Budget

Ashtabula County ESC (045849) - Ashtabula County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (90)

U.S.A.S. Fund #: 466

Plus/Minus Sheet (opens new window)

Object Code / Purpose Code	Salaries 100	Retirement Fringe Benefits 200	Purchased Services 400	Supplies 500	Capital Outlay 600	Other 800	Total
Instruction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Support Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Governance/Admin	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prof Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Family/Community	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Safety	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation	0.00	0.00	248,400.00	0.00	100,000.00	0.00	348,400.00
Indirect Cost						0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	248,400.00	0.00	100,000.00	0.00	348,400.00
						Adjusted Allocation	0.00
						Remaining	-348,400.00

Application

Ashtabula County ESC (045849) - Ashtabula County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (90)

Please respond to the prompts or questions in the areas listed below in a narrative form.

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
Ashtabula County Student Transportation Consortium

2. Project Summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.
This project will design and implement a comprehensive, coordinated student transportation program for the seven local school districts with

This is an ultra-concise description of the overall project. It should only include a brief description of the project and the goals it hopes to achieve.

3. Estimate of total students at each grade level to be directly impacted each year.

*This is the number of students that will receive services or other benefits as a **direct result** of implementing this project. This does not include students that may be impacted if the project is replicated or scaled up in the future. It excludes students who have merely a tangential or indirect benefit (such as students having use of improved facilities, equipment etc. for other uses than those intended as a part of the project). The Grant Year is the year in which funds are received from the Ohio Department of Education. Years 1 through 5 are the sustainability years during which the project must be fiscally and programmatically sustained.*

Grant Year

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8
1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12	

Year 1

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8
1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12	

Year 2

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8
1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12	

Year 3

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8
1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12	

Year 4

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8
1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12	

Year 5

0 Pre-K Special Education	1013 K	1065 1	990 2	1125 3
1020 4	1056 5	1054 6	1009 7	1084 8

1143 9	1139 10	1145 11	992 12

4. Explanation of any additional students to be impacted throughout the life of the project.
This includes any students impacted or estimates of students who might be impacted through future scale-ups or replications that go beyond the scope of this project.

Phase 1 (FY2017) and Phase 2 (FY2018) implementation will be for Ashtabula County. The baseline study completed in 2013/14 included Trumbull and Mahoning counties. Part of this project will include outreach to the school districts in these counties for possible expansion of the program in future years.

5. Lead applicant primary contact: - Provide the following information:

First and last name of contact for lead applicant
John M. Rubesich, Superintendent

Organizational name of lead applicant
Ashtabula County Educational Service Center

Address of lead applicant
4200 State Road Ashtabula Ohio 44004

Phone Number of lead applicant
440-576-9023

Email Address of lead applicant
john.rubesich@neomin.org

Community School Applicants: After your application has been submitted and is in Authorized Representative Approved status an email will be sent to your sponsoring entity automatically informing the sponsor of your application.

6. Are you submitting your application as a consortium? - Select one checkbox below

☑ Yes

☐ No

If you are applying as consortium, please list all consortium members by name on the "Consortium Member" page by clicking on the link below. If an educational service center is applying as the lead applicant for a consortium, the first consortium member entered must be a client district of the educational service center.

Add Consortium Members

7. Are you partnering with anyone to plan, implement, or evaluate your project? - Select one checkbox below

☑ Yes

☐ No

If you are partnering with anyone, please list all partners (vendors, service providers, sponsors, management companies, schools, districts, ESCs, IHEs) by name on the "Partnering Member" page by clicking on the link below.

Add Partnering Members

B) PROJECT DESCRIPTION - Overall description of project and alignment with goals

8. Describe the innovative project: - Provide the following information

The response should provide a clear and concise description of the project and its major components. The following questions will address specific outcomes and measures of success.

a. The current state or problem to be solved; and

Ashtabula County is the largest geographically in Ohio at 1,368 square miles. It is also very rural. There are seven school districts, one Career Center and one school for children with developmental disabilities serving approximately 14,000 students in grades K-12. None of the districts on its own can capture the logistical or organizational economies of scale necessary for maximum efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery. Yet each of the seven districts currently operates a separate, stand-alone transportation system. The primary current challenge is to ensure that all of the county's students receive safe and timely access to school; that every student arrives ready to learn; and that the associated transportation services are provided efficiently and responsibly relative to energy consumption, environmental considerations, and cost. The decentralized structure of service delivery leads to insufficiently focused management attention and intra-county competition for scarce resources. The outcome manifests in, for example, a chronic shortage of bus drivers, inefficient bus routing whereby multiple districts route buses individually to common central service locations, and an absence of resource sharing such as spare buses, fleet maintenance, and operational staffing. As a critical supporting service to the educational mission of the school districts, it should be incumbent on each entity to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and to drive resources to the classroom. As currently organized and implemented, student transportation services county-wide fail to take advantage of developments in technology and innovative management techniques. By addressing this issue aggressively, each education agency can enhance its focus on, and the resources

available for its core education mission.

b. The proposed innovation and how it relates to solving the problem or improving on the current state.

