

Project #1/78 Project Name: Office for Academic Reform and Innovation Associated with Criteria: A2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	142,623	145,476	148,385	151,353	587,837
2. Fringe Benefits	11,053	11,274	11,500	11,730	45,557
3. Travel	4,620	4,620	4,620	4,620	18,480
4. Equipment	3,400	-	-	-	3,400
5. Supplies	988	988	988	988	3,952
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	162,684	162,358	165,493	168,691	659,226
10. Indirect Costs*	19,751	20,132	20,521	20,918	81,322
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	182,435	182,490	186,014	189,609	740,548
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #1/78**Project Title: Office for Academic Reform and Innovation****Criteria:** (A)(2)(i)(a)**Project Description:**

This Office provides the coordination, management, and oversight for the full set educational reform projects in this application. Given the myriad and widespread reform projects that will be undertaken within a limited amount of time, a dedicated oversight and monitoring office is critical.

The Project Manager, a key position covered by a current staff person during the RTTT application phase, will continue in the implementation phase with a full time contractual employee. This person will be responsible for overall monitoring of the implementation of the grant in-house as well as in the LEAs. The project manager will also coordinate logistics, monitor the implementation of Memoranda of Understanding, and oversee timelines. A new position will be created for the purposes of this grant.

Recognizing the critical need for transparency and accountability in the use and reporting of Race to the Top funding, an additional position will be established to assist the Project Manager and to coordinate all administrative and reporting facets of the grant. The Staff Specialist position will be responsible for monitoring the financial aspects of this grant, including disbursement of funds, monitoring the expenditure of those funds, meeting reporting requirements, and ensuring accountability measures.

The State Superintendent will also appoint someone to the current vacant position of Deputy Superintendent and rename the office the Office for Academic Reform and Innovation. This position will be funded out of operating funds, not Race to the Top funds.

Funding:

This project connects to the overall monitoring of the RTTT grant from the implementation of the various initiatives to the substantial monetary accountability.

Year by Year Description:

Years 1-4:

The Project Manager will be responsible for overall monitoring of the implementation of the grant in-house as well as in the LEAs. The project manager will also coordinate logistics, monitor the implementation of MOUs, and oversee timelines. A new position will be created for the purposes of this grant.

The Staff Specialist position will be responsible for monitoring the financial and reporting aspects of this grant, including disbursement of funds, monitoring the expenditure of those funds, meeting reporting requirements, and ensuring accountability measures.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project. Contractual Staff are based upon State of Maryland Classifications and year to year salary changes are rounded to the nearest dollar. The attached detail document shows the full set of calculations for all positions in the budget.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
(1) Project Manager (Educational Program Manager) This person will be responsible for overall monitoring of the implementation of the grant in-house as well as in the LEAs. The project manager will also coordinate logistics, monitor the implementation of MOUs, and oversee timelines.	1 @ 100%	\$89,434	\$368,612
(1) Staff Specialist (Staff Specialist – Accountability and Reporting) This person will be responsible for monitoring the financial aspects of this grant, including disbursement of funds, monitoring the expenditure of those funds, meeting reporting requirements, and ensuring accountability measures.	1 @ 100%	\$53,189	\$219,225
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
---------	------------	-------------	-------

Travel to LEAs	240	\$77	\$18,480
----------------	-----	------	----------

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
(2) Laptop computers	\$1,700	Laptop computer	\$3,400

5) Supplies

\$494 per person per year (Office supplies)

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not Applicable

8) Other

Not Applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$162,684	\$162,358	\$165,493	\$168,691	\$659,226

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not Applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$182,435	\$182,490	\$186,014	\$189,609	\$740,548

Project #: 2/01 Project Name: Program Evaluation Associated with Criteria: A2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	330,000	990,000	990,000	2,690,000	5,000,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	330,000	990,000	990,000	2,690,000	5,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	330,000	990,000	990,000	2,690,000	5,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #2/01**Project Title: Program Evaluation****Criteria: (A)(2)(i)(b)****Project Description:**

Maryland understands the need to conduct an evaluation of its application, including its various projects. The cost of these studies will vary depending upon several factors including such things as the design complexity, number of teachers or other persons involved, and creation of special assessment materials. Maryland recognizes that the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) is conducting an evaluation for the USDE for the Race to the Top program. If we were to conduct an evaluation of the entire application Maryland would likely want to budget 8-10 percent of its portion of the budget for evaluation purposes, which is the generally accepted recommended amount according to the report by Marvin Alkin and Joan Ruskus (Reflections on Evaluation Costs: Direct and Indirect, California University, Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation), which included reference to evaluation costs of the Elementary and Secondary Act. The evaluation will be designed to ensure that it complements and does not duplicate the work being done by IES.

Funding:

Maryland is not certain of the breadth and depth of the federal evaluation by IES, but it does not wish to duplicate effort or waste resources. Thus, for current purposes, Maryland has chosen to budget \$5,000,000 of its allotted maximum state portion of \$125,000,000 to evaluate its progress during the course of the grant period. This will be contracted out to the Maryland Assessment Research Center for Educational Success (MARCES) headed by Dr. Robert Lissitz. This Center is a research arm of the University System of Maryland.

Year by Year Description:

The evaluation will be a three-stage evaluation model. It will deal with all four assurance areas, and it will have three phases.

Years 1-2: The first phase will be the process and product phase. It concerns the creation and implementation of the software systems, the staff development efforts and any of the many new “products” that will be developed and delivered to the educators in the State of Maryland.

Years 2-3: The second phase is the utilization phase. It concerns the use of materials by various stakeholders. MARCES wants to know if the teachers, principals, and other educators actually utilize materials that have been created.

Years 3-4: The third phase is the impact stage. MARCES will evaluate the ultimate reason for the creation of the process, materials, and the eventual product. It will answer the question: Did the processes/products/materials make a difference?

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

This will be contracted out to the Maryland Assessment Research Center for Educational Success (MARCES) headed by Dr. Robert Lissitz. This Center is a research arm of the University System of Maryland. **The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases. The project focuses on an evaluation of Maryland's Race to the Top application and resulting reforms. The costs are distributed over the four years assuming evaluation design in year 1. Years 2 and 3 will be data collection and interim evaluation reports to give feedback on project implementation and impact. Year 4 will be final data collection and a final evaluation report.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$330,000	\$990,000	\$990,000	\$2,690,000	\$5,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$330,000	\$990,000	\$990,000	\$2,690,000	\$5,000,000

Project#: 3/02 Project Name: Formative Assessments Associated with Criteria: B2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	678,826	692,399	706,247	720,372	2,797,844
2. Fringe Benefits	52,609	53,661	54,734	55,829	216,833
3. Travel	34,314	34,314	34,314	34,314	137,256
4. Equipment	13,500	-	-	-	13,500
5. Supplies	4,446	4,446	4,446	4,446	17,784
6. Contractual	37,801	2,237,801	1,927,801	1,927,801	6,131,204
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	821,496	3,022,621	2,727,542	2,742,762	9,314,421
10. Indirect Costs*	95,504	97,318	99,168	101,055	393,045
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	917,000	3,119,939	2,826,710	2,843,817	9,707,466
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #3/02**Project Title: Formative Assessments****Criteria:****Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments**

This project supports the work of a consortium of states developing summative assessments, and work within Maryland to develop high-quality formative assessments to form a comprehensive assessment system. This project supports the work described in Section B3, Transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments.

Project Description:

The program and project managers defined in this section will be working solely on the formative assessment systems in elementary, middle and high school similar to staff who are currently working on the Maryland summative assessments. These project staff will work closely with Division of Instruction staff as defined in Section B.3: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development. This structure will mirror MSDE's current structure for our summative assessments; however, none of this project's budget will be used to develop, administer, or revise statewide summative assessments. These staff will also work closely with local school system personnel on defining the requirements to implement an online formative assessment within each local school system and with the vendor who will eventually be engaged to develop the formative assessment system, and the vendor responsible for the alignment studies.

This project enables MSDE to fully collaborate with state consortium partners to design, field test, and construct a comprehensive summative assessment system in grade 3 -8 and high school in mathematics and English Language Arts that will determine if Maryland's students are career and college ready or on track to meet this goal. In addition, this project enables Maryland to build a comprehensive bank of formative assessment items and tools that are aligned to the summative assessment system. (Note that project managers within the Division of Instruction included in the budget for section B3 will spend one third of their time building the formative assessment bank) Funding for the following items is included in this budget:

Begin the development of formative assessments for use by classroom teachers. Activities include assessing current efforts across the state and begin creation of a formative assessment item bank. A vendor will work with MSDE staff (see budget for B-3) to create this system and a delivery portal (DOI). The vendor will work with MSDE staff to develop assessment items and ensure they are aligned with new state common core curriculum. Maryland teachers will come together during the summer to review items in much the same way teachers review items for current H S A and M S A assessments. Given that the work of an assessment consortium will not begin till fall, 2010, and that significant work to transition to the new common core assessments exists, work on developing the formative assessment system will begin in year two of this grant.

Instituting a new comprehensive assessment system requires significant planning. Thus, one (1) program manager will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating across the grade 3-8

and high school interim, formative, and summative assessment systems (DAA). The project managers will report to the program manager.

Three (3) project managers will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of development and implementation of the new assessment system, one project manager will be assigned to reading, one project manager for mathematics, and one for high school (DAA).

Five (5) additional project managers; two will be responsible for the coordination of development activities and committee meetings with consortia states, and LEA staff, and the development, review, and implementation of administration manuals for online and paper administrations. Two (2) project managers will be responsible for coordinating the assessment work related to the needs of special education students; one (1) project manager will be responsible for the assessment work related to Braille/vision needs (DAA).

Travel costs exist to join with consortium partners developing formative assessment system (two week long trips per year for three individuals—elementary, middle, high, and the program manager) (DOI and DAA).

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings. Out-of-state travel will be required of the program manager, project managers and the special education project manager to meet with consortia members two times per year, for a total of 10 days to coordinate a variety of planning and implementation activities. (DAA).

Computers for the nine (9) staff will be needed in the first year of the project (DAA).

It will be necessary to conduct alignment studies of the formative system with summative tests. A vendor will work with MSDE staff in this effort (DAA).

Finally, one additional important step will ensure that ALL Maryland students can become career and college ready. Additional funding will be employed to allow ALL 10th grade students in Maryland to take the PSAT in order to receive feedback regarding academic strengths and weaknesses and connecting to the extensive network of resources offered by the College Board to assist students in planning for a challenging academic future.

Funding:

Funding for this project connects with funding included in section B3 regarding transition to new assessments. Staff included in section B3 will not only work on formative assessment item development, but they will also assist Maryland in transitioning to the new Common Core Curriculum and the expansion of Maryland's on-line instructional tool kit.

Funding for this project also connects to the work of state consortium partners. Maryland staff will participate as members of the design team of the state consortium facilitated by Achieve. The positions included in this budget assume that the consortium members will collaborate in designing, field testing, and creating new assessments. Division of Accountability and Assessment staff members will ensure that the work described in this section is completed so that summative assessments for all students will be deployed by 2014-2015. (Note that existing, current staff in Maryland will maintain our existing MSA/HSA tests for school accountability until new tests are ready. At that point, they will replace the contractual employees hired for

this project, ensuring full sustainability of assessment efforts).

The funding stream for the contract for the development of formative assessment items decreases over time as the bank of items becomes more and more robust.

Year by Year Description:**Year 1:**

One (1) program manager will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating project activities across the grade 3-8 and high school interim, formative, and summative assessment systems (DAA). **That single program manager identified on page 357 will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating project activities across the grade 3-8 and high school formative assessment systems (DAA). He or she will play no role pertaining to summative assessments. The program manager will be responsible for development of the RFP to secure a formative assessment vendor and the RFP to secure a vendor to conduct the alignment study. The project managers assigned to the respective content/special needs area of the formative assessment system will report to the program manager.**

Three (3) project managers will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of development and implementation of the new assessment system, one project manager will be assigned to reading, one project manager for mathematics, and one for high school (DAA).

Five (5) additional project managers; two will be responsible for the coordination of development activities and committee meetings with consortia states, and LEA staff, and the development, review, and implementation of administration manuals for online and paper administrations. Two (2) project managers will be responsible for coordinating the assessment work related to the needs of special education students; one (1) project manager will be responsible for the assessment work related to Braille/vision needs (DAA).

Out-of-state travel costs to join with consortium partners developing formative assessment system (two week long trips per year for three specialists—elementary, middle, high) (DOI).

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings at 20 trips per year, 40 trips per year will be required of the two project managers focusing on the assessment requirements for special education students. Out-of-state travel will be required of the program manager, project managers and the special education project managers to meet with consortia members two times per year, for 5 days (DAA). Total travel costs, including in-state and out-of-state travel in year one are \$34,332.

Computers for the nine (9) staff will be needed in the first year of the project (DAA). Total computer cost in Year One is \$13,500. Supply costs for Year One are \$4,446.

\$37,800.75 will enable 10th grade students in Maryland districts not currently taking the PSAT to take that exam and receive feedback along with all other Maryland students.

Year 2:

2.05 million dollars to continue development of formative assessment system. A vendor will work with MSDE staff (see budget for B-3) to create this system and a delivery portal (DOI). Maryland teachers will be brought together during the summer to review items in much the same way teachers review items for current H S A and M S A assessments.

One (1) program manager will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating project activities across the grade 3-8 and high school interim, formative, and summative assessment systems (DAA).

Three (3) project managers will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of development and implementation of the new assessment system, one project manager will be assigned to reading, one project manager for mathematics, and one for high school (DAA).

Five (5) project managers; two will be responsible for the coordination of development activities and committee meetings with consortia states, and LEA staff, and the development, review, and implementation of administration manuals for online and paper administrations. Two (2) project managers will be responsible for coordinating the assessment work related to the needs of special education students; one (1) project manager will be responsible for the assessment work related to Braille/vision needs (DAA).

Out-of-state travel costs to join with consortium partners developing formative assessment system (two week long trips per year for three specialists—elementary, middle, high) (DOI).

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings at 20 trips per year, 40 trips per year will be required of the two project managers focusing on the assessment requirements for special education students. Out-of-state travel will be required of the program manager, project managers and the special education project managers to meet with consortia members two times per year, for 5 days (DAA). Total travel costs, including in-state and out-of-state travel in year one are \$34,332.

\$150,000 dollars to begin alignment study of formative system with summative tests. A vendor will work with MSDE staff in this effort (DAA).

\$37,800.75 will enable 10th grade students in Maryland districts not currently taking the PSAT to take that exam and receive feedback along with all other Maryland students.

Year 3:

1.74 million dollars to continue development of formative assessment system. A vendor will work with MSDE staff (see budget for B-3) to create this system and a delivery portal (DOI). Maryland teachers will be brought together during the summer to review items in much the same way teachers review items for current H S A and M S A assessments.

One (1) program manager will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating project activities across the grade 3-8 and high school interim, formative, and summative assessment systems (DAA).

Three (3) project managers will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of development and implementation of the new assessment system, one project manager will be assigned to

reading, one project manager for mathematics, and one for high school (DAA).

Five (5) project managers; two will be responsible for the coordination of development activities and committee meetings with consortia states, and LEA staff, and the development, review, and implementation of administration manuals for online and paper administrations. Two (2) project managers will be responsible for coordinating the assessment work related to the needs of special education students; one (1) project manager will be responsible for the assessment work related to Braille/vision needs (DAA).

Out-of-state travel costs to join with consortium partners developing formative assessment system (two week long trips per year for three specialists—elementary, middle, high) (DOI).

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings. Out-of-state travel will be required of the program manager, project managers and the special education project managers to meet with consortia members two times per year, for 5 days (DAA).

\$150,000 dollars to continue alignment study of formative system with summative tests. A vendor will work with MSDE staff in this effort (DAA).

\$37,800.75 will enable 10th grade students in Maryland districts not currently taking the PSAT to take that exam and receive feedback along with all other Maryland students.

Year 4:

1.74 million dollars to complete development of formative assessment system. A vendor will work with MSDE staff (see budget for B-3) to create this system and a delivery portal (DOI). Maryland teachers will be brought together during the summer to review items in much the same way teachers review items for current H S A and M S A assessments.

One (1) program manager will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating project activities across the grade 3-8 and high school interim, formative, and summative assessment systems (DAA).

Three (3) project managers will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of development and implementation of the new assessment system, one project manager will be assigned to reading, one project manager for mathematics, and one for high school (DAA).

Five (5) additional project managers; two will be responsible for the coordination of development activities and committee meetings with consortia states, and LEA staff, and the development, review, and implementation of administration manuals for online and paper administrations. Two (2) project managers will be responsible for coordinating the assessment work related to the needs of special education students; one (1) project manager will be responsible for the assessment work related to Braille/vision needs (DAA).

Out-of-state travel costs to join with consortium partners developing formative assessment system (two week long trips per year for three specialists—elementary, middle, high) (DOI).

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA

trainings at 20 trips per year, 40 trips per year will be required of the two project managers focusing on the assessment requirements for special education students. Out-of-state travel will be required of the program manager, project managers and the special education project managers to meet with consortia members two times per year, for 5 days (DAA). Total travel costs, including in-state and out-of-state travel in year one are \$34,332.

\$150,000 dollars to continue alignment study of formative system with summative tests. A vendor will work with MSDE staff in this effort (DAA).

\$37,800.75 will enable 10th grade students in Maryland districts not currently taking the PSAT to take that exam and receive feedback along with all other Maryland students.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project. Contractual Staff are based upon State of Maryland Classifications and year to year salary changes are rounded to the nearest dollar.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Assessment Program Manager to oversee and coordinate comprehensive assessment system activities.	1 @ 100%	\$89,434	\$89,434
Assessment Project Managers: One will work with reading assessment, another with math assessment, and the third with high school assessments. Two will coordinate all activities with consortium states and Maryland educators including the development of implementation manuals for on-line and paper assessment administrations. Two will coordinate work related to assessments for special education students. One will coordinate assessment work related to Braille/vision needs.	8 @ 100%	\$73,674	\$589,392
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
---------	------------	-------------	-------

The original narrative was not complete. It was envisioned that the manager would take 30 trips per year for a total of 246 trips. The original total of \$6396 remains accurate, and the total travel budget would require no change.	246	\$26	\$6,396
In-state travel for 9 positions @27 trips per year, and In-state travel for the manager @3 trips per year	18	\$1,551	\$27,918
Out-of-state travel for 9 positions @2 trips per year (10 days)			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Computers for nine staff	\$1500	computer	\$13,500

5) Supplies

Office supplies: @\$494 per year per position. \$4,446 per year, total cost of \$17,784

6) Contractual

Itemized cost for PSAT tests

Funds are targeted to pay for the cost of administering the PSAT to 10th grade students in those districts where the cost is not paid by the local school system. The cost is based on 75% of enrolled students with \$13.00 as the test fee (2010). The source of enrollment data is NCES.

Itemized cost for PSAT: $3877 \text{ students} * \$13/\text{student} * .75 = \$37,800.75/\text{yr.}$

The estimated cost for Year 1 development of the formative assessment system is \$2,050,000. This amount was estimated based on a past RFP solicited by MSDE for formative assessment development. The work, however, was never undertaken due to budget constraints. It is anticipated that there will be upfront costs in the vendor contract for start-up work that will not carry over into the remaining years of the contract. Therefore the subsequent years are estimated at \$1,740,000 per year. The cost for the alignment studies of \$150,000 in years 2, 3, and 4 are based on a past contract MSDE procured for alignment studies.

1) A vendor will be procured with experience in developing formative assessment items to work with MSDE staff to identify and develop formative assessment items to support classroom instruction as detailed in section C 3. The initial cost will be 2.5 million dollars, decreasing through year three as the item bank becomes populated with high quality items. The vendor will spend 100% FTE on this project.

2) In year 2, 3, and 4, a vendor will be procured to work with MSDE staff to conduct an

alignment study to ensure that formative assessment items that are developed are valid and reliable assessments of the common core curriculum. This vendor will spend 10% FTE on this project which should last for approximately 6 weeks.

\$37,800.75 will enable 10th grade students in Maryland districts not currently taking the PSAT to take that exam and receive feedback along with all other Maryland students.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

--

8) Other

--

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$821,496	\$3,022,621	\$2,727,542	\$2,742,762	\$9,707,466

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$917,000	\$3,119,939	\$2,826,710	\$2,843,817	\$9,704,466

Project#: 4/03 Project Name: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development Associated with Criteria: B3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	752,500	767,546	782,897	798,555	3,101,498
2. Fringe Benefits	58,319	59,485	60,675	61,888	240,367
3. Travel	15,400	15,400	15,400	15,400	61,600
4. Equipment	19,400	-	-	-	19,400
5. Supplies	4,940	4,940	4,940	4,940	19,760
6. Contractual	500,000	500,000	575,000	575,000	2,150,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,350,559	1,347,371	1,438,912	1,455,783	5,592,625
10. Indirect Costs*	103,064	105,074	107,125	109,217	424,480
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,453,623	1,452,445	1,546,037	1,565,000	6,017,105

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #4/03**Project Title: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development****Criteria: (B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments**

Maryland will adopt the Common Core Standards and begin the work to revise the current State Curriculum, build formative assessments and provide professional development that will support teachers in their implementation of the Common Core Standards, ensuring that Maryland students are prepared for credit-bearing courses in college or the workforce.

This project supports the work described in Section B2, Assessments. Note that this project provides the content support and the project in B2 provides the psychometric support for the assessments. As directed, this project does not fund development of the summative assessments.

Project Description: During the critical transition to the Common Core Standards and Assessments, Maryland will hire professional educators on a contractual basis to assist with development and or revision of curriculum in mathematics, English language arts, STEM interdisciplinary curriculum and exemplar STEM lesson ideas, related on-line instructional tools and resources, and formative assessments as well as assist with the planning and implementation of professional development. Maryland's current curriculum documents are enhanced through a variety of electronic resources linked to the on-line curriculum documents. These resources will be reevaluated and additional resources will be identified, purchased, or developed to support the understanding and effective implementation of the Common Core Standards.

One contractual position (Education Program Manager) will provide leadership and guidance for the development of curricula, related on-line instructional tools and resources, formative assessments and the essential related professional development work.

Nine contractual positions, (Education Program Specialists) three each at the elementary, middle, and high school level will develop curriculum and formative assessments for mathematics and reading, English, language arts. In addition, work will include the development, acquisition, review, and meta tagging (linking each of the resources to the specific objects in the curricular documents) of all items for the electronic toolkit for teachers as well as assisting in the professional development for teachers in the understanding and use of the Common Core and related curricular materials.

To provide equal access for all Maryland students, regardless of geographic location, size or capacity of the local high school, Maryland will contract out the development or purchase of on-line STEM courses for students. Another contractual cost will be the review of the science and social studies curricula after revisions to incorporate the discipline specific literacy skills.

Funding:

This project connects the instructional improvement system work defined in section C3 of this application, the formative assessment work described in Section B2, and the professional development described in section D5. In addition the STEM work connects to the STEM

projects funded by the ARRA IID funding referenced in the appendices of section D5. Curriculum staff assists the formative assessment in B2.

Year by Year Description:

The **first year** of the project Maryland will actively engage educators from across the State in revising the State curriculum for the transition to the Common Core Standards and evaluating current electronic resources from the Maryland curricular toolkit for alignment. Teams of educators will assist in the development of STEM curricula and exemplar lessons. By the end of year one, revised State Curriculum documents for mathematics and English language arts will be presented to the State Board for adoption. Maryland will contract services to acquire or build the first two of eight on-line STEM courses for students.

The **second year** contractual employees will begin the work on the formative assessments, with the assumption that the consortium will have accomplished significant progress on the summative assessment. Work will begin on the social studies and science curricula for inclusion of the discipline specific literacy skills. The development of STEM curriculum will be completed. The work on the toolkit will continue and professional development on the Common Core and available tools will begin. Maryland will contract services to acquire or build the third and fourth on-line STEM courses for students.

Years **three and four** contractual employees will continue work on formative assessments, acquire resources for the toolkit and assist in providing professional development. Maryland will use the procurement process in years three and four to acquire a vendor capable of evaluating the quality of the revised science and social studies curricular documents. This review will provide specific feedback about the inclusion of the discipline-specific literacy skills and the general quality of the document relative to national documents and other high-achieving states. Finally Maryland will complete the acquisition or development of the final four on-line STEM courses for students.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project. Contractual Staff are based upon State of Maryland Classifications and year to year salary changes are rounded to the nearest dollar.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Job title: Common Core Transition Manager Classification title: Education Program Manager This position will provide leadership and oversight of the development of curriculum and formative assessments for the Common Core Standards	1@ 100%	\$89,434	\$368,612
Job title: Common Core Education Specialist Classification title: Education Program Specialist These positions will work at the elementary, middle and high school level with representatives from local school systems and higher education to develop curriculum, electronic tools and resources, and formative assessments for mathematics and reading, English,	9@ 100%	\$73,674	\$2,732,886

language arts and STEM.			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total\$
A per person allocation of \$1,540 per year for travel will permit 10 staff to take 20 trips within the State each year for the 4 years of the project.	800	\$77	\$61,600

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
10 Lap-top computers with docking stations	\$1940	Computers for each contractual employee	\$19,400

5) Supplies

Office supplies @\$494 per contractual employee, \$4,940 per year over the four year period for a total of \$19,760

6) Contractual

In order to build or acquire on-line STEM courses for students, Maryland will hire consultants on a contractual basis. The anticipated cost of development is \$250,000 per course. The goal is to develop 2 courses per year for each of the four years for a total of 8 STEM on-line courses. The total cost for this will be \$2,000,000.

Science and social studies curriculum will be revised to ensure the inclusion of essential discipline specific literacy skills. Curricular revisions in Maryland always require an expert review to assure quality documents. Using the procurement process to identify vendors capable of completing a quality review at an anticipated cost of \$75,000 for each review for a total of \$150,000. **The fee of \$250,000 per course is based on the experience of developing the**

high school assessment on-line courses. This would include project management, content writing, editing, HTML/technical development, multimedia development, copyright purchasing, course audit, and special education/ELL review. The fee of \$75,000 for an expert review of curricular documents is based on prior experience with outside reviews of curricular documents with companies such as Achieve and Westat.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable.

8) Other

Not applicable.

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,350,559	\$1,347,371	\$1,438,912	\$1,455,783	\$5,592,625

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,453,623	\$1,452,445	\$1,546,037	\$1,565,000	\$6,017,105

Project #: 5/04 Project Name: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development for ITEEA Associated with Criteria: B3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	24,510	30,510	34,510	34,510	124,040
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	24,510	30,510	34,510	34,510	124,040
10. Indirect Costs*	3,039	3,783	4,279	4,279	15,380
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	27,549	34,293	38,789	38,789	139,420

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #5/04**Project Title: Curriculum and Formative Assessment for ITEEA**

Criteria: (B) (3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. As one part of the “T” in STEM, Maryland has a graduation requirement in technology education. Curriculum for this course will be standardized and aligned to the Common Core with complementary assessments and instructional materials.

Project Description:

The intent of this initiative is to provide funds for the consortium, assessment, and professional development fees to adopt internationally benchmarked standards aligned to the common core, model course guides, and end-of-course assessments available from the International Technology and Engineering Educators Association (ITEEA) STEM Center for Teacher and Learning (STEM-CTL) to increase students’ technological literacy.

