



November 7, 2019

Welcome Jennifer Thompson

[Logout](#)[Home](#) | [Data Entry](#) | [File Functions](#) | [Reports](#)**Retrive Grant Detail Data - Read Only**

Lea Code	Fiscal Year	Local ID	Grant Number	Fund Class Category	Title	Detail Amount
13	2018		<a href="#">18130401</a>	1130	Current Expense-Federal Revenue	\$824,533.44
			<a href="#">18130401</a>	1201	Current Expense-Administration	\$14,898.28
			<a href="#">18130401</a>	1203	Current Expense-Instructional Salaries & Wages	\$604,556.59
			<a href="#">18130401</a>	1212	Current Expense-Fixed Charges	\$205,078.57
			<a href="#">18130401</a>	9205	Fixed Charges-Other Instructional Costs	\$205,078.57

Total Row Count in Report- 5

Row(s) 1 - 5

DRES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
LEP % 4+	5.20%	<=5%	8.50%
WHITE % 4+	41.70%	52.00%	39.80%
ALL % 4+	31.40%	38.90%	31.00%
GAP VS. ALL	26.20%	*	22.50%
GAP VS. HIGH	36.50%	*	31.30%

DRES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
LEP % 4+	12.90%	<=5%	8.40%
WHITE % 4+	53.10%	51.00%	47.40%
ALL % 4+	39.50%	36.80%	35.30%
GAP VS. ALL	26.60%	*	26.90%
GAP VS. HIGH	40.20%	*	39.00%

DRES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
LEP % MET	<=5%	8.80%	8.70%
WHITE % MET	48.70%	49.30%	50.00%
ALL % MET	34.00%	36.80%	38.40%
GAP VS. ALL	*	28.00%	29.70%
GAP VS. HIGH	*	40.50%	41.30%

DRES MAP MATH Gr K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
LEP % MET	16.50%	8.00%	6.50%
WHITE % MET	53.20%	47.00%	46.00%
ALL % MET	41.40%	36.10%	34.40%
GAP VS. ALL	24.90%	28.10%	27.90%
GAP VS. HIGH	36.70%	39.00%	39.50%

At DRES, the lowest-performing LEP student group showed an increase in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. Similar growth was seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the LEP student group scoring proficient on the PARCC decreased (mirroring a trend seen in the highest performing White student group and All Students group) and the percentage of LEP students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics also decreased (again, mirroring the trend in the White and All Students groups). As a result, DRES shrunk performance gaps between LEP and White students on both PARCC subjects and MAP reading, with a slight increase in gaps on the MAP mathematics exam from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018.

LWES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	5.30%	<=5%	<=5%
ASIAN % 4+	62.50%	52.20%	50.00%
ALL % 4+	40.50%	34.90%	37.90%
GAP	35.20%	*	*
GAP VS. HIGH	57.20%	*	*

LWES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	10.50%	6.30%	12.50%
ASIAN % 4+	75.00%	70.80%	50.00%
ALL % 4+	44.70%	42.70%	37.30%
GAP	34.20%	36.40%	24.80%
GAP VS. HIGH	64.50%	64.50%	37.50%

LWES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	<=5%	<=5%	10.00%
ASIAN % MET	30.20%	38.10%	30.20%
ALL % MET	28.30%	34.10%	36.60%
GAP	*	*	26.60%
GAP VS. HIGH	*	*	20.20%

LWES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	8.50%	5.90%	7.80%
ASIAN % MET	55.80%	35.70%	34.10%
ALL % MET	38.60%	29.90%	28.10%
GAP	30.10%	24.00%	20.30%
GAP VS. HIGH	47.30%	29.80%	26.30%

At LWES, the lowest-performing students receiving special education services (SPED) student group showed a decrease in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. However, growth was seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the SPED student group scoring proficient on the PARCC increased (unlike the downward trend seen in the All Students and highest performing Asian student group) while the percentage of SPED students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics decreased slightly from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018 (a trend also seen in the All Students group with a much larger decrease in the Asian student group performance). LWES was able to close the achievement gap between the Asian and SPED student groups, although that had as much to do with decreasing Asian performance as SPED growth.

LOES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	7.40%	7.40%	20.00%
WHITE % 4+	51.10%	59.10%	68.10%
ALL % 4+	33.90%	39.70%	44.00%
GAP	26.50%	32.30%	24.00%
GAP VS. HIGH	43.70%	51.70%	48.10%

LOES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	7.40%	7.40%	20.00%
WHITE % 4+	73.30%	63.60%	76.60%
ALL % 4+	42.00%	38.70%	45.20%
GAP	34.60%	31.30%	25.20%
GAP VS. HIGH	65.90%	56.20%	56.60%

LOES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	12.80%	15.90%	16.30%
WHITE % MET	61.80%	70.00%	72.90%
ALL % MET	36.50%	42.20%	40.70%
GAP	23.70%	26.30%	24.40%
GAP VS. HIGH	49.00%	54.10%	56.60%

LOES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	18.80%	11.40%	14.00%
WHITE % MET	63.20%	65.70%	65.70%
ALL % MET	39.50%	35.30%	35.80%
GAP	20.70%	23.90%	21.80%
GAP VS. HIGH	44.40%	54.30%	51.70%

At LOES, the lowest-performing students receiving special education services (SPED) student group showed a large increase in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. More modest growth was seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the SPED student group scoring proficient on the PARCC also increased significantly while the percentage of SPED students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics decreased slightly from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. Performance gaps between the highest performing White student group and the SPED student group only decreased on the mathematics PARCC measure, partially due to consistent increases in performance in the White student group.