This project proposes to leverage the results of a past study of the issue conducted in 2013/14 for the three county region comprising Ashtabula, Trumbull and Mahoning counties. This study revealed the potential for improved energy efficiencies, but also alluded to the potential for cost avoidance in coordinated service delivery across current school district and administrative boundaries. The results are further supported by innovative implementation of consortium-based student transportation service delivery in locations as diverse as the State of Rhode Island, the Saint Louis metropolitan area, and the Province of Ontario. These actual and credible examples point to real-world results and will provide a model for the proposed solution this project will develop. This project will consist of a concerted "design-build-implement" effort to create a single, consolidated, and shared student transportation system for all K-12 students residing within the boundaries of Ashtabula County. As a secondary and related effort, it will also include outreach to the education agencies in the other two counties that participated in the 2013/14 study for possible inclusion in a later, expanded phase of implementation. The initial focus will be on Ashtabula County as all seven school district superintendents are currently in favor of, and willing participants in this project. A rare opportunity to carry an innovative and transformative approach to service delivery lacks only the planning and implementation resources required. The working model for the proposed single transportation system includes a single management, planning, and oversight organization coupled with three centralized bus parking and dispatch facilities strategically located in the North, Central, and Southern portions of the county. All activities would be coordinated through the centralized organization, and the three terminal facilities would be mutually supportive for all day-to-day operational needs including the provision of maintenance and fueling, the provision of spare buses and bus drivers, and on-road support such as route coverage, accident and incident response, and operational supervision. The entire system would be intensely technology-enabled and structured to be transparent and accountable to the parent agencies and school districts. Phase 1 of the project will be targeted for rapid implementation, with shared services to begin with the start of school in FY2017. Phase 1 will focus on capturing the organizational and planning benefits of the combined system by bringing technology and staffing together, but without major capital investments in facilities or other infrastructure. Past experience with similar efforts indicate that cost savings on the order of 15% are available through this level of coordination alone. To remain conservative in outlook, this project presumes just 7.5% savings in the first year. Phase 2 will build upon, and incorporate lessons learned from Phase 1. Adjustments to the service delivery model will be incorporated based on lessons learned, and further capital investments will be planned and funded to fully leverage any and all possible benefits from the shared delivery of services. The overall vision for the program will be achieved in this second phase of implementation which is scheduled to commence in FY2018. A key to success will be the engagement of industry partners to serve as designers, facilitators, and subject matter experts. School Bus Consultants, the advisory services arm of TransPar Group, Inc., has on-staff experts who have been involved with, and in many cases were the primary people responsible for all of the major successful programs of a similar type that are currently in place throughout the United States and Canada. Community Bus Services is the current service provider to a number of the agencies that will be participants in this endeavor. Research and experience indicates that outside experts such as

9. Select which (up to four) of the goals your project will address. For each of the selected goals, please provide the requested information to demonstrate your innovative project. - (Check all that apply)

☐ a. Student achievement

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: fewer students retained at 3rd grade, increase in graduation rate, increased proficiency rate in a content area, etc.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Examples: early diagnosis and intervention are needed to support all children learning to read on grade level; project-based learning results in higher levels of student engagement and learning, etc.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to measure progress toward your desired outcome.
These should be measurable changes, not merely the accomplishment of tasks. Example: Teachers will each implement one new project using new collaborative instructional skills, (indicates a change in the classroom) NOT; teachers will be trained in collaborative instruction (which may or may not result in change).

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to measure student achievement, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

☑ b. Spending reductions in the 5 year forecast

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: lowered facility cost as a result of transition to more efficient systems of heating and lighting, etc.; or cost savings due to transition from textbook to digital resources for teaching.

Reducing costs through the shared delivery of supporting services, both in the actual delivery of service (i.e., cross-use of buses and bus

drivers) and in the management, planning, and administration of the service. This latter category will include staffing, technology, facilities, and supplies. Historical experience with similar programs in diverse locations have revealed savings potential in the range of 15-20% as compared to base expenditures before program implementation. This project assumes a conservative estimate of 7.5% for Phase 1 alone. At this rate, payback of the total grant request would be achieved within six months, and before the end of the first fiscal year of operation.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Example: transition to "green energy" solutions produce financial efficiencies, etc.; or available digital resources are equivalent to or better than previously purchased textbooks.

