student populations similar to local district student populations, including high-need students.

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

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

(F)(3)- Ohio has been very flexible and liberal in creating favorable conditions for reform state-wide through law, regulation and policy as evidenced by the no cap approval process, high quantity of innovative programs, and financial support provided. Ohio has depicted a decade of ambitious reform and continuous state, LEA and school level efforts to address student achievement. While many of Ohio's most prominent reform conditions have been detailed throughout its application, others exist that will complement Ohio's reform agenda. These reform conditions fall into the following categories, including investments in P-20 systems that are focused on strong educational and economic development, improvements to structural constraints that have the potential to restrict student achievement and investments in school design innovations. Each reform condition is explained below:

Investments in P-20 Systems- Beginning with Ohio's youngest learners, the Center for Early Childhood Development (created through House Bill 1), will focus on early childhood issues beginning with prenatal care and prepare students and families for the successful transition into kindergarten. There is a joint responsibility for the success of this center. This cross-agency center is comprised of staff from Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, and the Ohio Department of Health, and is charged with administering early childhood programs and services for children. HB 1 requires that the progress from all agencies be combined into one cohesive center overseen by Ohio Department of Education ODE. A transition team is working to fulfill this responsibility. All day, every-day kindergarten is a priority of the Governor's education reform plan and, starting in fiscal year (FY) 2011, all districts are required to offer this opportunity to all students.

Improvements to structural constraints improve reform conditions- House Bill 1 includes a number of reforms that collectively improve reform conditions. Key components in these changes include an effort to extend the school year to increase time for classroom instruction, changes in the statutory language related to teacher dismissal, changing the former language requiring evidence of "gross inefficiency or immorality" to "good and just cause" as statutory grounds for termination of a school district teacher employment contract, spending flexibility including local flexibility, coupled with transparency and reasonable accountability, and the Comprehensive System of Learning Support Guidelines, which are guidelines for school districts in establishing school environments that support all students and assist districts in identifying and intervening with students who are at risk of failure or who may drop out of school.

Investments in school design innovations have yielded increased graduation rates. In 2001, Ohio and its non-profit partners instituted the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative (OHSTI) as part of the broad national effort to improve graduation rates. This support, coupled with a fully informed transparency system brought about by the inclusion of the graduation rate measurement on the School Report Card, yielded an immediate and substantial impact in results, increasing graduation rates from 81% in 2001 to 86% in 2004. Ohio is the only state participating in an international program called Innovative Learning Environments (ILEs), from the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Center for Education Research and Innovation, to understand how students learn and under which conditions and with what dynamics learning can be enhanced. The program includes an international knowledge management repository that provides guidance to teachers about the components of an effective, student-centered learning environment that encourages learning and creativity. This work is also supported by Ohio's RTTT application.

Ohio is to be commended for its efforts in demonstrating other significant reform conditions which the state has created, through law, regulation, and policy, that clearly support the state's plans to increase student achievement and graduation rates, narrow achievement gaps, and provide key linkages to stakeholders, prgrams and services that stregthen the state education system.

Total	55	48	48	

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 STEM initiatives target **all students**, focuses on preparing effective teachers, and proviing STEM programs for high achievig LEAs as well as LEAs with the most challenging student populations. The state has clearly integrated STEM initiatives throuhout its reform plan, enchancing the delivery of math, science, engineering and technology. The state plans to leverage its existing Ohio STEM Learning Network (OSLN), which includes 10 STEM platform schools 28 K-8 programs of excellence, seven regional hubs, and more than 300 K-12 higher education and 222 business partners. OLSN enables regions and districts to build on distinctive assets and simultaneously benefit from the lessons learned and knowledge gained from others. Ohio's RTTT plan aligns STEM education efforts within and across the four assurance areas and the state clearly explains the connection to each. Ohio's STEM initiative is a high-quality plan in both low achieving and high performing schools that the state addresses by levering an established statewide and national STEM learning network to implement a rigorous course of study in STEM; to support teachers in inquiry based applied learning approaches; and to build student motivation, competence and persistence to pursue advanced STEM academics and careers.

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 has clearly and comprehensively presented all four education reform areas specified in the ARRA in addition to successfully meeting other numerous requirements for this application. In order to demonstrate that the state and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform, Ohio focused on accelerating existing initiatives, using innovation to strive for new pathways to achieving its goal of improving student achievement, and reinforcing existing positive protocols, using lessons learned to replicate best practices statewide. Ohio's strategic planning process reflects state's commitment to improving standards and assessments, to creating a supportive political structure as a foundation for reform, to building positive relationships with a variety of key stakeholders, to establishing a culture of change, and to radically redesigning its model of 21st century education.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	450	470	