PLES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
LEP % 4+	6.80%	5.80%	<=5%
WHITE % 4+	59.60%	70.80%	67.60%

PLES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
LEP % 4+	5.90%	5.20%	8.10%
WHITE % 4+	75.00%	73.50%	73.00%

PLES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
LEP % MET	<=5%	<=5%	5.70%
WHITE % MET	57.50%	45.70%	57.70%

PLES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
LEP % MET	7.50%	<=5%	<=5%
WHITE % MET	73.80%	62.30%	64.80%

ALL % 4+	32.20%	39.30%	34.90%
GAP	25.40%	33.50%	*
GAP VS. HIGH	52.80%	65.00%	*

ALL % 4+	33.40%	34.10%	32.30%
GAP	27.50%	28.90%	24.20%
GAP VS. HIGH	69.10%	68.30%	64.90%

ALL % MET	31.80%	30.00%	32.70%
GAP	*	*	27.00%
GAP VS. HIGH	*	*	52.00%

ALL % MET	39.70%	30.70%	31.20%
GAP	32.20%	*	*
GAP VS. HIGH	66.30%	*	*

At PLES, the lowest-performing LEP student group showed an increase in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. Even larger growth was seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the LEP student group scoring proficient on the PARCC also increased (the opposite of the trend seen in the All Students and highest performing White student groups) while the percentage of LEP students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics decreased, as occurred with students in the White and All Students groups. As a result, PLES saw performance gaps shrink in both reading/ELA and mathematics on both MAP assessments and the PARCC mathematics subtest.

RBES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	<=5%	6.50%	<=5%
WHITE % 4+	43.90%	62.50%	62.20%
ALL % 4+	32.40%	35.80%	31.70%
GAP	*	29.30%	*
GAP VS. HIGH	*	56.00%	*

RBES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	7.10%	6.50%	<=5%
WHITE % 4+	50.00%	62.50%	59.50%
ALL % 4+	27.90%	28.80%	30.70%
GAP	20.80%	22.30%	*
GAP VS. HIGH	42.90%	56.00%	*

RBES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	5.70%	<=5%	<=5%
WHITE % MET	64.10%	65.10%	65.00%
ALL % MET	36.10%	34.40%	36.30%
GAP	30.40%	*	*
GAP VS. HIGH	58.40%	*	*

RBES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	11.30%	<=5%	6.10%
WHITE % MET	70.50%	57.10%	60.00%
ALL % MET	38.50%	28.20%	28.30%
GAP	27.20%	*	22.20%
GAP VS. HIGH	59.20%	*	53.90%

At RBES, the lowest-performing students receiving special education services (SPED) student group showed a small decrease in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. A slightly larger decrease was seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the SPED student group scoring proficient on the PARCC also decreased slightly (unlike the slight positive trends seen in the All Students and highest performing White student groups) as did the percentage of SPED students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018 (a trend also seen in the White and All Students groups). As a result there was no significant closing of achievement gaps due to increased performance of the SPED student group, although the gap on the MAP mathematics assessment did shrink due to a significant decrease in performance by the White and All Students groups.

SES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
HISPANIC % 4+	17.90%	14.00%	10.00%
ASIAN % 4+	61.90%	52.90%	41.20%
ALL % 4+	35.90%	34.40%	27.40%
GAP	18.00%	20.40%	17.40%
GAP VS. HIGH	44.00%	38.90%	31.20%

SES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
HISPANIC % 4+	17.90%	16.30%	12.50%
ASIAN % 4+	66.70%	52.90%	58.80%
ALL % 4+	33.00%	32.80%	29.00%
GAP	15.10%	16.50%	16.50%
GAP VS. HIGH	48.80%	36.60%	46.30%

SES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
HISPANIC % MET	10.70%	16.90%	21.30%
ASIAN % MET	38.70%	50.00%	48.30%
ALL % MET	32.50%	35.10%	33.00%
GAP	21.80%	18.20%	11.70%
GAP VS. HIGH	28.00%	33.10%	27.00%

SES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
HISPANIC % MET	13.30%	20.80%	16.90%
ASIAN % MET	51.60%	57.10%	51.70%
ALL % MET	35.00%	29.70%	28.20%
GAP	21.70%	8.90%	11.30%
GAP VS. HIGH	38.30%	36.30%	34.80%

At SES, the lowest-performing Hispanic/Latino student group showed a decrease in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. However, there was an large increase in the percentage of these students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the Hispanic/Latino student group scoring proficient on the PARCC decreased (mirroring a trend seen in the All Students group and highest performing Asian student group) while the percentage of these students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics increased (the opposite of the trend in the All Students group; the performance of students in the Asian student group was essentially flat). As a result, SES saw a closing of the performance gap from 2016 to 2018 on all measures, although the narrowing of the achievement gaps on the PARCC had more to do with decreased performance in the Asian student group.

TSES PARCC ELA GR 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	<=5%	<=5%	7.40%
WHITE % 4+	50.90%	66.00%	72.20%
ALL % 4+	36.30%	44.40%	51.30%
GAP	*	*	43.90%
GAP VS. HIGH	*	*	64.80%

TSES PARCC MATH Gr 3-5	2016	2017	2018
SPED % 4+	<=5%	<=5%	11.50%
WHITE % 4+	56.10%	60.40%	61.11%
ALL % 4+	36.70%	36.20%	47.30%
GAP	*	*	35.80%
GAP VS. HIGH	*	*	49.61%

TSES MAP ELA GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	6.80%	7.00%	11.10%
WHITE % MET	56.00%	60.00%	66.30%
ALL % MET	38.30%	39.80%	43.80%
GAP	31.50%	32.80%	32.70%
GAP VS. HIGH	49.20%	53.00%	55.20%