There are three significant assumptions on which the proposed solution is predicated. The first is that is that economies of scale can be captured in a consolidated system. The second is that governance and management can be structured in such a way as to mitigate concerns regarding loss of local control over service delivery and cost. The third is that the costs of the combined system can be equitably calculated and shared amongst the participating agencies. Of these, experience indicates that economies of scale will be the easiest to prove. After that, there are established and successful examples for structuring a workable management and governance solution, but establishing cooperation and trust amongst the participants will have to be a primary focus. Finally, there are also successful examples of cost sharing methodologies, but establishing an equitable comparison base across all of the participating agencies will require compromise on the part of those that are currently operating at the highest level of efficiency relative to the others.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

The 2013/14 shared services study previously completed provides an excellent foundation for understanding the challenges and for each of the participants to understand the assumptions and how these assumptions will most impact them. With this study in-hand, all seven of the participating local districts plus the regional educational services agency are currently in favor of this project.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcome.
These should be specific dollar savings amounts. THESE MUST MATCH THE COST SAVINGS AS PROJECTED IN THE FINANCIAL IMPACT TABLE (FIT).

While the proponents of this project believe, and past examples demonstrate, that improvements to service quality are readily achievable through this approach to service delivery, it is the anticipation of cost savings that underlies this request. A single indicator of progress is therefore required: that the aggregate cost of providing student transportation services in Ashtabula County decreases, net of inflationary factors, from the baseline being established in FY2016.

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to measure spending reductions, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.

Given the diversity that exists in the size, scale, scope, and structure of the individual transportation programs within the seven local districts, a unit-based comparison baseline will be developed. These unit-based metrics will focus on averages and distributions, as appropriate, for key cost and service-based measures of performance. These will be industry standard indicators such as annual cost per student, annual cost per bus, buses used per 100 students transported, and student ride time.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

The design-build-implement process will include a series of go/no-go decision points. Experience indicates that there will be logical interim milestones whereby the data and information used to validate assumptions will have improved and clarified understanding such that a rational decision as to whether to proceed can be reached before committing further resources. These decision points also facilitate a logical set of "course-change" milestones whereby the scale and scope of the proposed implementation can be altered to reflect findings. Key among these is the planned split into Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation, with most of the capital investments being deferred to Phase 2. Additionally, while the project presumes a single complete and consolidated transportation system, should some of the assumptions prove false or the expected savings not materialize, individual elements might still be profitably pursued. For example, it may be possible to share spare buses or bus drivers between districts without consolidating the entire program. These types of alternate approaches will be identified as the project proceeds, but will be pursued only if the original premise proves false or unachievable in its entirety.

☑ c. Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom

i. List the desired outcomes.
Example: change the ratio of leadership time spent in response to discipline issues to the time available for curricular leadership.

Ultimately, this project is focused on a support service to the educational mission. It is, however, a critical and necessary supporting service. By cooperating on optimizing both service delivery and efficiency, the underlying premise behind the entire project is that financial resources currently committed to transportation will be freed-up, and that these will be redirected to the classroom by the participating agencies.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Examples: improvements to school and classroom climate will result in fewer disciplinary instances allowing leadership to devote more time to curricular oversight.

There are three significant assumptions on which the proposed solution is predicated. The first is that is that economies of scale can be captured in a consolidated system. The second is that governance and management can be structured in such a way as to mitigate concerns regarding loss of local control over service delivery and cost. The third is that the costs of the combined system can be equitably calculated and shared amongst the participating agencies. Of these, experience indicates that economies of scale will be the easiest to prove. After that, there are established and successful examples for structuring a workable management and governance solution, but establishing cooperation and trust amongst the participants will have to be a primary focus. Finally, there are also successful examples of cost sharing methodologies, but establishing an equitable comparison base across all of the participating agencies will require compromise on the part of those that are currently operating at the highest level of efficiency relative to the others.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, etc), or how these are well-supported by the

literature.

The 2013/14 shared services study previously completed provides an excellent foundation for understanding the challenges and for each of the participants to understand the assumptions and how these assumptions will most impact them. With this study in-hand, all seven of the participating local districts plus the regional educational services agency are currently in favor of this project.

iv. Please provide the most recent instructional spending percentage (from the annual Ohio School Report Card) and discuss any impact you anticipate as a result of this project.
Note: this is the preferred indictor for this goal.

N/A

v. List any additional indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcome. Provide baseline data if available.
These should be specific outcomes, not just the accomplishment of tasks. Example: fewer instances of playground fighting.

