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OERC is a collaboration of seven universities and four research organizations across Ohio.

OERC develops and implements a statewide, preschool-through-workforce research agenda to address critical issues of education and workforce policy and practice.
Race to the Top (RttT)
Ohio bid for and received $400,000,000

Bid included creation of the Ohio Network of Education Transformation (ONET)

Ohio Educational Research Center (OERC) conducted a two-year ONET Evaluation
ONET: 5 REFORM DESIGNS

- **ONET Goal:** Dramatically improve a set of high need schools and serve as a model for many more schools.
- **Funding:** 54 schools received between $750,000 and $61,000 over 3 school years (2011-2014) to support implementation of one of 5 designs.
- **Designs** (Chosen by State Superindent):
  - AVID
  - Asia Society’s International Studies Schools Network (ISSN)
  - Early College
  - New Tech
  - STEM (locally developed)
FIVE QUESTIONS:

- To what extent were the models implemented and sustained?
- What factors affected (+ or -) levels of implementation?
- What steps were being taken to sustain reforms 1 year post-funding?
- Do these models / implementations increase desired student outcomes?
- Implications for other / future state-supported school improvement efforts?
**STUDY DESIGN**

- **Timeframe(s):**
  
  *Schools* were funded for 3 years of implementation (fall 2011-Spring 2014)

  *Evaluation:* Fall 2013 through 1 year post-implementation, Spring 2015.

- **Design:** Holistic, multiple case study (Yin, 2014; Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2012)

- **Sample:** 10 (of 54 funded) schools were identified by ODE for this study. 2 schools X 5 Design. 8 were followed through the 2nd year.
DATA COLLECTION

- Initial Applications
- 4 years of Annual State Report Cards (10 cases plus 44 additional ONET-funded schools) 2015 Outcome data: Jan. 2016
- 2 years of principal interviews
  Fall 2015 (3rd round) ongoing
- 60+ additional interviews with district personnel, teachers and model technical advisors in year (31 in year 2)
All interviews were recorded & transcribed

Topical coding: outcomes, leadership, program changes, factors of success and barriers, sustainability, lessons learned & recommendations.

Multiple coders & discrepancy discussions.

Cross-case & cross-model pattern analyses
THE NULL HYPOTHESIS: 41-YEAR TREND IN NAEP READING SCORES FOR 9, 13, AND 17-YEAR OLD STUDENTS
1. Designs had dramatically different histories & external involvement requirements. Ex.:

**AVID**: 20 years of experience & research, regular external PD

**ASIA/ISSN**: No prior research, years of experience, extensive, required external PD, site visits, regular external monitoring.

**STEM**: All locally developed, from budgeting to materials to PD (ex., passive solar electricity)
2. **Choice in picking designs:** State Superintendent’s office picked 5 options. *Most schools got their first choice, some didn’t, some schools weren’t funded.*

3. **Initial District, School, and Teacher needs varied greatly.** *Levels of prior experience with reforms, human capital, etc.*

4. **Funding provided** (3 yrs. = $61K- $750K)

5. **Intended Depth of Engagement:** *Whole school, School-within-a-school or a few teachers.*
6. Levels of buy-in: *Either built over time or never achieved.*

7. Opt-out: *No school required 100% teacher buy in.*

8. Professional Development: *varied greatly among designs, relatively consistent within designs.*
9. District & State Supports
10. Competing Initiatives / Demands (state, district & school)
11. Leadership & Human Capital (initial levels, (in)stability, developed/trained)
12. Technology requirements (Initial and ongoing)
13. Planning for Institutionalization ranged from extensive to none.

14. Evidence of 1st year post-funding institutionalization
   Strong in some sites (district, principal or teacher advocacy)
   Non-existent in others.
5 DESIGNS’ EFFECTS “REPORT CARD” ACROSS 50+ ONET SCHOOLS
10 INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS BY PROGRAM
“OHIO SCHOOL REPORT CARD”
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EXAMPLES OF POSITIVE STUDENT OUTCOMES

• **ASIA / ISSN.** Improved student atSSN: New Experiences and positive student outcomes. Students taking more responsibility for their learning.

• **AVID:** Improved student behaviors and strategies. More applied / advanced learning strategies.

• **Early College:** Enhanced college readiness.

• **New Tech:** Improved student engagement & confidence.

*Note: None on State Report Cards*
BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

- Non-aligned design, state, local goals
- Lack of initial planning time
- Not structuring to obtain broad buy-in (school board, central office, principal, teachers, community, etc.)
- Early transitions of key personnel
BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

- Competing Change efforts, existing or emerging
- Unresolved conflicts not necessarily inherent to the reform.
- Rigid school schedules
- Lack of multi-level plan for continuing funding for key components.
FACTORS PROMOTING IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS

• School Needs / Reform Capabilities match

• Teacher/ Reform match

• An Implementation Plan shared by those required to implement it

• Flexibility
FACTORS PROMOTING IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS

- Professional Development:
  a. much more than anticipated
  b. Out-years PD for new ADMINISTRATORS(!) and teachers.

- New types of leadership (typically shared)

- Empowerment to Lead
TO INCREASE PROBABILITY OF SUSTAINED EFFORTS (POST-FUNDING)

- Plan for Turnovers (principals, teachers, PD providers).

- Refresher PD for all.

- A workable plan to continue reform post-funding:
  District $ support
  Teacher planning & work time
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