TSES MAP MATH GR K-5	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Winter 2017/2018
SPED % MET	11.40%	<=5%	8.90%
WHITE % MET	68.10%	61.10%	62.10%
ALL % MET	43.90%	38.60%	39.90%
GAP	32.50%	*	31.00%
GAP VS. HIGH	56.70%	*	53.20%

At TSES, the lowest-performing students receiving special education services (SPED) student group showed a large increase in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from

At FSL, the lowest-performing students receiving special education services (SPED) student group showed a large increase in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the reading/ELA PARCC assessment from 2016 to 2018. Moderate growth was also seen in the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in ELA from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. In mathematics, the percentage of students from the SPED student group scoring proficient on the PARCC also increased significantly while the percentage of SPED students meeting the HCPSS MAP benchmark in mathematics decreased slightly from Spring 2017 to Winter 2017/2018. Performance gaps in ELA/reading did not decrease due to steady increases in performance by the highest performing White student group, but did increase in Mathematics where gains by the White student group were smaller.

**Title I 1003(a) School Improvement Grant  
Focus School(s) Application  
Application Cover Sheet  
School Year 2017-2018**

<b>LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM:</b>	<b>HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM</b>
<b>CONTACT PERSON &amp; TITLE:</b>	<b>CAROLINE WALKER TITLE I COORDINATOR DIRECTOR OF</b>
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	<b>10910 CLARKSVILLE PIKE ELLCOT CITY, MD 21042</b>
<b>TELEPHONE NUMBER:</b>	<b>410-313-6614</b>
<b>EMAIL:</b>	<b>CAROLINE_WALKER@HCPSS.ORG</b>
<b>FAX NUMBER:</b>	<b>410-313-6788</b>
<b>DUNS NUMBER:</b>	<b>030322424</b>

School Name		Amount of Funding Requested
Deep Run Elementary School		\$120,000
Laurel Woods Elementary School		\$120,000
Longfellow Elementary School		\$120,000
Phelps Luck Elementary School		\$120,000
Running Brook Elementary School		\$120,000
Swansfield Elementary School		\$120,000
Talbott Springs Elementary School		\$120,000
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDING REQUESTED</b>		<b>\$840,000</b>

**MSDE PROJECT CONTACT:**

Title I 1003(a) School Improvement Grant for Focus Schools  
Mary M. Cross, Ph.D.  
Office: (410) 767-0281  
mary.cross@maryland.gov

**GENERAL ASSURANCES for Title I 1003(a) School Improvement Grant – Focus School Application**

**Please note:** Once the LEA's application is approved, MSDE will begin the Notice of Grant Award (NOGA) process. The NOGA will be sent to the LEA, and will have the assurances for the grant attached. The LEA should have the superintendent sign and date the assurances, and return the original to MSDE.

**ASSURANCES PAGES HERE**

## I. LEA Overview

MSDE considers collaboration between and among various offices in the LEA as instrumental in assisting Focus Schools make progress towards closing the achievement gap. Consequently, each LEA must involve staff from appropriate offices to select and design the interventions that each Focus School will implement.

- 1. Please list the staff from the LEA, including the specific office for each member, who has been involved in determining the evidence-based strategies that each school will implement.**

Name and Title	Office
Amy Tieperman, Pam Zancan	Title I
John SanGiovanni, Stephanie Milligan	Elementary Curriculum
Debbie Misiag, Teri Savage	Department of Special Education
Julie Alonso Hughes	Office of Instructional Technology (OIT)
Maha Abdelkader, Deborah Puhak	ESOL
Elisa Montalvo	Hispanic Achievement

- 2. How will the LEA coordinate the support, as well as monitor and assess progress for each Focus School?**

The Title I and Curricular staff meet monthly to discuss progress at each Title I school based on formative and summative assessment data, MAP results, and teacher and administrator reports. Special attention will be given to assessing progress at each of the Focus Schools and coordinating support to maximize student success at those schools. Title I staff will meet at least quarterly with Special Education/ESOL/Hispanic Achievement and OIT staff to review data, assess progress, and discuss how UDL (Universal Design for Learning) and technology can help to better personalize instruction, especially for students receiving special education services, English language learners, and students underperforming in mathematics and reading. At least once per quarter, Title I staff will also visit each school with Curricular and/or Special Education staff for on-site monitoring of personalized learning instruction, during the school day tutoring, beyond school day instruction, staff co-planning, and/or professional learning. During these monitoring visits, Title I and Curricular staff will speak with administrators, Title I teachers, and interventionists to determine ways in which to improve provision of supports to the Focus schools.

## II. Individual School Narrative

### Section A

1. **School Name and ID Number:** Deep Run ES (0103)  
Laurel Woods ES (0618)  
Longfellow ES (0514)  
Phelps Luck ES (0612)  
Running Brook ES (0515)  
Swansfield ES (0517)  
Talbott Springs ES (0609)
2. **Grade Levels:** Pre-K-5 (all schools)
3. **Achievement Gap Student Groups:**  
  
**Highest Performing:** Asian (Laurel Woods ES, Swansfield ES)  
White (Deep Run ES, Longfellow ES, Phelps Luck ES, Running Brook ES, Talbott Springs ES)  
**Lowest Performing:** Special Education (Laurel Woods ES, Longfellow ES, Running Brook ES, Talbott Springs ES)  
Limited English Proficient (Deep Run ES, Phelps Luck ES)  
Hispanic/Latino (Swansfield ES)  
  
**Content Areas:** Reading & Math
4. **Continuing Title I School** Yes: Laurel Woods ES, Swansfield ES  
No: Deep Run ES, Longfellow ES, Phelps Luck ES, Running Brook ES, Talbott Springs ES
5. **Amount of Funding Requested:** \$120,000 each = \$840,000 Total
- 6.