Reducing costs through the shared delivery of supporting services, both in the actual delivery of service (i.e., cross-use of buses and bus drivers) and in the management, planning, and administration of the service. This latter category will include staffing, technology, facilities, and supplies. Historical experience with similar programs in diverse locations have revealed savings potential in the range of 15-20% as compared to base expenditures before program implementation. This project assumes a conservative estimate of 7.5% for Phase 1 alone. At this rate, payback of the total grant request would be achieved within six months, and before the end of the first fiscal year of operation.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

The design-build-implement process will include a series of go/no-go decision points. Experience indicates that there will be logical interim milestones whereby the data and information used to validate assumptions will have improved and clarified understanding such that a rational decision as to whether to proceed can be reached before committing further resources. These decision points also facilitate a logical set of "course-change" milestones whereby the scale and scope of the proposed implementation can be altered to reflect findings. Key among these is the planned split into Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation, with most of the capital investments being deferred to Phase 2. Additionally, while the project presumes a single complete and consolidated transportation system, should some of the assumptions prove false or the expected savings not materialize, individual elements might still be profitably pursued. For example, it may be possible to share spare buses or bus drivers between districts without consolidating the entire program. These types of alternate approaches will be identified as the project proceeds, but will be pursued only if the original premise proves false or unachievable in its entirety.

☑ d. Implementing a shared services delivery model

i. List the desired outcomes.
Examples: increase in quality and quantity of employment applications to districts; greater efficiency in delivery of transportation services, etc.

The very essence of this project is to design, build, and implement an industry-proven shared-services model. By focusing on a supporting service, local control over the core educational mission of each participating agency will be unaffected. This makes this project one of the most readily adoptable mechanisms for demonstrating the positive impact of shared-services while mitigating the prospect for conflict resulting from education policy or philosophical differences that may exist among the participants.

ii. What assumptions must be true for this outcome to be realized?
Example: neighboring districts have overlapping needs in administrative areas that can be combined to create efficiencies.

There are three significant assumptions on which the proposed solution is predicated. The first is that is that economies of scale can be captured in a consolidated system. The second is that governance and management can be structured in such a way as to mitigate concerns regarding loss of local control over service delivery and cost. The third is that the costs of the combined system can be equitably calculated and shared amongst the participating agencies. Of these, experience indicates that economies of scale will be the easiest to prove. After that, there are established and successful examples for structuring a workable management and governance solution, but establishing cooperation and trust amongst the participants will have to be a primary focus. Finally, there are also successful examples of cost sharing methodologies, but establishing an equitable comparison base across all of the participating agencies will require compromise on the part of those that are currently operating at the highest level of efficiency relative to the others.

iii. Describe any early efforts you have made to test these assumptions (pilot implementation, data analysis etc), or how these are well-supported by the literature.

The 2013/14 shared services study previously completed provides an excellent foundation for understanding the challenges and for each of the participants to understand the assumptions and how these assumptions will most impact them. With this study in-hand, all seven of the participating local districts plus the regional educational services agency are currently in favor of this project.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcomes.
These should be measureable changes, not the accomplishment of tasks.
Example: consolidation of transportation services between two districts.

Reducing costs through the shared delivery of supporting services, both in the actual delivery of service (i.e., cross-use of buses and bus drivers) and in the management, planning, and administration of the service. This latter category will include staffing, technology, facilities, and supplies. Historical experience with similar programs in diverse locations have revealed savings potential in the range of 15-20% as compared to base expenditures before program implementation. This project assumes a conservative estimate of 7.5% for Phase 1 alone. At this rate, payback of the total grant request would be achieved within six months, and before the end of the first fiscal year of operation

v. List and describe pertinent data points that you will use to evaluate the success of your efforts, providing baseline data to be used for future comparison.
Example: change in the number of school buses or miles travelled.

Given the diversity that exists in the size, scale, scope, and structure of the individual transportation programs within the seven local districts, a unit-based comparison baseline will be developed. These unit-based metrics will focus on averages and distributions, as appropriate, for key cost and service-based measures of performance. These will be industry standard indicators such as annual cost per student, annual cost per bus, buses used per 100 students transported, and student ride time.

vi. How are you prepared to alter the course of your project if assumptions prove false or outcomes are not realized?

The design-build-implement process will include a series of go/no-go decision points. Experience indicates that there will be logical interim milestones whereby the data and information used to validate assumptions will have improved and clarified understanding such that a rational decision as to whether to proceed can be reached before committing further resources. These decision points also facilitate a logical set of "course-change" milestones whereby the scale and scope of the proposed implementation can be altered to reflect findings. Key among these is the planned split into Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation, with most of the capital investments being deferred to Phase 2. Additionally, while the project presumes a single complete and consolidated transportation system, should some of the assumptions prove false or the expected savings not materialize, individual elements might still be profitably pursued. For example, it may be possible to share spare buses or bus drivers between districts without consolidating the entire program. These types of alternate approaches will be identified as the project proceeds, but will be pursued only if the original premise proves false or unachievable in its entirety.