Each student in Maryland is required to complete one credit of technology education prior to graduation. This instructional project will make resources available to all local education agencies to implement highly rigorous, technology education programs aligned to the common core. Instructional materials and model course guides are created by the International Technology and Engineering Educators Association (ITEEA) and available through a consortium of states. The annual membership fee will be covered through the grant for four years and subsequently sustained by the state. Local education agencies using these resources will be expected to implement ITEEA’s standards-based, end-of-course assessments to support instruction, assess students’ technological literacy, and identify needs for teacher professional development. Data reports will be created by ITEEA and distributed to the state, local education agencies, and individual teachers. Teacher professional development will be provided by ITEEA and aligned to the Maryland Professional Development Standards.

Funding: This project supports the state’s efforts to implement rigorous standards, implement formative assessments and provide professional development.

Year by Year Description:

Year One: The first year of the project will engage educators from 13 local education agencies in implementing ITEEA’s Foundation of Technology curriculum as well as the pre- and post-assessments. Maryland will contract services through ITEEA to enable local education agencies to acquire the curriculum from the STEM Center for Teaching and Learning (STEM CTL). Professional development will be provided to support teachers’ instructional practice based on data-based decision.

Year Two: The second year of the project will engage educators from 16 local education agencies in implementing ITEEA's Foundation of Technology curriculum as well as the pre- and post-assessments. Maryland will contract services through ITEEA to enable local education agencies to acquire the curriculum from the STEM Center for Teaching and Learning (STEM CTL). Professional development will be provided to support teachers' instructional practice based on data-based decision.

Year Three: The third year of the project will engage educators from 20 local education agencies in implementing ITEEA's Foundation of Technology curriculum as well as the pre- and post-assessments. Maryland will contract services through ITEEA to enable local education agencies to acquire the curriculum from the STEM Center for Teaching and Learning (STEM CTL). Professional development will be provided to support teachers' instructional practice based on data-based decision.

Year Four: The fourth year of the project will engage educators from 24 local education agencies in implementing ITEEA's Foundation of Technology curriculum as well as the pre- and post-assessments. Maryland will contract services through ITEEA to enable local education agencies to acquire the curriculum from the STEM Center for Teaching and Learning (STEM CTL). Professional development will be provided to support teachers' instructional practice based on data-based decision.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments

and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

In order to acquire the curriculum, assessments and professional development, Maryland will join the consortium led by ITEEA's STEM CTL. The total cost over four years will be \$124,040.

- Consortium Fee @ 18,900/yr x 4 yrs. = \$75,600
 - Assessments @ 0.75/assessment x 25,000 = \$18,750 (Years 1 and 2: 5,000 assessments each year. Years 3 and 4: 7,500 assessments each year).
 - Professional Development @ \$7,422.50/year x 4 years \$29,690
- The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.**

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$24,510	\$30,510	\$34,510	\$34,510	\$124,040

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable). **\$15,380**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not Applicable

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not Applicable				

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
Not Applicable		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$27,549	\$34,293	\$38,789	\$38,789	\$139,420

Project #: 6/76 Project Name: Curriculum & Assessment Development CTE-SREB Associated with Criteria: B3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	38,923	38,923	38,923	38,923	155,692
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	38,923	38,923	38,923	38,923	155,692
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	38,923	38,923	38,923	38,923	155,692

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #6/76**Project Title: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development CTE- SREB**

Criteria: (B) (3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments in CTE. MSDE will participate in the Southern Regional Education Board's (SREB) multistate consortium to develop curricula, assessments, instructional materials and teacher professional development to provide more students with relevant and challenging CTE/STEM programs of study.

Project Description:

Maryland will engage representatives from business and industry, higher education, non-profit organizations, secondary education, and professional organizations in the Southern Regional Education Board's multi-state consortium to develop curricula, assessments, instructional materials, and teacher professional development to provide more students with relevant and challenging CTE/STEM programs of study.

Engaging various stakeholder groups throughout the State will be critical in getting buy-in for effective implementation. Through the involvement of representatives from business and industry, higher education as well as teachers, school and central office administrators, Maryland will use the Common Core Standards to provide educators with an academically enhanced CTE curricular framework.

MSDE will partner with SREB to develop a new Career and Technology Education (CTE) Program of Study in **Construction Management and Design**, which includes the development of four CTE courses, field testing, and adoption of the final CTE curriculum and assessments. These technical courses are organized around authentic problems enabling all students to test their interests and aptitudes in the context of a career field while deepening their academic and technical knowledge. In addition to building technical knowledge skills, competencies embedded in the curriculum help students develop creative, practical, problem-solving and decision-making skill that will prepare them for the workplace of the 21st century in a high-demand, high-wage career field that is important to our state's economy.

While MSDE will lead this program development process, this will occur through a multistate initiative organized by SREB. MSDE has established a state-wide industry and postsecondary advisory group to guide the development of a high school-to-college level program in **Construction Management and Design**. SREB will assist in the development of curricular materials, assessments and teacher and counselor training materials, providing professional development for teachers and school counselors, field testing and revising curricular materials and training materials, implementing the new curriculum statewide, providing the curriculum to partner and non-partner states for implementation in their states, and adopting the newly developed curricula of partner states as appropriate.

Funding: Through this multistate consortium, each state will develop a CTE-STEM program of study to be shared with the consortium members for possible statewide adoption. This project aligns with (B)(3), the state's efforts to align the Common Core Standards, implement formative assessments and provide professional development for students enrolled in CTE programs of study.

Year by Year Description: The development of this program, including pilot testing of each course and professional development for teachers is based on a four-year timeline.

Year One: In the first year of the project, the first two courses will be developed and teachers will be trained on the curriculum requirements.

Year Two: In year two, the first two courses will be pilot tested in four high schools.

Year Three: In year three, the third and fourth courses will be pilot tested in these schools, with an additional 4 schools initiating the revised first two courses. Each year includes on-going feedback from teachers and professional development.

Year Four: Year four includes feedback and full implementation of the new *Construction Management and Design* program.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments

and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not Applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

In order to develop a CTE STEM program of study in Construction Management and Design, MSDE will join the SREB Multistate Consortium. Staff from SREB will work with MSDE to organize the program development as well as serve as the clearinghouse for all CTE programs of study designed and developed by consortium members. This will amount to \$38,923 per year. **The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not Applicable

8) Other

Not Applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$38,923	\$38,923	\$38,923	\$38,923	\$155,692

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not Applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
Not Applicable		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$38,923	\$38,923	\$38,923	\$38,923	\$155,692

Project #: 7/05 Project Name: World Languages Pipelines Associated with Criteria: B3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	221,022	225,441	229,950	234,549	910,962
2. Fringe Benefits	17,129	17,472	17,821	18,178	70,600
3. Travel	4,312	4,620	4,620	4,620	18,172
4. Equipment	5,820	100,000	100,000	100,000	305,820
5. Supplies	1,482	1,482	1,482	1,482	5,928
6. Contractual	12,000	12,000	22,800	22,800	69,600
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	128,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	293,765	393,015	408,673	413,629	1,509,082
10. Indirect Costs*	34,217	34,846	35,448	36,063	140,574
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	40,000	40,000	40,000	120,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	327,982	467,861	484,121	489,692	1,769,656
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 7/05**Project Title: World Languages Pipelines****Criteria: B(3)****Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments**

Maryland's competitive edge depends on the preparation of graduates who are highly skilled in STEM and proficient in languages other than English as measured on internationally benchmarked assessments.

Project Description:

MSDE will collaborate with LEAs to plan and implement World Languages Pipelines, beginning with articulated Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi K-5 programs and Spanish dual language programs. Under the leadership of MSDE's World Language Specialist, regional Language Specialists in Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi will be hired to design programs in participating LEAs, convene teacher committees to write and translate STEM curriculum modules that can be utilized in programs statewide, and guide the development of online courses in STEM content for world language teachers. Beginning with the second project year, participating LEAs will receive supplemental funding for program start-up costs, including the orientation of parents and staff and instructional materials. Funding for portable digital language laboratories will provide opportunities for individualized and group instruction and communicative activities. Internationally benchmarked proficiency assessments will be administered to students in project years 3 and 4.

Funding:

This project may connect to D3 *International Partnerships to recruit teachers in critical needs areas*. Participating LEAS may wish to use the D3 project funding to place international teachers with certification in STEM areas in new elementary world language programs. To enhance this project, MSDE will seek US Department of Education FLAP (Foreign Language Assistance Program) funding to provide assessment of all K-12 world language students statewide utilizing internationally benchmarked proficiency measures.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1 Hire Language Specialists; develop STEM modules in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Spanish; design online course in STEM content for world language teachers; identify participating LEAs; plan and design articulated programs

Year 2 Language Specialists provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs; install 4 digital language laboratories, provide supplemental start-up funding for 4 participating LEAs; develop additional STEM modules and annual online STEM course for world language teachers

Years 3-4 Administer internationally benchmarked proficiency exam to students in participating LEAs; Language Specialists provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs; install 4 digital language laboratories per year, provide supplemental start-up funding for 4 participating LEAs per year; develop additional STEM modules and annual online STEM course for world language teachers.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project. Contractual Staff are based upon State of Maryland Classifications and year to year salary changes are rounded to the nearest dollar.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Years 1-4: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi Language Specialists, (Education Program Specialists): One specialist per language will plan, implement, develop STEM curriculum modules, mentor world language teachers, and provide technical assistance for new elementary world language programs	3 @ 100%	\$73674	\$910,962
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel: State reimbursement rates for mileage Year 1: 56 trips shared by 3 specialists Years 2-4: 20 trips per specialist (3 x 20 = 60 trips per year x 3 years = 180 trips) Total 236 trips	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Three Language Specialists will be based in regions where new elementary programs are being implemented. Specialists will collaborate with LEAs during Year 1 to design and plan the programs. Specialists will schedule school visits throughout the region for the purpose of program planning, curriculum alignment, team teaching, and technical assistance.	236	\$77	\$18,172

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Year 1: Laptop computers/docking stations for	3 @ \$1,940 ea.	Laptop with	\$5,820

three Language Specialists to develop and translate STEM modules and communicate with participating LEAs via online eCommunity		docking station	
Years 2-4: Four portable or “drop down” digital language laboratories for new elementary world language programs will be installed each year, providing opportunities for individualized instruction, differentiation, paired/group practice and assessment.	\$25,000	Digital Language Labs	\$300,000

5) Supplies

Office supplies for 3 Language Specialists: \$494 each specialist/year, \$1,482 per year x 4 years
Total: \$5,928

6) Contractual

Years 1-4: Development of 1-credit online course in STEM content for elementary world language teachers
\$12,000/year Total: \$48,000

Years 3-4: Administration of international student proficiency assessments: i.e., DELLE (Spanish), ACTFL (Arabic, Hindi), STAMP (Chinese)
90 students/year @ \$120 per assessment = \$10,800/year x 2 years Total: \$21,600

The basis used for determining the cost of the contract amount was from the program manager’s past experience with similar contracts. The fee includes hours for project management, subject matter expert, HTML developer, and editor. World language teachers from participating LEAs that have initiated new Spanish dual language, Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi programs will be invited to enroll. If the courses are not filled, other Maryland world language teachers will be invited to participate.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

The amount includes stipends for teacher development committees to write STEM instructional modules and fees for translation into Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Spanish. The basis for determining the cost was from the program manager’s past experience with similar projects.

Years 1-4: Development and translation of STEM instructional modules by teacher and expert committees

\$32,000 /year x 4 years

Total: \$128,000

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$293,765	\$393,015	\$408,673	\$413,629	\$1,509,082

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Years 2-4: LEAs who wish to participate will receive funding for each new program implemented: One-time planning and start-up costs to design STEM world language programs, including publicity, orientation, purchase of instructional materials, and teacher professional development. LEAs will fund ongoing costs to	Develop K-5 pipelines that enable graduates to achieve proficiency in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Spanish.	\$10,000	12	\$120,000

maintain and expand programs. Selection will be based upon LEA design and implementation plans including potential for program sustainability.				
--	--	--	--	--

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$327,982	\$467,861	\$484,121	\$489,692	\$1,769,656

Project #: 8/11 Project Name: Develop the Overall Technology Infrastructure to Support Race to the Top Initiatives Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	912,067	930,305	948,911	967,890	3,759,173
2. Fringe Benefits	70,685	72,099	73,541	75,011	291,336
3. Travel	3,850	3,850	3,850	3,850	15,400
4. Equipment	1,799,500	-	-	-	1,799,500
5. Supplies	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	26,000
6. Contractual	780,000	780,000	780,000	-	2,340,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	3,572,602	1,792,754	1,812,802	1,053,251	8,231,409
10. Indirect Costs*	123,145	125,581	128,067	130,603	507,396
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	3,695,747	1,918,335	1,940,869	1,183,854	8,738,805
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 8/11

Project Title: Develop the overall Technology Infrastructure to support RTTT Initiatives

Criteria:

Maryland must build significant infrastructure to support the new reform initiatives that serve as the basis of the Race to the Top grant application. The following costs span projects and initiatives that are proposed in sections **A2, C2, C3, D2, D4, and D5** of the application. This budget is to cover the costs of new hardware, software, software licenses, and labor for installation, management and development of; (1) an enterprise portal, (2) an enterprise security system, (3) an expansion of our existing business intelligence reporting and analysis system down to the classroom for teachers and students, and (4) an end-user help desk and software application security support.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project is four projects that will be run in parallel. The four projects are:

1. Procurement, installation, and setup of an enterprise security tool for end-user authentication and data access authorization. This system will register and monitor over 800,000 students, teachers, and school administrators while preventing unauthorized access to sensitive educational data per FERPA and Federal Personal Identity Information (PII) data protection guidelines,
2. Procurement, installation, and setup of an enterprise software Internet portal that will serve a single point of access for all educational reform initiative software systems, and will be used as a management, collaboration, and document repository tool to management the RTTT project overall,
3. Procurement, installation, and setup of an expansion of our existing business intelligence servers and licenses to provide 840,000 students and 60,000 teachers with education performance improvement tools and information.
4. Procurement and installation of (1) help desk servicing and tracking tools such as “live chat”, (2) firewall and Intrusion Detection Management System (IDMS) security breach monitoring services and practices, and (3) the development and implementation of end-user software application online use tutorials to support end-users in using educational reform initiatives.

Type of Project: Software and hardware installation, and development of operations support practices for end-users, monitoring of security, and operation of computer systems and applications.

Benefits: These projects expand the enterprise IT infrastructure of MSDE in order to support all Race to the Top educational reform initiatives. This project promotes shared use of a common set of infrastructure tools that will result in economy of scale savings while creating

uniform technology solutions that will improve interoperability of systems both within MSDE and between MSDE and the LEA computer systems.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, MSDE, administrators, students and teachers.

Funding: This funding request is being use to augment existing State of Maryland and NCES YR09 SLDS grant funds to fully develop the Maryland Longitudinal Data System and business intelligence reporting system. The funding for this project will support the currently unfunded expansions of the Maryland Data Longitudinal System for the Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance reporting that is specifically being requested by the Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is multiple IT infrastructure projects that run the entire duration of the grant to support the basic technology infrastructure needs for all the educational reform initiatives as described above.

Year 1:

During year 1 an enterprise portal, enterprise security system, and an expansion of the business intelligence servers and software will be implemented along with thirteen (13) staff desktops for new development and support RTTT project staff.

A total of 13 contractual staff will be procured for this project. Five program specialists will be assigned to the following five areas: Early Childhood, P/20 Workforce, Teacher and Principal Effectiveness, Instructional Improvement, and Title I. Each of these staff members will work closely as liaisons between the program areas they represent and developers throughout the development phases to ensure solutions meet the specifications defined by the program and are implemented successfully. In addition, staff will include two Data Base administrators and two systems engineers to support operations and implementation activities. Three subject matter applications specialists will provide training and “help Desk” support to end-users on the new applications. This new Branch within MSDE’s Division of Accountability and Assessment will be managed by a new Branch Chief.

Travel for the first year will include on-site visits to school systems to provide training and support.

Contracts will be procured for technology expertise overseeing the installation and management of the solutions. This will include the Enterprise Portal, the Enterprise security system, and the Enterprise business intelligence reporting solution.

Year 2:

The year 2 budget continues the 13 personnel along with travel costs to accommodate support and training of locals. There are no hardware or software costs anticipated for Year 2.

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings.

Contract development costs continue.

Year 3:

The year 3 budget continues the 13 personnel along with travel costs to accommodate support and training of locals. There are no hardware or software costs anticipated for Year 2.

In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend committee meetings and LEA trainings.

Contracted development cost is completed by the end of year 3.

Year 4:

In year 4, development will be completed, and staffing will remain consistent at the 13 staff members charged with rollout and maintenance of the applications developed, and continuing support and training to LEAS. Travel is included to cover the costs of on-site visits to school systems to provide this training and technical integration and use support.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
1- Program Manager Grade 24	1 @ 100%	\$89,434	\$368,612
9 – Program Specialist for Grade 21 – 2 DBAs and 2 system engineers supporting development and operations and 5 subject matter experts working with Early Childhood, P/20 Workforce, Teacher and Principal Effectiveness, Instructional Improvement, and Title I on applications and development.	9@ 100%	\$73,674	\$2,732,886
3 – Staff Specialists Grade 16 providing application help desk usage support	3 @ 100%	\$53,189	\$657,675
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
In-state travel will be required of the project staff to attend	32	\$481.25	\$15,400

committee meetings and LEA trainings.			
---------------------------------------	--	--	--

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was based on previous quotes from a major software vendor that was prepared as part of the current Maryland State Longitudinal Data System FY 09 grant.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Desktops for installation and support team	1,500 each	13 desktops for RTT information system staff	\$19,500
Portal software	\$150,000	Enterprise portal software unlimited use licensed based on server CPUs	\$150,000
Portal Servers	\$230,000	1- portal server, 1 backup server, 2 http servers, and misc. network and rack equipment	\$230,000
Enterprise security software	\$750,000	Access security authentication and management software – enterprise license based on CPUs	\$750,000
Enterprise security servers	\$50,000	Access security authentication sever and misc. network and rack equipment	\$50,000
Business intelligence servers for expansion	\$300,000	1 additional BI server, 1http server, and misc. network and rack equipment	\$300,000
Additional business intelligence software licenses	\$300,000	Additional BI CPU licenses to cover use of system by 60,000 teachers and 800,000 students	\$300,000
Totals			\$1,799,500

5) Supplies

Miscellaneous office supplies @\$6,500 per year	\$26,000
---	----------

6) Contractual

Contractual support for installation, setup, and content development of management of content development of RTTT enterprise Portal, Security system, and RTTT accountability business
--

intelligence dashboards. Estimated at three procurements budgeted for 2080 hours per year at \$125 hour. Total cost: \$2,340,000

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$3,572,602	\$1,792,754	\$1,812,802	\$1,053,251	\$8,231,409

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$3,695,747	\$1,918,335	\$1,940,869	\$1,183,854	\$8,738,805

Project #: 9/27 Project Name: Accessing and Using State Data-Dashboards Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	1,040,000	1,040,000	1,040,000	-	3,120,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,040,000	1,040,000	1,040,000	-	3,120,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,040,000	1,040,000	1,040,000	-	3,120,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 9/27**Project Title: Accessing and Using State Data-Dashboards****Criteria:**

C2 Access and Using State Data – This project ensures that data from the State’s statewide longitudinal data system is accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (*e.g.*, parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers), and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of education.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project funds the programming development of the (1) 36 Effectiveness, Accountability and Performance (EAP) dashboards and associated reports, and (2) modifications to key systems such as the early childhood system to present data using the existing business intelligence platform that is operational as part of Maryland’s Longitudinal Data System and is referred to as MLDS-EAP. The development process for developing each dashboard consists of (1) meeting with end-user stakeholders to define data and analysis metrics for the dashboard, (2) design the dashboard and reports, (3) modification of select transactional system (*e.g.* early childhood, special education, career and technology education) and development of the dashboard, (4) testing the dashboard and reports with early adopter end-users, (5) performing a pilot test, (6) setting access security, (7) training end-users via webinars, and (8) putting the dashboard into the production environment.

Type of Project: Contractual programming labor that will provide staff augmentation to existing MLDS project staff.

Benefits: The MLDS-EAP system’s 36 new dashboards will provide aggregate and detailed student performance data to the classroom. While this project supports secure access to policy makers and educational administrators, it also extends data to teachers and students to improve student learning improvements in the classroom.

Participants: There are over 17 stakeholder end-users groups that will provide design input in the dashboards and metrics. For efficiency, many stakeholders are being represented by key design teams referred to as councils. Key councils include Dept. of Education MLDS data council, LEA design council, Higher education design council, National Psychometric Council, and MLDS University Research Council.

Funding:

This funding request is being use to augment existing State of Maryland and NCES YR09 SLDS grant funds to fully develop the Maryland Longitudinal Data System and business intelligence reporting system. The funding for this project will support the currently unfunded expansions of the Maryland Data Longitudinal System for the Effectiveness, Accountability,

and Performance reporting that is specifically being requested by the Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a three year programming project. Modifications to key transactional systems, to transfer data to the MLDS, and development work of the 36 dashboards, reports, and ETL programs will be scheduled evenly across the three years. The distribution of work is based on work effort, staffing, and work dependencies to complete other development projects. The development process for each dashboard is the same and includes the following steps;

1. Project planning and management
2. Define data requirements and metrics of dashboards and reports with stakeholders
3. Identify and map data sources to support reports and dashboards
4. Detailed design of dashboard and reports
5. Design of data stores, hierarchies to support dashboards
6. Creation of data store connect strings
7. Development of virtual business model and metadata layers
8. Development of presentation layer, reports, and security to support dashboards
9. Test dashboards and reports
10. Pilot dashboards and reports with stakeholders
11. Set security and rollout to all users
12. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Year 1: Development of additional data feeds into the MLDS server and the development, testing, and rollout of 12 dashboards, ETL programs, and associated reports for;

1. Class Progress
2. Early Childhood Outcomes
3. Student Performance
4. Student Growth Measures
5. Student High Risk Alerts
6. LEA- Growth
7. Instructional Improvement Outcomes
8. K-12-20 Curriculum Alignment by School
9. K-12-20 Remediation
10. K-12 Advanced Readiness AP/ACT/SAT
11. Standard Course Numbers and Content
12. Unofficial Student Transcript

Year 2: Development, testing, and rollout of additional data feeds into MLDS, and development of 12 dashboards, ETL programs, and associated reports for;

1. Summative Assessment Progress
2. Researcher Data Sets
3. Longitudinal Data System Utilization
4. Educator Evaluation Outcomes

5. Educator Programs Effectiveness
6. Credentialing Program Effectiveness
7. Educator I-Learning Courses
8. Professional Development Course Registration and Tracking
9. Teacher Supply
10. Principal Supply
11. Alternative Pathways for Teacher Certification
12. Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Year 3: Development, testing, and rollout of 12 dashboards, ETL programs, and associated reports for;

1. Longitudinal Data System Legal Mandates Index
2. Educator Equitable Distribution
3. Low-Performing School Profiles
4. Low-Performing Schools Educator Profiles
5. Equitable LEA Funding vs. Performance
6. Charter School Profiles
7. Equitable Charter School Funding
8. Funding Priorities
9. School Operations – financial, with programs
10. Access to STEM
11. STEM performance
12. Closing the Gap Progress

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	0	\$0	\$0

All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
---------	---------------	-------------	-------

NOT APPLICABLE

0

\$0

\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

4 FTE Contractual programming labor for business intelligence dashboard development. Each FTE is budgeted for 2080 hours per year at \$125 hour. Cost per year: \$1,040,000. 100% of the each FTE labor will be allocated to the project.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,040,000	\$1,040,000	\$1,040,000	\$ -	\$1,040,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,040,000	\$1,040,000	\$1,040,000	\$ -	\$3,120,000

Project #: 10/28 Project Name: Multi-Media Training Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	160,000	-	-	-	160,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	600,000	600,000	-	-	1,200,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	760,000	600,000	-	-	1,360,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	760,000	600,000	-	-	1,360,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 10/28**Project Title: Multi-Media Training****Criteria:**

C2 Access and Using State Data – This project directly supports the educational reform initiatives of Race for the Top by providing 40 tutorials to all levels of stakeholders that; (1) describes the content of the longitudinal effectiveness, accountability, and performance data reports and 36 dashboards, and (2) teaches select stakeholders on how to use such data to improve student performance in the classroom. It also trains local data coaches to provide data use support at the school, teacher and classroom level.

Project Description: This project designs, develops, implements 40 multi-media tutorials for stakeholders that will be accessible via the MLDS Education Portal using the Internet, and trains LEA data coaches.

Solution Overview: This project funds the purchase and modification of existing general LDS data tutorials, and the development of 36 custom dashboard specific tutorials using standard multi-media author ware. Where appropriate content knowledge testing will be available to track knowledge acquisition and document completion of training where mandated for select educators. Tutorials will be maintained and accessed via the MLDS Education Portal. LEA school level data coaches will also be trained to support use of the tutorials and MLDS-EAP reports and dashboards.

Type of Project: Multi-media software development and data coach training.

Benefits: Various Maryland education reforms for the Race for the Top grant will require not only the tracking of program outcomes, but the use of the data to formulate educational changes. The MLDS-EAP dashboards and report tutorials will explain to users how to interpret the reports, and link to the Educators Toolkit to help identify and promote evidence-based solutions.

Participants: There are main stakeholder groups that will participate in the design, development, testing, of the multi-media training will be (1) Maryland State Department of Education, (2) LEAs, and (3) vendor.

Funding: This funding request is new and supports the data needs of Race to the Top grant. There are no funds currently allocated to support the development of this project.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a three year project. Year 1 and year 2 are focused on the design and development of the multi-media training modules, while year 3 is focused on the rollout and training of data coaches. **The project will be carried out in year three with internal MSDE**

staff. The training of LEA data coaches, managing roll-out and overseeing web survey will be performed by MSDE Division of Accountability and Assessment and Division of Instruction staff with local LEA support.

Year 1: Project planning, design and procurement;

1. Project planning and management
2. Define training requirements by stakeholder group for 36 dashboards and general training for using LDS data to improve education.
3. Issue RFP for vendor for multi-media content and production development, portal software and hardware, and procurement of vendor resources
4. Detailed design of multi-media content

Year 2: Development and testing;

5. Development of 40 multi-media tutorials
6. Testing and modification of multi-media content
7. Installation of multi-media content on MSDE – MLDS Portal
8. Train LEA data coaches

Year 3: Rollout:

9. Train LEA data coaches
10. Rollout to stakeholders
11. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
---------	------------	-------------	-------

NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0
----------------	-----	-----	-----

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Software licensing	\$160,000	Multi-media I-learning development and delivery software Multi-media author ware	\$160,000

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

Fix-priced deliverables to develop MLDS modules for 36 dashboards and 4 general modules and to train data coaches. \$600,000 in years 1 and 2. Total cost - \$1,200,000. **These costs are based on existing vendor product and development information. Contractual costs were based on an estimate for the number of units of work times the effort to perform module modification or creation. Total costs for all modules will be bid as a fixed-price deliverable.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$760,000	\$600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,360,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of
--

Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$760,000	\$600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,360,000

Project #: 11/29 Project Name: LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	4,750,000	-	-	-	4,750,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	4,750,000	-	-	-	4,750,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 11/29**Project Title: LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades****Criteria:**

All Race to the Top educational reforms defined by Maryland.

Maryland has a successful decentralized education system with 24 LEAs. In some instances, education reforms are being implemented within the LEAs with integration via the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Data Exchange. In other cases, the LEAs will use a new centralized state system. This project is design to provide the LEAs with the necessary infrastructures to either integrate with the Maryland State Department of Education systems or enhance/replace LEA existing systems that cannot meet the data processing requirements for Race to the Top data collection, processing, and reporting.

