

78 Review by Grant Advisors

I. Budget Costs

(1) The budget narrative needs delineated - only the total matches the budget grid-nothing else matches.

The following revised budget narrative summary corrects and delineates the expenditures for the project. The budget grid as submitted in the CCIP is accurate.

The project budget includes costs associated with the development of a high quality mathematics and ELA aligned instructional resource that will be made available to the districts and ultimately to all educators in the state through the iLearnOhio and/or iQity platforms. The Consortium will contract with various math and ELA subject matter experts as well as IQ Innovations for development and evaluation of the resource. The following costs are included in purchased services under Support Services on the CCIP for a total of \$591,370.

The rate negotiated with IQ Innovations for a broad bundle of services totals \$542,245. Costs in the quote include the services of project management (\$67,500), mathematics and ELA subject matter experts (SMEs) to be provided and managed by IQ Innovations (\$217,700), software development of the suite of content creation tools (\$165,000), and quality assurance professionals to test the content created (\$75,000) to ensure bug-free functionality into the future. The grant will fund loading the approximately 1,500 Toolkit content pages into the content marketplace by HTML editors (\$12,000) making the resources available to all Ohio school systems through the iQity LMS that is also rebranded as the iLearnOhio statewide platform. Additionally, training for use of the content toolkit and the LMS platform will be made available through IQ Innovations “train the trainer” model. Cost for an initial live PD session for the lead district is provided (\$3,000). An online PD module will also be created for use by participating districts as well as all Ohio schools through iLearnOhio beyond implementation (\$2,045). PD beyond the first year will be incorporated into material covered by each district using funds already budgeted for PD activities.

Separately, ECOT will contract with SMEs from their district to assist with development of real world items (demonstrating career and technical applications) which would be relevant to students. Cost of these services is provided at \$34,125. This \$34,125 is part of the larger total of \$251,825 budgeted for SME work.

*****Note for clarity**: The total for all SME work is **\$251,825**.

\$217,700 (SME work to break down the standards and create assessment items)

+\$34,125 (SME work to complete the real world/career tech component for each standard)

\$251, 825

Program evaluation will be provided by an external third party to ensure objectivity. The cost is estimated at \$15,000. The consortium identified the evaluator in the grant as requested in question #22:

Thomas G. Reed, Ph.D., Director of Research and Assessment
Reedeus.com (company name) <http://reedeus.weebly.com/index.html> (website)
6926 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016
(614) 572-3519
thomasgreedphd@gmail.com

The sum of all Support Services contracted and included in the CCIP grid as Purchased Services, purpose code 400, are: IQ Innovations, \$542,245, ECOT SMEs, \$34,125, and Reedeus.com, \$15,000, for a total of \$591,370.

Also included on the support services line are stipends for education staff at the lead district to attend three hours of additional professional development on use of the system is provided at \$6,300. This amount is shown as Salary, code 100, (\$5,431) and fringe, code 200, (\$869) on the CCIP.

The project budget also provides for the administrative fee of 4.6% or \$27,493 which will be allocated to the lead applicant for program oversight and coordination. This fee is included on

the Governance Section of the CCIP and consists of salary and fringe for administrative staff at the lead district.

(2) Budget narrative lists \$340,000 is local expense for salaries and benefits - not identified in grant or budget grid.

This was accidentally inserted in the narrative during editing. This was not a part of the budget narrative for this grant and should not have been included.

(3) Indications are that indirect costs of 4.6% would be charged. The amount noted for the project director is the same amount of money. Please explain if this is a coincidence or the director is that charge.

Yes, administrative costs of 4.6% were planned for allocation to the lead applicant, Finneytown Local Schools. This 4.6% covers expenses incurred by Finneytown for leading and administering the grant. This amount does not represent project management/a project director. Details for the Project Manager are provided in #4 below.

***Note: We have operated under the assumption that a 4.6% fee to cover indirect costs was permissible under the grant. If this is not correct, then we agree to adjust this allocation to the extent allowed by the grant.

(4) Management team is budgeted for \$67,500. Explain who and what this cost is.