10. Which of the following best describes the proposed project? - (Select one)

- [ ] a. New - Never before implemented
- [x] b. Existing - Never implemented in your community school or school district but proven successful in other educational environments
- [ ] c. Replication - Expansion or new implementation of a previous Straight A Project
- [ ] d. Mixed Concept - Incorporates new and existing elements
- [ ] e. Established - Elevating or expanding an effective program that is already implemented in your district, school or consortia partnership

C) BUDGET AND SUSTAINABILITY

11. Financial Information: - All applicants must enter or upload the following supporting information. The information in these documents must correspond to your responses in questions 12-19.

a. Enter a project budget in CCIP (by clicking the link below)

Enter Budget

b. If applicable, upload the Consortium Budget Worksheet (by clicking the Upload Documents link below)

c. Upload the Financial Impact Table (by clicking the Upload Documents link below)

Upload Documents

The project budget is entered directly in CCIP. For consortia, this project budget must reflect the information provided by the applicant in the Consortium Budget Worksheet. Directions for the Financial Impact Table are located on the first tab of the workbook. Applicants must submit one Financial Impact Table with each application. For consortium applications, please add additional sheets instead of submitting separate Financial Impact Tables.

348,400.00 12. What is the amount of this grant request?

13. Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.
Responses should provide a rationale and evidence for each of the budget items and associated costs outlined in the project budget. In no case should the total projected expenses in the budget narrative exceed the total project costs in the budget grid.

This grant is necessary to enable Phase 1 of the project. Experience with similar efforts throughout North America has revealed that outside advice, facilitation, and subject matter expertise is critical to success. Thus, the majority of the budget is to fund the purchase of outside services to manage the entirety of the design-build-implement process. The firm being recommended is the largest, most experienced student transportation management and consulting services firm in North America. Current staff members of this firm, who have been committed to this project, have been directly responsible for similar design-build-implement projects in the State of Rhode Island, the Voluntary Inter-District Choice Corporation serving metro St. Louis school districts, and for the consortium-based service delivery model now standardized throughout the Province of Ontario. These outside experts will: ? Facilitate the process by providing unbiased interpretative advice to each of the independent agency participants, and by recommending the most efficient and effective policy solutions regardless of local circumstances, constraints, or beliefs; ? Design the shared-services program to include its organization structure, staffing requirements, technology integration, processes, procedures, and logistical solutions such as bus routing; ? Execute the implementation by providing subject matter, planning, and operational expertise coupled with the resources required in the short-term until the program is implemented and functioning as a stand-alone, regular part of day-to-day district operations. After the provision of these professional services, the next largest portion of the grant request will be attributable to a one-time expenditure on technology. As described previously, the program is deliberately designed to be technology-intensive. The large geographic area to be served, the transparency required to ensure equity, and the heavy reliance that will be placed on communications and information availability demands that a robust, common, and up-to-date technology solution be included in the baseline planning. This will include, at a minimum: ? Routing software to design and implement the most effective and efficient logistical solution possible and to provide the base data required for bus and student tracking; ? Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL or GPS) technology to enable real-time, on-demand tracking of all buses and student riders throughout the county and to provide the data required to enable real-time communication and status to all program stakeholders; ? Communications technology including mobile applications, on-board communication with bus personnel, and reporting to stakeholders such as building principals; and ? Administrative systems to enable program accounting and customer service management. All other budget items are small in comparison to these two, and primarily include miscellaneous administrative and project oversight costs, and imputed costs for staff overtime and local district participation in the design-build-implement process.

14. Please provide an estimate of the total costs associated with maintaining this program through each of the five years following the initial grant implementation year (sustainability costs). This is the sum of expenditures from Section A of the Financial Impact Table.

0.00 a. Sustainability Year 1
0.00 b. Sustainability Year 2
0.00 c. Sustainability Year 3
0.00 d. Sustainability Year 4
0.00 e. Sustainability Year 5

15. Please provide a narrative explanation of sustainability costs.
Sustainability costs include any ongoing spending related to the grant project after June 30, 2017. Examples of sustainability costs include annual professional development, staffing costs, equipment maintenance, and software license agreements. To every extent possible, rationale for the specific amounts given should be outlined. The costs outlined in this narrative section should be consistent and verified by the financial documentation submitted and explained in the Financial Impact Table. If the project does not have sustainability costs, applicants should explain why.

Properly designed and implemented, this program will be self-sustaining, with annual costs net of inflationary factors lower that the baseline comparison year. That said, should Phase 1 prove to be successful at the conservative levels predicted, Phase 2 may require up-front capital investments that far exceed those planned for Phase 1. It is impossible to predict at this stage what those may be, or where/ how they will be funded. Making these determination will be part of the design effort to be funded by this grant. Regardless, the program is designed to be sustainable with just the Phase 1 implementation; Phase 2 will proceed only if cost-justified as a stand-alone project. The estimated cost savings over and above those of Phase 1 must offset the savings predicted as a result of the investments made in Phase 2.

100 16. What percentage of these costs will be met through cost savings achieved through implementation of the program?

Total cost savings from section B of the Financial Impact Table divided by total sustainability cost from section A of the Financial Impact Table. If the calculated amount is greater than 100, enter 100 here.