The costs presented herein are based on the detailed analysis of the systems that LEAs have and what will be required to change to support the new education reforms. Funding will be granted to LEAs based upon the results of the technical needs analysis.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project defines a program of projects for each LEA, based on technical and functional needs, and implements a series of upgrade, integration, or system replacement projects to support Race to the Top education reforms. **The Maryland Race to the Top Technical Team contains an LEA Technical architectural sub-team. Verification of technical solution and implementation strategies will be performed by this team. This team will be responsible for working with and coordinating all LEA technical needs and implementations. The amount per LEA depends based on their need and size. The initial estimate of LEA needs was based on an extensive LEA Application survey and analysis that was performed during January – March, 2010. Results are available upon request.**

Type of Project: Hardware and software procurement, and implementation services procurement.

Benefits: This project ensures the distributed data process integrity to perform education reform data collection, data transfer, and reporting, and interoperability between the LEA systems with the Maryland State Department of Education systems.

Participants: Maryland State Dept. of Education, MLDS team, LEA technical teams.

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race

to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 3 year program management cycle that defines LEA technical needs and strategies to support Race to the Top education reforms, and allows them to participate in the technical solutions outlined in this application. Year 1 activities include; planning, selection, procurement, and initiate development for equipment or applications the LEAs may need. Year 2 and Year 3 focuses on development and implementation activities.

Year 1: Analysis, Requirements, Procurement, & Implementation

1. Identify what solutions the LEAs will be participating in for each of the projects, and analyze the unique needs of each LEA.
2. Identify integration and upgrade strategies for each LEA and define master project plan
3. Confirm budget allocations for each LEA for their project
4. Prepare detailed project plans for each LEA
5. Issue procurement RFPs for each LEA
6. Begin upgrades, integrations, implementations, and rollouts

Year 2: Continue with Analysis, Requirements, Procurement, and Implementations

Rollover of unspent funds for LEA projects in progress

Year 3: Continue with Implementations

Rollover of unspent funds for LEA projects in progress

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Totals			

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

Not Applicable

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

10) Indirect Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
Not applicable				

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
\$ 4,750,000		\$ 4,750,000	TBD	\$ 4,750,000

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$ 4,750,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,750,000

Project #: 12/60 Project Name: Expansion to LDS- Data Exchange Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	105,000	-	-	-	105,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	225,000	225,000	225,000	-	675,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	330,000	225,000	225,000	-	780,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	330,000	225,000	225,000	-	780,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #12/60**Project Title: Expansion to LDS- Data Exchange****Criteria:**

C2 Access and Using State Data – This project provides a system for collecting and distributing data from the LEAs, Maryland State Department of Education, and Maryland higher education institutions for consolidation and distribution.

Project Description: In Maryland both the colleges and the 24 independent K12 LEAs (i.e., Districts) have their own computer systems. In order to facilitate data consolidation and transfer between various educational data warehouses and student transactional information systems, a master data management strategy and data exchange subsystem is needed. A data exchange will replace and reduce duplicate and costly Extract, Transform and Load (ETL) programming that would otherwise be required if individual educational organizations wrote their own data send/receive data transfer programs. A data exchange provides standard inbound and outbound data record formats and storage transfer tables so information can be uploaded to the data exchange and then automatically be sent to target computer application systems in a format they can read and import. This project develops and implements a shared data exchange for longitudinal data transfer.

Solution Overview: This project funds the purchase of additional master data management software, and designs and develops a (1) a data exchange data warehouse with associated data tables, standard inbound record formats and data transfer and translations (i.e., ETL) programs, standard outbound data record formats and data transfer and translations (i.e., ETL) programs, a control program with event driven tracking tables to manage data inbound and outbound transfer activities, and a data dictionary to standardize data definitions and data translations between participating computer applications.

Type of Project: Contractual programming labor that will provide staff augmentation to existing MLDS project staff.

Benefits: The MLDS Data Exchange will replace and reduce duplicate and costly data transfer and translation programming that would otherwise be performed if individual educational organizations write their own data send/receive data transfer programs. This project provides an efficient way for the Maryland State Department of Education to share data with its 24 LEAs, the Maryland Statewide Longitudinal Data Center, and Maryland Higher Education Commission's college data collection systems.

Participants: There are four main stakeholder groups that will participate in the design, testing, and uploading of data to the MLDS Data Exchange in addition to the MLDS development team. The key stakeholder groups to be involved with the Data Exchange included (1) 24 LEAs, (2) Maryland Higher Education Commission, (3) Maryland Statewide Longitudinal Data Center, and (4) select student information system vendors.

Funding: This funding request is being use to augment existing State of Maryland and NCES YR09 SLDS grant funds to fully develop the Maryland Longitudinal Data System. The funding for this project will support the currently unfunded expansion and consolidation of data to the Maryland Data Longitudinal System from the LEAs and higher education institutions that is being requested by the Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a three year phased programming project. Year 1 focuses on project planning, design, and procurement. Year 2 and Year 3 is focused on specific data sets for inclusion into the data exchange data warehouse with associated data tables, standard inbound record formats and data transfer and translations (i.e., ETL) programs, standard outbound data record formats and data transfer and translations (i.e., ETL) programs, a control program with event driven tracking tables to manage data inbound and outbound transfer activities, and a data dictionary to standardize data definitions and data translations between participating computer applications.

Year 1: Project planning, design and procurement;

1. Project planning and management
2. Define data exchange requirements
3. Design data and high level process architecture
4. Select technology approach, assess market tools and tools within MSDE DAA, and evaluate SIF and Common Data Standards for Application Interface transaction record formats and methods
5. Procure market software if required
6. Detail design of exchange application, ETL processes, record formats, inbound record formats, and inbound ODS tables –

Year 2: Phase I development, testing, and rollout;

7. Implement a master data management or data dictionary to manage and document data lineage in the exchange
8. Develop staging inbound ODS tables, inbound ETLs/processes for inbound student data, course data, grade data, LEAs SIS system interface
9. Testing of Inbound tables and ETL load processes
10. Pilot of Inbound data transfers and ETL Load processes with early adopter LEAs
11. Rollout of inbound data exchange to all LEAs
12. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Year 3: Phase II development, testing, and rollout:

13. Implement a master data management or data dictionary to manage and document data lineage in the exchange
14. Develop staging inbound ODS tables, inbound ETLs/processes for teacher data, teacher assignment data, teacher evaluation data for LEAs SIS system interface
15. Testing of Inbound tables and ETL load processes

16. Pilot of Inbound data transfers and ETL Load processes with early adopter LEAs
 17. Rollout of inbound data exchange to all LEAs
 18. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	0	\$0	\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Additional software licensing from Informatica	\$105,000	This software supports master data management and data dictionary development for the data exchange	\$105,000

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

1 FTE Contractual programming labor for business intelligence dashboard development. Each FTE is budgeted for 1800 hours per year at \$125 hour. Total Cost - \$675,000. 100% of the FTE labor will be allocated to the project.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$330,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$ -	\$780,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$330,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$ -	\$780,000

Project #: 13/61 Project Name: Enhancement to LDS -Develop P-20 and Workforce Data Warehouse and Center Associated with Criteria: C2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	2,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	3,000,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	3,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	5,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	3,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	5,000,000
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 13/61

Project Title: Enhancement to LDS – Develop P-20 and Workforce Data Warehouse and Center

Criteria:

C2 Access and Using State Data – This project directly supports educational reform initiatives of Race for the Top by collecting and analyzing higher educational longitudinal student data, and combining it with K12 student and workforce data to help the state’s 24 LEAs align their K12 curriculum and student readiness skills with post-secondary education institution expectations.

Project Description: This is a 3 year project that creates a new, higher education data warehouse that is integrated with the existing Maryland’s Longitudinal Data System K12 data warehouse and Maryland’s Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation’s labor workforce data warehouse. The purpose of the LDS P20 Higher Education and Workforce Data Warehouse is to; (1) collect and store higher education student data, select workforce data, and select K12 student data, (2) analyze data and report on educational outcomes, program effectiveness, K12 educational readiness and remediation, (3) research educational improvement and policies, and (4) provide information to policy makers.

Solution Overview: This project funds the purchase of; (1) computer server equipment, (2) database and business intelligence software, and (3) contractual programming labor to develop and implement a new LDS P20 Higher Education and Workforce Data Warehouse.

Type of Project: Data warehouse software development.

Benefits: Currently there is poor integration among higher education systems, and therefore poor tracking of student performance, transition readiness of K12 students to higher education institutions, and transition to the workforce. This new system will enable the data collection, consolidation, analysis, and reporting of student K12, higher education, and workforce transitions and help identify programs and policies to improve transition success.

Participants: The main stakeholder groups that will participate in the design, testing, and uploading of data to the LDS P20 Higher Education and Workforce Data Warehouse include; (1) Maryland Statewide Longitudinal Data Center ((2) Maryland Higher Education Commission, (3) Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, and (4) Maryland State Department of Education.

Funding: This funding request is new, and the project in part support the data needs and performance questions of the Race to the Top grant. There are no funds currently allocated to support the development of this project.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a three year phased programming project. Year 1 focuses on project planning, design of the P20 higher education data warehouse, and business intelligence reporting system, and procurement of staffing and hardware. Year 2 and Year 3 is focused on the development, testing and production implementation of the P20 data warehouse.

Year 1: Project planning, design and procurement;

1. Project planning and management
2. Define P20 data center location, and processing requirements and data architecture
3. Write and issue RFPs, and procure consulting development services, and hardware and software for data warehouse development as necessary.
4. Implement and test P20 DWH hardware and software

Year 2: Phase I development, testing, and rollout;

5. Detailed design and development of initial P20 data warehouse data structures, and ETL programs for initial data loads and extracts
6. Test ELT programs and perform quality assurance of data loading and storage in P20 data structures
7. Load initial data kernel to P20 data warehouse
8. Develop and test select reports and dashboard for data sets implemented in phase I.

Year 3: Phase II development, testing, and rollout:

9. Phase 2 of integration of P20 with MLDS, MHEC, and DLLR – development and implementation of additional data structures and ETL programs
10. Development of supporting reports and dashboards
11. Testing of data structures and dashboards with early adopter stakeholders
12. Rollout of reports and dashboards
13. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	0	\$0	\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment costs for this project are based on the current Maryland PK14 Educational Data Warehouse infrastructure.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
P20 computer servers for P20 data warehouse infrastructure	\$1,000,000	1- database servers, 1- BI server, 1- portal server, 2-HTTP web servers with load balancer, 1 BI backup server, 2 firewalls, network and management servers and connections with racking.	\$1,000,000
Software licensing for P20 data warehouse infrastructure	\$1,000,000	Software includes; database, Portal, BI, ETL, Security, Backup software, and server monitoring and management software	\$1,000,000

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

4 FTE Contractual programming labor for data warehouse implementation Each FTE is budgeted for just over 1800 hours per year at \$138 hour (higher level skill set required than the other projects). 100% of the each FTE labor will be allocated to the project. Total cost: \$3,000,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project (just over 1800 per year), estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$ -	\$5,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$ -	\$5,000,000

Project #: 14/31 Project Name: Develop and Implement a State Curriculum System Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	1,300,000	-	-	-	1,300,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,800,000	-	-	-	1,800,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,800,000	-	-	-	1,800,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: 14/31**Project Title: Develop and Implement State Curriculum Management System****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project provides a standardized curriculum management system whose purpose it is to; (1) maintain common core curriculum standards, (2) provide instructional alignment, (3) provide assessment alignment, and (4) provides teachers with design tools, lesson plans, and course syllabi to help them develop courses that are common core aligned. This project is part of the instructional improvement process to provide teachers in the classroom with education delivery options and tools that enables them to provide class and individual instruction interventions to improve student learning.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This system is part of the student improvement process. The project is a 1 year selection, procurement, and deployment process to implement advanced curriculum management system. Access to this application will be via the Online Toolkits for teachers. The system will provide extensive import and export capabilities and will be interoperable with the other proposed instructional improvement systems as well as the Maryland Longitudinal Data System. The implementation will be centralized, and shared by all LEAs. However, those LEAs that already have a curriculum management system may continue to use it as long as it integrates and supports the instructional improvement process.

Type of Project: Hardware and software procurement, and implementation services.

Benefits: This system is expected to reduce the work load of teachers, improve their development and delivery of courses that are state curriculum and formative and interim test aligned.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEA curriculum teams

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms present in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 1 of the project.

Year 1:

1. Coordinate with all the LEA curriculum teams to select and procure a common system,
2. Implement application at the MSDE computer center, and as appropriate, allow select LEAs to implement a copy of the application in their computer centers.

3. Test application.
4. Train early adopter LEAs and develop educational methods and procedures for using the system to develop courses and instructional improvement interventions.
5. Pilot system with early adopter LEAs.
6. Develop and provide multi-media instructions on how to use system and approaches to improving instruction (Note this is part of the multi-media training project)
7. Rollout to all LEAs.
8. Perform web-survey to assess satisfaction.

The budget is designed to procure the curriculum application for centralized or decentralized use. The budget also identifies a 1.5 FTE contractor to support installation, set up, and development of best practices with MLDS team and the LEAs. Integration and training activities for the curriculum application are included in other projects.

Year 2: Maintenance of system

Year 3: Maintenance of system

Year 4: Maintenance of system

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ?%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top application.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$300,000	Centralized application servers, with a shared failover server, associated network and backup equipment.	\$300,000
Software	\$1,000,000	Curriculum Management application that is internet capable and can be implemented with either a centralized or decentralized architecture.	\$1,000,000
Totals			\$1,300,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Contractual labor on fixed priced contract from vendor to setup, implement and rollout the application to the LEAs. Budget includes travel and all other expenses the vendor will incur. Total cost: \$500,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Contractual costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during the initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top application. This application will run and be maintained by the MSDE Data center.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$ 1,800,000	\$	\$	\$	\$ 1,800,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$ 1,800,000	\$	\$	\$	\$ 1,800,000

Project #: 15/07 Project Name: Expand Instructional Toolkit Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	4,200,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	4,200,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	4,200,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 15/07**Project Title: Expand Instructional Toolkit****Criteria: C3 Using Data to Improve Instruction**

This project also supports Section B3, Transition to new curriculum and assessments. Data regarding student achievement is only useful if teachers can access a rich bank of instructional resources that allows them to differentiate classroom strategies to match student needs.

Project Description:

This project procures a consultant to identify multi-media, instructional resources to expand the instructional toolkit, meta-tag items, and manage the on-line portal for the INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM. Three specialists (their salary included in section B3) working in the Division of Instruction will collaborate with the consultant, working to bring Maryland educators together annually to ensure that resources are aligned with the state Common Core Curriculum and represent high quality instructional resources. The consultant and MSDE staff will also gather best practices—lesson seeds, project ideas, simulations, print and video resources—from classroom teachers throughout Maryland as well as from public domain sources, to include in this new instructional toolkit.

MSDE will also collaborate with Maryland Public Television to catalog, aggregate, articulate, and conduct technical correlations for adolescent literacy, STEM and algebra II from local, regional, national, and international sources. These resources would become part of the instructional toolkit.

Funding:

This project allows Maryland to build on its existing Instructional Toolkit which currently supports classroom teachers implementing the Maryland State Curriculum. Many existing toolkit items will be adapted to support the state Common Core Curriculum. But the existing toolkit model provides a platform that will be a useful starting point for expansion.

Year by Year Description:

This project is equally distributed across the four years of this grant. Instructional resources tied to the common core curriculum will be added each year to provide teachers more and more resources to meet the diverse needs of students. Cost basis for the annual \$300,000 vendor fee is based on the following estimates, which are based on previous costs for this type of work:

To identify resources: 924 work hours per year @ \$50/hr = \$46,200

To ensure items are aligned to state curriculum: 3384 work hours (6 grade bands of 188 topics/band with 3 items per topic taking 1 hour per item); 3384 hours @ \$50/hr = \$169,200.

To metatag items: (1/2 hr. per item to metatag) : 3384 items * .5 hr @ \$50/hr = \$84,600

Total estimated vendor fee equals \$300,000 annually.

MPT has provided the following estimates for the work necessary to create the instructional toolkit. The estimates are based on previous work that MPT has done for MSDE.

Technical correlations/articulation of available Thinkport resources \$100,000
 Development of four online courses (calculation based on comparative cost of Ed Tech Grant online course) \$1,600,000
 Instructional resources for adolescent literacy and STEM (includes aggregation, articulation, and technical correlation for existent resources) \$800,000
 Production and broadcast of town hall meetings and PSAs \$500,000

Total cost @ \$750,000/year \$3,000,000

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

1) A vendor will be procured to work with MSDE educational specialists to expand the instructional toolkit, meta-tag items, and manage the on-line portal for the INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM. The cost of this procurement will be \$300,000 per year and the vendor will devote 100% FTE to this project.

2) Maryland Public Television will contract with MSDE to conduct a technical review of existing MPT resources and develop new, online courses for algebra I, government, biology and English II, new instructional resources in adolescent literacy, STEM, and algebra II, and provide public outreach programming. This contract will total \$750,000 per year for four years. All costs will be charged to the Race to the Top budget. Cost basis for the annual \$300,000 vendor fee is based on the following estimates, which are based on previous costs for this type of work:

To identify resources: 924 work hours per year @ \$50/hr = \$46,200

To ensure items are aligned to state curriculum: 3384 work hours (6 grade bands of 188 topics/band with 3 items per topic taking 1 hour per item); 3384 hours @ \$50/hr = \$169,200.

To metatag items: (1/2 hr. per item to metatag) : 3384 items * .5 hr @ \$50/hr = \$84,600

Total estimated vendor fee equals \$300,000 annually

MPT has provided the following estimates for the work necessary to create the instructional toolkit. The estimates are based on previous work that MPT has done for MSDE.

Technical correlations/articulation of available Thinkport resources \$100,000

Development of four online courses (calculation based on comparative cost of Ed Tech Grant online course) \$1,600,000

Instructional resources for adolescent literacy and STEM (includes aggregation, articulation, and technical correlation for existent resources) \$800,000

Production and broadcast of town hall meetings and PSAs \$500,000

Total cost @ \$750,000/year \$3,000,000

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$4,200,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	\$4,200,000

Project #: 16/20 Project Name: STEM Instructional and Career Support Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	569,500	498,900	498,900	432,700	2,000,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	569,500	498,900	498,900	432,700	2,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	569,500	498,900	498,900	432,700	2,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #16/20**Project Title: C3 – STEM Instructional and Career Support**

Criteria: C3 (ii) Support Participating LEAs and Schools in providing instructional and career-related resources in STEM subjects as part of the Instructional Improvement System

Project Description:

MSDE will establish a partnership with the Maryland Business Roundtable (MBRT) to support educator effectiveness and student engagement in delivering STEM instruction to students. The first year budgets \$596,500 through the Race to the Top grant and \$150,000 of in-kind support to accomplish two goals. The first supports teachers and principals by establishing a STEM support hub that links industry experts and the resources of their workplace to STEM instructional objectives. This support hub allows teachers to easily identify experts who can advise them on best practices, visit classes to share their authentic work, and potentially open up their workplace for student visits. The second goal promotes student engagement in STEM careers through the creation of an on-line system that allows students to communicate with STEM experts directly, and to view STEM workplace experience opportunities.

Funding:

This project connects with funding in Section B3 and C3 by providing resources to support classroom teachers in their work to promote student achievement in STEM courses.

Year by Year Description:

Year One: Determine with educators areas of critical need for – and preferred delivery methods of – external reinforcement in classroom instruction. Map resources and services to Maryland’s science, math, engineering and technology curricula. Identify, recruit and train STEM industry practitioners/ volunteers (business, higher education, and government) to provide timely, relevant, curriculum-specific support to classroom instruction. Develop delivery model and test in one school district in one subject area (Biology). Redesign volunteer management system to facilitate deployment, scheduling and communication with STEM industry volunteer. Evaluate effectiveness and refine plans for expansion. Establish digital-based STEM-career tools, designed to meet youth in preferred media.

Utilize mobile, web, video and social networking elements to drive student engagement with STEM careers. Deploy strategies to build community of students aspiring to STEM careers. Design activities to support classroom instruction on Maryland career exploration, and informal student exploration.

Year Two

Establish Teacher and Principal STEM support hub and expand model for STEM

instructional support.

Improve efficiency of how business connects with and supports schools. Develop electronic hub to aggregate STEM resources needed by schools from outside the education system that links directly to MSDE's portal. Broaden base of STEM-career volunteers who can be easily accessed by educators. Coordinate engagement of external STEM industry practitioners to engage in classroom topical activities. Expand model to six school districts and two subject areas (Biology and Math).

Communicate online with STEM experts

Establish online learning environments in live web sessions, connecting classrooms to a variety of STEM- workplace settings. Prepare STEM-career volunteers to engage with students around real-world projects and activities connected to STEM subjects. Design activities centered on career exploration, career goal setting, education mapping, and periodic goal-checking.

Year Three

Scale up model for STEM instructional support and coordinate inventory of STEM experts/resources

Scale up STEM instructional support model to all Maryland school districts in four subject areas (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Math). Scale and maintain centralized STEM asset inventories. Provide easy access to STEM resources for local districts and low-performing schools. Provide links across organizations that will sustain meaningful program linkages beyond the grant cycle. Promote the resource to educators in easily-utilized formats.

Establish an inventory of STEM workplace experience opportunities

Provide students with a centralized resource to locate meaningful workplace experience opportunities (internships, mentoring, projects, job shadows). Map opportunities to STEM topics and promote directly to participating schools via volunteer, educator and student hubs.

Year Four

Establish inventory of STEM workplace experience opportunities for teachers and principals that support professional development

Create a central online repository of opportunities for educators to engage with their STEM-topical peers in the workplace. Identify and promote opportunities to enrich professional development of participant educators.

Drive growth of student hub

Promote the youth resource, adding content and activity. Connect youth to work- and college-ready resources appropriate to specific grade-levels.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable	# @\$	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Products and services provided by the Maryland Business Roundtable are elaborated in the year by year description above. Additional in-kind support of MBRT members is estimated to enhance this proposal by \$150,000 per year. **The annual cost basis for the partnership with MBRT was determined through extensive discussions with MBRT executive staff. An hourly rate was not part of these discussions, but time commitments per month for six staff members served as a basis for budgeting. Costs for each program area—Principal and Teacher Support and Student Engagement—include costs for MBRT staff and contractual staff, technology expenditures, and other related costs. Costs decline over the four years as a result of our discussions with MBRT executive staff, acknowledging that technology expenditures and expenditures for contractual staff will decline over time.**

The additional in-kind support HAS been secured.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$569,500	\$498,900	\$498,900	\$432,700	\$2,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$569,500	\$498,900	\$498,900	\$432,700	\$2,000,000

Project #: 17/32 Project Name: Implement a Test Item Bank System Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	1,400,000	-	-	-	1,400,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,900,000	-	-	-	1,900,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,900,000	-	-	-	1,900,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 17/32**Project Title: Implement a Test Item Bank System****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project provides schools with a standardized test item bank to be used to either generating standalone paper tests or as an adaptive computer-based testing application and delivery system. This project procures and implements test item bank management software with and items database that is curriculum aligned.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This is a one-year procurement and implementation project for a computer based item test bank system. This item test bank will be used for interim benchmark testing and formative assessments to measure student performance and growth. Initially, the system will be seeded with existing course aligned questions to be replaced over time with standardized common core test questions. The system will be interoperable with the proposed adaptive testing system, but will be capable of being used in standalone mode to help teachers generate paper tests. The system will provide extensive import and export capabilities and be able to produce multiple equivalent paper test forms in a variety of formats.

The implementation of item test bank will be centralized at MSDE and shared by all LEAs. However, those LEAs that already have item test banks may continue to use them with the option to contribute to the standardized test bank or draw test items from the standardized bank.

Type of Project: Hardware and software procurement, and implementation services.

Benefits: This system is expected to reduce the work load of teachers, improve their analysis of student needs for instructional remediation and enrichment, and enable more time to be allocated to instruction delivery. Additional value of an item test bank is that it improves consistency, validity, and reliability of testing student knowledge acquisition on summative and interim benchmark tests. Standardized test banks will be used with our consortium partners to help develop normative test responses over a wide pool of students in order to improve predictive performance of students on standardized questions.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEAs curriculum instruction teams, and LEA technology departments.

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 1 of the project.

Year 1:

1. Coordinate with all the LEA CIOs and their technology teams to select and procure an test item bank,
2. Implement test item bank application at the MSDE computer center, and as appropriate, allow select LEAs to implement a copy of the application in their computer centers.
3. Test application with import and export of items from a test bank, and export of test question results.
4. Train school technology teams on technology support and defining distribution and use policies,
5. Pilot system with early adopter LEAs.
6. Rollout to all LEAs.
7. Develop and provide multi-media instructions for teachers on use test item bank for test creation, and how to it to improve instruction (Note this is part of the multi-media training project)
8. Integrate test item bank with the Teacher Toolkit portal. (Note: Included in another project)

The budget is designed to procure the item test bank application for centralized or decentralized use. The budget also identifies a single technical support contractor who is an expert in installing and setting up the system to work with MLDS team and the LEAs. Integration and training activities for the adaptive test application are included in other projects.

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable	# @ ?%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual

personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top application.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$400,000	Centralized application servers with a shared failover server, associated network and backup equipment.	\$400,000
Software	\$1,000,000	Test bank application and test item database with import and export capabilities, and ability to produce multiple paper test forms.	\$1,000,000
Totals			\$ 1,400,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Fixed price contractual labor to support procurement, installation, setup, and policy development. Total cost: \$500,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Contractual costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during the initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top application.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and

Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,900,000	\$	\$	\$	\$1,900,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,900,000	\$	\$	\$	\$1,900,000

Project #: 18/33 Project Name: Implement a Computer Adaptive Test Delivery system Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	2,400,000	-	-	-	2,400,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	260,000	-	-	-	260,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	2,660,000	-	-	-	2,660,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	2,660,000	-	-	-	2,660,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 18/33**Project Title: Implement a Computer Adaptive Test Delivery System****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(ii) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project provides schools an adaptive computer-based testing application and delivery system. Computer based adaptive testing provides a more flexible method for utilizing a standard test item bank, test delivery, and test scoring and is an important part of instructional improvement strategy. Such systems are important for performing objective and standardized diagnostic analysis of a student's knowledge acquisition in the classroom. This project procures and implements an adaptive testing system for Maryland LEAs as part of the instructional improvement reforms, and integrates the system with a standardized item test bank for summative and interim benchmark testing to assess student performance and growth.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project is a one year procurement and implementation project for a computer based adaptive testing system. This testing system will be used for summative and interim benchmark testing to assess student performance and growth. The system will be interoperable with standard item test banks, and integrate with the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) reporting system. The system will provide extensive import and export capabilities and be able to produce multiple equivalent paper test forms in a variety of formats. Student and class performance data will be available to teachers to identify instructional improvements for the class as well as individual students based on test results, and be a key element in the instructional improvement process discussed in section (C)(3)(i).

Since Maryland is a decentralized education system with 24 LEAs, the implementation of adaptive testing and this project will provide the LEAs with three options:

1. Use the state adaptive testing system which will be maintained in a centralized location.
2. LEAs may use their own adaptive testing system if it; (a) has key functional capabilities comparable to the state system, and (b) integrates with the state item test bank with the ability to transfer its student test data to the MLDS system for growth and performance analysis.
3. LEAs may implement at their own expense, a standalone copy of the state adaptive test application in their LEAs computer facilities as long as they integrated to the MLDS data exchange for transfer of student data for growth and performance analysis.

Type of Project: Hardware, software procurement and implementation services.