#### Needs Assessment

For Focus Schools identified by a racial or ethnic student group, please discuss the lowest-performing students in the school rather than the racial or ethnic subgroup only.

- **What data were collected to look at the achievement of the student group?**
- **How does the achievement of the identified student group compare to the achievement of other students?**
- **What grade level(s) and subject areas seem to be affected most?**

#### **Provide a brief analysis of the data that the school reviewed:**

For each of the seven HCPSS Focus Schools Deep Run ES (DRES), Laurel Woods ES (LWES), Longfellow ES (LOES), Phelps Luck ES (PLES), Running Brook ES (RBES), Swansfield ES (SES), and Talbott Springs ES (TSES) data were examined to better understand the achievement of the lowest



performing student group and the reason for the large gap between these students and those in the highest performing student groups. For four schools (LWES, LOES, RBES, and TSES) the lowest group was students receiving special education services, for two schools (DRES and PLES) it was students who are Limited English Proficient, and for one school (SES) it was students who are Hispanic/Latino.

To examine whether students in this student group have been making progress in closing the achievement gap, the HCPSS had historically examined MSA performance and local assessment data. PARCC data has replaced MSA data and, rather than county-made local assessments, HCPSS has focused on utilizing NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments. These assessments were given to all elementary students in Grades 1-5 beginning with the 2014-2015 school year. Students were tested in mathematics and reading at least twice during the school year (Fall and Spring). Certain schools also elected to assess the students a third time, during the winter. These assessments gauge how well students are performing in mathematics and reading as compared to their district peers, the group used to standardize the assessment, and a group of college-bound students (i.e., NWEA created benchmarks based on regression analysis of the performance of students who graduated college ready). For this needs assessment, the Spring 2017 data for Grades 1-5 was examined at each school.

Because the 2017 PARCC data had not been made public when the application was initially completed, 2016 PARCC and 2017 MAP data was used for the initial analysis. 2017 PARCC data has now been added and will help guide interventions going forward.

**Deep Run ES (DRES):** DRES was previously an Approaching Targets school, with students receiving special education services not reaching their 2013 MSA AMO in mathematics. DRES was identified as a Focus school in 2016 with students with limited English proficiency significantly underperforming their peers.

Looking at the identified Limited English Proficiency (LEP) student group, only 5.3% of LEP students scored a 4 or 5 (indicated college readiness) on the 2016 PARCC ELA subtest and 14.8% did so on the mathematics subtest. On the 2017 PARCC ELA subtest, the LEP student group still showed significant underperformance with only  $\leq 5\%$  scoring a 4 or 5. On the mathematics subtest only  $\leq 5\%$  scored a 4 or 5, although that was higher than the  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services who scored a 4 or 5 on that subtest.

The 2017 MAP scores show some progress for the LEP group in mathematics, with 18.2% in mathematics, and 50% of LEP 2<sup>nd</sup> graders reaching the benchmark. Reading results were less positive, with only  $\leq 5\%$  of LEP students meeting the benchmark in that subject. This extreme underperformance was seen at all grade levels. However, LEP students were not the lowest performing student group at DRES for the 2017 MAP, rather, only  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services achieved the MAP benchmark in reading and only 6.4% in mathematics.

**Laurel Woods ES (LWES):** LWES is a continuing Focus school, with the same highest (Asian) and lowest (students receiving special education services) student groups identified in 2016 as in past years.

Looking at the identified Special Education (SpEd) student group, in 2015,  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the PARCC ELA subtest or on the mathematics subtest. Some growth has been seen on the 2016 results, however, with 6.5% of students receiving special education services achieving a 4 or 5 in reading and 9.7% in mathematics. In 2017,  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest, with  $\leq 5\%$  students receiving ESOL services scoring a 4 or 5. On the 2017 PARCC math subtest, 7.7% of students with IEPs scored a 4 or 5.

Similar modest improvement can be seen on the 2017 MAP scores in mathematics, with 11.6% of students receiving special education services achieving the benchmark, as opposed to only 5.8% in the prior year. In 2<sup>nd</sup> grade, 30% of students receiving special education services met the benchmark, with lower percentages in the other grades

On the MAP reading subtest, 6.8% of students in the special education subgroup met their benchmark, compared with only  $\leq 5\%$  in the prior year. In 2017, students receiving special education services outperformed their LEP peers on the MAP reading subtest, 6.8% to  $\leq 5\%$ . Achievement on the MAP reading subtest was consistent across grade levels.

**Longfellow ES (LOES):** LOES was previously an Approaching Targets school, with students in the Asian and FARMs student groups not reaching their 2013 MSA AMOs in reading and students in the All, Asian, African-American/Black, FARMs, and LEP student groups not reaching their AMOs in mathematics.

Looking at the identified Special Education (SpEd) student group, only 9.1% of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the 2016 PARCC ELA subtest and only 6.5% did so on the mathematics subtest, both small improvements from the prior year. In 2017, 11.5% of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest, with 10% scoring a 4 or 5 on the mathematics subtest, slight increases from the prior year. Students receiving ESOL services showed similar underperformance with  $\leq 5\%$  scoring 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest and 11.5% doing so on the mathematics subtest.

Similar relative performance can be seen on the 2017 MAP results, with only 15.8% of students receiving special education services meeting their benchmark in mathematics (a slight decrease from 16.2% the prior year) and 8.1% meeting the benchmark in reading (a modest increase from  $\leq 5\%$  the prior year). Students in 5<sup>th</sup> grade especially struggled on the MAP mathematics and reading subtests, with  $\leq 5\%$  achieving the benchmark. As a group, however, students receiving special education services outperformed their LEP peers who achieved their MAP mathematics benchmark only 9.1% of the time and their MAP reading benchmark only  $\leq 5\%$  of the time.

