

Budget

Wickliffe City (045088) - Lake County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (115)

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

Plus/Minus Sheet ([opens new window](#))

Purpose Code	Object 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		10,000.00	0.00	739,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	749,000.00
Governance/Admin		55,000.00	16,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	121,000.00
Prof Development		0.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00
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	120,000.00	0.00	120,000.00
Transportation		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indirect Cost							0.00	0.00
Total		65,000.00	16,000.00	739,000.00	10,000.00	120,000.00	50,000.00	1,000,000.00
							Adjusted Allocation	0.00
							Remaining	-1,000,000.00

Application

Wickliffe City (045088) - Lake County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (115)

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

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
NEO Family and Workforce Development Resource Center (NEO FWDRC)

2. Project Tweet: Please limit your responses to 140 characters.
The NEO FWDRC will provide programming and services to students to support their academic, social, and workforce readiness needs.
This is an ultra-concise introduction to the project.

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				
582 Pre-K Special Education	1304 K	1307 1	1328 2	1263 3
1234 4	1207 5	1246 6	1262 7	1223 8
1469 9	1342 10	1303 11	1225 12	

Year 1				
619 Pre-K Special Education	1324 K	1304 1	1300 2	1279 3
1265 4	1245 5	1211 6	1245 7	1261 8
1428 9	1387 10	1376 11	1255 12	

Year 2				
623 Pre-K Special Education	1317 K	1323 1	1297 2	1301 3
1331 4	1277 5	1249 6	1212 7	1244 8
1467 9	1336 10	1434 11	1328 12	

Year 3				
625 Pre-K Special Education	1304 K	1316 1	1297 2	1303 3
1343 4	1282 5	1248 6	1211 7	1461 8
1774 9	1383 10	1385 11	1328 12	

Year 4				
627 Pre-K Special Education	1299 K	1303 1	1312 2	1327 3
1303 4	1321 5	1345 6	1279 7	1244 8
1358 9	1357 10	1417 11	1355 12	

Year 5				
628 Pre-K Special Education	1277 K	1298 1	1299 2	1322 3
1333 4	1321 5	1323 6	1342 7	1275 8

4. Explanation of any additional students to be impacted throughout the life of the project.

This includes any students impacted indirectly and estimates of students who might be impacted through replication or an increase in the scope of the original project.

Consortia members are located in 3 northeast Ohio counties - Lake, Lorain and Cuyahoga. As NEO-FRC expands, partners anticipate all districts in each county to participate in - at least the professional development and coordination of services aspects of the initiative. This initiative can ultimately touch all 211,000 children and families living and/or attending school in Lake, Lorain and Cuyahoga counties.

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

First and last name of contact for lead applicant
Joseph Spiccia

Organizational name of lead applicant
Wickliffe City School District

Address of lead applicant
2221 Rockefeller Road, Wickliffe, Ohio 44092

Phone Number of lead applicant
440.943.6900

Email Address of lead applicant
joseph.spiccia@wickliffeschools.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

The Wickliffe City Schools and consortia districts (Painesville CLSD, Lakewood CSD, Lorain CSD) serve a large number of economically disadvantaged students and most have large English Language Learner populations. As demonstrated by the 2013-14 and 2014-15 Report Cards for 'closing the gap' these children experience significant achievement gaps as compared to non disadvantaged children and/or native English speaking peers. Wickliffe: 46% ED doubled since 2005, and scores of D and C in gap closing, Painesville: 95% ED and a score of F in gap closing, Lakewood: 45% ED and a score of F in gap closing, and Lorain: 89% ED and a score of F in gap closing. Such results cannot continue. Consortia districts must maximize student achievement and prepare ALL students for postsecondary success. This will require innovative approaches addressing the academic and non-academic needs of students.

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

Expanded school improvement involving strategic family community partnerships are essential for good outcomes (Anderson, Butcher, 2010). NEO FRC will replicate Painesville Family Resource Center (FRC) & incubate a regional FRC network to collectively sustain/grow all FRCs improving learning outcomes for 17295 students. FRCs use Ohio Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement (OCCMSI) model to maximize family community resources. Painesville FRC: Painesville FRC opened in 2014 providing solutions and interventions to