We did state in the budget narrative the words “project management team.” This is because the project manager will interact with technical leads in various areas (content, QA, software development). However, the \$67,500 figure is the proposed contract rate for project management.

Kate Morris will be the lead project manager for IQ Innovations acting as the day-to-day liaison between consortium member schools and the technology partner. Below is her professional bio which was included in #16 of the application.

Kate Morris, Project Manager

Responsibility: On this project Kate will act as the tactical lead for cross-disciplinary teams throughout the Toolkit project handling day to day communications between consortium stakeholders and the IQ Innovations team, thus ensuring project deadlines are met and completed in the manner envisioned.

Qualifications: Kate has a bachelor's degree in economics and journalism from Ohio Wesleyan University.

Prior experience: Kate has 9 years of project management experience. Her career covers a diverse history in project management dealing with multimillion dollar accounts in fields ranging from health care and pharmaceuticals, marketing, E-commerce, search engine optimization and K-12 education. Kate's primary responsibilities at IQ Innovations are overseeing the management of software development practices and major client initiatives ensuring that projects are completed on-time and as envisioned.

(5) Math & ELA subject experts are budgeted for \$251,825 - who are they and what will they do in the grant?

*****Note for clarity:** The total for all SME work is **\$251,825**.

\$217,700 (SME work to break down the standards and create assessment items)

+\$**34,125** (SME work to complete the real world/career tech component for each standard)

\$251, 825

The subject matter experts (SMEs) will be teachers and curriculum specialists from within the consortium school districts and/or external resources as needed. Our plan calls for having SMEs spanning grades K-12 in mathematics and English to:

- A) Break down the standards and create assessment items (\$217,700). The SMEs completing this work will be contracted by IQ Innovations.
- B) Provide an exemplar of real world/career tech application for each standard (\$34,125). The SMEs completing this work will be contracted by ECOT.

Because funding of this project was not guaranteed, personnel were not yet identified. Upon formal notification of award Finneytown, IQ Innovations, and ECOT will meet to discuss recommended personnel whose strengths are consistent with the needs of this project. Sarah

Hanka will oversee this aspect of the project. Her professional bio as it appeared in the grant and is provided below:

Sarah Hanka, Director of Curriculum

Responsibility: On this project Sarah will oversee the development of the Toolkit pages aligned to each standard, the content creation framework, and teacher professional development to use the Toolkit.

Qualifications: Sarah is a graduate of Kent State University with a bachelor’s degree in English and a master’s degree in Curriculum, Technology and Education Reform from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Sarah also holds an Administrative Specialist license for Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development.

Prior experience: Sarah has been involved in curriculum management for the past 10 years working with school districts to continue to improve digital content, lessons and assessments for Common Core State Standards and other academic standards. Sarah directs the process for the selection of resource materials which support teaching and learning through working with vendors and suppliers to match their material with instructional programs. Before becoming involved with curriculum development Sarah taught English Language Arts to middle school and high school students.

Roles/responsibilities for SMEs:

Due to character constraints a full outline of duties was not possible in the CCIP. The primary duties of the subject matter experts and what they will be tasked with is as follows:

- Take each Common Core Standard and provide additional pedagogical context of what a given standard means above and beyond the singular standard as it appears in the Common Core documents. This consists of outlining what a student should know, understand and be able to do within the context of each standard.

The SMEs completing this work will be contracted by IQ Innovations at a total cost of \$217,700.

- Provide an applied example of a Common Core Standard in the real world, career-oriented context that can be translated into classroom teaching and content development. For example, the Pythagorean Theorem is used for GPS navigation as GPS uses triangulation to pinpoint a location when two reference points are known. Create an assessment item that relates to a given standard. This assessment item is formative in nature (e.g., bell-ringer or exit slip) to see if students are grasping the concept/s covered within a standard.

The SMEs completing this work will be contracted by ECOT at a total cost of \$34,125.

- After completion of pages all SMEs will review and edit their peer's pages to ensure work is free from typos and grammatical errors and provides practical pedagogical value to teachers whether that is how to teach a given standard or to create their own content.