Benefits: This system is expected to reduce the work load of teachers, improve their analysis of student needs for instructional remediation, and enable more time to be allocated to instruction

delivery. Additional value of adaptive testing is that it greatly increases the flexibility of test delivery, management, and quality of student performance assessments. Key benefits of this testing approach include: (1) tests can be taken anytime and anyplace, (2) scores are available immediately and can be included in advanced student performance analyses automatically, (3) tests can be individually paced to accommodate for learning and test taking styles, (4) knowledge acquisition can be more fully analyzed on an individual basis, and (5) tests can be standardized using an item bank across teachers and classes.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEAs curriculum instruction teams, and LEA technology departments.

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 1 of the project.

Year 1:

1. Coordinate with all the LEA CIOs and their technology teams to select and procure an adaptive testing system,
2. Implement adaptive testing application at the MSDE computer center, and as appropriate, allow select LEAs to implement a copy of the application in their computer centers.
3. Test application with import and export of items from a test bank, and export of test question results.
4. Create and test student data results transfer program with the Data Exchange (Note: this is a data exchange project)
5. Create and test student and class test performance results dashboards (Note: this is a dashboard project).
6. Train school technology teams on technology support and defining distribution and use policies,
7. Pilot system with early adopter LEAs.
8. Rollout to all LEAs.
9. Develop and provide multi-media instructions for teachers on use of adaptive testing to analyze student performance and growth, and how to improve instruction (Note this is part of the multi-media training project)
10. Provide multi-media instructions for students on use and policies associated with the how to use and benefit from adaptive testing (Note this is part of the multi-media training project).

The budget is designed to procure the adaptive testing application for centralized or decentralized use. The budget also identifies a single technical support contractor who is an expert in installing and setting up the adaptive testing system to work with MLDS team and the

LEAs. Integration and training activities for the adaptive test application are included in other projects.

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top application.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$400,000	Centralized application servers with a shared failover server, associated network and backup	\$400,000

		equipment.	
Software	\$2,000,000	Adaptive testing application with import and export capabilities, and ability to produce multiple paper test forms	\$2,000,000
Totals			\$2,400,000

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

1 FTE Contractual labor to support procurement installation, setup, and policy development. FTE is budgeted for 2080 hours per year at \$125 hour. 100% of the each FTE labor will be allocated to the project. Total cost: \$260,000.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,660,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,660,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,660,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,660,000

Project #: 19/34 Project Name: Complete an Item Load and Set Up for the Item Bank and CAT System Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual		780,000		-	780,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)		780,000		-	780,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)		780,000		-	780,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 19/34**Project Title: Item Load and Integration Setup for Test Item Bank System****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project provides technical and content subject matter expert support to assess and load the test items into our bank from our consortium partners and existing LEA test item banks. This project also provides integration between the test item bank and the MLDS Data Exchange to securely transfer imports and exports of test items.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project is a one year procurement and implementation project for a computer based item test bank system. This project provides technical and content subject matter expert support to assess and load the test items into our bank from our consortium partners and existing LEA test item banks. This project also provides integration between the test item bank and the MLDS Data Exchange to securely transfer imports and exports of test items. **This is a 1 year project slated to begin in year two that coordinates and supplements the PARCC initiative. This is an open source application. Costs are for implementation and technical consultants that will support the installation of the item bank software and initial loading of the test items. The budget will reflect a move of funds to project year two.**

Type of Project: Consulting services.

Benefits: Provides a ready to go quality, standardized test item database. This project will provide our consortium research partners with de-identified, aggregate data to assess test items for their quality, and curriculum alignment.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEAs curriculum instruction teams, and LEA technology departments.

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 2 of the project.

Year 1: NA

Year 2:

1. Coordinate with all LEAs and their content teams to select and procure test items.
2. Import test items into test bank application.
3. Train school technology teams on technology support and defining distribution and use policies,
4. Pilot test times with early adopter LEAs.
5. Rollout to all LEAs.
6. Develop and provide multi-media instructions for teachers on use test items by content area, and how to it to improve instruction (Note this is part of the multi-media training project)
7. Integrate test item import and export utilities with the Teacher Toolkit portal and the Test item bank software (Note: Included in another project)

The budget identifies a single subject matter expert to support setting up the test item data bank and coordinate LEA contributions to the test item data bank.

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	#	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and

a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
NOT APPLICABLE			
Totals			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE			
----------------	--	--	--

6) Contractual

1 FTE contractual labor to support test bank item loads, coordination with LEA test item banks, and integration of transferring test items via the MLDS Data exchange. Estimate is for 1 FTE budgeted for 2080 hours per year at \$125 hour. 100% of the each FTE labor will be allocated to the project. Total cost: \$780,000.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
0	\$780,000	0	\$0	\$780,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
0	\$780,000	0	\$0	\$780,000

Project: #20/35 Project Name: Adaptive Testing Units for High Schools Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	750,000	-	-	-	750,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	260,000	-	-	-	260,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,010,000	-	-	-	1,010,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,010,000	-	-	-	1,010,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 20/35**Project Title: Adaptive Testing Units for High Schools****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This infrastructure project provides schools with inexpensive portable Internet WIFI devices for students to take adaptive computer-based tests. This test delivery strategy ensures that adaptive testing for high-stakes summative tests, presented in this grant application, will be successfully implemented. This project is required in order for adaptive testing to be successful.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: The ability of a school to benefit from the advantages of computer adaptive testing depends on its ability to provide all students with computers for testing taking. The majority of schools do not have enough classrooms fitted with computers for each student to make adaptive testing feasible. In order to solve this problem and move our schools into the technology realities of the 21st century, this project provides high schools with a flexible, low cost adaptive testing delivery platform that is non-intrusive to the classroom or instruction.

Internet enabled WIFI technologies are now common mobile information technologies that deliver information to a variety of low-costing mobile devices including PDAs, smart-phones, mini-notebooks, and laptops. Gone are the days of costly, inflexible desktop computers. Mobile WIFI Internet technology has the ability to deliver information anytime and anywhere in a variety of traditional testing formats, but is also enabled to deliver simulations and multimedia for a richer testing experience.

This project will purchase and distribute low-cost mobile Internet WIFI devices that are browser enabled and will be compatible with any Internet based testing system. Since the units are portable and can be moved anywhere in the school, implementation will be simple, and it will not be necessary to purchase a unit for every student but only a fraction of the students.

Type of Project: Hardware procurement.

Benefits: Provides an inexpensive and flexible way to deliver adaptive testing that is not disruptive to class instruction, and easy to implement. .

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEAs technology departments

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms present in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 1 of the project. We believe that a low-cost bulk purchase can be done through a state technology consortium for Maryland schools.

Year 1:

1. Coordinate with all the LEA CIOs and their technology teams to select and procure portal, low-cost technology for adaptive testing system selected in the grant,
2. Deploy and train school technology teams on technology support and defining distribution and use policies,
3. Provide multi-media instructions for students on use and policies associated with the portable testing units.

The budget calls for a single technical support contractor who is an expert in mobile devices and content delivery to facilitate the procurement and installation. The budget is designed to procure enough initial devices to allow simultaneous testing of 25% of the high school population. It is estimated that 7500 units will be needed at \$50-\$100 each.

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$100 each	Portable, Internet WIFI devices for Testing – 7500 units	\$750,000
Totals			\$750,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable.

6) Contractual

1 FTE Contractual labor to support procurement installation, setup, and policy development. FTE is budgeted for 2080 hours per year at \$125 hour. 100% of the each FTE labor will be allocated to the project. Total cost: \$260,000.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,010,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,010,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are**

usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,010,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,010,000

Project #: 21/42 Project Name: Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	1,300,000	-	-	-	1,300,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,800,000	-	-	-	1,800,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,800,000	-	-	-	1,800,000
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 20/42**Project Title: Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project is part of the instructional improvement process and provides teachers with a system that enables them to develop and document instructional interventions to improve both class and individual learning while tracking outcomes. For the student, this system places them at the center of the learning process allows them to interact with the teacher to plan a course of action for the student and track progress. This system especially important to promote individualized learning programs.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This is a 1-year project for the selection, procurement, and deployment of the student learning and intervention system. This will be a State centralized system for the LEAs to use. As appropriate, a copy of the system may be deployed at the LEA level if the LEA incurs the cost to implement, and integrate it with other systems to create the instructional improvement process. This application integrates with the Online Toolkits and is available via the Educators Portal.

Type of Project: Hardware, software procurement and implementation services.

Benefits: Support teachers in developing and documenting learning improvement strategies for the class and individual students. This system integrates teaching and learning solutions for the teacher along with diagnostic and reporting tools to identify student\class progress. For the students this system gives them a learning plan online with digital learning objectives and ability to review and track their learning interactively with their teachers.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEA curriculum teams, and LEAs technology departments.

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms present in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a short term project to be completed in year 1 of the project.

Year 1: Procure, Implement, and Pilot

1. Coordinate with all the LEA curriculum teams, and their technology teams, to select and procure an instructional intervention system,
2. Implement application at the MSDE computer center, and as appropriate, allow select LEAs to implement a copy of the application in their computer centers.
3. Provide multi-media instructions for teachers on use and policies associated with the application, and how to use to improve instructional outcomes. (Note this is part of the multi-media training project).
4. Pilot the application with select early adopter LEAs.
5. Train school curriculum teams on how effectively use the application.
6. Rollout to all LEAs.
7. Perform satisfaction web-survey.

The budget is designed to procure the instructional intervention application for centralized or decentralized use. The budget also identifies a several technical support contractors who will install and set up the system with MLDS team and the LEAs. Integration and training activities for the instructional intervention application are included in other projects

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment and application costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top Application.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$300,000	Centralized application servers with a shared failover server, associated network and backup equipment.	\$300,000
Software	\$1,000,000	Intervention application with import and export capabilities.	\$1,000,000
Totals			\$1,300,000

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

Contractual labor on fixed price contract from vendor to support installation, setup, and policy development. Total cost: \$500,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Contractual costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top Application.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000

Project #: 22/06 Project Name: Develop On-Line Instructional Intervention Modules Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 22/06**Project Title: Develop On-Line Instructional Intervention Modules****Criteria: C3 Using Data to Improve Instruction**

This project supports the activities described in Section B3, transition to curriculum and assessments. Data regarding student achievement is only useful if teachers can access a rich bank of instructional intervention resources that allows them to prescribe instructional intervention strategies to match student needs based on assessment outcomes.

Additionally, this project connects to the project for Implementing a system to support e-learning for instructional intervention, enhancement and enrichment, in this section, C3 regarding the creation of the technology infrastructure to support this project

To differentiate between the two closely-related projects, this one involves developing content and instructional activities that a student can use for enrichment and remediation. The other involves the hardware and software necessary to deliver this through our Instructional Improvement system

Project Description:

Procure a vendor to develop 250 on-line instructional modules per year for students as part of the instructional improvement system intervention/enrichment system. Modules would be developed through a contract at \$2000 per module. Students will complete modules as assigned by their teacher to remediate and/or enrich classroom instruction based on the results of formative assessment testing.

Funding:

This project connects with the funding stream for section B1, B2 and B3, and the project regarding on-line instructional toolkit development in this section, C3. When teachers teach to high level curricular standards (B1), and are able to formatively assess student learning (B2), and fully understand the resources at their disposal to teach and assess effectively (B3 and C3), then the one remaining component of an effective Instructional Improvement System is an array of intervention/enrichment strategies that allow students to receive differentiated assistance to extend their learning.

Year by Year Description:

This project has no funding in year one to allow work in the area of curriculum alignment, assessment development, and on-line instructional toolkit development to occur. Then, beginning in year two, a constant funding stream that will enable 250 modules to be developed each year will commence.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.
--

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.			
Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

A vendor will be procured to work with MSDE staff to develop instructional intervention modules targeted to specific curricular objectives. This procurement will specify that \$500,000 contract will produce 250 learning modules each year for three years. The vendor will devote 100% FTE to this project. There is no alternative funding stream for this project.
In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000

Project #: 23/55 Project Name: Develop Framework for Teacher Toolkit Portal Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	260,000	260,000	260,000	-	780,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	260,000	260,000	260,000	-	780,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	260,000	260,000	260,000	-	780,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 23/55**Project Title: Develop Framework and Content for Online Toolkit Portal****Criteria:****(C)(3) Using data to Improve Instruction****(D)(4)(ii) Improving Teacher and Principal Professional Development**

This project identifies the professional learning resources for teachers and principals that will be available on line from the Online Instructional Toolkit. This project supports all Race to the Top education reforms focused on improving teacher and principal professional development to improve individual job skills and performance. The Toolkit will provide educators with access to a variety of online and face-to-face professional development, tools that will help them plan their individual professional development plans and opportunities to collaborate online.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This is a 3 year project that supports all educator professional development initiatives in Race for the Top. This project uses a full time educational professional development specialist for three years to help identify Professional development available from MSDE, LEAs, higher education and other providers. The professional development specialist will facilitate a stakeholder group who will develop quality control review protocols identify content and tools to be included in the portal, and ensure that the content and tools get integrated into the toolkit portal.

Type of Project: Consulting

Benefits: Provides a user friendly resource for teachers and principals to tap professional development resources linked to the State Common Core Curriculum, multiple dashboards for student, teacher and principal performance and teacher and principal evaluation systems.

Participants: Maryland State Department of Education - All Divisions, LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education.

Funding: This funding request is new and supports the data needs of Race to the Top grant. There are no funds currently allocated to support the development of this project.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This project provides the consultants necessary to set up the Professional Development Resources, identify content, and add tools and content to the educator toolkit portal.

Year 1: Portal Design and Content Development

The professional development specialist will establish a stakeholder group to develop professional development quality control protocols, collect resources from MSDE, LEAs and IHEs to review and post those that meet the quality standards.

Year 2: Portal Design and Content Development

The professional development specialist will collect resources from MSDE, LEAs and IHEs to review, facilitate the quality control review process and post those that meet the quality standards.

Year 3: Portal Design and Content Development

The professional development specialist will collect resources from MSDE, LEAs and IHEs to review, facilitate the quality control review process and post those that meet the quality standards.

Year 4: NA**Details by Category:****1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one

year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

1 FTE contractual labor to support portal content development. Estimate is for 1 FTE for 2080 hours per year at \$125/hr. Total cost: \$780,000.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$260,000	\$260,000	\$260,000	\$0	\$780,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$260,000	\$260,000	\$260,000	\$0	\$780,000

Project #: 24/56 Project Name: Develop and Implement a Course Registration System Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	2,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	400,000	160,000	-	-	560,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	2,400,000	160,000	-	-	2,560,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	2,400,000	160,000	-	-	2,560,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 24/56**Project Title: Develop and Implement Course Registration System****Criteria:**

- (C)(3)(ii) – Using Data to Improve Instruction – Educator training and education
- (D)(4) – Delivery and documentation of educator preparation training and credentialing
- (D)(4) – Implementation of fair evaluations with complete history of accomplishments
- (D)(5) – Providing effective support to teacher and principles

Maryland education reforms for the Race to the Top will require extensive professional development training, performance tracking, and performance evaluation for educators. As a result of these initiatives, delivery of training, and tracking of one's professional development history is critical as input into evaluation, individual professional development plans and promotion process. This project procures and implements a centralized course registration system to support both the delivery of professional development training to educators as well as track their professional development history.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project is a 2 year procurement and implementation project for a centralized course registration system. This system will provide the ability to provide a single point of access for educators to register for a variety of online, instructor, and academy programs, and act as a historic repository for professional development education and skills training. If possible, a software-as-a-server approach might be adopted if it is cost effective.

Since training may be provided by a variety of vendors the system will have the ability to integrate and receive course completion data from other systems. The system will be able to interface with LEA HR systems and the Maryland evaluation system to transfer training and certification history data for longitudinal analysis and incorporation into the educator evaluation process.

Type of Project: Hardware and software procurement, and implementation services procurement.

Benefits: This system will help Maryland meet the core educational reforms focused on implementing improved educator training, and ability to conduct and document fair educator evaluation process.

Participants: Maryland State Dept. of Education, MLDS team, LEA HR teams

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 2 year application selection, procurement, and implementation project. Year 1 is the selection, procurement, and initial implementation of the application. Year 2 completes the application implementation and rollout to the LEAs. This project will follow a tradition business application implementation project methodology.

Year 1: Selection, Procurement and Implementation

1. Define application requirements
2. Issue an RFI to review evaluation applications and vendors
3. Develop RFP for application procurement
4. Procure hardware and software
5. Initiate map and gap process to define application setups
6. Identify application integration points with LEAs and other systems
7. Test interface for manual entry of training history

Year 2: Implementation, Conversion, Rollout

1. Complete implementation
2. Define case scenarios and perform a conference room pilot
3. Do a limited “go-live” pilot with early adopter LEA
4. Develop import routines and procedures for LEAs not using the system but transferring their data to consolidate data in the state repository
5. Convert or load historic training data from various systems
6. Develop training
7. Rollout application to LEAs
8. Perform a Web-based survey to determine LEAs satisfaction and suggestions

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	#	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Equipment and application costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the Top Application.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	500,000	Centralized application server with a shared failover server, associated network and backup equipment.	500,000
Software	1,500,000	Centralized HR evaluation system for LEAs to either use or upload and import educator evaluation data	1,500,000
Totals			2,000,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Fixed price project based on contract from vendor to support procurement installation, setup of the registration system. Total cost: \$560,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. Contractual costs for this project are based on the vendor quotes and estimates that were collected during discovery and initial design phase of preparing the Race to the**

Top Application.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,400,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,560,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,400,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,560,000

Project #: 25/10 Project Name: MSDE-IHE Teacher Preparation Workgroup Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
10. Indirect Costs*	1,240	1,240	1,240	1,240	4,960
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	11,240	11,240	11,240	11,240	44,960
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 25/10**Project Title: C3 MSDE – IHE Teacher Preparation Workgroup****Criteria: Using Data to Improve Instruction**

Support LEAs and schools in the effective use of instructional improvement systems by ensuring that teacher preparation programs in Maryland incorporate this topic in their programs.

Project Description:

This project provides meeting and travel funds to support MSDE – Higher Education work group regarding teacher preparation and the implications of the new Common Core curriculum, new summative and formative assessment tools, and the effective use of the Instructional Improvement System.

Funding:

This project connects with those projects in section B regarding the adoption of the Common Core standards, new assessments, and transition to them.

Year by Year Description:

This project will fund several meetings of the proposed workgroup each year to ensure that new teachers in Maryland are fully prepared to use the Instructional Improvement System upon entrance into the classroom.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
---------	---------------	-------------	-------

Not applicable		\$	\$
----------------	--	----	----

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Not applicable
In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

This budget will support 5 meetings per year @\$2,000 per meeting for location rental, travel reimbursement, supplies and associated costs.

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$40,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$11,240	\$11,240	\$11,240	\$11,240	\$44,960

Project #: 26/43 Project Name: Implement a System to Support E-Learning for Instructional Intervention, Enhancement and Enrichment Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	2,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	300,000	-	-	-	300,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	2,300,000	-	-	-	2,300,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	2,300,000	-	-	-	2,300,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 26/43**Project Title: Implement a system to support E-Learning for Instructional Intervention Enhancement, and Enrichment****Criteria:**

(C)(3)(i) Using Data to Improve Instruction – This project provides select vendor available tools and materials via internet access to implement an advanced web-based, multi-media learning environment for (a) student learning remediation, and (b) advance accelerated learning to augment classroom instruction. This strategy is part of the instructional improvement process to provide teachers in the classroom with education delivery options that enables them to provide individual instruction interventions to students to improve learning.

Additionally, this project connects to the project for Developing On-Line Instructional Intervention Modules, C3.

To differentiate between the two closely-related projects, this one involves the hardware and software necessary to deliver this through our Instructional Improvement system. The other involves developing content and instructional activities that a student can use for enrichment and remediation.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This system is part of the student improvement process. The project is a 1 year selection, procurement, and deployment process to implement advanced web-based, multi-media learning modules that is provided by existing vendors. This will be a Software-as-a Service system for teachers to use in the classroom as part of their instructional improvement strategies. Access to these applications will be via the Online Toolkits for teachers, and accessible to students via the student education portal. Selection of applications will be evidence-based where existing outcome data can show effectiveness. Use of these modules will be evaluated for outcome effectiveness in the low achieving classrooms, with alternate learners, and with students needing accelerated education.

Type of Project: Service procurement

Benefits: Provide teachers and students education and training support that extends and augments the classroom experience. Provides resources to students to engage in lesson remediation or accelerated learning. Use of web based deliver allows for anytime, anywhere learning and allows education to be extended outside of the classroom beyond traditional school hours. Use of multimedia provides support to alternate learners, and provides a rich and engaging delivery of subject matter.

Participants: Dept. of Education MLDS team, LEA curriculum teams

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms present in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This project is to be implemented in 1 year. Requirements for areas in need of instructional augmentation will be identified by the LEAs and MSDE, and software-as-a-service will be procured from a vendor with existing modules. On a yearly basis we will evaluate use and value of each educational content module and determine if it should be retained or substituted.

Year 1: Procure, Implement, and Pilot

1. Coordinate with all the LEA curriculum teams, define requirements, target subjects for support
2. Review and identify modules to support classroom and course instructional improvement process.
3. Issue RFP and procure online services from vendor
4. Provide multi-media instructions for teachers on use, and policies, to successfully use modules to improve instructional outcomes. (Note this is part of the multi-media training project).
5. Pilot the application with select early adopter LEAs.
6. Train school curriculum teams on how effectively use the application.
7. Rollout to all LEAs.
8. Perform satisfaction web-survey.

The budget is designed to procure the instructional modules for web-based delivery from a vendor. Budget also include 1 FTE to help design the rollout plan, define how to use each module as part of an instructional improvement program, and support the LEAs who plan to implement the instructional tools in their courses.

Year 2: Track, Evaluate, and Replace

Evaluate data on module's frequency of use, student impressions of value, teacher impressions of value, and evidence that modules when used as part of the instructional intervention support educational improvement. Make a retain or replace decision.

Year 3: Track, Evaluate, and Replace

Evaluate data on module's frequency of use, student impressions of value, teacher impressions of value, and evidence that modules when used as part of the instructional intervention support educational improvement. Make a retain or replace decision.

Year 4: Track, Evaluate and Replace

Evaluate data on module's frequency of use, student impressions of value, teacher impressions of value, and evidence that modules when used as part of the instructional intervention support

educational improvement. Make retain or replace decision.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience.**

The Equipment costs are for purchase of a consolidated e-learning system modules to support both students and professional development. Applications costs are based on RFI responses for existing COTS modules that will be modified to meet MSDE's needs. Cost information was collected during the Race to the Top application development.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Software	\$2,000,000	Variety Internet based, multimedia learning modules that are to be used for student	\$2,000,000

		remediation, alternate learners, and advanced learners to accelerate learning.	
Totals			\$2,000,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Contractual labor on fixed price contract from vendor to help design the rollout plan, define how to use each module as part of an instructional improvement program, and support the LEAs who plan to implement the instructional tools in their courses. Budget includes travel and all other expenses the vendor will incur. Total cost: \$300,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience. The contractual labor costs are based on previous costs provided by a vendor for work of this type.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,300,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,300,000

Project #: 27/46 Project Name: Equating of MSA for Use on Growth Model Associated with Criteria: C3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	200,000	-	-	-	200,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	200,000	-	-	-	200,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	200,000	-	-	-	200,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 27/46**Project Title: Equating Maryland School Assessments for use in Growth Modeling****Criteria:**

(D)(2)(i) Student Growth Measures – Student growth measures are an essential component in teacher, principal and school evaluations in Maryland’s education reform initiatives. Maryland is currently participating in national assessment consortia that are developing vertically equated tests to support educator performance evaluations. In the interim, the Maryland School Assessments (MSA) tests will be used in student growth measures. However, these tests are not vertically equated. This project supports pilot research on multiple ways to use MSA scores in growth measures. Based on those results, the subsequent statistical modification of scoring methods of previous and current MSA tests will be implemented to allow their use as a growth measure pending the availability of a vertically equated national assessment system that is designed to measure growth.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project researches, evaluates, and develops a statistically valid method to vertically equate current Maryland MSA tests. Work will be performed by the psychometricians that are fully versed with the history and structure of the Maryland MSA tests.

Type of Project: Consulting.

Benefits: Vertically equating current and past MSA scores allows for the implementation of growth models and measures as component in effective teacher, principal and school evaluations

Participants: Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Accountability and Assessment and the National Psychometric Council.

Funding: This funding request is new and supports the data needs of Race to the Top grant. There are no funds currently allocated to support the development of this project.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 1 year project. Once a statistical method is developed to vertically equate existing MSA test, historical test scores will be adjusted and tested with a growth model.

Year 1: Project planning, design and procurement, development and testing

1. Project planning and management
2. Define MSA score adjustment vertical equating requirements
3. Issue letter of scope to the National Psychometric Council.

4. Analyze and develop a vertical equating method
5. Apply method to historical MSA test data and evaluate the outcome.
6. Test data in growth model

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

Fixed price contract for labor to develop method to vertically equate existing MSA scores. Total cost: \$200,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience. Cost estimations were performed in MS Project.**

This project is essential to proof-of-concept tests that are currently underway to define and test the initial model so that production implementation will be based on increment work that has been tested. Maryland has already convened its National Psychometric Council to begin work on possible methods to re-scale the MSA to provide growth information. In addition, the Governor's Educator Effectiveness Workgroup has begun its work to inform this system and is expected to complete its work in December or January. This project must be completed in year one to coincide with the pilot Educator Effectiveness systems being conducted in seven school systems beginning in spring 2011. The scores from the tests and the programming for the system will be needed in year one to meet the implementation year timeline of the 2012-2013 school year.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000

Project #: 28/47 Project Name: Develop and Implement a Statistical Model to Measure Student Growth Associated with Criteria: D2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	1,500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	1,500,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	1,500,000
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 28/47**Project Title: Develop and Implement a Statistical Model to Measure Student Growth****Criteria:**

(D)(2)(i) Student Growth Measures – Student growth model and measures are used to track the change in student performance over time, and are a component in teacher, principle and school evaluations in Maryland’s education reform initiatives. This project supports Maryland educational reform initiatives by developing and implementing a growth model so that student performance outcome measures may be used in educator evaluations and to track and report on student performance change over time.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: Maryland must develop and implement a student growth model in order to meet new federal requirements and link teacher and principal evaluations to individual student growth. A multi-phase plan involves a careful study phase including stakeholder involvement and exploration by Maryland’s National Psychometric Council. Once defined, the model must be programmed, validated and implemented. This project plans on building upon the experience of the Tennessee growth model and expand it to include a variety of value added student measurement components to develop a 360 degree view of a student’s change and growth over time. This is a three-year process and project.

Type of Project: Consulting

Benefits: Implementation of a longitudinal student growth model and measures as components in effective teacher, principal and school evaluations, and to track student performance over time.

Participants: Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Accountability and Assessment.

Funding: This funding request is new and supports the data needs of Race to the Top grant. There are no funds currently allocated to support the development of this project.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 3 year project that is focused on designing, developing, testing, and validating a Maryland student growth and performance measurement algorithms for implementation with the Maryland Longitudinal Data System.

Year 1: Project planning, Design and Procurement,

The budget includes \$500,000 to support consultants to work on an initiative to study and plan a

growth model that addresses meeting the target (college and career readiness) and eliminating achievement gaps. Year 1 will be focused on project planning, procurement of a vendor, and development of requirements and statistical specifications for the Maryland growth model.

Year 2: Development and testing

The budget includes \$500,000 to support consultants to work on initial development, programming, and testing of a growth model and student measures that addresses meeting the target (college and career readiness) and eliminating achievement gaps.

Year 3: Implementation and Validation

The budget includes \$500,000 to support consultants to work on an initiative to validate and implement a growth model that addresses meeting the target (college and career readiness) and eliminating achievement gaps.