improve family social, economic, behavioral, and mental well-being. It is a convenient central point of contact for all families to access multiple services and minimizes barriers to academic success. Physical (hunger/nutrition) or mental health, trauma, negative peer influences, substance abuse, difficulties with concentration/attention & social/emotional barriers all hinder a child's ability to learn. Each county has family services agencies but resources are not always readily accessible to families in need. FRC offers a "one stop" service that increases awareness, addresses barriers & connects families to the supports available in each community. In addition, the FRCs will provide workforce development training, and contacts for students and families to prepare for and find employment. FRC Site Coordinator, in partnership with school staff, identifies students at risk of under performance and assesses student/family needs. On behalf of families, the coordinator networks with other non-profits, social agencies & health care providers to facilitate service delivery so children succeed in school. Students and families receive services in school setting, where they are easily accessible, coordinated, and accountable. FRC targets students most at risk (deficiencies in math/reading, truancy, behavioral difficulties) but is open to all. FRC Project Planning: Research site visits to successful FRC programs. Consultants will: conduct school/community gap resource maps for each district; create implementation/continuous improvement, marketing, partnership development and family engagement plans; support district staff/Site Coordinators to define key practices, policies, procedures for start up. Create District Advisory Boards to coordinate all local efforts & recruit partners. Districts will renovate facilities to open Wickliffe, Lakewood, and Lorain FRCs, and expand Painesville FRC; assess local training needs to drive instructional/system, instructional/organizational change (ie. Bridges Out of Poverty, Teaching Trauma Impacted Youth), & create structures to train students/families in career planning & workforce development. FRC Network Development: Lake ESC and Cuyahoga County ESC will incubate shared service NEO FRC Advisory Board to regionalize financial sustainability & fundraising; establish common data collection/evaluation process; purchase hardware/software, resources to collect data for project & collaborate with Kent State University to monitor project outcomes. Capacity building: Train district Site Coordinators to update plans, operate FRC, create new programs, manage data, implement partnership development, outreach and marketing. Local trainers offer PD aligned with identified needs. Train school districts to implement school based wraparound model & prepare local partners to scale wraparound to all schools. Organizational/instructional changes: New school/community/partnerships & services; greater access to services; increased teacher efficacy & student readiness to learn, improved climate; new strategies to reach ED/ELL. WUSD requests \$1,000,000 will have \$1,911.105 in sustainable costs between the three new FRC sites, excluding Painesville's existing FRC which will not require sustainable costs outside what is already reflected with the district budget forecast. NEO FRC is reducing costs with a net savings of \$3,406,910 by 2022 so it is sustainable without additional income and shows savings

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 process. - (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.

The Summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children in the consortia districts who experience significant achievement gaps in comparison to non-disadvantaged peers. The 'gap' will be reduced 10% per year over five years resulting in a 50% improvement over the five-year grant period. Annually, 85% of ED, disabled, and ELL students served through the FRC will decrease unexcused absences from school, decrease the number of discipline referrals, & improve academic performance in reading and math, as noted above. Annually, each consortia school will report a decrease in the number of out-of-school suspensions for the targeted students (Baseline 2015-16 school year). Beginning with 2018 District Report Card, each consortia district will report an increase in the high school graduation rate for the targeted students (Baseline 2015-16 school year).

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.

Assumption: Schools serving at risk youth improve outcomes by intentionally linking school family community using Ohio Community Collaboration OCCS model. Research: Traditional solutions focused on academic instruction, tutoring & remediation supports are not sufficient. It is impossible to achieve educational goals without addressing health, mental health, & positive developmental needs. Expanded school improvement approaches involving strategic school/family/community partnerships are essential for good outcomes (Anderson Butcher, 2010). Assumption: Successful FRC framework must engage community families beyond academics to improve achievement. Research: OCCS recommends five core components: Academics, After School Programs, Parent Involvement, Health and Social Services, & Youth Development Programs connected to academic learning and achievement. Schools/partners provide comprehensive & coordinated academic, social, mental, physical, and vocational programs & services for students.