Administrative roles/responsibilities for each grant partner:

Finneytown Local Schools – Superintendent Tyron Olverson will serve as the consortium's lead as well as the implementation lead in his district (Finneytown Local Schools) wherein he will be responsible for oversight and administration of the grant to ensure the project vision is realized, funds are disbursed appropriately, and timelines are met. Tyrone will also coordinate efforts to assess the project with the independent program evaluator. Tyrone will maintain communication with ODE and fulfill all administrative responsibilities required by ODE for the grant.

Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow (ECOT) – Superintendent Rick Teeters will serve as the implementation lead for ECOT and be responsible for oversight of all ECOT SMEs working to complete the real world/career tech application component of the Toolkit. Rick will coordinate financials and logistics with the consortium lead (Tyron Olverson) as well as report ECOT SME progress to the consortium.

IQ Innovations will work with the consortia to implement the Standards and Content Creation Toolkit (Toolkit) project and develop appropriate user-training modules during the grant

timeframe. Specifically, IQ will contract and oversee mathematics and ELA SMEs tasked with breaking down the standards and creating assessment items, as well as handling all Toolkit configurations, system maintenance, and uploading content for consumption by consortium members. IQ will oversee all aspects of project management and provide consortium members with a digital project management tool so project updates can be viewed in real time. Lastly, IQ will also disseminate uploaded content to the state via ilearnOhio and/or the iQity platform.

(6) Software development of content creation tools is budgeted for \$165,000 - what is this and who is doing this job?

The IQ Innovations software team required to develop the Toolkit project consists of 3.5 software developers. Activities of the software team consist of the following:

- Creation of a system to automate the uploading of teacher created content into the learning management system classrooms as well as for sharing created content with all users across the state using an HTML editor that does not require coding skills, functionality to permit embedding web-links, videos, audio, images, text editor, graphic art.
- Integration and uploading of the Toolkit pages with the ilearnOhio/iQity learning management system to create a seamless user experience.
- Software infrastructure adjustments to account for the Toolkit feature.
- User interface design to create what the end-user's tools look like and how they are laid out in the learning management system.

***The key benefit and outcome of this development work will be an easy to use and intuitive system that gives teachers a comprehensive, one-stop-shop curriculum resource that meets their pedagogical needs around the new learning standards.

Provided below is the company bio for IQ Innovations which was provided in #16 of this grant:

IQ Innovations

Responsibility: The consortia will work with our technology partner, IQ Innovations, to implement the Standards and Content Creation Toolkit (Toolkit) project and develop appropriate user-training modules during the grant timeframe. For this initiative IQ will serve as the consortium's partner handling Toolkit configurations, system maintenance, and uploading

content for consumption by consortium members. IQ will also disseminate uploaded content to the state via iLearnOhio and/or the iQity platform.

Qualifications: Established in 2007, IQ Innovations has extensive experience in large-scale transformational education technology initiatives from inception to completion. IQ's Learning Management System (LMS), iQity, was originally created to meet the unique LMS and digital curriculum needs of the K-12 education market. This process involved utilizing extensive input from teachers, administrators, parents and students. Across all of these K-12 educational entities, iQity is supporting over 51,000 users and has the capacity to handle 2,000,000.

Prior experience: iLearnOhio is Ohio's version of iQity rebranded as a statewide virtual clearinghouse for digital courses offered by multiple publishers for all Ohio students in grades K-12. iLearnOhio provides a comprehensive e-learning platform and digital curriculum funded by the Ohio General Assembly to ensure that Ohio students have access to high-quality online courses. This statewide platform includes a searchable repository of standards-aligned educational content (courses and digital resources), an e-commerce marketplace, and an LMS provided at no cost to facilitate the delivery of course content from multiple providers to various end users. iLearnOhio is administered by the Ohio Resource Center, located at the College of Education and Human Ecology at The Ohio State University, under the direction of the Ohio Board of Regents.