17. Please explain how these cost savings will be derived from the program.
Applicants who selected spending reductions in the five-year forecast as a goal must identify those expected savings in questions 16 and 17. All spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. Explanation of savings must be specific as to staff counts; salary/benefits; equipment costs, etc.

The vast majority of costs incurred by any student transportation program is attributable to on-board labor and the capital and operating costs of the school buses. The broad experience of our industry partners in examining programs nationwide indicates that roughly 60 percent of costs will be attributable to on-board labor (drivers and attendants); 25 percent to bus asset depreciation, maintenance, and repair; and 10 percent to fuel. The remaining five percent, while representing a small minority of cost, adds the most value through the proper planning, oversight, and execution of all related program activities. By making the upfront and innovative investment in this program, the participants will realize a disproportional benefit in the level of management attention and professionalization that can be devoted to the overall transportation program. The savings will not result from lower management and administrative costs. Indeed, in total these are likely to increase. In fact they should increase in proportion to overall expenditures because the underlying presumption is that this marginal investment in the smallest proportional cost will yield savings through a reduction in the aggregate number of buses required to operate the combined system, and in its largest component cost categories. Thus, for a nominal 100 bus system, eliminating even one percent of the assets in use will generally pay for the added investment in technology and management attention. Each additional bus eliminated from the system will lower the net costs of the program in real terms, and on an annual recurring basis. It is through this process that the program becomes self-sustainable with no further infusion of funds required following implementation.

0 18. What percentage of sustainability costs will be met through reallocation of savings from elsewhere in the general budget?

Total reallocation from section C of the Financial Impact Table divided by total sustainability cost from section A of the Financial Impact Table
Note: the responses to questions 16 and 18 must total 100%

19. Please explain the source of these reallocated funds.
Reallocation of funds implies that a reduction has been made elsewhere in the budget. Straight A encourages projects to determine up front what can be replaced in order to ensure the life of the innovative project.

Not applicable (self-sustaining program)

D) IMPLEMENTATION

20. Please provide a brief description of the team or individuals responsible for the implementation of this project, including other consortium members or partners.

This response should include a list of qualifications for the applicant and others associated with the grant. Please list key personnel only. If the application is for a consortium or a partnership, the lead should provide information on its ability to manage the grant in an effective and efficient manner. Include the partner/consortium members' qualifications, skills and experience with innovative project implementation and projects of similar scope.

Enter Implementation Key Personnel information by clicking the link below:

Add Implementation - Key Personnel

For Questions 21-23 please describe each phase of your project including its timeline, and scope of work.

A complete response to these questions will demonstrate awareness of the context in which the project will be implemented and the time it will take to implement the project with fidelity. A strong plan for implementing, communicating and coordinating the project should be apparent, including coordination and communication in and amongst members of the consortium or partnership (if applicable). Not every specific action step need be included, but the outline of the major steps should demonstrate a thoughtful plan for achieving the goals of the project. The timeline should reflect significant and important milestones in an appropriate time frame.

21. Planning

a. Date RangeFebruary, 2016 to March, 2016

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks.

1 Project kickoff, data collection, & planning 2 Determine the comparison baseline (cost & service) 3 Develop proposed consortium model - operational, staffing & one-time capital investments for Phase 1 & 2 4 Develop proposed consortium model - cost sharing & accounting for Phase 1 & 2

22. Implementation(grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date RangeApril, 2016 to August, 2016

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

5 Present, discuss, negotiate, revise, and finalize Phase 1 consortium model 6 Develop, document, present, discuss, revise, and finalize Phase 1 consortium implementation plan 7 Execute Phase 1 implementation plan (FY2017 proof-of-concept implementation)

23. Programmatic Sustainability (years following implementation, including institutionalization of program, evaluation and communication of program outcomes)

a. Date RangeAugust, 2016 to December, 2016

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

8 Monitor Phase 1 implementation & adjust as required 9 Assess Phase 1 implementation; adjust Phase 2 consortium model as required 10 Develop Phase 2 implementation plan and funding request, as dictated by circumstance

E) SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT AND LASTING VALUE

24. Describe the expected changes to the instructional and/or organizational practices in your institution.

The response should illustrate the critical instructional and/or organizational changes that will result from implementation of the grant and the impact of these changes. These changes can include permanent changes to current district processes, new processes that will be incorporated or the removal of redundant processes. The response may also outline the expected change in behaviors of individuals (changes to classroom practice, collaboration across district boundaries, changes to a typical work day for specific staff members, etc.). The expected changes should be realistic and significant in moving the institution forward.