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

Painesville FRC Results: The PCLSD (3,000 students) has served hundreds of families in tis community since opening last year. A partial list of services provided to the community include: 1,327 coats distributed to children, 200 children received 1,200 meals for weekends, over 550 families serviced through the school market program, over 200 adults served through the English as a Second Language Program, and the FRC has provided mentoring, tutoring, workforce development, & financial literacy programs. Finally, over 180 people have volunteered at the FRC demonstrating that the center not only serves its clients, it also brings members of the community together. In 2007, Ohio State Board of Education adopted the Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement (CAYCI) developed by the Ohio State University's Community and Youth Collaborative Institute as the primary framework for family school collaboration. Since then, CAYCI has been refining this framework in Ohio and beyond. In October 2015, CAYCI completed a two year evaluation of its work in Canyon School District in Utah. During the two year project, CSD implemented new and expanded strategies for supporting students and families across five pathways: academics, parent and family engagement, youth development, health and social services, and community partnerships. Results showed: increased school/family/community partnerships; system-wide improvements including a new referral system for each school; strengthened planning teams and better data systems to inform change efforts, Such system-wide improvements contributed to increased number of youth served in out of school programming, improved quality of services delivered, and marked improvement of academic achievement and attendance. Office discipline referrals dropped significantly over the two years. Teacher perceptions of school climate, teacher efficacy, the learning support system, & students' readiness learn were more favorable in 2014 than

2012. In some schools, parents/caregivers and youth perceptions improved in key constructs such as parent involvement, student well-being, and quality of community supports. School-based wraparound teams have had a strong presence in Ohio since 2003. Ohio Care Team Collaborative (CTC) started 2 Muskingham county pilots in 2003. By 2011, 28 schools in 6 Ohio counties had adopted all or aspects of CTC framework to address non-academic needs. 2010 Results: 12/15 CTC trained schools increased the % of Report Card Indicators Met, 7/15 schools met 100% of indicators (previously only 4 had 100%). Consortia district leaders have attended Ruby Payne's Bridges Out of Poverty training and plan to bring this to the region by having local educators trained to provide these workshops internally. These and other similar trainings will create positive psychosocial changes for participants from poverty and the professionals who serve them.

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).

The Summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children in the consortia school districts. Formative indicators to measure progress: Annually, each FRC will demonstrate Increased staff and community awareness of the referral process, families will report improved access to services, increased staff perception of school readiness to learn, increased numbers of families served through the FRC, increased number of partner organizations providing services through the FRC, improved communication among partner organizations, families, and schools, and increased participation in workforce and career development programs. Annually, 85% of ED and ELL students served through the FRC will decrease unexcused absence from school, decrease in number of discipline referrals, improve academic performance in math and reading (baseline 2015-16).

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

The summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children living in the consortia districts. Pertinent data points for improved student achievement: Increased attendance and graduation rates among the target population, improved reading and math achievement for ED and ELL children, decreased achievement gap in reading and math for ED and ELL populations, decreased out-of-school suspensions and/or expulsions for the targeted groups, increased staff and community awareness of the referral process, families will report increased access to services addressing health, mental health, and positive youth development, and increased staff perception of readiness to learn.

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

Multiple touch points are built into the project to gauge progress and impact. These measures provide formative feedback about implementation success and identify areas where greater attention may be needed. The first priority is to establish a well coordinated leadership team, focused on achieving the grant's outcomes, to track progress and alter the plan where needed. The leadership team (district and building administrators, ESC, external stakeholders) will take an iterative approach to implementation. Monthly check in meetings have been included to provide a structure for project leaders to review implementation against goals and benchmarks and make adjustment as needed. The second priority is to develop a year long implementation plan with clear monthly goals and milestones. This plan provides a road map for the implementation team to use formative data to identify areas of success, challenges, and anticipate potential barriers. Grant activities will be adjusted in response to data and feedback. In addition, a number of steps were taken during the proposal phase to identify potential barriers and take actions to increase the likelihood of success. One potential barrier to success is lack of buy in from participants and community. To address this issue, district administrators have held pre-application meetings with teachers, community leaders and local government to build support. If awarded, additional steps will be taken during the planning phase of the grant to communicate clear expectations for time lines, activities, and other program requirements. NEO FRC is contracting with Kent State University as an external evaluator at \$100,000.00 which is 10% of the project budget.

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.

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.

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. Please enter the Net Cost Savings from your FIT.

v. List and describe the budget line items where spending reductions will occur.

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

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.

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.

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. 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 indicator for this goal.

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.

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

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 summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children in Wickliffe, Painesville, Lakewood and Lorain who experience significant achievement gaps in comparison to their non-disadvantaged peers. Share service outcome by June 30, 2022, consortia districts will have increased capacity to sustain NEO FRC locally without additional income (baseline only 1 FRC exists in Painesville and not regional entity exists).

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.