In California, iQity was rebranded in August of 2010 as CaliQity and is delivered to students in collaboration with the California K12 High-Speed Network (K12HSN). The system went live for the state of California to deliver a common statewide LMS, along with a digital curriculum repository and marketplace to all schools. K12HSN is available in 79% of California schools. The California Department of Education commissioned K12HSN to deliver access to a reliable high-speed network for educators and students of the State. K12HSN is a state program funded by the California Department of Education. K12HSN is operated by a consortium consisting of Imperial County Office of Education, which serves as the Lead Education Agency, Butte County Office of Education, and Mendocino County Office of Education.

II. Sustainable Costs

(1) Lead district has no notes in impact table and noted no sustaining costs – explain ongoing costs mentioned in grant.

Assuming we understand the question and its context correctly, please see response to #3 below as it covers this question and #3.

(2) Consortium district noted they were going to incorporate this ongoing PD into PD already budgeted in General Fund – so what is being sacrificed from what is budgeted in order to sustain this?

Our consortium has regularly scheduled PD days for teachers. Teacher professional development needs are constantly evolving and developing as legislation, technology, best practices, data-driven decision-making and student diversity evolve. As such, we adapt with our needs. For example, with the incoming PARCC assessments replacing the OAA and OGT we will no longer need to allocate resources to train our teachers on the OAA and OGT. Instead, those PD resources will be shifted to PD centered on training needs related to PARCC. By reallocating how we will use our current PD resources there will not be a need to sacrifice anything else in the current budget to make the project sustainable. If awarded, we will reallocate our PD resources to Toolkit training which will replace PD such as the following:

- Initial Common Core adoption (moving us from basic rollout to full adoption and application of the standards into our curricula).
- Sessions on how to leverage technology and digital resources to create personalized lessons, or supplemental content intended for a wider audience of diverse learners.

As new teachers are hired into our districts we have funds already allotted for training to get them up-to-speed for teaching within our district. Toolkit training will be just another part of technology training teachers will receive. Additionally, with the Toolkit we will not do redundant training as described in the aforementioned bullet points. In sum, training for the Toolkit is cost neutral as we are reshuffling existing PD resources.

Districts that choose to adopt outside of those included in the consortium are technically outside the scope of the grant. However, beyond the life of the grant teacher PD to use the Toolkit will be available free via existing online training courses available with the learning management system, resulting in no direct costs for adopting districts even after the grant period. If an adopting school district outside of the consortium wanted to have their teachers get a substitute for the few hours of training needed to understand how to use the Toolkit via the online training (resulting in higher net expenses) that would be up to them, but outside the scope of the grant.

(3) Grant noted that contractor will provide maintenance on the system for free because they need to maintain the platform for 6 years, A written contract needs to be in place stating this plus any other services contractor is going to provide over the five-year period and the costs. Is it possible that this is being sold for a fee to make enough money so that they are able to provide this service to this consortium for free?

IQ Innovations agrees to put a contract into place stating that over the five-year grant period all system maintenance will be absorbed by IQ Innovations in the course of its normal operations supporting the larger platform and therefore there will be no maintenance cost to the consortium.

Next, no, the Toolkit is not being sold for a fee to make enough money so that IQ Innovations is able to provide this service to the consortium for free. IQ Innovations operates iQity as a “Freemium” model similar to that of LinkedIn and Pandora. Both are free to anyone who would like to use their product and customers decide whether they would like to have premium features which are provided at a cost. In this way anyone can use LinkedIn and Pandora and reap the benefits of their base system offerings for free. These businesses know that users typically gravitate towards these premium features over time and are therefore willing to absorb ongoing maintenance costs associated with offering the free systems as part of their business model. If they did not offer their base systems/services for free then they would not gain the large user-bases that eventually buy the premium features and therefore promote revenues. As such, it is in their interest to provide users with free access to their base products even though it may cost a small fee to provide ongoing maintenance. Similarly, IQ Innovations absorbs ongoing maintenance for current base product offerings and will continue to do so as the Toolkit is

integrated into the platform. Plainly stated, IQ Innovations has no identifiable marginal cost to support the integrated Toolkit and has no interest in charging consortium members for ongoing maintenance or any other “hidden fees” as it is contrary to the “freemium” business model they follow. As mentioned earlier, a contract will be put in place protecting the ongoing availability of the Toolkit at no cost.