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

NOT APPLICABLE - All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$0	\$0	\$0

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments

and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

Fix priced contractual for a vendor's services to work with MSDE to develop student growth measure, process and test student data, and return processed data to MSDE for import and display in the Maryland Longitudinal System. Total cost: \$1,500,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience. The contractual labor costs are based on previous costs provided by a vendor for work of this type.**

MSDE will be the key coordinator chairing a growth model development and implementation team overseeing this project. Members on the collaborative team include LEAs, psychometrics council members, and MSDE divisions.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	-	\$1,500,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$1,500,000

Project #: 29/48 Project Name: Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System Associated with Criteria: D2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	1,800,000	-	-	-	1,800,000
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	2,300,000	-	-	-	2,300,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	2,300,000	-	-	-	2,300,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 29/48**Project Title: Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System****Criteria:**

(D)(2)(ii) – Implement fair evaluations

(D)(2)(iii) – Conduct evaluations

(D)(2)(iv) – Use evaluations

Maryland education reforms for the Race to the Top require an extensive approach to evaluating and reporting on educator performance at all levels. This project procures and implements a centralized evaluation system that allows both the LEAs and Maryland State Department of Education to implement a system of fair evaluations that use student performance measures, conduct and track evaluation outcomes, and use the evaluations for educator incentives and career planning.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This project is a 1 year procurement and implementation project for a centralized educator evaluation system. This system will provide the ability to plan educator performance objectives, and then measure achievement of those objectives. The system will provide the ability to define different educator performance measures based in an individual's role, and will utilize student growth data where appropriate as a component of the evaluation formula.

Since Maryland is a decentralized education system with 24 LEAs, the implementation of educator evaluation system will provide the LEAs with two options:

1. Use the state's evaluation system which will be maintained in a centralized location,
2. LEAs may use their own educator evaluation system if; (a) system has the necessary key functional capabilities to use state defined evaluation formulas, (b) can integrate with the State's MLDS system to retrieve student growth data for use with select performance evaluations, (c) maintain an educator evaluation history, and (4) can export its evaluation data to the State's evaluation system,

Type of Project: Hardware and software procurement, and implementation services procurement.

Benefits: This system will help Maryland meet the core educational reforms focused on implementing improved performance based educator evaluations, ability to conduct and document fair educator evaluation process, and use student performance data where appropriate

in the evaluation process.

Participants: Maryland State Dept. of Education, MLDS team, LEA HR teams

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 1 year application selection, procurement, and implementation project.

Year 1: Selection, Procurement and Implementation

This project will follow a traditional business application implementation project methodology. The tasks for this project is as follows:

1. Define application requirements
2. Issue an RFI to review evaluation applications and vendors
3. Develop RFP for application procurement
4. Procure and implement/setup system
5. Define case scenarios and perform a conference room pilot
6. Do a limited “go-live” pilot with early adopter LEA
7. Develop import routines and procedures for LEAs not using the system but transferring their data to consolidate data in the State repository
8. Develop training
9. Rollout application to LEAs
10. Perform a Web-based survey to determine LEAs satisfaction and suggestions

Year 2: NA

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

- All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience. The equipment costs are based on previous costs provided by a vendor for work of this type, and similar solutions being implemented by other RTTT grantees.**

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	300,000	Centralized application server, with a shared failover server, associated network and backup equipment.	300,000
Software	1,500,000	Centralized HR evaluation system for LEAs to either use or upload and import educator evaluation data	1,500,000
Totals			1,800,000

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Fixed price project based contract from vendor to support procurement installation, setup of the evaluation system. Total cost: \$500,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost**

of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience. The contractual costs for implementing the solution are based on previous costs provided by a vendor for work of this type, and similar solutions being implemented by other RTTT grantees.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,300,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,300,000

Project #: 30/49 Project Name: Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data Associated with Criteria: D2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	76,650	78,183	154,833
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	5,940	6,059	11,999
3. Travel	-	-	924	924	1,848
4. Equipment	500,000	-	1,500	-	501,500
5. Supplies			494	494	988
6. Contractual	600,000	400,000	300,000	200,000	1,500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,100,000	400,000	385,508	285,660	2,171,168
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	10,417	10,622	21,039
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,100,000	400,000	395,925	296,282	2,192,207
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 30/49**Project Title: Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data****Criteria: D2**

Maryland's education reforms for Race to Top implements a number of educator professional development, credentialing, evaluation, and assignment initiatives that require additional educator information to be tracked. This project supports the additional data collections to meet the Maryland education reforms in the following sections of the Race to the Top grant application;

- (D)(1)(ii, iii) – Alternate certifications,
- (D)(2)(ii, iii, iv) -Evaluation of teachers,
- (D)(3)(i, ii) - Assignments, distributions of teachers in low achieving schools, retention of teachers, and training in subjects where teachers are hard to find, and
- (D)(4) – Expanded credentialing programs

Recent federal and state reporting requirements have changed to include data not currently collected in the Educator Information System which is used in the documentation of certification for all teachers and principals in the State. Maryland's next era of reform, with an emphasis on teacher and principal accountability as it relates to student growth, necessitates major changes to EIS in order to facilitate access to these new data to make employment decisions.

The existing EIS provides requisite functionality which facilitates the determination and issuance of certificates for more than 260,000 educators. The enhancement will require a vendor, in conjunction with the Department, to collaborate on the design, testing, and implementation of new features in phases called releases. The release strategy is designed to:

- reduce the overall risk to the existing system by grouping new features/functionality into more manageable sections;
- prioritize the development efforts to align with reform changes; and,
- establish the dependencies and interfaces that exist between functions.

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This is a 2 year system upgrade project to expand the data and reporting capabilities of the Maryland Educator Information System (EIS), and a two year implementation project to develop and implement; (1) new educator data sets, (2) data import programs, and (3) data analysis reports to support Race to the Top education reform initiatives.

Type of Project: Custom expansion of the existing system with hardware, software, and consulting procurements. Personnel in Years 3 and 4 to coordinate the ability of the enhanced EIS System to collect and report teacher and principal data by LEAs and State.

Benefits: The expansion of the EIS system will increase accountability, effectiveness, and performance tracking and reporting of; (1) educator performance, (2) educator credentialing, (3) educator development programs, and (4) educator supplies and assignments in low performing schools to improve education delivery decisions and policies.

Participants: Maryland State Department of Education – All divisions.

Funding:

The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a four year project with two phases. Phase one is a two year development and upgrade project for the EIS system. Phase two is a two-year implementation of data for LEA and State reporting. Year 1 is focused on project planning and procurement of resources and beginning of development. Year 2 is full year of development, testing, and upgrade implementation. Years 3 and 4 are for coordination of LEA and State teacher and principal data reporting.

Year 1: Project Planning, Procurement, Requirements, Initiate Development

1. Hire contractual labor to support the custom modifications of the EIS data tables, develop new data load programs and reports.
2. Plan project and issue RFPs for development contractor labor and new hardware,
3. Install hardware upgrades,
4. Prepare requirements and functional specifications for data structure upgrades, ETL programs, and data collection interfaces
5. Setup development environments and begin development.

Year 2: Development, Testing, and Implementation

1. Continue and complete upgrade development
2. Test upgrades
3. Perform load and security tests
4. Prepare end-user training and operations support documents
5. Rollout upgrades.

Year 3 and 4: Data Collection and Reporting

Hire a full-time contractor to coordinate the ability of the enhanced EIS System to collect and report by LEAs and State yearly include the following:

- Evaluation ratings for teachers and principals linked to student growth
- Dates of evaluations for teachers and principals

- Evaluation ratings for other certificated staff (specialists, supervisors, assistant principals, etc)
- Preparation program for teachers and principals by IHE or other preparation programs[alternative preparation]
- Alignment of teacher and principal Professional Development Plans with student outcomes and effectiveness ratings
- Linkage of student growth and teacher and principal evaluation data
- Collection of teachers on “class II” status by LEA [less than satisfactory]
- Standard reports to address additional federal and State reporting requirements.

Enhancements to EIS will:

- Allow automated input of evaluation data for all certificated staff
- Store records in a manner that ensures confidentiality
- Store data in a manner that allows easy integration and alignment with other relevant teacher data in the State Longitudinal Data System
- Store data in a manner that allow easy integration with other relevant principal data;
- Store data in a manner that is easily accessible for analysis to support decision making; and
- Facilitate the rapid retrieval of data for reporting.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as an employee of the project in years three and four.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
(1) Education Program Specialist/EIS Program Specialist	1.0	\$76,650	\$154,833
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers’ Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Trips to LEA for training and problem solving discussions 12 trips per year. (Travel is for 2 years and occurs in years 3 and 4.)	24	\$77.00	\$1,848

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Hardware	\$500,000	Upgrade servers, backup servers, and storage for additional processing loads.	\$500,000
Laptop computer (Year Three)	\$1,500	Laptop computer	\$1,500

5) Supplies

Supplies Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
Office Supplies	\$494	Office Supplies	\$988

6) Contractual

Contractual Item	Cost of Item	Description of Item	Totals
Contractual labor to support the custom modifications of the EIS data tables, develop new data load programs and reports.	\$125/hour	Year 1 – 4800 hours Year 2 – 3200 hours Year 3 – 2400 hours Year 4 – 1600 hours TOTAL	\$600,000 \$400,000 \$300,000 \$200,000 \$1,500,000

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,100,000	\$400,000	\$385,508	\$285,660	\$2,171,168

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is**

opting not to apply the rate against sub grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Sub grant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,100,000	\$400,000	\$395,925	\$296,282	\$2,192,207

Project #: 31/13 Project Name: Building Leadership Capacity in Low-Achieving Urban and Rural Districts Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	800,000	1,400,000	1,700,000	1,100,000	5,000,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	800,000	1,400,000	1,700,000	1,100,000	5,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	800,000	1,400,000	1,700,000	1,100,000	5,000,000
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 31/13**Project Title:****Building Leadership Capacity in Low-Achieving Urban and Rural School Districts****Criteria: (D)(3)(i)**

Ensure the equitable distribution of effective principals to high poverty and high minority schools

Project Description:

In order to be world class, Maryland must have principals rated Effective or Highly Effective in the schools that have the most challenges in terms of student achievement and in the schools that are the hardest to staff with effective leaders. Maryland will expand the leadership program that has proven successful as evidenced by student achievement data so that the number of these schools will form a critical mass of impact in the two lowest achieving LEAs in Maryland and will increase the number of effective principals in a cluster of rural schools.

Funding:

This project connects with other projects aimed at equitable distribution and targeted training of principals, especially the Principals' Academy for Low Achieving Schools.

Year by Year Description:

Project Year 1: Plan, recruit and select the first cohort of Resident Principals

Project Year 2: Assign and continue ongoing training of first cohort. Recruit and select the second cohort of Resident Principals.

Project Year 3: Assign and continue ongoing training of second cohort. Work in conjunction with LEAs to assign first cohort of Resident Principals to the principalship at a high needs school. Maintain coaching and mentoring for both cohorts of Resident Principals.

Project Year 4: In conjunction with LEAs assign second cohort of Resident Principals to the principalship at a high needs school. Maintain coaching and mentoring for both cohorts of Resident Principals.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

The Maryland State Department of Education will contract with an entity similar to New Leaders for New Schools to turn around selected low-achieving schools through school leadership selection and skill specific training that impacts all students and closes achievement gaps. **The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.**

The costs for this project vary over the four years deliberately. The first year will focus on start-up and recruitment of the first cohort. In the second year, the first cohort will be assigned and trained and the second cohort will be selected. The third year focuses on assigning the second cohort and coaching and mentoring both cohorts. The fourth year builds on the work of the third year.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$800,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,700,000	\$1,100,000	\$5,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$800,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,700,000	\$1,100,000	\$5,000,000

Project #: 32/73 Project Name: Teach for Maryland Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	44,717	45,612	46,524	47,454	184,307
2. Fringe Benefits	3,466	3,535	3,606	3,678	14,285
3. Travel	53,200	53,200	64,288	75,376	246,064
4. Equipment	2,950	-	-	-	2,950
5. Supplies	1,494	1,494	1,494	1,494	5,976
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	26,200	101,200	131,200	150,950	409,550
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	132,027	205,041	247,112	278,952	863,132
10. Indirect Costs*	16,006	25,425	30,642	34,590	106,663
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	148,033	230,466	277,754	313,542	969,795

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 31/13**Project Title: Teach for Maryland****Criteria: D3 (A) (2) (i) (d) - Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals – (i) Ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers for high-poverty and/or high minority schools.**

This project is designed to expand the number of teachers prepared to teach in high poverty/high minority schools, and to aid in the retention of teachers in such schools using the expertise of the Breakthrough Center and Maryland's Professional Development School (PDS) learning community model for preparing teachers and providing professional development and support for all members of the school learning community focused on student growth. The project includes both traditional and alternative pathways for teacher preparation.

Supporting Criteria: D4 (A) (1) (ii) – Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs – (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals.

This project expands the Maryland Professional Development School (PDS) model to focus on preparation for teaching in high poverty/high minority schools. The project includes both traditional and alternative pathways for teacher preparation.

Project Description:

The Teach for Maryland Consortium will develop a program specifically designed to prepare teachers to serve in high poverty/high minority schools, to increase teacher retention in high poverty/high minority schools, and to eliminate inequitable distribution of effective teachers in those schools.

Working with the Breakthrough Center, Maryland's cross-divisional reform program for low-performing schools, MSDE will work with IHE, LEA and MAAPP providers to determine program components of a specially designed teacher preparation program that will support teachers to be effective or highly effective in low-performing schools. The Breakthrough Center is the leading edge of Maryland's school turnaround work, and this program will connect teacher preparation programs to the expertise that the Center offers. The high-visibility work of the Center ensures that there is timely assistance to schools to accelerate school performance and cultivate people by improving their capacity to work in low-performing schools. This program will make use of the successful Professional Development School (PDS) model to train teachers before they enter classrooms and provide professional development to their mentor teachers and others in their schools who work with them. MSDE will provide direct technical assistance and coordinate cross-institutional sharing through the Teach for Maryland Consortium.

Sub-grants will be awarded to teacher preparation providers to develop initial teacher preparation programs. Across the grant period, using the Maryland Professional Development School (PDS) Network model, 13 institutions of higher education will pair an existing high

functioning PDS with a high poverty/high minority school to establish a PDS learning community that supports a partnership focused on student growth. Across the grant period, the goal is to train 165 teachers specifically for work in high poverty/high minority schools, and to provide professional development through the PDS structure to teachers in the PDSs in which teacher candidates (interns) are placed.

The PDSs will use the Maryland PDS standards focused on teacher preparation, continuing professional development, research and inquiry, and student achievement. Professional development focused on the identified needs of the school and strategic planning will be key components of program implementation. This program and the work of the Consortium will expand the successful PDS program to focus on high poverty/high minority schools. To extend the reach of the program, the results of program development and implementation will be shared across Maryland's PDS Network, and at local (Annual Maryland Professional Development School Conference) and national (National Association for Professional Development Schools [NAPDS]) conferences.

Each year of the project, consortium members will convene for bi-monthly meetings and professional development and attend a three-day Teach for Maryland Consortium Summer Institute. Program refinement will be accomplished by involvement of key stakeholders. Aggregate data on candidate and program performance will be collected and reviewed annually. Based on data gathered through the program, guidelines for Preparing Teachers and Principals for High Poverty/High Minority Schools will be published and disseminated in year four.

Funding: Total Funding: \$969,795

No additional funding provided.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1:

- Advertise for and hire a Consortium Manager who will facilitate all activities throughout the funded years, with an emphasis on building sustainability after funding ends (MSDE).
- Develop and publish Request for Sub-Grant Proposals for Years One and Two to teacher preparation providers and select participants (MSDE).
- Examine Breakthrough Center materials and protocols and other resources to provide background for program component development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Convene six Teach for Maryland Consortium meetings to begin program component development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance weekly to project participants at their institutions (Teach for Maryland Consortium Manager and Program Approval Staff).
- Participate in Teach for Maryland Consortium Summer Institute to finalize initial components for fall pilot implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Develop initial course/program offerings for Teach for Maryland (IHE and MAAPP providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to High Poverty/High Minority schools and National Association for Professional Development Schools (MSDE).

Year 2:

- Convene six Teach for Maryland Consortium meetings to begin program component development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance weekly to Project participants at their institutions (Teach for Maryland Consortium Manager and Program Approval Staff.)
- Participate in Teach for Maryland Consortium Summer Institute to examine and revise program components (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).
- Develop/revise additional course/program offerings and opportunities (IHE and MAAPP providers).
- Publish Request for Proposals for Year 3 sub-grants and select program participants (MSDE).
- Present at national and local conferences related to High Poverty/High Minority schools and National Association for Professional Development Schools (MSDE).

Year 3:

- Convene six Teach for Maryland Consortium meetings to continue program component development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance weekly to Project participants at their institutions (Teach for Maryland Consortium Manager and Program Approval Staff.)
- Participate in Teach for Maryland Consortium Summer Institute to examine and revise program components (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).
- Develop/revise additional course/program offerings and opportunities (IHE and MAAPP providers).
- Draft Guidelines for Preparing Teachers for High Poverty/High Minority Schools (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to High Poverty/High Minority schools and PDS (MSDE)
- Publish Request for Proposals for Year 4 and select program participants (MSDE).

Year 4:

- Convene six Teach for Maryland Consortium meetings to provide professional development concerning program components (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance weekly to Project participants at their institutions (Teach for Maryland Consortium Manager and Program Approval Staff.)
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Participate in Teach for Maryland Consortium Summer Institute to finalize program components (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).
- Develop/revise additional course/program offerings and opportunities (IHE and MAAPP

providers).

- Present at national and local conferences related to High Poverty/High Minority schools and PDS (MSDE)
- Publish and disseminate Guidelines for Preparing Teachers and Principals for High Poverty/High Minority Schools (MSDE and Program Providers).

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
<p>Teach for Maryland Consortium Manager/Education Program Manager. (50% Contractual Position; Base Salary \$89,434)</p> <p>Work with IHEs and LEAs to initiate, develop, and oversee Consortium activities; coordinate with the Breakthrough Center regarding development of common program components; facilitate consortium meetings (6 per year); coordinate Summer Institute; provide technical assistance to IHEs and LEAs in PDS development and implementation; facilitate consortium-wide professional development on assessed needs; collect performance data on multiple measures including aggregate candidate performance and school achievement data; present at local and national conferences; and, facilitate development and dissemination of Guidelines for Preparing Teachers and Principals for High-Poverty, High Minority Schools.</p>	.5	\$89,434	\$184,307
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

<p>Travel: The annual cost of \$25,000 covers lodging, meals, equipment, and conference rooms for a 3-day Summer Institute for 50 people (representatives from higher education, local school systems, and the state). This cost reflects the amount paid in previous years for the federal Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant. The Institute will be held at a conference facility, which will be selected based on the MSDE bid process. Printing of materials and supplies are in addition to this fee. Printing will be done at MSDE to guarantee the lowest price, and materials will be</p>	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
--	------------	-------------	-------

purchased using the state bulk procurement process.			
Weekly travel (48 weeks) for Consortium Manager and bi-weekly travel (24 weeks) for 3 MSDE Staff for meetings at IHEs and LEAs for Teach for Maryland technical assistance for PDS development and implementation (1 staff @ 48 trips @ \$77 per trip); (3 staff @ 24 trips @ \$77 per trip) – 120 trips per year	120	\$77	\$36,960
Travel for 6 representatives each from PDS partners (IHEs and LEAs) to attend 6 regional meetings per year of the Teach for Maryland Consortium: Years 1 and 2 (6 reps @ 5 partnerships @ 6 trips @\$77 per trip); Year 3 (6 reps @ 9 partnerships @ 6 trips @\$77 per trip); Year 4 (6 reps @13 partnerships@ 6 trips @\$77 per trip)	180(1) 180(2) 324(3) 468(4)	\$77	88,704
Annual Teach for Maryland Consortium Program Development Summer Institutes – (50 participants representing MSDE, IHEs, MAAPPs and LEAs @ 3 days) - \$25,000 per year	4	\$25,000	\$100,000
Travel for Consortium Manager and 2 MSDE Staff to attend annual National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Conference (\$1,700 to include registration [500]; hotel [500]; air travel [500] and meals [200]) – 3 @ 1,700	4	\$5,100	\$20,400

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Laptop Computer (1) \$1,700, LCD Projector (1) \$1,200, Remote Control (1) \$50 to expand current office supply and to meet demand of a new employee – Year 1 only	\$1,700 \$1,200 \$50	Laptop Computer (1) LCD Projector (1) Remote Control (1)	\$2,950

5) Supplies

Supplies for new employee - \$494 (Years 1-4) – Total \$1,976

Instructional materials for 50 participants in Annual Summer Institutes - (Years 1-4 - (50 @ \$20) - \$1,000 per year - \$4,000 total

6) Contractual

Not applicable

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

Not applicable

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Maryland will sub-grant with 13 (total) IHEs to develop paired PDS partnerships to prepare teachers and principals for high poverty/high minority schools). **The MSDE Program Approval and Assessment Branch will develop a competitive grant process (similar to the process used for the federal TQE grant) that will open the application process to include all teacher preparation programs that have Maryland approval and a designated local school system partner to ensure that both partners in the Professional Development School model are represented. MSDE will hold a technical assistance session to answer questions concerning the grant application, and the grants will be reviewed by a panel consisting of local school system, higher education and state personnel. Once the grants have been awarded, the Project Manager and MSDE Program Approval staff will work with the institutions and their local school system partners in implementation.**

Year 1 – 5 IHEs receive \$5,000 each to support strategic planning- total \$25,000;

Year 2 – Same 5 IHEs receive \$20,000 for PDS implementation and development – total, \$100,000;

Year 3 – Original 5 IHEs receive \$10,000 and 4 new IHEs receive \$20,000 – total \$130,000 ;

Year 4 – Original 5 IHEs receive \$5,000; 4 second year IHEs receive \$10,000 and 4 new IHEs receive \$20,000 – total \$145,000

Total Years 1-4 (\$400,000)

Printing/Duplication for 6 Network Meetings @ \$100 per meeting - \$600 per year – Total Years 1-4 - \$2,400

Printing/Duplication for annual Residential Summer Institute @ \$600 per year – Total Years 1-4 - \$2,400

Stipends for Development of Guidelines for Preparing Teachers and Principals for High Poverty/High Minority Schools – 5 participants @ \$750 – Year 4 – Total \$3,750

Printing/Duplication of Guideline for Preparing Teachers and Principals for High Poverty/High Minority Schools - \$1,000 – Year 4

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$132,027	\$205,041	\$247,112	\$278,952	\$863,132

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$148,033	\$230,466	\$277,754	\$313,542	\$969,795

Project #: 33/50 Project Name: Compensation to Teachers and Principals in the Lowest 5% Schools Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	804,000	804,000	804,000	804,000	3,216,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	804,000	804,000	804,000	804,000	3,216,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #33/50**Project Title: Compensation to Teachers and Principals in Lowest 5% Schools****Criteria:****D3 Increase the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in high-poverty, high-minority and hard to staff schools.**

Maryland will provide incentive program for highly effective teachers and principals to transfer to low-achieving, high-minority, high-poverty schools in Tier I and Tier II and remain in the schools.

Project Description:

To encourage Maryland's best teachers to tackle the challenge of teaching in high-minority and high-poverty schools, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation, the Education Reform Act of 2010, to establish a new incentive program to encourage the best principals and teachers to work at the neediest schools. The legislation directs incentives go to educators rated Highly Effective who accept an assignment and work in a school meeting federal criteria for In Improvement, In Corrective Action, or In Restructuring Status.

Funding:

LEAs with Tier I and Tier II (and Tier III which meet the criteria) schools will provide incentives to highly effective teachers and principals to teach and lead in these high-minority, high-poverty schools.

Year by Year Description:

In year 1, the State Board of Education will establish policies for this new program, including defining the range of allowable stipends and incentives and the appropriate amounts. Criteria will be established to identify the teachers and principals in year 1 and 2, prior to the implementation of highly effective in the teacher and principal evaluation instrument. In year 3 and 4, teachers and principals who are rated highly effective and who transfer to the Tier I and II schools will be eligible for the incentives.

Details by Category:1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$-

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The State Board must adopt guidelines to implement the incentive program. Local school systems may employ more stringent standards than those established by the guidelines. The incentives in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 will be based on the definitions of effective and highly effective teachers and principals determined by the State Board with input from the Maryland Educator Effectiveness Council. Grants to Participating LEAs:

If after allocating the grants to participating LEAs in any project there are still funds available, these will be used toward grants in budget project #11, LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades.

The State Board will determine the guidelines for the incentive program. Based on the Education Reform Act of 2010, during the 2010-2011 and the 2011-2012 school years, stipends awarded under this program may be based on whether the teacher has obtained certification from the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards.

There are two local school systems with schools in Tier I and Tier II and seven local school systems with schools in Tier III for a total of nine local school systems. The State Board will establish the criteria for the funding for these schools.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
To provide incentives for highly effective teachers and principals who transfer to and remain in Tier I and Tier II (and Tier III which meet the criteria) schools	To encourage Maryland's best teachers and principals to tackle the challenge of teaching and leading high-minority and high-poverty schools	Incentives to be determined in the first year	2 LEAs in Tier I and II; 7 LEAs in Tier III	\$804,000 per year

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$804,000	\$804,000	\$804,000	\$804,000	\$3,216,000

Project #: 34/51 Project Name: Compensation Incentives for Teachers in Shortage Areas Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	240,000	240,000	420,000	420,000	1,320,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	240,000	240,000	420,000	420,000	1,320,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 34/51**Project Title: Compensation Incentives for Teachers in Shortage Areas****Criteria:****D3 Increase the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in high-poverty, high-minority and hard to staff schools.**

Maryland will provide an incentive program for highly effective STEM, special education, and ELL teachers to teach in low-achieving, high-minority, high-poverty schools.

Project Description:

To encourage Maryland's best teachers in identified shortage areas to tackle the challenge of teaching in high-minority and high-poverty schools, Maryland is establishing programs to reward highly effective STEM teachers and teachers of English Language Learners (ELL) and students with disabilities who choose to work in low achieving, high-minority, high-poverty schools.

Funding:

LEAs will provide incentives to highly effective STEM, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and Special Education Teachers to teach in high minority, high-poverty schools.

Year by Year Description:

In year 1, MSDE will establish procedures with LEAs for the allowable stipends and incentives and the appropriate amounts for STEM, ESOL and special education teachers to teach in and remain in high-minority, high-poverty schools. These incentives will be made available in years 1 through 4. In years 3 and 4 additional incentives will be provided to highly effective STEM, ESOL and special education teachers to teach in low-achieving schools.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$-

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The funding is established to provide incentives for 4 STEM, ESOL, and/or Special Education teachers to teach in high minority, high poverty schools. The selection of the teachers will be based on the need and criteria established by the LEA. As noted, the selection will be determined by the LEA.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
To provide incentives for effective STEM, ESOL and Special Education teachers to teach in high-minority, high-poverty schools	To encourage Maryland's effective and highly effective STEM, ESOL and Special Education teachers to teach in and remain in high-minority and high-poverty schools	<p>Years 1 through 4: \$2500 for 4 teachers for 24 LEAs</p> <p>Years 3 and 4: An additional \$180,000 incentives for highly effective teachers to be determined based on the number of LEAs and the number of teachers compensated: For example - \$1,500 for 4 LEAs for 30 teachers</p>	<p>24</p> <p>To be determined</p>	<p>\$240,000 per year for years 1 through 4</p> <p>\$180,000 per year for years 3 and 4</p>

Note: to the extent that Maryland has less than 24 participating LEAs, the grant amount per participating LEA will be increased, accordingly.