Assumption: By linking together through NEO FRC to access shared services for fundraising, research, marketing and communication each FRC will be more sustainable. In 2005, Deloitte published 'A Promise of Shared Services' assessing the cost/benefits of shared service models. According to Deloitte, small school districts tend to have comparatively high non-instructional cost. By implementing shared services they "can band together to share everything from transportation services to building gymnasiums, creating the purchasing power and economies of scale of medium sized districts. Shifting just a quarter of tax dollars spent by school district throughout America on non-instructional operations to shared services, for example, could potentially yield savings in the range of \$9 billion." The report also stated that sharing services creates economies of scale and consistency of process and results that come with more centralized models while keeping the benefits of a small district

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.

Consortia districts are well connected and collaboration occurs on a variety of levels. Below are just a few examples of shared service activities that demonstrate that the NEO FRC consortia has a high likelihood of successful shared services. Lake County ESC supports Lakewood, Lorain, and Painesville English Language Learner efforts. Through the Lake ESC, Painesville and Wickliffe collaborate for educational services to the detention home. Painesville and Wickliffe conduct shared professional development in the areas of poverty and literacy. Lake ESC provides high quality preschool services to member districts including Wickliffe and Painesville. Districts also collaborate through joint superintendents, principals, and administrator meetings. Wickliffe staff have collaborated with Painesville FRC during food pantry efforts in an effort to learn more about the workings of the FRC.

iv. List the specific indicators that you will use to monitor progress toward your desired outcomes.

These should be measurable changes, not the accomplishment of tasks.

Example: consolidation of transportation services between two districts.

The summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children in consortia districts. Shared service outcome by June 30, 2022, consortia districts will have increased capacity to sustain NEO FRC locally without additional income. Formative: Consortia district will monitor reallocation cost savings as described designated on FIT NEO FRC sustainability and fundraising plan fundraising efforts partnerships resources redeployed collaboration among FRC increase family access to supports change in local practices promote increased sustainability of FRC revamp infrastructures at the school, district, and regional levels. Summative: Consortia districts will annually report reallocation of cost savings equal to or greater than NEO FRC sustainability costs. Annually, local and regional fundraising efforts raise at least \$300,000 toward long-term sustainability plan.

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.

The summative (long term 2022) outcome will be implementing a shared service FRC model to 'close the gap' for economically

disadvantaged and/or English Language Learning children in the consortia districts. Shared Service Outcomes by June 30, 2022: consortia districts will have increased capacity to sustain NEO FRC locally without additional income. Each consortia district will use reallocation cost saving described on FIT as the data points to measure shared services outcome. Baseline is May 2015. Increases in fundraising amounts, fundraising commitments, and number of committed funders will be identified annually. Agency "no show" rate will decrease, as children will receive services on the school site. Common data collection and evaluation system will be in place to improve monitoring and demonstrate collective efficacy of the FRC. The consortia districts will demonstrate increases in shared PD in the areas of knowledge and understanding of family needs.

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

The planning team will meet quarterly to ensure the project stays on track and modifications will be made as necessary to ensure goals are being met. The on going review of the project will reduce the need for significant changes in the project and the process by which the project goals are being met. However, if assumptions are proven false, the consortium members will adjust it action plan to reflect the needs presented by students and families. As students/families are being served the consortium members will track progress, survey participants, and service providers and adjust services to better meet the needs of the target students/families. Based on the data (qualitative and quantitative), services will be changed to meet the determined needs. In addition, with assistance from KSU, at least bi-annually, consortia treasurers will review forecasts and report on cost savings through cost reallocation. The information will be provided to ODE as required per grant. If, at any time, consortia fiscal data suggests that the assumptions made are false or the outcomes will not be realized, treasurers will convene a work session with the planning team and external evaluator. During that work session, the team will make plans to adjust the course of the project to improve outcomes and/or make shifts in project delivery/shared services plans to improve project fidelity. Wickliffe on behalf of the consortia will also report such challenges to the ODE with request for clarification or technical assistance.

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

- a. New - Never before implemented
- 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.

1,000,000.00 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.