III. Cost Savings/Shared Services

(1) Noted in grant overview and beginning of grant that teachers will create a content delivery model (framework) for Math and ELA and those would be shared with teachers across the state as a shared service program (which would indicate that it was free) However, several other places in the grant, indicate that teachers must belong to third party entity to receive these files - so which is it? If districts have to pay for this framework, how can it be called a shared service? Please explain.

There is no third party entity that adopting districts must belong to in order to receive the Toolkit’s benefits. All Ohio users will have FREE access to the Toolkit via ilearnOhio or the iQity learning management system – both offered by the technology partner for the grant, IQ Innovations. iQity is IQ Innovations’ base LMS platform and the Ohio version of it is called ilearnOhio. So, both are the same platform and will provide the same single point of access to the Toolkit (and are therefore not a third party entity). The Toolkit, online training modules and content created from it will be provided for free to the consortium districts by using the stated digital access medium – the ilearnOhio or iQity learning management system. The Toolkit will also be provided for free with no direct adoption costs to districts outside of the consortium via ilearnOhio or iQity learning management system. As such, all users are connected to the same FREE system and are able to participate in a shared services program.

If a school did not want to adopt ilearnOhio or iQity, the Toolkit can still be available to them if they wanted. However this would be unwieldy and impractical. This is because someone in a district would have to create a free user account to go in and print all of the more than 1500 Toolkit pages then make copies of them to give to the appropriate teachers within their district in

order to give them the pedagogical understanding of the Common Core standards. Or, if a teacher wishing to create a piece of content, but not wanting to use the Toolkit suite of content creation tools they could do the same thing and then refer to the Toolkit pages while using their own content creation tool. Finally, if a district did not want to use the learning management system with their students in theory a district could print off teacher created content pages and hand them out to their students. As these scenarios show, a school district would not need to fully adopt the learning management system and the Toolkit to get some benefit, but it would be very impractical.

(2) In savings question, grant noted there were no cost savings, but savings would be attained through value added – please explain.

Correct, we chose to not formally specify that the Toolkit would result in fiscal savings to consortium districts or districts outside of the consortium. Since this is a new idea and we cannot definitively say what the full cost savings will be until a full one year cycle has been completed, we felt that putting an arbitrary or speculative dollar amount on the application could lead to us being disqualified. However, one of the consortium members did feel that the Toolkit could replace their need for an NWEA assessment product so we did include that single estimated cost savings of \$20,000 as we knew it could be substantiated. Again, we felt that anything beyond that amount such as assuming savings for content could not be substantiated until the end of the first year so we did not speculate on those savings.

However, what we meant by value-add is that beyond the potential cost savings, our proposed project is easily scalable and can lead to an entire digital library of content that all Ohio teachers would have access to (and would ultimately lead to cost savings). With the Toolkit, once a piece of content is created, it will be uploaded into the learning management system for all teachers in the consortium to use. Adopting schools outside of the consortium will also have access to this content and associated assessment items. Teachers will be able to easily search teacher-created content pages and assessment items by academic standard. This will allow the consortium to pool content and assessment resources and eventually adopting districts outside of the district to also pool resources. With this type of large-scale crowdsourced model of creating and reviewing content and assessment items there is significant potential that schools may spend less money on supplemental content and assessment items for their students. However, again, we were hesitant

to say that the Toolkit would save consortium members 100% or 50% or 25% of the amount currently spent on academic content or assessment items purchased through vendors. What we do know is that the Toolkit will be a fantastic resource for creating personalized supplemental content, filling gaps in existing content, and offering Common Core aligned assessment items – all which could lead to significant cost savings.

(3) No cost savings are listed in the Impact Table, but \$20,000 savings appear in the metric table – no match.