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$240,000	\$240,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$1,320,000

Project #: 35/26 Project Name: Elementary STEM Certification Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	44,717	45,612	46,524	47,454	184,307
2. Fringe Benefits	3,466	3,535	3,606	3,678	14,285
3. Travel	92,044	92,044	92,044	92,044	368,176
4. Equipment	2,750	-	-	-	2,750
5. Supplies	1,494	1,494	1,494	1,494	5,976
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	141,550	141,550	141,550	141,550	566,200
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	286,021	284,235	285,218	286,220	1,141,694
10. Indirect Costs*	35,126	35,245	35,367	35,491	141,229
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	321,147	319,480	320,585	321,711	1,282,923

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 35/26**Project Title: Elementary STEM Certification****Criteria: D3 (A) (2) (i) (d) – Strategies to increase effective teachers in STEM areas**

This project will develop Elementary STEM standards, an Elementary STEM teacher certificate, and teacher preparation programs for Elementary STEM.

Project Description:

Maryland is focused on being a state where innovation thrives, particularly in the area of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). The Governor's STEM Task Force stresses the importance of P-20 STEM education, with a goal of increasing the number of STEM teachers. Through the development of Elementary STEM standards, and by developing teacher preparation programs to train teachers to staff elementary classrooms, Maryland's elementary students will have a solid base on which to build as they prepare for college and careers. This project will be part of the Maryland STEM Innovation Network, a virtual and physical presence, whose goal is to promote communication and share resources among all of Maryland's STEM stakeholders.

Maryland has committed to be the first State to develop Elementary STEM standards and a corresponding Elementary STEM Teacher Certificate. The program design reflects a problem-based approach to teaching an integrated STEM curriculum to elementary students – a pedagogical strategy identified through research to increase student achievement at all levels. Maryland's Professional Development School (PDS) Network will provide an ideal base for piloting field experiences to train prospective Elementary STEM teachers and practicing teachers who wish to expand their expertise. Professional Development Schools are learning communities focused on student growth, including both initial teacher preparation and continuing teacher professional development. This project will use the successful model previously used to develop the Maryland PDS Standards and Developmental Guidelines, and the Standards for Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs. Stakeholders, who eventually will implement the programs, will be involved from the beginning in standards development and will work together across institutions through the Elementary STEM Network.

Project participants (MSDE, IHEs, LEAs and Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) providers will develop Elementary STEM standards during year one. In the remaining years of the grant, to meet the need for preparing Elementary STEM certified teachers, the Elementary STEM Certification Project will develop, pilot, revise and implement Elementary STEM standards in teacher preparation programs with seven Maryland Approved Program (MAP) and MAAPP providers. Sub-grants will be provided to pilot programs to cover course release for four-member teams from each provider who will engage in course development or equivalent for MAAPP, data collection, and coordination with PDS and MAAPP placement. MSDE, working with IHEs, LEAs and MAAPP providers, will facilitate standards development, implementation, and final revision. Pilot program participants will play a key role in both standards development and program development.

MSDE will provide direct technical assistance to teacher preparation providers and will bring providers together through the Maryland Elementary STEM Network, thus reaching preparation providers outside of the pilot project and providing them with professional development. The Elementary STEM Network will meet monthly through the academic year, and annually in a 3-day residential STEM Standard/Rubric/Program Development Summer Institute. To extend the reach of the program, Elementary STEM standards and preparation program components will be shared across Maryland and at local and national STEM, certification, and alternative preparation conferences.

Funding:

All funding will be through the Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1:

- Publicly announce and systematically explain to the public the Elementary STEM Teacher Certificate (MSDE).
- Advertise for and hire a STEM Network Manager who will facilitate all activities throughout the funded years, with an emphasis on building sustainability after funding ends (MSDE).
- Develop and publish Request for Sub-Grant Proposals for seven teacher preparation providers to develop Elementary STEM teacher preparation programs and select pilot project participants (MSDE).
- Examine STEM materials and other resources to provide background for standards development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Convene eight STEM Network meetings to engage in Elementary STEM standards development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance bi-weekly to pilot project participants at their institutions (STEM Network Manager and Program Approval Staff).
- Participate in STEM Summer Institute to develop draft Elementary STEM standards for use in pilot implementation of beginning elements of teacher preparation programs (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Develop initial course/program offerings for Elementary STEM preparation programs (IHE and MAAPP Providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to certification, STEM, and alternative preparation (MSDE).

Year 2:

- Convene eight STEM Network meetings to continue standards development and provide cross-institutional sharing and professional development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance bi-weekly to pilot project participants at their institutions (STEM Network Manager and Program Approval Staff).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).
- Participate in STEM Summer Institute to examine beginning implementation of Elementary STEM standards and recommend revisions to standards and teacher preparation program components (MSDE and Program Providers).

- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Develop/revise additional course/program offerings for Elementary STEM (IHE and MAAPP Providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to certification, STEM, and alternative preparation (MSDE).

Year 3:

- Convene eight STEM Network meetings to extend outreach to non-pilot program providers (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance bi-weekly to pilot project participants at their institutions (STEM Network Manager and Program Approval Staff).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).
- Participate in STEM Summer Institute to refine teacher preparation programs and provide professional development (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning implementation and sustainability once funding ends (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Develop/revise additional course/program offerings for Elementary STEM (IHE and MAAPP Providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to certification, STEM, and alternative preparation (MSDE).

Year 4:

- Convene eight STEM Network meetings to disseminate information from each pilot program and provide professional development state-wide (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Provide technical assistance bi-weekly to pilot project participants at their institutions (STEM Network Manager and Program Approval Staff).
- Participate in STEM Summer Institute to finalize Elementary STEM standards and essential preparation program components (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Engage preparation program providers in strategic planning with PDS and MAAPP providers concerning sustainability (MSDE and Program Providers).
- Present at national and local conferences related to certification, STEM, and alternative preparation (MSDE).
- Collect data on program and candidate performance (Program Providers and MSDE).

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Elementary STEM Certification Network Manager. (50% Contractual Position; Base Salary \$89,434) Work with IHEs, MAAPPs, and LEAs	.5	\$89,434	\$184,307

to develop and implement Elementary STEM certification standards; work with IHEs, MAAPPs, and LEAs to develop, pilot, and revise preparation programs; facilitate Elementary STEM Network meetings (8 per year); coordinate Summer Institute; provide technical assistance to IHEs, LEAs and MAAPPs in implementation; facilitate Network-wide professional development; present at local and national conferences; and collect performance data.			
---	--	--	--

All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.
--

3) Travel

<p>This new teacher preparation program requires extensive collaboration between content departments and schools of education. In our work with previous projects, we found that strong technical assistance from MSDE (which requires travel to the IHEs, other preparation providers, and LEAs that are involved) and the bringing together of stakeholders for statewide meetings (both one day and multiple days) facilitates the implementation of new standards and programs. The annual cost of \$25,000 covers lodging, meals, equipment, and conference rooms for a 3-day Summer Institute for 50 people (representatives from higher education, local school systems, and the state). This cost reflects the amount paid in previous years for the federal Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant. The Institute will be held at a conference facility, which will be selected based on the MSDE bid process. Printing of materials and supplies are in addition to this fee. Printing will be done at MSDE to guarantee the lowest price, and materials will be purchased using the state bulk procurement process.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>Using the successful model of developing the Maryland Standards for Professional Development Schools (funded by a TQE grant), the Program Approval and Assessment Branch within MSDE's Division of Certification and Accreditation will lead a multi-year process of bringing together state, local school system, and higher education practitioners who are grounded both in STEM content and teacher preparation program development. Prior to the initial Elementary STEM Certification Institute, representatives from higher education and local school systems will work with the Program Approval and Assessment Branch (Division of Certification and Accreditation) and with Content Area Specialists (Division of Instruction) to examine Elementary STEM issues in order to come prepared to develop standards for teacher preparation programs that can be piloted, reviewed and revised.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Weekly travel (48 weeks) for Network Manager and 2 MSDE Staff for meetings at IHEs, MAAPPs and LEAs for Elementary STEM standards and program development and implementation (3 staff @ 48 trips @ \$77 per trip) – 144 trips per year	144	\$77	\$44,352
--	-----	------	----------

Travel for 1 representative each from 23 IHEs, 19 MAAPPs, and 24 LEAs to attend eight regional meetings per year of the Maryland Elementary STEM Network. (66 representatives @ 8 trips @\$77 per trip) – 528 trips per year	528	\$77	\$162,624
Annual residential STEM Standard/Rubric/Program Development Summer Institutes – (50 participants representing MSDE, IHEs, MAAPPs and LEAs @ 3 days) - \$25,000 per year		\$25,000	\$100,000
Travel for Network Manager and 2 MSDE Staff to attend annual national STEM Conferences (\$1,700 to include registration [500]; hotel [500]; air travel [500] and meals [200]) – 3 @ \$1,700	4	\$5,100	\$20,400
Travel for Network Manager and 2 Program Approval Staff to attend the National Association for State Directors of Teacher Certification and Accreditation Conference (\$1,700 to include registration [500]; hotel [500]; air travel [500] and meals [200]) – 3 @ \$1,700	4	\$5,100	\$20,400
Travel for Network Manager and 2 MSDE Staff to attend alternative preparation conferences. (\$1,700 to include registration [500]; hotel [500]; air travel [500] and meals [200]) – 3 @ \$1,700	4	\$5,100	\$20,400
Total Travel			\$368,176

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Laptop Computer (1) \$1,500, LCD Projector (1) \$1,200, Remote Control (1) \$50 to expand current office supply and to meet demand of a new employee	\$1,500	Laptop Computer (1)	\$2,750
	\$1,200	LCD Projector (1)	
	\$50	Remote Control (1)	

5) Supplies

Office supplies for new employee - \$494 (Years 1-4) – Total \$1,976

Instructional materials for 50 participants in Annual Summer Institutes - (Years 1-4 - (50 @ \$20) - \$1,000 per year - \$4,000 total

6) Contractual

Not applicable

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Maryland will sub-grant with 7 (total) IHEs and MAAPPs to develop and pilot Elementary STEM programs. Each program provider will receive \$20,000 yearly to support course release for four-member teams (4x \$3,500 = \$14,000) or equivalent for MAAPP; course development, data collection, coordination with PDS and MAAPP placement.

Printing/Duplication for 8 Network Meetings @ \$100 per meeting - \$800 per year – Total Years 1-4 - \$3,200

Printing/Duplication for annual Residential Summer Institute @ \$750 per year – Total Years 1-4 - \$3,000

The MSDE Program Approval and Assessment Branch within MSDE's Division of Certification and Accreditation will develop a competitive grant process (similar to the process used for the federal TQE grant) that will open the application process to include all teacher preparation programs that have Maryland approval and a designated local school system partner to ensure that both partners in the Professional Development School model are represented. Members of the teams will be chosen by the teacher preparation program and included as part of the grant application, and must reflect experience in STEM content/teacher preparation program development. MSDE will hold a technical assistance session to answer questions concerning the grant application, and the grants will be reviewed by a panel consisting of local school system, higher education and state personnel. Once the grants have been awarded, the Project Manager and MSDE Program Approval staff will work with the institutions and their local school system partners in implementation.

The \$6,000 for other expenses (in addition to the \$14,000 for team members) includes course development, data collection, meeting facilitation with local school system Professional Development School (PDS) representatives, protocol development, and supplies (paper, flash drives, printing, duplicating, materials, etc.).

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$286,021	\$284,235	\$285,218	\$286,220	\$1,141,694

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs (Not applicable)

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$321,147	\$319,480	\$320,585	\$322,711	\$1,282,923

Project #: 36/75 Project Name: Maryland Approved Programs (MAP) Cost for LEAs, Providers and IHEs (UTeach Maryland) Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	44,717	45,612	46,524	47,454	184,307
2. Fringe Benefits	3,466	3,535	3,606	3,678	14,285
3. Travel	45,588	45,588	45,588	45,588	182,352
4. Equipment	1,700	-	-	-	1,700
5. Supplies	2,994	2,994	2,994	2,994	11,976
6. Contractual	61,500	101,500	101,500	101,500	366,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	500,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	284,965	324,229	325,212	326,214	1,260,620
10. Indirect Costs*	27,499	27,618	27,740	27,865	110,722
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	312,464	351,847	352,952	354,079	1,371,342

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 36/75**Project Title: Maryland Approved Programs (MAP) Cost for LEAs, Providers and IHEs (UTeach Maryland)****Criteria: D3 (a)(2)(i)(d)**

This project will develop a secondary teacher preparation program in partnerships between the University of Maryland College Park and Prince George's County Public Schools, and one other university and Baltimore City Public Schools focused exclusively on the teaching of STEM area subjects.

Project Description:

In keeping with the Governor's STEM Task Force, this program will produce 160 secondary teachers in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) areas of certification prepared specifically and intensely to serve Maryland students with the result being higher test scores and stronger college and career-bound graduates. Partner institutions will recruit 20 candidates as juniors for entry into a STEM-specific teacher education program. All content and education courses will be developed exclusively to support the teaching of STEM with the institution committing to offer no competing certification programs. Coursework will be co-designed through strong and mandatory collaboration between the colleges of arts and sciences in which the content department resides and the colleges of education where STEM-specific pedagogical courses reside. Local school system content specialists, members of the STEM Innovation Network (Recommendation # 7 of the Governor's STEM Task Force) local and MSDE Professional Development Schools (PDS) specialists, and others will provide input into program development to ensure alignment of all STEM initiatives in the state. Early field experience in partnership with the local school systems will begin immediately upon entry into the program, and as with all undergraduate teacher education programs in Maryland, the senior year will be spent in a specially-designed PDS for a minimum of 100 days across both semesters of the senior year. Activities will include three STEM Residential Training Academies which will develop and implement linkages among all participating stakeholders and prepare PDS to expertly support STEM interns throughout the initially-funded years of the program, analyze data for program improvement, and share knowledge gained and one Secondary STEM Conference in Year 4.

Funding:

All funding would be through the Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1: MSDE will advertise for and hire a project manager who will facilitate all activities throughout the funded years, with an emphasis on building sustainability after funding ends. Faculties from Departments of Education and Arts and Sciences at the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) with Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS) and one other university in collaboration with Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS), other colleges and universities with teacher education programs, local school system and MSDE content experts, and PDS facilitators will develop the specialized curriculum. In addition, the collaborative will develop the knowledge and skill sets necessary to prepare faculty in four high schools each (4 X 2) in both PGCPS and BCPS to be STEM-specific professional development schools. MSDE will sponsor the first STEM Residential Training Academy to build specific skills and knowledge of principals, department chairs, mentors and field supervisors in participating PDS. 20 Program candidates are recruited from each university's sophomore classes with scholarship incentives offered. MSDE, in collaboration with the STEM Innovation Network partners, will develop a system of data collection and analysis for alignment and program evaluation and improvement.

In Year 2: PGCPS and BCPS Cohorts 1 will enter their junior years of college beginning the specialized STEM teacher education sequence of courses and early field experiences in the eight summer-prepared STEM high school PDS. The second Residential Training Academy will concentrate on the preparation of PDS principals, department chairs, and mentors expressly prepared to receive and guide the 100-day internships in eight participating high schools. Data are collected from all stakeholders (students, faculties, PDS partners, etc.) for program evaluation and improvement. PGCPS and BCPS Cohorts 2 are recruited (20 X 2). Participating local school systems, universities, and the STEM Innovation Network will focus on sustaining the program beyond funding through specialized recruiting and prioritized scholarship, grant, work/study and other opportunities for qualified students.

Year 3: PGCPS and BCPS Cohorts 1 (20 X 2) begin the 100-day internship in eight prepared high school PDS with eligible candidates continuing on scholarship, completing their programs, and earning eligibility for full secondary certification by the end of the year. Cohorts 2 (40) begin their junior years as above and participate in early field experiences. Cohorts 3 (40) are recruited and offered one year of scholarship money for their first year in the program. Participating local school systems and universities will work to leverage additional financial support for program sustainability. The third Residential Training Academy will take the form of a several-strand colloquium charged with examining data from Years 1 and 2, making program improvements as indicated, promoting other colleges' or universities' program development, and assuring alignment of all STEM-related initiatives. The data systems are now fully operational.

Year 4: Cohorts 2 (40) begin the 100-day internship in eight prepared high school PDS with eligible candidates continuing on scholarship, completing their programs, and earning eligibility for full secondary certification by the end of the year. Cohorts 3 (40) begin their junior year as above and participate in early field experiences. The end of project funds will preclude scholarships for the final year of the program for Cohorts 3. MSDE projects that 30 of 40 will

complete their senior year and earn certification through stakeholders' efforts to support institutionalization of project. MSDE will sponsor a Secondary STEM Conference assembling members of STEM Innovation Network, participating LSSs and universities, teachers prepared through the project, mentors, principals, and content experts who will examine final project data, share experiences, act as Critical Friends to now-institutionalized Secondary STEM Teacher Education Programs, and identify future innovative efforts emerging as a result of the project.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Education Program Specialist, Grade 24 as Project Manager responsible for project management, facilitation, and oversight at 50%. (Note: additional .5 time and salary STEM Certification, D3, Goal 3a)	.5	\$44,717	\$184,307
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Years 1-4: Weekly travel for Project Manager, staff (1) from MSDE Department of Instruction, and staff (1) from Program Approval Branch to partner Institutions of Higher Education (3 staff X 48 weeks @ \$77 per trip) = 11,088 per year X 4 project years	576	\$77	\$44,352
Expenses for Project Manager or designee to attend (with IHE partners) annual 3-day national UTeach Conference (airfare @ \$700 x 4 = 2800), Registration (\$500 x 4 years = \$2,000), Hotel (\$500 x 4 years = \$2,000), Meals (\$300 x 4 = \$1200).	4	\$2,000	\$8,000
Years 1-2 Residential Training Academy preparing PDS Field Supervisors, Mentors, Principals for STEM candidates' field experiences and internships. 50 participants @ \$650 ea. For 2 ½ days training = \$32,500 Years 1 and 2 Year 3 STEM Colloquium, 50 participants @ \$650 ea. For 2 ½ day conference = \$32,500 Year 3	200	\$650	\$130,000

Year 4 Secondary STEM Conference, 50 participants @ \$650 ea. For 2 ½ days conference = \$32,500 Year 4			
--	--	--	--

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Lap-top computer (1) @ \$1,700 to support Project Manager	\$1,700	Computer	\$1,700

5) Supplies

Office supplies for Project Manager and for Residential Trainings. \$2,994 per year.
--

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

Faculty collaboratively develop STEM-teacher focused education and content coursework, oversee delivery, set up data collection, analyze and share data results with educational Community, take leadership role in 3 rd year colloquium and 4 th year STEM Conference. 2 faculty from Arts and Sciences, 2 faculty from Departments of Education from UMCP and one other participating university = 8 x one course offset @ \$3500 each x 4 years = \$112,000.

8 liaisons x one course offset @ \$3500 x 4 years: \$112,000 Professional Development Schools (PDS) University Liaison to oversee development of STEM-specific UMCP secondary high school PDS in Prince George's County Public Schools and university partnership with Baltimore City Public Schools.
--

2 graduate students @ \$11 per hour x 250 hours x 4 years = \$22,000 One graduate student at each university to assist faculty in data system development, data entry, and analyses production.
--

Mentors in 8 PDS to support 40 candidates each year for 3 years (years 2-4). 40 x \$1,000 x 3 = \$120,000

The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.

Course offsets were determined by surveying the colleges and universities in the University of Maryland System asking what they considered the costs to be when a professor was given an assignment other than teaching for a semester and an adjunct or other instructor had to be hired to teach one class. \$3,500 was the average amount factored into budgets for that purpose.

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Scholarship incentives to recruited candidates 40 student per year x average equivalent costs per credit hour at @ \$255.50 x 12 credit hours = \$122,640 x 4 years = \$490,560. **Currently, individuals preparing to teach in Maryland at the undergraduate level must spend a year as an intern in a specially-designed Professional Development School (PDS). In the UTeach model, participants also have the PDS experience. Each intern has a paid mentor for the year's service. The average amount paid to intern mentors across the state is \$1,000. Consequently, that figure was used for this budget purpose.**

Book allowance for 40 candidates per year x \$59 (average cost of one book) = \$2,360 x 4 year

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$284,965	\$324,229	\$325,212	\$326,214	\$1,260,620

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$312,464	\$351,847	\$352,952	\$354,079	\$1,371,342

Project #: 37/54 Project Name: International Partnerships to Recruit Teachers in Critical Needs Areas Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	15,000	22,500	37,500	45,000	120,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	15,000	22,500	37,500	45,000	120,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 37/54**Project Title: International Partnerships to recruit teachers in critical needs areas****Criteria: D3 Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas**

Through international partnerships, LEAs will hire international teachers in critical needs areas, enabling Maryland students to excel while developing the 21st century skill of global awareness.

Project Description:

Maryland has entered into Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with Spain, China, and Italy to enhance international education and world language programs. Among the benefits of these partnerships are options for LEAs to hire effective international teachers in critical needs/shortage areas through comprehensive visiting teacher programs sponsored, for example, by Spain and China. MSDE will expand international partnerships and provide funding to participating LEAs for expenses involved with the hiring of international teachers, including J-1 Visa fees.

Funding:

Participating LEAs may use this project funding to recruit and sponsor international teachers for new elementary world language programs in the B3 project, World Languages Pipelines.

Year by Year Description:

In years 1-4, MSDE will provide information sessions to LEAs regarding international partnership agreements and international visiting teacher programs. Supplemental funding will be provided for participating LEAs to recruit and sponsor international teachers for critical needs areas. LEAs or regional LEA consortia that propose to hire a minimum of five teachers will receive sub-grants to fund expenses to recruit and sponsor international teachers in areas of critical needs. **The Division of Certification and Accreditation and the Division of Instruction will provide information sessions during regularly scheduled meetings with LEA Certification (Certified Authorized Partners), HR Directors, and Assistant Superintendents for Instruction at no cost.**

LEAs will be selected based upon plans for oversight and sustainability.

Preference will be given to LEAs that are able to hire at least five international teachers; however, LEAs with strong proposals and fewer teachers will be funded.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
NOT APPLICABLE	\$		\$

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	NOT APPLICABLE

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Participating LEAs will recruit and sponsor effective international teachers in critical needs areas through MD partnerships	All schools in participating LEAs will have access to international teachers for STEM, world languages, and other critical needs vacancies. Project funding will negate extra expenses for visa sponsorship. LEAs will pay the salary and fringe benefits for each international teacher.	\$750 J-1 Visa fee for at least 5 international teachers per LEA	20 Statewide total: 160 teachers	\$120,000

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$15,000	\$22,500	\$37,500	\$45,000	\$120,000

Project #: 38/53 Project Name: Incentives for Teachers Who Obtain ESOL Certification Associated with Criteria: D3 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	1,200,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	1,200,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 38/53**Project Title: Incentives for Teachers who obtain ESOL certification****Criteria: D3 Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas.**

Maryland will target programs and incentives to increase the number of teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

Project Description:

The number of English Language Learner (ELL) students has steadily increased in Maryland to approximately 44,062 ELL students in the 2009-2010 school year from 29,502 students in the 2004-2005 school year, a 49% increase. Content teachers who obtain an additional certification in ESOL are better prepared to work with the ELL students and meet the diversified needs to develop both language and content knowledge. RTTT funds will support LEAs to provide incentives to content teachers in low-achieving, high-minority, high-poverty schools with significant numbers of ESOL students who obtain certification in ESOL.

Funding:

LEAs would use this funding to provide incentives to effective and highly effective content teachers who obtain certification in ESOL and teach in high-minority, high-poverty schools.

Year by Year Description:

In years 1-4, MSDE will identify schools with low-achieving ELLs and link LEAs with Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) to establish cohorts of teachers to obtain ESOL certification. In the first year, MSDE would work to identify the IHEs and provide information sessions to LEAs and content area teachers regarding obtaining certification in ESOL. Teachers may become ESOL certified and teach ESOL or would obtain ESOL certification and continue to teach their content with ability to meet the unique needs of the ESOL student in their classroom. Incentives would be provided to teachers who complete the certification.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual

personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	Not applicable

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually

assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**Grants to Participating LEAs:**

If after allocating the grants to participating LEAs in any project there are still funds available, these will be used toward grants in budget project #11, LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Provide incentives for content teachers who complete ESOL Certification	Meet the language and content needs of the growing population of ELL students in Maryland	\$2,500 incentive per teacher for 24 LEAs for 5 teachers per LEA	24	\$300,000
Note: to the extent that Maryland has less than 24 participating LEAs, the grant amount per participating LEA will be increased, accordingly.				

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$1,200,000

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project #: 39/25 Associated with Criteria: D5 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	73,674	75,147	76,650	-	225,471
2. Fringe Benefits	5,710	5,824	5,940	-	17,474
3. Travel	1,540	1,540	1,540	-	4,620
4. Equipment	1,730	-	-	-	1,730
5. Supplies	494	494	494	-	1,482
6. Contractual	550,000	550,000	550,000	-	1,650,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	633,148	633,005	634,624	-	1,900,777
10. Indirect Costs*	10,096	10,293	10,493	-	30,882
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	643,244	643,298	645,117	-	1,931,659

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 39/25**Project Title: D5 Teacher Induction Academies****Criteria: Providing Effective Support for Teachers and Principals**

Ensure that teachers new to Maryland are fully supported in their efforts to access the curriculum, assessments, and instructional tools to deliver effective instruction.

Project Description:

Procure services to develop and conduct Teacher Induction Academies that train LEA Induction Program Coordinators and new teacher mentors (5 days in summer plus three follow up sessions). Academies will ensure that teachers at every Maryland public school participate in a high quality program of induction into the teaching profession. At least one mentor teacher for every 15 new teachers in Maryland will receive training through these academy experiences. Funds to conduct academies would be awarded through a procurement contract with potential providers such as the New Teacher Center, The New Teacher Project, Teach For America, and Maryland institutions of higher education. A Division of Instruction project manager will oversee the contract of the selected provider. Since Maryland LEAs hire approximately 7,500 new teachers each year, a total of 500 mentors (one for each of 15 new teachers) plus the 24 Induction Program Coordinators from the 24 LEAs will participate each of the three years in the Academy. Following the three year training investment, Maryland will have ensured LEA capacity to both run the Induction Programs in accordance with the regulations regarding comprehensive teacher induction programs adopted by the State Board of Education in April, 2010 and have a cadre of well-trained mentors to serve in those programs.

Funding:

This project connects to the tools and resources for teachers described in section C (3) regarding the on-line instructional toolkit and the instructional intervention modules. It also connects to section B (2) and B (3) regarding the State Common Core Curriculum, emerging multi-state summative assessments and Maryland developed formative assessment tools. Thus, this work will support the funding LEAs currently have in place to implement their Induction Programs.