\$55,000 budgeted for salary, \$16,000 for benefits expenses for .5 FTE project/fiscal management costs associated with the project. \$10,000 per district is budgeted in direct salary expenses for stipends for project staff to coordinate planning. \$739,000 is budgeted as purchased services contracts: providers, consultants, and dispersing of funds to consortum districts for renovation of facilities \$120,00 Lakewood and Lorain, \$58,000 for Painesville. \$283,000 multi-year contract with LCESC: \$130,00 manage consultant contracts to provide guidance/technical support, PD/marketing; \$30,000 manage contract with external technical assistance to train district educators/leaders on wraparound servies; mult-year contract allowable per guidance because it provides substancial/lasting impact to project by providing relevan technical assistance. \$45,000 to purchase FRC technology for data collection/evaluation needs, allowable per guidance because it provides lasting impact & enables sites to track data to monitor progress. \$70,00 for external partnership development/management services for the FRC sites implementation year/ sustainability year 1. \$8,000 LCESC to facilitate planning meetings and related activities. \$8,000 for districts for FRC planning team/leaders to travel to site visits. \$20,000 for the districts to attend facilitate train the trainer model workshops. \$30,000 purchased services contract between Wickliffe and three consortium districts for stipends for project staff. \$30,000 for other related costs such as substitute costs, travel expenses for meeting, trainings and FRC supplies. \$100,000 external evaluation/outcomes reporting conducted by KSU. \$50,000 for 5% fiscal fee related to Wickliffe's management of project/fiscal. \$120,000 in capital outlay for renovation to Wickliffe facilities. \$10,000 for Wickliffe project related

meetings/travel and expenses.Total budget: \$1,000,000. Through shared services model approach to leverage existing efforts in PCLS.

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.

357,221.00 a. Sustainability Year 1

357,221.00 b. Sustainability Year 2

357,221.00 c. Sustainability Year 3

357,221.00 d. Sustainability Year 4

357,221.00 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.

Each of the consortium districts' FRC sites have varying sustainability costs. Most of these costs are associated with added staff positions and supplies during the sustainability years. Including: Wickliffe: \$500,000 total (\$100,000/yr.) in salary expense and \$77,000 (\$15,400) in fringe benefit costs for 1.5 positions for the FRC (1 social worker and .5 clerical position), and \$50,000 (\$10,000/year) for program materials and supplies. Lakewood: \$237,000 total (\$47,500/yr.) in salary expense and \$64,125 in fringe benefits (\$12,825/yr.), and \$25,000 for materials and supplies (\$5,000/yr). Lorain: 540,000 total (\$108,000/yr.) in salary expense and \$191,320 (\$38,264/yr) in fringe benefit costs for 2.0 positions for the FRC (1 social worker and site coordinator), and \$201,160 (\$40,232/year) for program materials and supplies. There will be no direct sustaining costs to Painesville as a result of this major project because the district has an existing FRC, which the consortium is leveraging to be replicated. As a result, the existing costs of sustaining the Painesville FRC have already accounted for within the district budget. The total sustainability costs for the four districts is \$1,786,105

0 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.

N/A

100 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.

Instead of direct cost savings, each consortium district will utilize savings from reallocation of costs from elsewhere in their respective budgets. These reallocations include: Wickliffe \$1,563,470 total (\$312,694/year) in salary and \$396,610 (\$79,322/year) in benefits expenses related to selected staff reductions during the sustainability years. Lakewood: \$405,000 total (\$81,000/year) in salary and \$109,350 (\$21,870/year) in benefits expenses related to selected staff reductions during the sustainability years. Lorain: \$800,000 total (\$160,000/year) in salary and \$132,480 (\$26,496/year) in benefits difference between the projected 4.0 FTE retiring teachers and the average new hire teacher (\$40,000 salary savings/teacher and \$6,624 benefits savings/teacher x 4 teachers). Painesville: Due to the fact that Painesville has an existing FRC within the district and is participating in the consortium largely to replicate their existing efforts, as such there is no sustainability costs associated with this project beyond what is already budgeted for in the district budget. Therefore, there is no need to reallocate funds. Total savings through reallocation of costs from all four consortium districts is \$3,409,910.

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 Team Key Personnel information by clicking the link below:

[Add Implementation Team](#)

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 Range 8/1/16 - 4/1/17

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

8/1/16: media notification: board approvals/contracts signed; planning team designated; recruit partners for local FRC/regional FRC. Advisory boards: finalize PD surveys; weekly project leadership team meetings during the planning period to ensure all processes are in place for implementation; identify/contract with consultants; school/community gap/resource maps created for each district; Bridges Out of Poverty Train the Trainer; site visits. By 1/17: planning teams create draft of key practices, policies, procedures for start up; schedule school PD; train/trainer workshops; advisory board begin planning for implementation; submit final evaluation plan & quarterly reports to ODE. By 4/17: FRC renovations begin in each community; media events; Local/regional FRC implementation and continuous improvement, marketing, development plans approved by the local boards; common data collection/evaluation processes finalized benchmarks to demonstrate success; signed contract copies; # partners engaged: local/regional; meeting attendance; PD needs survey results; site visit reports; final plans; media reports; PD schedule; evaluation and data collection plans; Advisory board agendas/minutes; renovation plans communication/key stakeholder engagement/consent from all required officers, governing bodies districts hold local celebrations, board/staff meeting to announce project; quarterly board/media updates; Project Director facilitates weekly Project Leadership Team meetings through 7/1/2017; monthly advisory board meetings; media and social communication; district leadership recruits key partners; district/ESC boards approve costs, receive quarterly updates; ESC leads regional advisory board to keep all districts connected and promote interdependence.