The \$20,000 savings in the metric table was included as the lead district (Finneytown) did see the assessment item component of the Toolkit project as a potential substitute for their current NWEA assessment product. The NWEA product provides Finneytown with diagnostic assessments at three intervals throughout the year. However, Finneytown would like to be conducting regular formative assessment with Common Core standards-aligned items so students' deficits can be ascertained more quickly and action taken more frequently than three times a year. Finneytown sees the Common Core aligned assessment items included with the Toolkit as an opportunity to frequently formatively assess students and know exactly which standard/s need to be focused on in real time – while the teacher is teaching the concept, not two months after when it is too late. Furthermore, once these deficits are identified, teachers will be able to access the curricular component of the Toolkit to obtain the pedagogical supports to meet students' needs in relation to the standards (and have access to content that has been created for that standard). Finneytown sees the Toolkit as a much better and more comprehensive solution than the current NWEA offering. As such, Finneytown is able to save \$20,000 per year by not renewing with NWEA and instead utilizing the Toolkit.

STRAIGHT A FUND - Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics
Applicants with Local Report Cards

| APPLICANT: Finneytown Local | | Unweighted ADM 1419 | | | | | | APPLICANT: 047332 | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| IRN (6 digits): 047332 | | Weighted ADM 1677 | | | | | | | |
| | | FY13 | | FY20 | | EXPLANATION | | | |
| <i>Do not alter any of the shaded cells.</i> | | Financial Baseline from the FY13 Final EMS Data | Expenditures per Pupil | Expenditures per Equivalent Pupil | Since FY15 is the grant year, its expenditures are not required in this table. In the FY20 columns, ENTER only the projected change in expenditures that will result from the grant. | Projected Expenditure per Pupil | Projected Expenditure per Equivalent Pupil | Explanation Provide detailed notes regarding the financial impact on each line affected by the grant funds. These notes are critical to the evaluation of the supplemental financial reporting metrics. | |
| OPERATING - CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL | | FY13 | | FY20 | | | | | |
| II.1 | Instruction | \$ 9,666,184 | \$ 6,813 | \$ 5,764 | | \$ 6,813 | 5,764 | | |
| II.2 | Pupil Support Service | \$ 1,390,993 | \$ 980 | \$ 830 | | \$ 980 | 830 | | |
| II.3 | Instructional Staff Support Services | \$ 296,788 | \$ 209 | \$ 177 | \$ (20,000) | \$ 195 | 165 | Award of the grant will eliminate the need to annually purchase NWEA - MAP assessment resources | |
| | Total Ops - Classroom Instr. | \$ 11,353,965 | \$ 8,002 | \$ 6,771 | \$ (20,000) | \$ 7,988 | 6,759 | | |
| OPERATING - NON-CLASSROOM | | FY13 | | FY20 | | | | | |
| II.4 | General Administration | \$ 477,812 | \$ 337 | \$ 285 | | \$ 337 | 285 | | |
| II.5 | School Administration | \$ 707,728 | \$ 499 | \$ 422 | | \$ 499 | 422 | | |
| II.8 | Other and Non-Specified Support Services | \$ 1,132,117 | \$ 798 | \$ 675 | | \$ 798 | 675 | | |
| II.6 | Operation and Maintenance of Plant | \$ 1,483,303 | \$ 1,045 | \$ 885 | | \$ 1,045 | 885 | | |
| II.7 | Pupil Transportation | \$ 845,226 | \$ 596 | \$ 504 | | \$ 596 | 504 | | |
| II.9 | Elem-Sec Noninstructional Food Service | \$ 25,536 | \$ 18 | \$ 15 | | \$ 18 | 15 | | |
| | Total Ops. - Non-Classroom Instr. | \$ 4,671,721 | \$ 3,293 | \$ 2,786 | \$ - | \$ 3,293 | 2,786 | | |
| NON-OPERATING (EXCLUDED) | | FY13 | | FY20 | | | | | |
| II.10 | Elem-Sec Noninstructional - Enterprise Ops. | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | - | | |
| II.11 | Elem-Sec Noninstructional - Other | \$ 346,429 | \$ 244.17 | \$ 207 | | \$ 244 | 207 | | |
| II.12 | Nonelem-sec Programs - Community Svcs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | - | | |
| II.13 | Nonelem-sec Programs - Adut Ed | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | - | | |
| II.14 | Nonelem-sec Programs - Other | \$ 1,565,338 | \$ 1,103 | \$ 933 | | \$ 1,103 | 933 | | |
| III.1 | Construction | \$ 2,957,542 | \$ 2,085 | \$ 1,764 | | \$ 2,085 | 1,764 | | |
| III.2 | Land and Existing Structures | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | - | | |
| III.3 | Equipment - Instructional | \$ 20,821 | \$ 15 | \$ 12 | | \$ 15 | 12 | | |
| III.4 | Equipment - Other | \$ 82,996 | \$ 58 | \$ 49 | | \$ 58 | 49 | | |
| IV.6 | Interest on Debt | \$ 338,788 | \$ 239 | \$ 202 | | \$ 239 | 202 | | |
| | Total - Non-operational | \$ 5,311,915 | \$ 3,744 | \$ 3,168 | \$ - | \$ 3,744 | 3,168 | | |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | FY13 | | FY20 | | | | | |
| | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | \$ 21,337,601 | \$ 15,039 | \$ 12,724 | \$ (20,000) | \$ 15,025 | \$ 12,712.47 | | |