**Phelps Luck ES (PLES):** PLES had not previously been identified as a Focus or Approaching Targets school, prior to 2016.

Looking at the identified Limited English Proficiency (LEP) student group,  $\leq 5\%$  of LEP students scored a 4 or 5 on the 2016 PARCC ELA subtest and or 5.1% did so on the mathematics subtest, both improvements from the prior year. In 2017, 5.8% of students receiving ESOL services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest and 5.6% did so on the mathematics subtest, slight increases from the prior year. Students receiving special education services showed similar underperformance with  $\leq 5\%$  scoring 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest and  $\leq 5\%$  doing so on the mathematics subtest.

Similar underperformance can be seen on the mathematics and reading MAP scores from the spring of 2017. On the MAP mathematics subtest, only 9.5% reached the benchmark, slightly down from 10.2% the prior year. Performance was especially poor for 1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students, with  $\leq 5\%$  obtaining the benchmark score. In reading, we again see a small decrease in the percentage of students hitting the benchmark, with only  $\leq 5\%$  of LEP students doing so in 2017 compared with  $\leq 5\%$  in 2016. Underperformance was consistent across grades. In positive news, however, students receiving special education services posted significant gains on the MAP, going from 6.8% to 18.2% meeting the mathematics benchmark and from 6.8% to 14.3% meeting the reading benchmark.

**Running Brook ES (RBES):** RBES had not previously been identified as a Focus or Approaching Targets school prior to 2016.

Looking at the identified Special Education (SpEd) student group, only  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the PARCC ELA subtest (a decrease from the prior year) and only 8.3% did so on the mathematics subtest (a slight increase from the prior year). In 2017,  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest, with  $\leq 5\%$  scoring a 4 or 5 on the mathematics subtest, slight decreases from the prior year.

Similar underperformance can be seen on the mathematics and reading MAP scores from the spring of 2017. Only 8.7% of students receiving special education services met their benchmark in mathematics (a slight increase from 8.3% in 2016) and only  $\leq 5\%$  did in reading (a decrease from 5.6% in 2016). Performance on the MAP mathematics subtest was stronger among students in grades 1 and 2. Underperformance in reading was consistent across grade levels.

**Swansfield ES (SES):** While SES is a continuing Focus school, it had succeeded in raising the achievement of its prior lowest performing group, students receiving special education services

Looking at the identified Hispanic student group there is modest improvement from 2015, with 16.7% of Hispanic students scored a 4 or 5 on the 2016 PARCC ELA subtest (a 2% increase) and 16.7% doing so on the mathematics subtest (a 5% increase). However, the performance of students receiving ESOL and special education services remained low, with only 8.3% of ELs and 6.7% of students with IEPs scoring a 4 or 5 on the mathematics subtest and  $\leq 5\%$  of ELs and 10% of students with IEPs doing so on the ELA subtest. In 2017, 11.9% of students identifying as Hispanic scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA PARCC subtest with 14.3% doing so on the math subtest. In 2017, 10% of students receiving ESOL services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest and  $\leq 5\%$  did so on the mathematics subtest, slight increases from the prior year. Students receiving special education services showed similar underperformance with 11.4% scoring 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest and 5.7% doing so on the mathematics subtest.

Similar levels of relative underperformance can be seen on the 2017 park results. Only 16.1% of Hispanic students reached their benchmark in mathematics, a decrease from 29.3% the prior year. Likewise, only  $\leq 5\%$  of ELs met the benchmark, down from 14.3% the prior year. Performance is similar across grade levels. On the MAP Reading subtest, only 14.5% of Hispanic students met the benchmark, down from 20.3% the prior year, and  $\leq 5\%$  ELs met the benchmark, down from  $\leq 5\%$  the prior year. Again, underperformance was consistent across grade levels.

**Talbott Springs (TSES):** TSES was previously an Approaching Targets school, with students in the All and FARMs student groups not reaching their 2013 MSA AMOs in reading and students in the All, African-American/Black, FARMs, and Special Education student groups not reaching their AMOs in mathematics.

Looking at the identified Special Education (SpEd) student group,  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the PARCC ELA subtest and the mathematics subtest, the same result as in the prior year. In 2017,  $\leq 5\%$  of students receiving special education services scored a 4 or 5 on the ELA subtest, with  $\leq 5\%$  scoring a 4 or 5 on the mathematics subtest, the same as the prior year.

However, modest gains can be seen on the 2017 MAP mathematics subtest, with 11.1% of students with IEPs meeting the benchmark, up from  $\leq 5\%$  the prior year, and 5.6% meeting the reading benchmark, up from  $\leq 5\%$  the prior year. A strong second grade cohort seems to be responsible for most of the gains.

The above quantitative data are in alignment with qualitative data gathered by Title I staff from Focus school staff and administrators.

7.

#### Root Cause(s)

- *What does the school believe are the causes of the gap?*

#### **Comments:**

Analysis of the data for the seven Focus schools revealed similar patterns of underperformance by students receiving special education and/or ESOL services at each school. The main factors that have

impacted student achievement for these students, besides that by definition students receiving special education services are likely to underperform their peers, are:

- **Expertise/Professional Development Problem** – Regular education staff at the seven Focus schools need more and more extensive professional learning opportunities related to differentiation, universal design for learning (UDL), and personalization of instruction in order to adapt instruction to fit the strengths and needs of students receiving special education services, English language learners, and other students demonstrating consistent underperformance in reading and/or mathematics. Professional learning opportunities will be provided through Title IA and operating funds during the 2017-2018 school year.
- **Lack of Professional/Collaborative Learning Community** – In order to successfully build upon the professional learning opportunities provided, these seven schools need to commit additional time and resources to put in place professional learning communities (PLCs) based in ongoing co-planning with special education or ESOL staff and interventionists, and team-level long range planning based on student data. School-based staff, paid with Focus funds, and central office staff, paid with Title IA and operating funds, will work to create collaborative learning communities consisting of early childhood and primary grade teachers, special education staff, ESOL staff, and other interventionists. At the primary level, reading teachers will receive professional learning in Guided Reading, while intermediate reading teachers will focus on strategy instruction and grouping. Mathematics teachers in grades 1-5 will receive professional learning on creating and instructing with high quality authentic tasks. Teachers will support each other's learning and implementation through co-planning and other PLC opportunities
- **Limited Areas of Support** – Each of the seven Focus schools also needs to strengthen during and beyond the school day academic intervention and tutoring programs so that students with special education needs or limited English proficiency and their struggling peers receive individual or small group attention in reading and mathematics. Students' families must also be engaged to continue instruction at home. Interventions will be overseen by a Title I staff member at each school, paid with Focus funds. The Title I Office will work closely with the Department of Special Education, elementary curricular offices, and school staff to target interventions to underperforming students. Classroom and intervention materials that address the needs of English Language Learners (e.g., bilingual texts at DRES, PLES, and SES) and students with disabilities (e.g., manipulatives at LWES, LOES, RBES, and TSES) will also be purchased with Title IA and operating funds to better personalize instruction and implement UDL principles.

**Based on the root causes noted above, what strategies will the school implement to address those root causes?**

**Strategies to be implemented:**

**Strategy 1:** Hiring additional, highly-trained teachers to implement a co-teaching model in one or more grades. Hiring additional highly-trained staff that has been trained in instructional methodologies, differentiation, scaffolding, acceleration strategies, and progress monitoring to provide small group and/or one-to-one support to the lowest-performing students.

<b>Is this a New or a Continuing Strategy?</b> New
<p><b>Rationale: How does this strategy address the root cause(s) identified above?</b></p> <p>This strategy will address the root causes, especially limited areas of support and lack of professional/collaborative learning communities, by overseeing interventions and collaboration at each of the Focus schools. This additional staff person will serve as a point of contact between the Title I Office and their Focus school and will work with Title I Office and other central office staff and school-based staff to use data to identify underperforming and potentially underperforming students, especially those with IEPs and ELs, schedule appropriate targeted interventions, and create robust learning communities of school leaders, interventionists, and classroom teachers to monitor and adjust interventions based on student progress.</p>
<p><b>Targeted Population:</b> Students receiving special education services, students with limited English proficiency, and those underperforming or at risk of underperforming in reading and/or mathematics, particularly in the primary grades.</p>
<p><b>Specific timeframe for implementation:</b></p> <p>Beginning in <b>July 2017</b>, Title I Office staff will meet with school-based leaders to identify an appropriate staff member to take on the new role and be paid from the Focus grant. Prior Title I interventionists/school contacts will be given first consideration. Title I, Special Education, ESOL, Office of Information Technology, Elementary Curricular staff, and school-based instructional leaders, including the new Focus Intervention/Collaboration staff member will collaborate to review the intervention programs and student data at their Focus school, determine what did and did not work, decide on avenues for improvement, and determine appropriate curricular resources during <b>June-August 2017</b>. If necessary purchases of additional appropriate curricular resources, paid with Title IA and operating funds, will begin in <b>August 2017</b>, so that the materials are in place and interventions can begin shortly after students return. The hiring of tutors and implementation of intervention programs will occur during <b>September and October 2017</b>, overseen by the Focus Intervention/Collaboration staff member. Beginning in <b>October 2017</b>, Title I, Special Education, ESOL, Office of Information Technology, and Elementary Curricular staff will visit schools on a quarterly basis to monitor during and beyond school day interventions. This will help gauge fidelity of implementation and also inform changes that need to be made to ensure maximum effectiveness of the interventions. The Focus Intervention/Collaboration staff member will monitor both interventions and collaborative planning around interventions on an ongoing basis, beginning in <b>October 2017</b>, and will work with school leadership and Title I Office staff to modify as needed.</p>
<p><b>Assessment(s) to be used to monitor the effect of this strategy:</b></p> <p>The effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by staff and administrator feedback and central office staff monitoring visits. Formative and summative assessments in mathematics and reading will be examined on a quarterly basis for overall student growth and reduction of achievement gaps. Students will show progress throughout the year in both mathematics and reading on the MAP administrations.</p>
<p><b>Resources needed to implement this strategy that will be funded with this grant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Salary, FICA, other benefits</b> for the additional staff member at each school</li> </ul>

**Strategy 2:** Providing tiered interventions strategically designed to address the needs of the lowest-performing students, for example, periodic screening of those students and a customized implementation of intervention; or, a thorough diagnostic assessment of those students, and a more customized

implementation of intervention and one-to-one support for these students./Providing evidence-based interventions for the lowest-performing students or those who are at risk of needing Tier III support.

**Substrategies:**

- Provision of beyond and during the school day individual and small group interventions to students struggling mathematics and reading, especially those receiving special education and/or ESOL services. The Focus grant will pay for the planning and instructional workshop wages of interventionists.

**Is this a New or a Continuing Strategy?** Continuing

**Rationale:** How does this strategy address the root cause(s) identified above?

This strategy will address the root causes, especially limited areas of support, by providing students with research-based Tier II and III supports through small group and one-on-one instruction in reading and/or mathematics. At the two continuing Focus schools this will also involve careful examination of the prior years' interventions and student data to determine new strategies that will be more successful in narrowing achievement gaps and improving the performance of students receiving special education and/or ESOL services.