22. Implementation (grant funded start-up activities)

a. Date Range 4/2/2017 - 12/1/17

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

April 2, 2017 - December 1, 2017 Weekly: Project Leadership Team meetings Monthly: Advisory Board meetings; implement plans to address gaps, increase partnerships, enhance infrastructure; renovation updates; family and community outreach events Quarterly: Evaluation; training (school staff, FRC site coordinators, wrap around teams); Project Leadership Team adjust plans based on evaluation By 6/30/2017 & annually evaluation and project adjustments based on evaluation survey-students/families to assess FRC needs; FRC families/students to assess FRC effectiveness; district staff to assess PD needs/FRC effectiveness of partner survey to assess services available & FRC effectiveness By 9/30/2017 & annually Annual project evaluation and fiscal reporting complete Refine program plans based on evaluations Benchmarks to demonstrate success 3 FRC Centers open by 3/30/2017

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

a. Date Range 12/1/17 - 8/1/22

b. Scope of activities - include all specific completion benchmarks

By 12/1/17 and ongoing through 6/30/22 FRC Advisory Board contract with fundraiser/grant writer(s) to implement sustainability/fundraising plan Quarterly through Project end 12/1/2022 ESC facilitate quarterly NEO FWDRRC meetings to plan/implement long term sustainability Quarterly project evaluation to assess system changes and impact Project Leadership Team quarterly planning to adjust based on evaluation & plan for sustainability By 12/1/17 and annually through project Annual project evaluation and fiscal reports conduct surveys (student, families, partners, staff) to assess ongoing needs and plan FRC expansion Benchmarks to demonstrate success FRC Advisory Board increases partnerships by 20% annually and has commitments for \$300,000 by 6/30/2017 Reframe current student/learning supports programs Redeploy resources Develop in-classroom and school-wide approaches, including learning supports found effective in High Poverty/High Achieving schools Develop the capacity to implement learning supports through leadership training Revamp infrastructures at the school, district, and regional levels Develop and implement accountability indicators directly related to the Learning Supports System and fully integrate them into school improvement accountability. Communication/key stakeholder engagement/consent from all required officers, governing bodies Kent State University creates systems so local FRC can provide outcome reporting throughout sustainability period; semi-annual board reports; FRC newsletters and surveys keep families, staff, partners informed; administer and manage scope of work/ develop interdependent system of change. Effective data collection: Each consortia member will provide access to student level data for analysis. This agreement will include project related surveys and other relevant data needed to effectively access and analyze data. NEO FRC brings collective power across counties to leverage resources for all FRCs.

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:

Instructional changes: NEO-FWDRRC will train educators/partners to facilitate workshops such as Bridges Out of Poverty and Getting Ahead in a Just-Gettin'-By World (for adults living in poverty). These and other trainings will create positive psychosocial changes for participants and build practical skills for educators so they can provide learning experiences more in tune with the needs of the children/families they serve. Wraparound Teams will provide teachers with deeper understanding of challenges facing at risk students and create increased empathy. Students will build resilience and better engage in learning. As teachers learn to more effectively design units to meet at risk student needs, student achievement will increase. As FRC programming grows, students will have greater access to after school tutoring and healthy youth development programs. This will improve learning process, social, emotional and academic outcomes. Organizational Changes: As the communities implement FRC, they will be shifting to an integrated, systemic approach to student support that will reduce the number of absences and discipline infractions, and increase course passage rates for target populations. Organizationally, the districts will integrate FRC into school improvement policies and practices with a systematic focus on how to: Reframe current student/learning supports programs. Redeploy resources Develop school-wide approaches, including learning supports found effective in High Poverty/High Achieving schools. Partnerships change behaviors of individuals to develop interdependent system of change. The purpose of the FRC is to: promote healthy development and prevent problems, act early to address problems, intervene with chronic/serious problems. Schools work with their communities to address efforts to enable the varying developmental aspects of student growth and development: academic, social, emotional, and physical development, as well as to address public and mental health.