Please enter your response below:

Implementation of the Ashtabula County Student Transportation Consortium will be a defining moment for student transportation programs throughout the region and the State. It will mark a first demonstrable and significant step forward in establishing true collaboration and cooperation in the delivery of support services to our students across district boundaries. As such, it will serve a dual purpose: first as a real, demonstrable improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of this critical support service locally; second as a demonstration project regionally and statewide. The major change in organizational practice will be the establishment of a service delivery organization jointly funded and staffed by the participating agencies. This alone will demonstrate a significant departure from tradition. To be successful, this joint organization must also be governed via a joint committee of the participating agencies. This will establish a regular forum for further discussion of cooperation across district boundaries. It is incumbent on the success of the program that it include permanent changes to the associated policies, processes, and procedures of the participating districts. There will be a natural process of standardization of expectations and service quality that will, over the long-term, prove to be a benefit to all. This will also include, through a concentration of effort and management attention, a net increase to the professionalization of the function. More scale will provide the ability to attract and retain more management capacity, furthering a process of education and continuous improvement that will further benefit the participants over time. Lastly, the financial benefits that form the core of the justification for this project will be real, substantial, and sustainable well beyond the early years of the program. With the organization, collaboration, communication, and professionalization of this function throughout Ashtabula County this project will create a platform for the rational, business-case evaluation of all future decisions as they relate to transportation service delivery. This will be, in the opinion of this applicant, an absolutely critical mechanism of support as the nature of the educational mission continues to evolve and the variety and dispersal of educational programs continues to increase in the years ahead.

25. Please provide the name and contact information for the person and/or organization who will oversee the evaluation of this project.

Projects may be evaluated either internally or externally. However, evaluation must be ongoing throughout the entire period of sustainability and have the capacity to provide the Ohio Department of Education with clear metrics related to each selected goal.

Please enter your response below:

This project is being established to enable a cross-use of resources and expertise. While the lead applicant will serve as the primary nexus of control and oversight, staff from Community Bus Services will be utilized to provide day-to-day oversight of the design team from SBC, and day-to-day feedback and assessment of progress to the lead applicant and the participating school districts. Contact information is as follows:

26. Describe the overall plan for evaluation, including plans for data collection, underlying research rationale, measurement timelines and methods of analysis.

This plan should include the methodology for measuring all of the project outcomes. Applicants should make sure to outline quantitative approaches to assess progress and measure the overall impact of the project proposal. The response should provide a clear outline of the methods, process, timelines and data requirements for the final analysis of the project's progress, success or shortfall. The applicant should provide information on how the lessons learned from the project can and will be shared with other education providers in Ohio. Note: A complete and comprehensive version of the evaluation plan must be submitted to ODE by all selected projects.

The project plan itself incorporates mechanisms to ensure that progress is measured and reported, and that success is evaluated quantitatively. Key among these is the independent calculation, using methods consistently applied to all participants, of a comparison baseline using FY2015/16 data collected as task 1 in the development timeline. This will form the comparison baseline against which all other activities and outcomes will be measured. It will include measures of cost and service quality, and will be documented in a report format for purposes of historical comparison and future expansion. The second key mechanism for evaluation will be the independent participation of the oversight services provider. This proposed vendor is a long-time provider of busing services in the region and a member of the local community. Ongoing contact with, and surveys of the participating agencies will serve to keep the project on task, ensure that desired outcomes are being achieved, and will provide an historical record of the process and its results and lessons learned. The entire process, including these measurement techniques and data, will be reported at the conclusion of the implementation in a form and format that can be distributed, studied, and discussed within the broader statewide education community. The purpose for this will be to encourage continuous improvement and replication of the process for expansion in other regions and for other services.

27. Please describe the likelihood that this project, if successful, can be scaled-up, expanded and/or replicated. Include a description of potential replications both within the district or collaborative group, as well as an estimation of the probability that this solution will prove useful to others. Discuss the possibility of publications, etc., to make others aware of what has been learned in this project.

The response should provide an explanation of the time and effort it would take to implement the project in another district, as well as any plans to share lessons learned with other districts. To every extent possible, applicants should outline how this project can become part of a model so that other districts across the state can take advantage of the learnings from this proposed innovative project. If there is a plan to increase the scale and scope of the project within the district or consortium, it should be noted here.

In conclusion, it is the opinion of this applicant that the service delivery model being proposed for design, build, and implementation in this project will be eminently expandable and replicable. Indeed, the seed funding required to bring this project to a successful conclusion will reap benefits in awareness and in example that will far exceed the investment and the immediate financial benefits to accrue locally. Part of the attraction is exactly that. This is not a new concept. It has been successfully implemented on a grand scale in Ontario. Fully 32 consortium operations are responsible for the delivery of student transportation services throughout the province, representing more than $800 million in annual expenditures and more than 10,000 school buses. Millions in documented savings have resulted from this effort, with thousands of school buses being removed from service with all of the energy and environmental benefits this implies. Ohio can be next.