STRAIGHT A FUND - FINANCIAL IMPACT TABLE
Traditional District

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| IRN (6 digits): 047332 | | | | | | | |
| APPLICANT: Finneytown Local SD | | | | | | | |
| | | FY14 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 |
| <i>Do not alter any of the shaded cells.</i> | | Financial Baseline from the Current Five-Year Forecast | <p align="center">Since FY15 is the grant year, its expenditures are not required in this table.</p> <p align="center">In the FY16-FY20 columns, ADD only the SUSTAINING COSTS to the appropriate line items (refer to Question 15), and SUBTRACT only the SUSTAINING COST REDUCTIONS to the appropriate line items (refer to Questions 16 & 17).</p> | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES - OPERATIONAL | | FY14 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 |
| 3.010 | Personal Services (Salaries & Wages) | \$ 9,745,635 | | | | | |
| 3.020 | Fringe Benefits | \$ 3,010,000 | | | | | |
| 3.030 | Purchased Services | \$ 3,829,962 | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) |
| 3.040 | Supplies and Materials | \$ 593,670 | | | | | |
| 3.050 | Capital Outlay | \$ 382,458 | | | | | |
| 3.060 | Intergovernmental | \$ - | | | | | |
| | Total Expenditures - Operational | \$ 17,561,725 | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) |
| EXPENDITURES - DEBT SERVICE | | FY14 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 |
| 4.010 | Debt Service-Principal-All (Historical Only) | \$ - | | | | | |
| 4.020 | Debt Service-Principal-Notes | \$ - | | | | | |
| 4.030 | Debt Service-Principal-State Loans | \$ - | | | | | |
| 4.040 | Debt Service-Principal-State Advances | \$ - | | | | | |
| 4.050 | Debt Service-Principal-HB264 Loans | \$ 100,000 | | | | | |
| 4.055 | Debt Service-Principal-Other | \$ - | | | | | |
| 4.060 | Debt Service-Interest and Fiscal Charges | \$ 69,204 | | | | | |
| 4.300 | Debt Service-Other Objects | \$ 262,367 | | | | | |
| | Total Expenditures - Debt Service | \$ 431,571 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| EXPENDITURES - NON-OPERATIONAL | | FY14 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 |
| 5.010 | Operating Transfers-Out | \$ 5,700 | | | | | |
| 5.020 | Advances-Out | \$ 26,620 | | | | | |
| 5.030 | All Other Financing Uses | \$ - | | | | | |
| | Total Expenditures - Non-operational | \$ 32,320 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | FY14 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | | | | | | |
| For FY16-20, total expenditures must be cost neutral (e.g. \$0 or less) to prove sustainability. | | \$ 18,025,616 | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) | \$ (20,000) |