**Targeted Population:** Students receiving special education services, students with limited English proficiency, and those underperforming or at risk of underperforming in reading and/or mathematics, particularly in the primary grades.

**Specific timeframe for implementation:**

Title I, Special Education, ESOL, Office of Information Technology, Elementary Curricular staff, and school-based instructional leaders will collaborate to review the intervention programs and student data at the two continuing Focus schools (Laurel Woods and Swansfield ES), determine what did and did not work, decide on avenues for improvement, and determine appropriate curricular resources during **June-August 2017**. Purchases of appropriate curricular resources to be utilized during interventions at all seven schools will begin in **August 2017**, so that the materials are in place and interventions can begin shortly after students return. The hiring of tutors and implementation of intervention programs will occur during **September and October 2017**. Beginning in **October 2017**, Title I, Special Education, ESOL, Office of Information Technology, and Elementary Curricular staff will visit schools on a quarterly basis to monitor during and beyond school day interventions. This will help gauge fidelity of implementation and also inform changes that need to be made to ensure maximum effectiveness of the interventions.

**Assessment(s) to be used to monitor the effect of this strategy:**

The effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by staff and administrator feedback and central office staff monitoring visits. Formative and summative assessments in mathematics and reading will be examined on a quarterly basis for overall student growth and reduction of achievement gaps. Students will show progress throughout the year in both mathematics and reading on the MAP administrations.

**Resources needed to implement this strategy that will be funded with this grant:**

- **Workshop wages** for staff to plan and implement during and beyond the school day individual and small group interventions

## **Section B**

### **Measures of Progress**

All schools must complete both items below.

1. Identify how, by the end of the 2017-2018 school year, the school will determine whether the proposed strategies are helping to close the identified achievement gap.

All student subgroups in the seven HCPSS Focus Schools in grades 1-5 will show improvement in performance on the PARCC English language arts and mathematics assessments from the 2017 to 2018 administrations. At least 50% of students in the special education and LEP student groups will score a 4 or 5 on the 2018 mathematics and English language arts PARCC assessments.

2. Identify the interim measures that the school will use to determine whether it is closing the identified achievement gap.

All student subgroups in the seven HCPSS Focus Schools in grades 1-5 will show improvement in performance on the MAP reading and mathematics assessments from the Fall to Spring administrations. At least 50% of students in the special education and LEP student groups will meet or exceed their expected growth from the Fall to Spring Administrations.

### **III. Budget and Budget Narrative**

#### **Budget Narrative**

The project's budget should cover the project in detail and include any other funding sources. It should demonstrate the extent to which the budget is reasonable, cost-effective, and integrates other sources of funding. All strategies/activities described with in the project narrative must appear in the budget narrative. There should be no items in the budget narrative that do not appear in the project narrative.

#### **Supplies and Materials**

Reflect the unit cost, the number of units to be purchased, if applicable, and total cost.

#### **Equipment**

Reflect the unit cost, the number units to be purchased, if applicable, and the total cost.

#### **Contracted Costs**

Describe each anticipated service or activity, including the number of days, and cost per day.

#### **Salaries and Wages**

Indicate the salary, or cost per day and the number of days.

Show how the expense was calculated for each line item and total each category. Reviewers will use this information to determine if your budget is reasonable and cost effective.

#### **Table C1**

#### **School Budget Narrative**

This is provided as a template. The LEA/school may choose to submit information below in an Excel spreadsheet.

**SEE ATTACHED EXCEL SPREADSHEETS**



## The Proposed MSDE C-1-25 Budget Form

Proposed Budget C-1-25 contains the itemized budget form that must be submitted with the application. If you are having difficulties categorizing your budget, consult with the financial officer in your local school system.

**This form must be signed by both your district's Finance Officer and the Superintendent** (after you receive notification that your application is approved).

Only the most current grant budget forms will be accepted, so please use the forms found on MSDE's website.

- <http://archives.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/superintendent/grants/Budget+Information.html>

Or

- Go to the <http://marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE> website

Click **Grants Administration and Resource Development** (on the Left side under Opportunities)

Then Click **Budget Information** (on the Right Side of the Page under Grant Resources)



**Insert C-125**

<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/superintendent/grants/Budget+Information>

**MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
GRANT BUDGET C-1-25**

ORIGINAL GRANT BUDGET	840,000	AMENDED BUDGET #		REQUEST DATE	10/31/17
GRANT NAME	ESEA, Title I, 1003(a) - Focus Schools	GRANT RECIPIENT NAME	Howard County Public School System		
MS DE GRANT #		RECIPIENT GRANT #			
REVENUE SOURCE	ESEA, Title I	RECIPIENT AGENCY NAME	Howard County Public School System		
FUND SOURCE CODE		GRANT PERIOD	1-Jul-17	30-Sep-18	

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02 - CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER CHARGES	05 - EQUIPMENT	06 - TRANSFERS	BUDGET BY CAT/PROG
<b>201 Administration</b>							
Prog. 21 General Support							0.00
Prog. 22 Business Support						11,186.00	11,186.00
Prog. 23 Centralized Support							0.00
<b>202 Mid-Level Administration</b>							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							0.00
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.							0.00
<b>203-205 Instruction Categories</b>							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.	622,373.00						622,373.00
Prog. 02 Special Prog.							0.00
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.							0.00
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.							0.00
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							0.00
Prog. 08 School Library Media							0.00
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							0.00
Prog. 10 Guidance Services							0.00
Prog. 11 Psychological Services							0.00
Prog. 12 Adult Education							0.00
<b>206 Special Education</b>							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.							0.00
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							0.00
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							0.00
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.							0.00
<b>207 Student Personnel Serv.</b>							0.00
<b>208 Student Health Services</b>							0.00
<b>209 Student Transportation</b>							0.00
<b>210 Plant Operation</b>							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.							0.00
Prog. 31 Operating Services							0.00
<b>211 Plant Maintenance</b>							0.00
<b>212 Fixed Charges</b>	206,441.00						206,441.00
<b>214 Community Services</b>							0.00
<b>215 Capital Outlay</b>							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements							0.00
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions							0.00
Prog. 36 Remodeling							0.00
<b>Total Expenditures By Object</b>	828,814.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,186.00	840,000.00