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:

Pamela Freeman Co-Director, Research and Evaluation Bureau (College of Education Health, Human Services) 408 White Hall, Kent, OH 44242 Phone: 330-672-2202 Email: pfreema4@kent.edu

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.

NEO-FWDRRC will engage an outside evaluation group (KSU) to externally evaluate the entire project from planning through the sustaining years. The outside evaluation group will be responsible for acquiring an expedited IRB for the tenure of the study to protect the rights of all stakeholders. The evaluation team will also be responsible for acquiring informed consents from all participants prior to any evaluation research. The initial planning and implementation of the project will employ both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data. The evaluation team will use a mixed methods approach to collect qualitative data including observations, key informant interviews, online surveys, and focus groups. The stakeholders include, teachers, families, administrators, community partners, and students. The rationale behind use of these methods is to insure that the project team has actionable information so that they can quickly and agilely respond to constraints during planning and implementation of the project. These real time course corrections are intended to be responsive to the varying needs of the student populations served by the hybrid teaching teams, as well as the partners of the elementary hybrid program. Research findings of both the qualitative and quantitative data collection will be reported quarterly to the funder during the planning and implementation phases of the project. Collection of qualitative data will end at the close of the implementation period, and a full report on the findings and responses will be submitted in December 2017. In the sustaining years of the project only quantitative data from pre-designed surveys and any standardized testing will be collected and reported upon in the bi-annual reports along with the FIT reports. The continuation of quantitative data collection will allow for the consideration of long line academic achievement within and among multiple student populations. Multiple touch points are built into the project to gauge progress and impact. These measures provide formative feedback about implementation success and identify areas where greater attention may be needed. The first priority is to establish a well-coordinated leadership team, focused on achieving the grant's outcomes, to track progress and alter the plan where needed. The leadership team (district and building administrators, ESC and key external partners) will take an iterative approach to implementation. Monthly check-in meetings have been included to provide a structure for project leaders review implementation against goals and milestones and make adjustments as needed. The second priority is to develop a year-long implementation plan with clear monthly goals and milestones. This plan provides a roadmap for the implementation team and allows the leadership team to use formative data to identify areas of success, challenges, and anticipate potential barriers. Grant activities will be adjusted in response to data and feedback. In addition, a number of steps were taken during the proposal phase to identify potential barriers and take action to increase the likelihood of success. One potential barrier to success is lack of buy-in from participants. To address this issue, district and building administrators have held pre-application meetings with teachers to build support and garner buy-in. If awarded, additional steps will be taken during the planning phase of the grant to communicate clear expectations for timelines, activities, incentives, and other program requirements. During initial planning phase, the evaluation team will meet with planning team members and finalize the complete evaluation plan. This plan will then be submitted to Ohio Department of Education.

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.

FRC scale up, expansion and replication are highly likely. The non-negotiable factor in replication is the leadership commitment to put non-

academic needs at the heart of school improvement. Too often, districts cut 'learning supports' first when budget crises hit - focusing on the 'core' academics. Both the Ohio Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement (OSU) and the national Unified and Comprehensive System of Learning Supports (UCLA) initiatives demonstrate that time and leadership are the most important factors to successful implementation. When leaders put non-academic needs at the same level of importance across a system as academics and operations, the likelihood of successful replication increases. Straight A Grant funds will support building the infrastructure and fund planning/research phases of the project. Seed money for planning is helpful to scale quickly. Funds for renovation are important to build a sense of community pride. Once the infrastructure is in place for regional collaboration, the cost will significantly decrease. NEO-FWDRC will be able to offer trainings and support across Ohio so any community can replicate the model. Within 1 year, a community can plan and implement a small scale FRC and embed school based wraparound supports. But as those initiatives come 'online' district and community partners will need to thoughtfully plan for sustainability by redesigning operating systems and shifting funding streams to ensure the work continues. FRC is based upon Ohio Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement (OSU) and aligned with the national Unified and Comprehensive System of Learning Supports (UCLA); the stage is set for it to be part of a state and/or national model. As the work grows and NEO-FWDRC is created, the consortia will have strong capacity to replicate the model in the additional interested districts. The consortia districts will present the FRC project at statewide conferences.

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).