Year by Year Description:

This project is designed to fully prepare a state-wide cadre of teacher mentors over a three year period. Since the Induction Program Coordinators in each LEA are also participants, they will take over the ongoing training needs at the local level when the project ends after year three.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as	% FTE	Base	Total
---	-------	------	-------

employees of the project.		Salary	
Education Program Specialist to oversee the contract for the service provider to plan and organize teacher induction academies	1@ 100%	\$73,674	\$225,471
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel: The Education Program Specialist will be the person conducting site visits. There was an error in Maryland's original submission, and the "Total" figure in the narrative portion for travel should be changed to \$4,620.	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Visit site of all academies plus meet with planning team during year.	20	\$77	\$4,620

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Computer	\$1730	Computer	\$1730

5) Supplies

\$494 per year for three years

6) Contractual

A vendor will be procured to organize the logistics of the academies, assist with planning content, and provide the instruction. Total contract will be \$550,000 per year and the vendor will devote 100% FTE to the project. There is no alternative funding stream for this project. **The consulting, travel, program design, participant stipends, and supplies for teacher induction academies over three years will be procured through a competitive bid process. Participants will be the induction coordinators in the 24 school districts plus the teacher mentors employed in each district for a total of approximately 525 participants. Supplies,**

expenses, and stipends of \$125/day for participants not currently working on a year-long contract will be included in the contract. The cost basis for the contract was derived through discussions with potential vendors regarding similar work at this scale they have done in other states and large school districts.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$633,148	\$633,005	\$634,624	\$0	\$1,900,777

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$643,244	\$643,298	\$645,117	\$0	\$1,931,659

Project #: 40/15 Project Name: Professional Development for Executive Officers Associated with Criteria: D5 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	89,434	241,517	246,347	251,274	828,572
2. Fringe Benefits	6,931	18,718	19,092	19,474	64,215
3. Travel	-	8,624	8,624	8,624	25,872
4. Equipment	2,950	5,900	-	-	8,850
5. Supplies	7,494	8,482	8,482	8,482	32,940
6. Contractual	125,000	-	-	-	125,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	231,809	283,241	282,545	287,854	1,085,449
10. Indirect Costs*	12,879	34,390	35,036	35,694	117,999
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	244,688	317,631	317,581	323,548	1,203,448

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 40/15**Project Title:****Professional Development for Executive Officers****Criteria: (D) (5)(i)**

Provide effective data informed professional development to principals that is appropriate, ongoing, and job embedded. Based on their evaluations, all 1459 principals in Maryland will receive differentiated staff development delivered by their evaluators who are executive officers in each LEA.

Project Description:

In order to be world class, Maryland must have a principal rated Effective or Highly Effective in every school. To maximize individual potential, every principal will be provided with differentiated professional development based on their individual evaluations. This Project will work as follows:

- A) The contractor in collaboration with MSDE and the Center Coordinator will develop content and provide the training for two Regional Trainers
- B) The Coordinator and Regional Trainers will train every principal in the State through the executive officers

This professional development will enable both the executive officers and principals to implement the new evaluation system effectively, i.e. executive officers evaluating principals and principals evaluating teachers. Based on the principal evaluation, executive officers will provide the coaching and support to each principal to address their individual needs which surfaced from their evaluation. In addition, the Center Coordinator and Regional Trainers will work with individual LEAs to implement their succession plans.

Funding:

This project connects with the implementation of the new evaluation systems for teachers and principals.

Year by Year Description:

Project Year 1: In conjunction with MSDE and the Center Coordinator, an outside contractor will develop the content of the professional development for executive officers.

Project Years 2 – 4: The Center Coordinator and Regional Trainers will deliver and implement the professional development to executive officers at regional sites and provide individual follow-up. They will also work with LEAs to successfully implement each system's succession plan.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
(1) Center Coordinator (Education Program Manager) To be responsible for the overall leadership and management of the regional professional development centers for executive officers To assist the contractor in developing the content to provide professional development for executive officers to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate principals effectively and implement effective leadership development plans • help principals evaluate teachers using the Teacher Evaluation Framework • help implement LEA's Succession Plan To train regional trainers to provide professional development for executive officers using the content developed by the contractor and coordinator	1 @ 100%	\$89,434	\$368,612
(2) Regional Trainers (Education Program Specialist) To provide professional development for executive officers using the content developed by the contractor and coordinator (The position begins July 1, 2011 and ends June 30, 2014)	2@ 100%	\$75,147	\$459,960
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
All personnel hired to complete this project's key activities in the Regional Training Centers for Executive Officers will be provided with reimbursement for traveling to LEAs in Maryland. This represents 112 trips per year for three staff members for three years. This works out to an average of 37 trips per year for each of 3 staff members in three years. It includes regional training and trips to 22 LEAs. Copying and supplies are included in the budget (numbers 4 and 5 on the project level narrative). Executive officers will not receive	336	\$77	\$25,872

stipends.			
------------------	--	--	--

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Laptop Computers (3), Printer (1), LCD Projectors (3), Remote Controls (3): Three laptop computers, three LCD projectors, and three remote controls will be needed to meet the needs of the three new employees		Laptop Computer	\$5,100
	\$1,700		
	\$1,200	LCD Projector	\$3,600
	\$50	Remote Control	\$150

5) Supplies

Office Supplies \$494 per person per year	\$4,940
Printer lease for Project \$7,000 per year For the printing of necessary materials for project.	\$28,000

6) Contractual

Working collaboratively with MSDE staff, the contractor will develop the content used to provide training for executive officers to be able to:

- Evaluate principals effectively and implement appropriate leadership development plans

Assist principals in effectively evaluating teachers using the Teacher Evaluation Framework.

\$125,000 for Project Year 1. **Amount dedicated for the contract of an outside vendor to design the content. Executive Officers will not receive stipends.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$231,809	\$283,241	\$282,545	\$287,854	\$1,085,449

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$244,688	\$317,631	\$317,581	\$323,548	\$1,203,448

Project #: 41/24 Project Name: Educator Instructional Improvement Academies Associated with Criteria: D5 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	221,022	225,441	229,950	234,549	910,962
2. Fringe Benefits	17,129	17,472	17,821	18,178	70,600
3. Travel	4,620	4,620	4,620	1,540	15,400
4. Equipment	5,100	-	-	-	5,100
5. Supplies	1,482	1,482	1,482	1,482	5,928
6. Contractual	1,312,000	1,312,000	1,312,000	-	3,936,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	2,625,000	2,625,000	2,625,000	-	7,875,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	4,186,443	4,186,015	4,190,873	255,749	12,819,080
10. Indirect Costs*	355,787	356,378	356,980	31,713	1,100,858
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	4,542,140	4,542,393	4,547,853	287,462	13,919,848

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 41/24**Project Title: D5 Educator Instructional Improvement Academies****Criteria: Providing Effective Support for Teachers and Principals**

Ensure that teachers and administrators in every public school in Maryland are supported in the professional development needs for effectively implementing all aspects of Maryland's reform plan. This project supports the work found in Section B3 regarding transition to curriculum and assessments, and section C3, implementation of an Instructional Improvement System in every LEA.

Project Description:

Educator Instructional Improvement Academies will provide high quality professional development for administrators and tenured teachers in teams (one coach or teacher leader in each content area of reading/English language arts, mathematics and STEM) from each of the 1,400 schools to participate in Educator Common Core Academies. Principals will receive similar but differentiated training as appropriate. This three-year investment (five days of training in the summer and two days during the school year for each of three years from 2011-2013) will ensure that the school teams have the skills and materials to support teachers in their schools. Content in these Academies will focus on (1) effective strategies for implementing curriculum based on Common Core, (2) using the new formative, interim, and summative assessments, and (3) using the Instructional Improvement System (IIS) and Online Instructional Toolkit (all described more fully in section (B)(3). LEA Central Office Instructional and Professional Development Staff and representatives from the Maryland State Education Association and the Baltimore Teachers Union also will be invited to participate in these Academies. The total number of participants engaged in this critical professional development will total 5,800 teachers, administrators, and teacher association representatives.

This project requires three project managers to plan and deliver the academies and the follow ups for the three years they will be offered as face to face programs. In the fourth year, project managers will work overseeing the implementation of the on-line resources.

Master teachers will be recruited and contracted to deliver instruction each year in the face to face academies. Teachers not under a 12 month contract will be provided a stipend of \$125 per day (currently, this is the stipend paid to Governor's Academy participants).

Academies will occur in seven regions throughout the state to minimize teacher travel during the summer and follow up sessions. Each Academy will work with coaches in groups of 20 – 35 depending on the region.

Funding:

This project connects to the tools and resources for teachers described in section C (3) regarding the on-line instructional toolkit and the instructional intervention modules. It also connects to section B (2) B (3) regarding formative assessment tools. It also connects with the project in this section regarding the development of virtual academies for educators, since the content and lessons learned from the face to face academies will be used to plan the on-line experiences.

There is no other funding stream identified for this project.

Year by Year Description:

Funding is stable for the first three years of this project as MSDE seeks to build the capacity in every school to implement Maryland's reform plan by training school-based coaches.

In the final year, the academies will use an on-line delivery model. However, the three project managers will teach these academies and oversee implementation.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project. Contractual Staff are based upon State of Maryland Classifications and year to year salary changes are rounded to the nearest dollar.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Education Program specialist to plan, organize, and deliver instruction in Common Core Teacher Academies and follow-ups. These individuals will also assist with work regarding the development of components associated with the Instructional Improvement System	#3@ 100%	\$73,674	\$910,962
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Years 1-3: 20 trips for three specialists for a total of 60 trips at \$77 per trip. Total cost for years 1-3: \$13,860. In year 4, 20 trips at \$77 per trip for a total cost of \$1,540. Travel total for the project: \$15,400. The amount of travel in year four is reduced because the Academies occur in years one through three. Year four focus is on oversight of the implementation of online resources.	80	\$77	\$15,400

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
One computer per specialist (3)	\$1700	Computer	\$5100

5) Supplies

\$494 per year per specialist, $3 \times 494 = \$1,482$ per year = \$5,928 total

6) Contractual

Master teachers will work under contract for the academies at the rate of \$400 per day (This is the current pay structure for master teachers in Maryland's Governors Academies). Each region will require 22 master teachers for a total of 154 master teachers.

Assuming a total of 10 days per year (7 actual teaching academies/follow-ups plus three planning days) @ 400 per day for 154 master teachers = \$616,000 per year for 3 years = **\$1,848,000.**

Academy costs: Location, materials and related costs:

Daily costs: 5800 participants at 7 days each at \$10 per day = \$406,000 each year

Per participant costs: 5800 at \$50 per participant = \$290,000 each year

Total Annual Academy Costs: \$696,000 for 3 years = **\$2,088,000** This estimate is based on three teachers and one administrator from each of the 1400 schools, plus central office instructional and professional development staff, MSDE staff and members of the Baltimore Teachers Union. The participant costs reflect a per day cost for lunch as well as a share of the program location and materials costs. The per day cost is \$10 per person. The program cost is \$50 per person.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Teachers are not under contract for the summer. Using the daily stipend of \$125 per day provided to teachers participating in Maryland's existing Governors Academy as a guide, the cost of stipends will be 4200 teacher participants for 5 days @ \$125 per day = \$2,625,000 per year with a total three year cost of \$7,875,000.

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$4,186,443	\$4,186,015	\$4,190,873	\$255,749	\$12,819,080

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$4,542,230	\$4,542,393	\$4,547,853	\$287,462	\$13,919,938

Project #: 42/17 Project Name: Expand Maryland Principals' Academy to Target Principals of Low Achieving Schools Associated with Criteria: D5 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	62,000	62,000	-	124,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	62,000	62,000	-	124,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	-	62,000	62,000	-	124,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 42/17**Project Title:****Expand Maryland Principals' Academy to Target Principals of Low Achieving Schools****Criteria: (D)(5)(i)**

Provide ongoing researched based professional development with content that will include data-driven decision making, designing instructional strategies for improvement, differentiating instruction, creating school environments focused on teaching and learning, and implementing instruction to meet the specific needs of high needs students for principals of the 200 schools in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Project Description:

In order to be world class, Maryland must have principals who are steeped in research-based best practices that will effectively impact student achievement in low achieving schools. The new principals' academy will be modeled on the existing successful year-long Principals' Academy and will focus on best practices for success in low achieving schools. MSDE will establish a partnership with Johns Hopkins University and/or other Institutes of Higher Education to design, develop, and implement the expansion of the Maryland Principals' Academy to target low achieving schools. By targeting the 200 principals of the lowest achieving schools in the State over a two year span, a critical mass will be created to impact the students in the most need.

Funding:

This project relates to the Building Leadership Capacity in Low Achieving Urban and Rural Districts Project.

Year by Year Description:

Project Year 1: Identify the IHE partner(s)

Project Year 2: Design, develop, and implement the expansion of the Maryland Principals' Academy to target 100 low achieving schools

Project Year 3: Design, develop, and implement the expansion of the Maryland Principals' Academy to target the remaining 100 low achieving schools

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by			

2% annually throughout the grant period.

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Establish a partnership with Johns Hopkins University and/or other Institutes of Higher Education to design, develop, and implement the expansion of the Maryland Principals' Academy to target low achieving schools. **MSDE will establish a partnership with Johns Hopkins University and/or other Institutes of Higher Education to design, develop, and implement the expansion of the Maryland Principals' Academy to target low achieving schools. The first such Academy will take place during the summer of 2011 – year two of the grant period. The cost basis is determined based on the cost of our current Principals' Academy. We will target 200 principals of the lowest achieving schools in the State over a two year span.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$62,000	\$62,000	\$0	\$124,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$62,000	\$62,000	\$0	\$124,000

Project #: 43/21 Project Name: Develop On-Line PD on Educator Instructional Improvement Content Associated with Criteria: D5 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	-	-	1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 43/21**Project Title: D5 Develop On-Line PD on Educator Instructional Improvement Content****Criteria: D5 Providing Effective Support for Teachers and Principals**

This project extends the work of the Educator Instructional Improvement Academies by making them sustainable for the future. This project ensures that the content presented in the face-to-face academies is accessible to teachers across the state for years to come.

Project Description:

Develop an on-line model to deliver teacher academies regarding Common Core Curriculum, Assessments, and effective use of the Instructional Improvement System in future years. A total of 12 courses must be developed: Elementary reading, math, and STEM, middle school reading, math, and STEM, Algebra I and II, English 10 and 11, and 2 high school STEM courses. Development will take place in the most cost effective manner by either buying existing course content and adapting it to Maryland's needs or hiring a consultant to develop courses as part of a procurement contract. Initial projections indicate a development cost of \$250,000 per course for a total of \$3,000,000 over two years. (\$1,500,000 per year)

Funding:

This project connects to the Educator Instructional Improvement Academy project also described in this section. The 12 courses developed as part of this project will be accessible to educators across the state each year, and the content can be updated yearly by existing staff in the Division of Instruction. Once the courses are developed, tuition paid by future course takers will fund ongoing development and expenses.

Year by Year Description:

Academies will be taught face to face for the first three years. Beginning with year 4, academy courses will be offered as an on-line model. Initial projections indicate a development cost of \$250,000 per course for a total of \$3,000,000 over two years. (\$1,500,000 per year).

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable			
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not Applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

Development will take place in the most cost effective manner by either buying existing course content and adapting it to Maryland's needs or hiring a consultant to develop courses as part of a procurement contract. Total costs for the purchase/procurement are projected to be \$1,500,000 per year for a total award of \$3,000,000. The time the vendor devotes to the project is 100% FTE. There is no alternative funding stream for this project. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience.**

This project will be implemented in years three and four as it is coordinated with the Educator Instructional Improvement Academies (project 41). The academies provide face to face instruction in years 1-3. In year four, the online courses will be available.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not Applicable

8) Other

Not Applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000

Project #: 44/41 Project Name: The Breakthrough Center Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	814,827	831,119	847,742	864,697	3,358,385
2. Fringe Benefits	63,149	64,412	65,700	67,014	260,275
3. Travel	43,680	43,680	43,680	43,680	174,720
4. Equipment	18,000	-	-	-	18,000
5. Supplies	5,681	5,681	5,681	5,681	22,724
6. Contractual	91,969	-	-	-	91,969
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,037,306	994,892	962,803	981,072	3,926,073
10. Indirect Costs*	114,990	117,167	119,388	121,653	473,198
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,152,296	1,062,059	1,082,191	1,102,725	4,399,271
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 44/41**Project Title: The Breakthrough Center****Criteria: Section E (2) (ii)****Project Description:
The Breakthrough Center**

In 2008, the State Superintendent of Schools took bold and culture-changing action to address long-standing challenges that limited MSDE's ability to deliver effective and successful support to low-achieving schools. Challenges such as the pervasive lack of 1) coordination in services provided by MSDE offices and external partners; 2) clarity or prioritization around which schools are required to participate in which services; 3) breakthrough vision, standards, and services to address the needs of low-achieving schools; and 4) cohesive dashboard of turnaround services.

To address these challenges — and the urgency for improved performance in persistently low-achieving schools — MSDE launched a major organizational and operational shift with the creation of the Breakthrough Center (the Center). The Center is the leading edge of Maryland's school turnaround work. The Center gives high visibility and high priority to the provision of integrated public and private services to support reform in underperforming districts and schools. It serves as *the* interface among MSDE, LEAs, and identified chronically underperforming schools adopting one of the four intervention models — Turnaround, Restart, Closure, and Transformation — and places strong emphasis on building capacity in these districts and schools so that turnaround is not just achieved, but sustained.

The mission of the Center is to ensure that the right services are delivered to the right districts and schools at the right time to: (1) accelerate school performance; and (2) cultivate people by improving the capacity of individuals through Breakthrough Leading and Teaching. The core work of the Center's operation is instruction. Every effort, every expectation, and every consequence leads to the same result: *improved teaching, improved school leadership, and improved learning*.

The Center establishes personal and customized relationships with district and school leaders and instructional staff. These solid, candid partnerships give way to authentic assessment of need and capacity for change, as well as clarity regarding the expectations and consequences when performance falls short. The outcome, coupled with a mutual drive to turnaround low performance, informs a tight *and focused* path to achievement. The newly achieved coordination at the State level makes it easier for districts and schools to navigate the turnaround process and gain access to supports and services that will make a difference.

The Center is unique for many reasons: its strategic identification and allocation of resources (human, material, fiscal), its integrative approach, its knowledge-management repository, and its cross-district sharing of best practices. In addition, the Center is structured to operate on two tracks: basic and deep support.

Basic support: At its most basic level, the Center supports districts and schools at risk of

moving deeper into improvement status. Often, it is the result of one or two subgroups in these districts and schools failing to meet performance targets. The needs are isolated, but they require focused and immediate intervention. In these cases, the Center currently works with districts and schools to:

- Assess their comprehensive capacity to improve;
- Streamline and differentiate the services and supports consistent with capacity and need;
- Collaborate in the development and execution of structures and strategies to build and sustain their capacity to improve; and
- Spearhead the identification of policies and conditions that will enable them to successfully turnaround their patterns of underperformance.

Deep support: At its most intense level, the Center will work with persistently low-achieving districts and schools — those in the bottom 5 percent plus their feeder schools— to provide the above-mentioned activities as well as the following:

- Negotiate with partner districts on the adoption of one of the four school intervention models and the development of a detailed and sound plan for implementing the model;
- Drive the passage and adoption of policy-changing conditions in cooperation with the partner districts that will grant access to monetary and human supports, teachers specially trained and skilled to work in low-achieving schools, and specially trained and/or highly effective principals;
- Deliver access to real-time data through an integrated State and district data system that will allow teams to make instructional decisions using integrated, comprehensive, and accurate formative and summative performance and behavioral data;
- Provide targeted and intensive principal leadership development and teacher professional development;
- Ensure local curriculum alignment with the Maryland State Curriculum and assessments; and
- Engage students, families, and the community in improvement efforts.

In order to fully leverage the coordinating and brokering capacity of the Breakthrough Center, Maryland is instituting a **Breakthrough Zone**. Schools and districts identified for inclusion in the Breakthrough Zone will have access to policy, monetary, and assistance resources to support the implementation of one of the four intervention models and promote rapid and sustained student achievement.

Maryland has identified five Tier I and eleven Tier II schools that will be part of the Breakthrough Zone, as well as feeder schools. The Center will expand its work to include the Tier I and Tier II schools in Baltimore City and Prince George's County school systems (16 schools identified in the 1003(g) Title I School Improvement Grant; 10 additional schools which are low-achieving feeder schools for the Tier I and Tier II schools) with Race to the Top funding.

Funding:

Funding for the operation of the Breakthrough Center will be provided by the 1003(g) Title I School Improvement Grant (16 schools) and Race to the Top (additional 10 low-achieving feeder schools).

Year by Year Description:

A. Establish LEA/MSDE District Turnaround Teams, develop MOU (partnership agreement) established between LEAs and Breakthrough Center with agreed deliverables based on needs assessment.	Fall 2010 and ongoing	MSDE Title I Office, Breakthrough Center, MSDE/LEA District Support Teams
B. Monitor and assess the implementation of improvement strategies and determine impact at all levels, classroom, school, district, MSDE and partners.	2010-14 and ongoing	Breakthrough Center, MSDE/LEA District Support Teams, MSDE Title I Office
C. Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance (RITA) Teams will conduct school audits for Tier I and II feeder schools. Audits will provide feedback to the school and district with a focus on building the capacity of the district and school to meet needs. Recommendations will be used to modify improvement strategies. The Breakthrough Center and MSDE will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and broker services and set fiscal priorities • Identify funding streams for sustainability of improvement activities • Monitor and refine implementation of intervention model, adjust strategies based on analysis of performance indicators • Continue to use a variety of strategies to monitor progress including the use of RITA audits, school “walk-throughs,” climate surveys, etc. • Provide /facilitate professional development to district leaders, school staff, and parents on building capacity for schools and families. 	Spring 2011 and ongoing	Breakthrough Center, MSDE Title I Office, MSDE RITA team, MSDE/LEA District Support Teams, MSDE Title I Family Involvement Staff, LEA Family Involvement staff, LEA/School staff
D. Schools and Districts will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue implementation of intervention model, adjust strategies based on analysis of performance indicators 	2010-14	LEAs, Schools, Breakthrough Center, MSDE Title I Office

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise and incorporate improvement strategies into district's Master Plan and individual school improvement plans Determine district capacity to sustain improvement efforts and provide support from MSDE as appropriate 		
--	--	--

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Breakthrough Center Administrative Specialist – (1) To be responsible for the overall development and management of a school improvement knowledge management system via the website for The Breakthrough Center, provide technical support for online professional development, produce video segments for the website, and coordinate online e-communities among practitioners in low-performing schools.	1	\$41,250	\$170,017
Professional Development Education Specialist I – (10.5) Working collaboratively with MSDE staff, the 10.5 contractual employees will provide job-embedded teacher professional development in low-performing schools to close the achievement gap among student groups. Professional development will be provided for English/Language Arts and mathematics in elementary and middle schools and the high school assessed courses in Algebra, Biology, American Government, and English.	10.5	\$73,674	\$3,188,367

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.
 Total: \$260,275

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of \$42 per trip for English/Language Arts, mathematics, social studies and science consultants team to visit the 26 schools one a week during the school year. (Using \$42 since most, but not	1040/year	\$42.00	\$174,720

all schools will be in the two LEAs with the lowest performing schools.

26 schools x four visits per month x 10 months per year = 1,040 trips x \$42 (average) = 43,680 per year

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Laptop computers for 12 FTE	\$1,500		\$18,000

5) Supplies

\$494 per year for 11.5 FTE; \$5,681 per year, total: \$22,724

6) Contractual

Funds will be used to contract an external evaluator to conduct a formative assessment of the operations of The Breakthrough Center among the 26 schools. The contract amount is \$91,969 in year one only. Other funding opportunities will be investigated to further fund this evaluation. **The basis used for determining the cost of the contract amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.**

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,037,306	\$944,892	\$962,803	\$981,072	\$3,926,073

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use

of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$1,152,296	\$1,062,059	\$1,082,191	\$1,102,725	\$4,399,271

Project #: 45/67 Project Name: RITA Team Audits Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	202,500	202,500	-	-	405,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	202,500	202,500	-	-	405,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	202,500	202,500	-	-	405,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 45/67**Project Title: Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance Team Audits (RITA)****Criteria: (E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools**

RITA on-site school/district audit teams will analyze all facets of the identified school's programs and operations and the district's support of those schools. RITA audit recommendations will be used by the school, district, and MSDE through the Breakthrough Center to prioritize the critical technical assistance MSDE will provide to drive reform in 20 of the lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II feeder schools ranked in order by performance.

Project Description: In order to provide support to turn around the lowest-achieving schools, MSDE through the Breakthrough Center will conduct a variety of robust, evidence-based needs assessments to determine priorities for district action and state assistance. One essential component of the comprehensive needs assessment process is the Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance (RITA) school/district audits. In January, 2011 and January, 2012, MSDE's Division of Business Support will release "Request for Qualified Providers" bid requests for highly qualified and effective educators to serve as RITA Team Leaders and RITA Team Members to conduct on-site school audits in 20 of the lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II feeder schools (10 schools and 2 districts in year 1 and 10 schools and 2 districts in year 2). RITA audit reports will provide critical feedback to the school and district with a focus on building the capacity of the district and school to meet the identified priority needs. Recommendations will be used to rapidly leverage focused improvement strategies and technical assistance for the school and district.

Funding: After feeder schools are identified, there may be some Title I, Part A; Title I 1003(g); or Title I 1003(a) funding available to support and continue the RITA initiative. If those funds become available, the RTTT funds could be supplemented and RITA audits could be provided annually to provide additional technical assistance.

Year by Year Description:

2010-2011: March, 2011, RITA on-site school audits for 10 of the lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II feeder schools

2011-2012: March, 2012, RITA on-site school audits for 10 additional lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II feeder schools

2012-2013: no funding requested; work will be continued as school and district capacity is enhanced to conduct their own school and district audits

2013-2014: no funding requested; work will be continued as school and district capacity is enhanced to conduct their own school and district audits

The RITA teams are already in existence and are used to support the work of the Title I Office in the lowest performing schools; they are not directly funded by the LEAs. Previous School Improvement Grant (SIG) Teams have been funded by Regular Title I administrative funds and administrative funds from the School Improvement Grants.

During Years 1 and 2, RTTT funds will be used to support on-site visits in 20 of the lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II feeder schools (10 schools and 2 districts in Year 1 and 10 schools and 2 districts in Year 2). MSDE, in partnership with the LEAs, will work to build capacity so that LEAs will be able to increase their role in terms of identifying school needs, analyzing data, and implementing focused improvement strategies in Years 3 and 4. The Breakthrough Center will continue to provide support by conducting robust, evidence-based needs assessments to determine priorities for district action and State assistance. In Years 3 and 4, the Breakthrough Center and Title I staff will transition to a role with more emphasis on technical assistance, providing critical feedback to the school and district and helping to sustain district capacity.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
<u>Not Applicable</u>		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
<u>Not Applicable</u>		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
<u>Not Applicable</u>	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not Applicable

6) Contractual

Copying of RITA materials placed in binders with tabs for 20 school audits

- Year 1 \$5,000.
- Year 2 \$5,000.

(Year 1 and 2) **Subtotal** **\$10,000**

Contract Work (per hour bid includes mileage, meals, lodging, etc)

- Year 1 RITA Team Leaders for 10 school audits
[5 Team Leaders x 150 hours x \$90.00 per hour] = \$67,500.
- Year 1 RITA Team Members for 10 school audits
[20 Team Members x 100 hours x \$65.00 per hour]= \$130,000.
Costs for 5 RITA Teams Subtotal for Year 1 \$197,500.
- Year 2 RITA Team Leaders for 10 school audits
[5 Team Leaders x 150 hours x \$90.00 per hour] = \$67,500.
- Year 2 RITA Team Members for 10 school audits
[20 Team Members x 100 hours x \$65.00 per hour] = \$130,000.
Costs for 5 RITA Teams Subtotal for Year 2 \$197,500.