By virtue of applying for the Straight A Fund, all applicants agree to participate in the overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund for the duration of the evaluation time frame. The Governing Board of the Straight A Fund reserves the right to conduct an evaluation of the project and request additional information in the form of data, surveys, interviews, focus groups and other related data on behalf of the General Assembly, Governor and other interested parties for an overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund.

PROGRAM ASSURANCES: I agree, on behalf of this applicant, and any or all identified consortium members or partners, that all supporting documents contain information approved by a relevant executive board or its equivalent and to abide by all assurances outlined in the Straight A Assurances (available in the document library section of the CCIP).

We agree to all assurances.

Consortium

Ashtabula County ESC (045849) - Ashtabula County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Consortium Contacts							
First Name	Last Name	Telephone Number	Email Address	Organization Name	IRN	Address	Delete Contact
John	Rubesich	440-576-9023	john.rubesich	Ashtabula County ESC	045849	4200 State Rd, Ashtabula, OH, 44004-6017	
John	Montanaro	440-576-9180	john.montanaro@jalsd.org	Jefferson Area Local	045872	121 S Poplar St, Jefferson, OH, 44047-1328	
Tom	Diringer	440-998-4411	t.diringer@buckeyeschools.info	Buckeye Local	045856	3436 Edgewood Dr, Ashtabula, OH, 44004-5967	
Michael	Notar	440-593-7200	mnotar@cacsk12.org	Conneaut Area City	043810	230 Gateway Ave, Conneaut, OH, 44030-2355	
Patrick	Colucci	440-992-1202	patrick.colucci@aacs.net	Ashtabula Area City	043513	2630 W 13th St, Ashtabula, OH, 44004-2405	
Michael	Candela	440-293-6488	mike.candela@neomin.org	Pymatuning Valley Local	045880	PO Box 1180, Andover, OH, 44003-1180	
William	Nye	440-437-6260	william.nye@grandvalley.school	Grand Valley Local	045864	111 Grand Valley Ave West, Orwell, OH, 44076-9420	
Eric	Kujala	440-466-4831	eric.kujala@neomin.org	Geneva Area City	044057	135 S Eagle St, Geneva, OH, 44041-1513	

Partnerships

Ashtabula County ESC (045849) - Ashtabula County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Partnerships							
First Name	**Last Name**	**Telephone Number**	**Email Address**	**Organization Name**	**IRN**	**Address**	**Delete Contact**
Tom	Binaut	443-668-8066	tbinaut@verizon.net	Community Bus Services, Inc		11 Federal Plaza, , Youngstown, OH, 44503	
Tom	Platt	888-506-3413	tplatt@schoolbusconsultants.com	School Bus Consultants		60 West St, , Annapolis, MD, 21401	

Implementation Team

Ashtabula County ESC (045849) - Ashtabula County - 2016 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections

Implementation Team								
First Name	Last Name	Title	Responsibilities	Qualifications	Prior Relevant Experience	Education	% FTE	Delete Contact
Tom	Binaut	Vice President of Development	Legal consultant and planning in methods of student transporation. Advisory capacity.	School Bus Consultants (SBC), a component of TransPar Group, Inc., is the largest consulting company in North America dedicated to pupil transportation. They have performed more than 350 consulting projects of various sizes and types for more than 200 school districts in 31 states and 3 Canadian provinces. A total of nine staff consultants with more than 200 combined years in student transportation operations will provide this project with a unique perspective on the needs and requirements of transportation providers. SBC clients have included rural, suburban, and urban school districts with both contracted and district-owned operations. SBC also worked with state pupil transportation agencies, regional cooperative transportation organizations, private investment firms, private sector transportation providers, and student transportation professional associations.	SBC has previously performed more than 20 prior studies related to opportunities for collaboration and cooperation in student transportation service delivery. These have included assessments of opportunities in regular education, special education, magnet/vocational program options, and transportation support activities. These studies have been conducted in six states plus the Provinces of Ontario and Alberta in Canada. They have been conducted on a large and small scale, and have ranged from baseline feasibility assessments through and including implementation of comprehensive programs. Of particular note, SBC staff assisted with the assessment, design, and implementation of a statewide transportation system for Rhode Island in 2007-2009, and have been providing on-going assistance since 2006 with the implementation and refinement of the Province of Ontario's now standardized service model of student transportation consortia.	SBC and CBS staff members that will be assigned to this project all hold bachelor degrees, with some holding one or more masters level deg	50	
Tom	Platt	Vice President	Implement improvement plan for efficiency and effectiveness for Ashtabula County transportation.	Vice President of School Bus Consultants. He has published many articles on school bus transportation, fleet utilization, and managing special education costs.	Served as Director of Operations of Sayres Computer Source and was senior manager in Fleet Management Consulting with Maximus Inc.	Has Bachelors in Science, Transporation, Main Maritime Academy. Masters in Business Administration from Syracuse.	100	