Joseph Spiccia Superintendent, Wickliffe City School District Lead Applicant, NEO FWDRC

Consortium

Wickliffe City (045088) - Lake County - 2017 - 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
Jeffrey	Graham	440.830.4000	jgraham@lorain.k12.oh.us	Lorain City	044263	2350 Pole Ave, Lorain, OH, 44052-4301	
John	Shepard	440.392.5060	john.shepard@pcls.net	Painesville City Local	044628	58 Jefferson St, Painesville, OH, 44077-3114	
Jeffrey	Patterson	216.529.4000	jeff.patterson@lakewoodcityschools.org	Lakewood City	044198	1470 Warren Rd, Lakewood, OH, 44107-3918	

Partnerships

Wickliffe City (045088) - Lake County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections 

Partnerships

First Name	Last Name	Telephone Number	Email Address	Organization Name	IRN	Address	Delete Contact
Rick	Cicero	440.354.1739	rick.cicero@lakehealth.org	Lake Health		7590 Auburn Road, , Concord Twp., Ohio, 44077	
Dave	Skursha	440.347.2539	dave.skursha@lubrizol.com	Lubrizol Corporation		29400 Lakeland Blvd., , Wickliffe, Ohio, 44092	
Philip	Guban	440.943.7600	pguban@dioceseofcleveland.org	Center for Pastoral Leadership		28700 Euclid Avenue, , Wickliffe, Ohio, 44092	
Paula	Kucinic	216.901.4244	paula.kucinic@esc-cc.org	Educational Service Center of Cuyahoga County		6393 Oak Tree Blvd., , Independence, Ohio, 44131	
Brian	Bontempo	440.350.2563	bbontempo@lakeesc.org	Lake County ESC	047860	382 Blackbrook Rd, Painesville, OH, 44077- 1294	

Implementation Team

Wickliffe City (045088) - Lake County - 2017 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Sections 

Implementation Team								
First Name	Last Name	Title	Responsibilities	Qualifications	Prior Relevant Experience	Education	% FTE on Project	Delete Contact
Christine	Foote	Coordinator of Teaching and Learning	Christine will have oversight over this grant for the Lakewood schools. She will work with other district coordinators to ensure the grant's success. She will lead professional development related to the grant and will oversee its budget.	As coordinator of teaching and learning, Christine has led large professional development programs, and has been responsible for a variety of state and federal grants.	Christine has led grant efforts, professional development programs and has working knowledge of state and federal grant procedures.	M.Ed	25	
Heidi	Fyffe	Director of Federal Loans, Programs and Grants	Heidi will oversee the grant for the Painesville Schools. Heidi will be responsible for all aspects of the grant including budget, professional development and programming.	Heidi oversees the entire state and federal grant program for the Painesville Schools. In addition she has served as an ESC consultant and started an online credit recovery school for the Lake County ESC	Heidi's experience with state and federal grants makes her highly qualified for this project. She has recovered millions of dollars in funding for the Painesville Schools in her time on the job.	M. Ed.	25	
Rachel	Tansey	Director of Federal Loans, Programs and Grants	Rachel oversees more than \$10 million in federal program fund dollars with responsibility of maximizing financial resources to best meet student needs and reporting the impact of federal programs through tracking and analysis of student data.	During her tenure she has directed several major federal and state grant initiatives including Smaller Learning Communities, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and a Magnet Schools Assistance Program grant requiring coordination of multiple services for six thousand students and two hundred teachers. She is certified by the University of Houston as an academic consultant. Ms. Tansey graduated Phi Beta Kappa from The College of Wooster in Ohio.	For the past twenty years, Ms. Rachel Tansey has served as teacher and executive administrator for education institutions including the Columbus Urban League, Elaine High School, Oberlin College, Project GRAD and Lorain City Schools. These experiences have provided Ms. Tansey with extensive knowledge of the best educational practices for serving under privileged youth and the ability to coordinate and lead diverse groups or organizations to work together.	The College of Wooster	25	
Julie	Ramos	Director of Strategic Innovation	Overall administration of the program. Mrs. Ramos is the program lead. She is ultimately	Former superintendent of schools- Ledgemont Local School District Grant writing experience. Part of the	As noted above was on the writing and implementation team of the Geauga iSTEM Grant that was funded in 2014-15.	M.Ed. in School Administration Superintendent License	25	

responsible for all aspects of the program.

team that wrote and implemented the iStem School Straight A Grant for Geauga County. Trained in Bridges Out of Poverty Created Wickliffe's FRC Project Created Wickliffe's Workforce Development Program