Finance Official Approval	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="flex: 1;"> <u>Rafiu O. Ighile</u> Name </div> <div style="flex: 1; text-align: center;">  Signature </div> </div>	10/31/17 Date	410-313-6600 Telephone #
Supt./Agency Head Approval	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="flex: 1;"> <u>Dr. Michael Matriano</u> Name </div> <div style="flex: 1; text-align: center;">  Signature </div> </div>	10/31/17 Date	410-313-6600 Telephone #
MSDE Grant Manager Approval	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; height: 40px;"> <div style="flex: 1; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> <div style="flex: 1; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> <div style="flex: 1; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> <div style="flex: 1; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> </div>		
	Name	Signature	Telephone #

**Table C2**

**Consolidated LEA Budget Narrative**

*To be completed by the LEA for all participating school budget totals*

This is provided as a template. The LEA/school may choose to submit information below in an Excel spreadsheet. In either case, list each school's expenses.

**SEE ATTACHED EXCEL SPREADSHEETS**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 72,700.00			1	\$ 72,700.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	52	2	5	\$ 26,000.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 98,700.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					\$ 7,550.55	
	RETIREMENT					\$ 11,401.45	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					\$ 750.00	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 19,702.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 63,995.00			1	\$ 63,995.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	45	2	5	\$ 22,500.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 86,495.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					<b>\$ 6,616.87</b>	
	RETIREMENT					<b>\$ 10,356.13</b>	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					<b>\$ 14,934.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 31,907.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 76,619.00			1	\$ 76,619.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	43	2	5	\$ 21,500.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 98,119.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					\$ 7,506.10	
	RETIREMENT					\$ 12,026.90	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					\$ 750.00	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 20,283.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 68,348.00			1	\$ 68,348.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	42	2	4	\$ 16,800.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 85,148.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					\$ 6,513.82	
	RETIREMENT					\$ 10,790.18	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					\$ 15,950.00	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 33,254.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 66,171.00			1	\$ 66,171.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	40	2	5	\$ 20,000.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 86,171.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					<b>\$ 6,592.08</b>	
	RETIREMENT					<b>\$ 10,196.92</b>	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					<b>\$ 15,442.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 32,231.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	



<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 67,913.00			1	\$ 67,913.00	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	43	2	4	\$ 17,200.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 85,113.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					\$ 6,511.14	
	RETIREMENT					\$ 10,929.86	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					\$ 15,848.00	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 33,289.00</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person	\$ 61,852.80			1	\$ 61,852.80	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	51	2	5	\$ 25,500.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						<b>\$ 87,352.80</b>	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						<b>\$ -</b>	
FIXED CHARGES	FICA @ 7.65%					\$ 6,682.49	
	RETIREMENT					\$ 9,932.31	
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS					\$ 14,434.40	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						<b>\$ 31,049.20</b>	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					<b>\$ 1,598.00</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						<b>\$ 120,000.00</b>	

HCPSS Total  
(DRES, LWES, LOES, PLES, RBES, SES, TSES)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rate/Price</u>	<u># Times/Units</u>	<u># Hours Each Time</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Salary	Salary for Focus Intervention/Collaboration Staff Person				7	\$ 477,598.80	
WW	Tutoring-Math &/or Reading BSH	\$ 50.00	~45	2	33	\$ 149,500.00	\$50 rate = 1 hour planning @ \$20/hr for 1 hour tutoring @ \$30
<b>TOTAL WW</b>						\$ 627,098.80	
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED</b>						\$ -	
<b>TOTAL MOI</b>						\$ -	
<b>FIXED CHARGES</b>	<b>FICA @ 7.65%</b>					\$ 47,973.05	
	<b>RETIREMENT</b>					\$ 75,633.75	
	<b>TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS</b>					\$ 78,108.40	
<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES</b>						\$ 201,715.20	
<b>INDIRECTS</b>	<b>Transfers for Business Support @ 1.35%</b>					\$ 11,186.00	
<b>TOTALS</b>						\$ 840,000.00	

## **V. The General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), Section 427**

Each applicant must develop and describe the steps such applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to and equitable participation in the project by addressing the special needs of students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries in order to overcome barriers to equitable participation.

Section 427 of the General Education Provision Act ensures access to, and participation in, federally assisted programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. The statute highlights six barrier types that may impede equitable access or participation. These include gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. In addition to its current policies on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment, the Howard County Public School System (HCPSS) has adopted four strategic goals. Goal 1 is that “Every student achieves academic excellence in an inspiring, engaging, and supportive environment.” This proposal is aligned with this strategic goal. The major purpose of this proposal is to increase achievement in reading and mathematics for underperforming students, particularly those receiving special education services. The following are examples of Equitable Access and Participation within the design:

- Utilizing interpreters and translators to make family programming accessible to all families, regardless of native language
- Working with the Office of Special Education and Student Services to provide accommodations to students receiving special education services and to remove barriers to participation to students and families experiencing homelessness (through the provisions of transportation and childcare at family programs, for example)
- Incorporating Universal Design for Learning elements into all interventions and programs to maximize access and achievement for students with a variety of academic and behavioral strengths and challenges.

The HCPSS will exhaust every effort to guarantee that all students experience equal access and actively participate in planned activities.