Costs for 5 RITA Teams Total for Year 1 and 2 **\$395,000**

Costs for copying for Year 1 and Year 2 + **\$ 10,000**
\$405,000

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not Applicable

8) Other

Not Applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$202,500	\$202,500	\$0	\$0	\$405,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not Applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
Not Applicable			\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$202,500	\$202,500	\$0	\$0	\$405,000

Project #: 46/57 Project Name: Extend Student Learning and Improve School Culture, Climate, and Student Support Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	94,299	96,185	98,109	100,071	388,664
2. Fringe Benefits	7,308	7,454	7,603	7,756	30,121
3. Travel	4,966	4,966	4,966	4,966	19,864
4. Equipment	1,500	-	-	-	1,500
5. Supplies	741	741	741	741	2,964
6. Contractual	-	50,000	250,000	200,000	500,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	108,814	159,346	361,419	313,534	943,113
10. Indirect Costs*	13,307	13,559	13,816	14,078	54,760
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	102,500	102,500	102,500	102,500	410,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	224,621	275,405	477,735	430,112	1,407,873
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 46/57**Project Title: Extend Student Learning and Improve School Culture, Climate, and Student Support**

Criteria: (E)(2)(ii) An analysis of suspension data for the schools involved in the project revealed high numbers of out-of-school suspensions for a variety of offenses. Some of these schools have either been on probationary status as at risk for becoming persistently dangerous and have been designated persistently dangerous under the State's Unsafe School Choice Option Policy. When a high rate of misbehavior is occurring and un-checked, academic instruction and learning is compromised.

Project Description: The State has a national reputation for its Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Initiative (PBIS). Since 1999, the MSDE has been in partnership with the Sheppard Pratt Health System and the twenty-four local school systems to implement PBIS with fidelity. The Johns Hopkins University has joined the partnership to conduct research studies on the effectiveness of PBIS in improving school culture. The results of those studies are very promising.

Some of these schools have been trained in PBIS but failed to implement. This project seeks to train these schools and coaches for these schools in PBIS, to monitor the progress in implementation, and to provide ongoing technical assistance to the LEAs and schools in order to build system capacity for PBIS.

Once the foundation system of PBIS is in place, trainings will need to be offered based on needs assessment in such areas as classroom management, cooperative discipline, and de-escalation techniques.

Funding: Additional funding for this project comes from MSDE funds used to support PBIS. Moreover, the LEAs have a history of appropriating funding for the support of PBIS.

Year by Year Description:

Aside from the year 1 purchase of equipment, the cost of this project remains constant over the four year project period.

The contractor in this case is an evaluator to determine the effectiveness of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The first year will entail training the 16 lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II Schools (in two LEAs) in PBIS. The evaluator will be brought in mid-way through the second year and continue in Years 3 and 4. The evaluator will measure the fidelity of implementation of the PBIS initiative, the impact on the school, the impact on students and staff, and the change in the climate of the school. The evaluator will analyze data on student achievement, suspension, and school climate, as well as other relevant data.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Education Program Specialist, Behavioral Interventions, Grade 21	1@ 100%	\$73,674	\$303,654
Administrative Specialist, Grade 12	1@ 50%	\$41,250	\$85,008
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
It is expected that the Education Specialist will spend the majority of time in the LEAs working with schools and the central office staff. The purpose of the travel is to provide firsthand technical assistance in the initiatives to improve school climate, including, but not limited, to implementing PBIS with fidelity, acting as PBIS coach to the schools and training coaches, and assisting school improvement teams with the use of climate survey data to create school improvement plans that have goals, objectives, strategies, and activities driven by data.	191	\$26	\$4,966

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
1 Computer	\$1,500	Computer	\$1,500

5) Supplies

Supplies for office set up and materials for trainings in classroom management and de-escalation techniques. \$741 per year x 4 years=2,964. **This estimate for supplies includes the costs of supplies for contractual staff as well as training materials in classroom management and de-escalation techniques.**

6) Contractual

The hiring of an outside evaluator to evaluate the effectiveness of this project. Beginning in year 2. Total cost: \$500,000. **The costs here are based on paying for the cost of providing PBIS, ongoing coaching, and the attendance at PBIS on-going training in Years 2-4. In Year 1, needs assessments in areas such as classroom management, cooperative discipline, and de-escalation techniques will be conducted in the 16 lowest-performing Tier I and Tier II schools. Services, beginning in Year 2, will be provided based on the needs assessments.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

None

8) Other

None

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$108,814	\$159,346	\$361,419	\$313,534	\$943,113

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

All funding in additional LEA grants are for the 22 Participating LEAs. No funding in the proposal is for grants to the two Involved LEAs.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
teams to attend Summer Institute and follow-up meetings, travel, and substitutes		102,500	22	\$410,000

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$224,621	\$275,405	\$477,735	\$430,112	\$1,407,873

Project #: 47/45 Project Name: Coordinated Student Services Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	114,924	117,222	119,567	121,958	473,671
2. Fringe Benefits	8,907	9,085	9,266	9,452	36,710
3. Travel	936	936	936	936	3,744
4. Equipment	4,000	-	-	-	4,000
5. Supplies	988	-	-	-	988
6. Contractual	-	5,000	5,000	-	10,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	3,000	2,000	2,000	-	7,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	132,755	134,243	136,769	132,346	536,113
10. Indirect Costs*	15,966	16,026	16,339	16,411	64,742
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	113,610	113,610	113,610	113,610	454,440
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	262,331	263,879	266,718	262,367	1,055,295

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 47/45**Project Title: Coordinated Student Services**

Criteria: (E) (2) (ii) In order for issues that relate to and impede instruction, a process needs to be in place to address the needs of the whole child—emotional, physical, psychological, and behavioral. Maryland has mandated a coordinated program of student services that includes health services, counseling, social work, psychological services, and pupil personnel services since the mid-1980s to which all students have access. Experience has taught that schools without a functioning student services teams has no mechanism by which to prevent and intervene in issues such as high absenteeism, chronic misbehavior, drug and alcohol involvement, etc.

Project Description: This project entails the assessment of the existence and level of functioning of student services teams in the Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools and the capacity for the central offices to oversee a coordinated program. A program specialist will be hired to work in conjunction with the local educational agency, to conduct audits of student services teams. The audits are specifically intended to determine the capacity of the teams to manage cases, use effective, evidenced-base interventions, and to monitor student progress in order to witness and evaluate improvement.

The audits will produce a needs assessment. Based on the needs assessment, specialists will implement the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Initiative and provide ongoing professional development in areas such as classroom management, anger management, de-escalation skills, and cooperative discipline.

In years two and three, effective case management systems and evidence-based interventions will be implemented with contracted services.

Training will be provided in years 1 through 3. In year one, a two day retreat will be offered. In years two and three, a one day training in effective case management and evidence-based interventions.

A supplemental grant will be provided to Baltimore City Public Schools to hire two guidance counselors to support elementary, middle and elementary/middle schools.

Funding: The funding request is paired with local school system funding for student services and the State's resources for providing leadership and technical assistance in this area.

Year by Year Description:

The funding remains constant over the four years except in Years two and three where contractual services will be needed to hire national consultants on effective case management and evidence-based interventions.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Educational Program Specialist, Student Services, Grade 21	1 @ 100%	\$73,674	\$303,655
Administrative Specialist, Grade 12	1 @ 100%	\$41,250	\$170,016
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
The Educational Program Specialist will spend the majority of time in the LEAs at the central office or the schools. This is estimated at 36 trips per year.	144	\$26	\$3,744

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Purchase of two computers and printers	\$2,000	Computer and printer	\$4,000

5) Supplies

One time cost of supplies for new offices \$494 per person. Total-\$988

6) Contractual

Contracted services to provide effective case management systems and evidence-based interventions in years two and three. \$5,000 per year Total-\$10,000. Their time will be dedicated 100% to the Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools. **This cost is for a nationally recognized speaker/trainer to train teams on effective case**

management in Year 2 and selecting interventions that are evidence-based in Year 3.

The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

None

8) Other

The first three years will entail a great deal of training.

Year 1: two-day retreat will be held for school teams, central office supervisors and MSDE partners. Materials and space is estimated at \$3,000

Year 2 and 3: one-day training will occur for school teams and central office staff in effective case management and evidence-based interventions. Materials and space is estimated at \$2,000 per year. Total-\$7,000

Each school will send a student services team comprised of an administrator, counselor, psychologist, nurse, and social worker in one jurisdiction and in the other it is the same except instead of a social worker it will be a pupil personnel worker. Central office staff responsible for those disciplines will also attend. 90 individuals will attend these trainings.

The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$132,755	\$134,243	\$132,769	\$132,346	\$536,113

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Hiring of 2 school counselors	A supplemental grant will be provided to Baltimore City Public Schools to hire two guidance counselors to support elementary, middle and elementary/middle schools.	2 x \$56,805	1	\$454,440

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
1	Guidance support at elementary and middle school level	\$113,610 x 4 years	\$454,440

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$262,331	\$263,879	\$266,718	\$262,367	\$1,055,295

Project #: 48/69 Project Name: School Health Services Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	73,674	75,147	76,650	78,183	303,654
2. Fringe Benefits	5,710	5,824	5,940	6,059	23,533
3. Travel	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	10,400
4. Equipment	9,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	16,500
5. Supplies	494	494	494	494	1,976
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	91,478	86,565	88,184	89,836	356,063
10. Indirect Costs*	10,227	10,424	10,625	10,830	42,106
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	35,600	-	-	-	35,600
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	137,305	96,989	98,809	100,666	433,769

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #48/69**Project Title: School Health Services**

Criteria: (E) (2) (ii) A great body of evidence shows that a quality school health services program within a school improves attendance. Thus, allowing students to be present for learning.

Project Description: This project is essential to coordinating the collaboration between the nurses in each of the schools, the central offices health services staff, and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The position requested here is essential in overseeing the implementation of the Children's Health Alert Network (CHAN) which is a program tracking school absenteeism rates on a daily basis. These results assist school staff, central office staff, and state and local health department officials to track outbreaks of illnesses within the given school communities. The position will also provide training for school and central office personnel in the CHAN and provide daily, ongoing technical assistance in its use and how to use the data to make appropriate health decisions. Moreover, this position will work with school personnel in the use of CHAN data to improve school attendance. **This individual will work with the schools in using the data received from the Children's Health Alert Network and collaborating with the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene on the implications of the data for local communities. The person will be housed at the MSDE Headquarters building but will spend most of his/her time in the schools (16 lowest-performing Tier I and Tier II schools), the central offices, and collaborating with the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.**

Funding: This project will be also funded through the monies appropriated to provide school health services in the school systems.

Year by Year Description: The costs remain virtually the same across all years of the project, except in the first year where there are start up costs in the way of equipment for the schools.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
One full time equivalent of a Education Program Specialist, Health Services, Grade 21	1.0 @ 73,674	\$73,674	\$303,654
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
This position will work daily in the schools and school systems.	100	\$26	\$ 10,400

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Purchase of a computer for new employee	\$1,500	Computer	\$1,500
Purchase of a CHAN Server	\$5,000	Server	\$5,000
Software Development	\$2,500	Software	\$2,500

5) Supplies

One time cost of outfitting new employee's office with office supplies Total-\$494

6) Contractual

Not applicable

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

None

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$91,478	\$86,565	\$88,184	\$89,836	\$356,063

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The position requested, staff from the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and MSDE health services staff will provide this training.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
One computer for each of the 16 Tier I and Tier II Schools (\$1,500)	Implement the Children's Health Alert Network (CHAN)	\$1,500	16 sites	\$24,000
One data line for each of the 16 Tier I and Tier II Schools (\$1,500)	Implement the Children's Health Alert Network (CHAN)	\$600	16 sites	\$9,600
Training on use of the system	Implement the Children's Health Alert Network (CHAN)			\$2,000

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$137,305	\$96,989	\$98,809	\$100,666	\$433,769

Project #: 49/63 Project Name: Physical Activity Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	57,462	58,612	59,784	60,980	236,838
2. Fringe Benefits	4,453	4,542	4,633	4,726	18,354
3. Travel	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	5,200
4. Equipment	1,500	-	-	-	1,500
5. Supplies	494	494	494	494	1,976
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	65,209	64,948	66,211	67,500	263,868
10. Indirect Costs*	7,900	8,054	8,210	8,370	32,534
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	41,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	65,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	114,109	81,002	82,421	83,870	361,402
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 49/63**Project Title: Physical Activity**

Criteria: (E) (2)(ii) A growing body of research suggests a correlation between physical activity and student attention span as well as academic achievement. The goal of this project is to increase student activity, improve classroom atmosphere, and develop life-long positive habits concerning exercise.

Project Description: This project entails working with school and central office personnel to assess the quality and level of implementation of school wellness plans. Moreover, classroom teachers will be trained in the usage of the computer program entitled 'Fitness Gram.' Materials to use in the conducting of physical activities will be purchased on a yearly basis. The project requests funding for half-time equivalents of a Education Program Specialist I, Grade 21 and Administrative Specialist, Grade 12 to aid the school system central office personnel to assess the level of wellness and the wellness plans at the school sites, train school personnel in methods of incorporating physical activity into the normal daily routine of the classroom and school in a seamless fashion that supports high quality instruction. This project spans all four years. **These personnel will spend the majority of the time working with school staff in the 16 lowest-performing Tier I and Tier II schools incorporating physical activity in the daily school day.**

Funding: This funding will be supported by existing funding that the school systems have for physical fitness, nutrition, and obesity prevention.

Year by Year Description: Year 1 funding requires the hiring of personnel, the purchase of equipment and materials to support those individuals. Also, included is the purchase of the hardware and software for Fitness Gram/Fitness Activity Computer Software.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Education Program Specialist, Grade 21	.5 @ 73,674	\$36,837	\$151,827
Administrative Specialist, Grade 12	.5 @ 41,250	\$20,625	\$85,008
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
The Education Program Specialist will work directly with the central office supervisor of physical education and the staff in the school. The travel is based on the employees spending most of their time outside of MSDE and among the 16 lowest-achieving Tier I and Tier II schools in two LEAs.	50	\$26	\$5,200

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Purchase of one computer	\$1,500	Computer	\$1,500

5) Supplies

The purchase of office supplies to outfit the offices to be used by the two personnel over four years. \$494 per year x four years = \$1,976.

6) Contractual

Not applicable
In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$65,209	\$64,948	\$66,211	\$67,500	\$263,868

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The funds will go to materials for the 16 lowest-achieving schools in two LEAs. Year 2-4 are replacement manipulatives to replace used ones. This is for students to chart their daily physical activity successes and needs for improvement.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Purchase of software, computers, and materials for each site.	Ready for incorporating physical activity in the daily school routine.	Year 1-\$20,500 Year 2-\$4,000 Year 3-\$4,000 Year 4-\$4,000	2	\$65,000

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$114,109	\$81,002	\$82,421	\$83,870	\$361,402

Project #: 50/58 Project Name: Extended Learning Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	126,863	129,400	131,988	134,628	522,879
2. Fringe Benefits	9,832	10,029	10,229	10,434	40,524
3. Travel	728	728	728	728	2,912
4. Equipment	3,000	-	-	-	3,000
5. Supplies	247	247	247	247	988
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	140,670	140,404	143,192	146,037	570,303
10. Indirect Costs*	17,071	17,410	17,756	18,109	70,346
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	157,741	157,814	160,948	164,146	640,649

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: #50/58

Project Title: Extended Learning
Criteria: (E)(2)(ii)
<p>Project Description: Where dictated by needs assessments, Maryland will require LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools and their feeder pattern/cluster schools to apply for 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) awards to fund after-school and summer programs. If the LEA and school are not awarded a 21st CCLC grant due to a lack of available funding, they will implement these programs using RTTT funds based on priority need.</p> <p>An Extended Learning Coordinator /Education Program Specialist will be hired to plan and coordinate, in conjunction with the Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools and the local school system, successful grant applications and the implementation of the 21st CCLC programs in these schools. A Site Coordinator/Education Staff Specialist will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the program.</p> <p>Funding: RTTT funds would be used to fund 21st Century Community Learning Center programs for eligible Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools that may not otherwise be served due to a lack of available 21st Century Community Learning Center program grant funds.</p> <p>Year by Year Description: Race to the Top grant funds will be used to implement 21st CCLC programs in Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools in each of the four years of the grant. These funds will be required in the event 21st CCLC grant funds are not available.</p>

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
An Extended Learning Coordinator /Education Program Specialist will be hired to plan and coordinate, in conjunction with the Tier I and Tier II Breakthrough Zone schools and the local school system, successful grant applications and the implementation of the 21 st CCLC programs in these schools.	1 @ 1.0	\$73,674	\$303,654
A Site Coordinator/Education Staff Specialist will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the program.	1 @ 1.0	\$53,189	\$219,224
The State Director of the Youth Development Branch will also be providing oversight and support to the project. This Office is		\$0	\$0

responsible for providing leadership to the development of youth development programs in schools in Maryland. Her salary is funded partially by the State of Maryland and partially by federal funds.			
---	--	--	--

All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.
--

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
In order to fully implement all of the strategies in this grant proposal, the Extended Learning Administrator and Coordinator will be required to attend bi-monthly networking meetings held within the State of Maryland to network with other extended learning specialists and participate in professional development.	Approximately 28 trips @ \$26 for four years.	\$26	\$2,912

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
The Extended Learning Coordinator and Site Coordinator will each need a computer to effectively perform required activities. The cost of computers is based on the MSDE current procurement contract.	2 @ \$1,500 ea = \$3,000	Computer	\$3,000

5) Supplies

Office supplies calculations are based on current MSDE cost estimates. These funds will support the expenses involved in the management of the project including office supplies, mailing supplies, copying supplies and other materials that will be used to support the delivery of technical assistance. \$247 per year for four years = \$988

6) Contractual

Not applicable.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$140,670	\$140,404	\$143,192	\$146,037	\$570,303

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$157,741	\$157,814	\$160,948	\$164,146	\$640,649

Project #: 51/71 Project Name: STEM Project Lead The Way Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	240,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	330,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	240,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	330,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 50/71**Project Title: STEM Project Lead The Way – Gateway To Technology**

Criteria: (E) (2) (ii) Maryland has identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools, ten of which are middle schools. Grants will be provided to the local school systems to implement STEM curriculum provided by Project Lead The Way using the Gateway To Technology (GTT) modules as one of many intervention models used to transform the school and increase student achievement in mathematics and science. The GTT modules are designed to actively engage students in rigorous problem solving through project-based learning.

Project Description:

RTTT funds will support the implementation of Project Lead The Way's Gateway to Technology (GTT) integrated math, science, and technology modules in 10 low-achieving middle schools and provide professional development to teachers in cooperation with the national Project Lead The Way and the University of Maryland at Baltimore County (UMBC). Funds will be used to purchase the necessary materials and supplies as indicated in the PLTW purchasing manual for GTT as well as pay registration fees to UMBC for teachers to attend the two-week professional development offered at UMBC.

The Project Lead The Way (PLTW) middle school program, Gateway To Technology (GTT), is an activities-oriented program designed to help students in grades six through eight see the connections among math, science, and technology through hands-on projects. It gives students the foundational knowledge and skills needed to be successful in the high school PLTW Engineering program. GTT is comprised of six independent units: Design and Modeling, Automation and Robotics, the Magic of Electrons, the Science of Technology, Flight and Space, and Energy and the Environment, which is currently under development.

Funding: Currently, 40 Maryland middle schools in 11 local school systems are or soon will be implementing the GTT modules. A variety of funding sources have been used to initiate GTT including State STEM dollars as well as Federal Perkins dollars. Perkins dollars have been used to support GTT in schools that feed to high schools with the Project Lead The Way Engineering Career and Technology Education Program of Study.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1: The first year of the project, 10 low performing middle schools will receive grants of up to \$21,000 to implement the Project Lead The Way (PLTW) middle school modules called Gateway To Technology (GTT). An additional \$3,000 will be available for teachers to attend the Summer Training Institute provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Maryland's PLTW Affiliate. By the end of year one, 10 middle schools will be ready to implement the GTT modules. Baseline data will be tracked to determine whether students show an increase in their scores on Maryland's Student Assessments and other available data.

Year 2: During the second year, grants of up to \$3,000 will be available to each of the 10 low performing schools for ongoing professional development and to acquire additional resources (equipment and supplies) for continued implementation of the modules. Compare and analyze data to determine adjustments needed to improve instruction and student performance.

Year 3: During the third year, grants of up to \$3,000 will be available to each of the 10 low performing schools for ongoing professional development and to acquire additional resources (equipment and supplies) for continued implementation of the modules. Compare and analyze data to determine adjustments needed to improve instruction and student performance.

Year 4: During the fourth year, grants of up to \$3,000 will be available to each of the 10 low performing schools for ongoing professional development and to acquire additional resources (equipment and supplies) for continued implementation of the modules. Compare and analyze data to determine adjustments needed to improve instruction and student performance.

Details by Category:**1) Personnel**

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.
N/A

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Not applicable

6) Contractual

Not applicable

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Not applicable

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Support 10 low-achieving middle schools to implement Project Lead The Way's Gateway To Technology	Provide students with experiences and applications improving their STEM knowledge and skills.	\$21,000/yr. x 1 st year x 10 sites = \$210,000 \$3,000/yr. x 4 years x 10 sites = \$120,000	10	\$330,000

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$240,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$330,000

Project #: 52/77 Project Name: Primary Talent Development Associated with Criteria: E2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	5,600
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	18,000
8. Other	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	13,200
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	9,200	9,200	9,200	9,200	36,800
10. Indirect Costs*	1,141	1,141	1,141	1,141	4,564
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	10,341	10,341	10,341	10,341	41,364

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 52/77**Project Title: Primary Talent Development**

Criteria: (E) (2)(ii) The **Primary Talent Development** initiative will train teachers to identify potential in students attending the 20 low-performing elementary schools that feed into the identified lowest performing schools in Baltimore City and Prince Georges County.

Project Description:

PTD is a science-based expert thinking curriculum based on gifted education and early childhood education theory and practice. The PTD methodology provides data about student achievement that may not be directly assessed by state proficiency tests but actually may be a more reliable predictor of what students can achieve in the real world. By the completion of Grade 2, each student has a cumulative PTD Behavioral Scale documented by portfolio artifacts that can be used to make referrals for gifted and talented student identification.

The two PTD modules in each grade focus on four of the seven learning behaviors. Each time one of the seven behaviors is introduced, the module includes a PTD behavior *Focus Lesson* to define and model the learning behavior. Students learn that these behaviors are valued in the learning community and are important tools for academic success and lifelong achievement. Each module consists of six to eight sequenced lessons and a summative product-based *bridging experience*.

Three *Essential Strategies* are scaffold across the modules to provide challenge and increase the intensity, frequency, and/or complexity of students' responses. The strategies include *analyzing attributes*, *questioning*, and *creative problem solving*.

Goals of the Primary Talent Development Early Learning Program

- Provide opportunities for *all* children to develop and demonstrate advanced learning behaviors, including children from groups underrepresented in advanced programs.
- Build a profile of student strengths over time, prekindergarten – second grade, which can be used to document the need for differentiated instruction and gifted and talented education.
- Provide models of the Essential Strategies of analyzing attributes, questioning, and creative problem solving scaffold across the early learning years which are transferrable to new learning situations.

Along with implementing the PTD modules and collecting data on students' behavioral responses, teachers begin to use the strategies modeled in the lessons to provide continued challenge. Teachers are encouraged to capture the learning behaviors as they are revealed using checklists embedded in lessons, sticky notes, or audio/video tape recordings as documentation for students' portfolios

The MSDE Breakthrough Center, Title I, and the Office of Gifted and Talented Programs will oversee the program. Principals of the 20 identified feeder schools to the low achieving

schools will select kindergarten, first grade, and second grade teachers who will attend the training and comprise their schools' early talent development teams.

Funding: There is no other funding available for this project at this time.

Year by Year Description:

Year 1: One pre-kindergarten teacher from each of the 20 feeder elementary schools will be identified for training in the use of the Primary Talent Development materials and will work with all students at that grade level in their assigned school. These teachers will receive 9 hours of training, all materials and an on-line professional development course in early talent development.

Year 2: One kindergarten teacher from each of the 20 feeder elementary schools will be identified for training in the use of the Primary Talent Development materials and will work with all students at that grade level in their assigned school. These teachers will receive 9 hours of training, all materials and an on-line professional development course in early talent development.

Year 3: One first grade teacher from each of the 20 feeder elementary schools will be identified for training in the use of the Primary Talent Development materials and will work with all students at that grade level in their assigned school. These teachers will receive 9 hours of training, all materials and an on-line professional development course in early talent development.

Year 4: One second grade teacher from each of the 20 feeder elementary schools will be identified for training in the use of the Primary Talent Development materials and will work with all students at that grade level in their assigned school. These teachers will receive 9 hours of training, all materials and an on-line professional development course in early talent development.

All trained teachers will form the early talent development team for each of the schools.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not applicable		\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout

the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Not Applicable		\$	\$

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Not Applicable	\$		\$

5) Supplies

Primary Talent Development Guide and CD - \$40 per teacher
 Print resources - \$30 per teacher
 20 teachers per year @ \$70 = \$1,400 x 4 years = \$5,600

6) Contractual

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

\$25 per hour for nine hours = \$225 per teacher
 20 teachers per year = \$ 4,500 x 4 years = \$18,000

8) Other

MSDE Early Talent Development on-line continuing professional development course
 \$165 per teacher
 20 teachers @ \$165 = \$ 3300 x4 years = \$13,200

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$9,200	\$9,200	\$9,200	\$9,200	\$36,800

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Not applicable				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
Not Applicable		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$10,341	\$10,341	\$10,341	\$10,341	\$41,364

Project #: 53/44 Project Name: Charter Schools Associated with Criteria: F2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	73,674	75,147	76,650	78,183	303,654
2. Fringe Benefits	5,710	5,824	5,940	6,059	23,533
3. Travel	616	616	616	616	2,464
4. Equipment	1,500	-	-	-	1,500
5. Supplies	494	494	494	494	1,976
6. Contractual	150,000	75,000	37,500	37,500	300,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	400,000	400,000	400,000	1,200,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	231,994	557,081	521,200	522,852	1,833,127
10. Indirect Costs*	9,981	59,778	59,979	60,184	189,922
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	300,000	350,000	350,000	300,000	1,300,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	541,975	966,859	931,179	883,036	3,323,049
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 53/44**Project Title: Charter Schools****Criteria: (F)(2)****Project Description:**

Charter schools are an integral part of Maryland's public education landscape. The State's charter schools have often served at the forefront of innovation and have represented much-needed choices for families who previously had few or no options for their children. As the charter movement grows in Maryland, the State will focus its efforts on ensuring not only the quantity of its charter schools but also their quality. Maryland will use Race to the Top (RTTT) funds to help advance the crucial goals of 1) making sure that only high-quality charter schools exist and thrive across the state, 2) creating incentives for charter schools to be used as a school turnaround strategy, and 3) improving the transparency and consistency of the charter school approval process.

Race to the Top funds give the state additional opportunities to ensure that charter schools are true partners in Maryland's education reform strategy. This is particularly relevant when it comes to the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools. Charter schools have a role in the turnaround strategy both as one of the options allowed in the RTTT guidelines and as a way to enable LEAs to develop portfolios of schools with innovative approaches.

Funding: Two charter schools in two different LEAs will be selected to pilot the self assessment process using the developed Quality Standards. One of the schools will be a K- 8 school and the second one will be a high school. Each school will receive \$50,000 as an incentive to pilot the assessment.

Year by Year Description:
Specific Activities:

Using the RTTT funds, Maryland proposes to implement the following strategies and tactics upon receipt of RTTT funds and continuing for the four-year grant:

- Maryland will design Maryland's Charter School Quality Standards and implement related learning experiences that will be shared with all charter schools and authorizers. These standards will serve as the framework for charter schools to conduct self-assessments (similar to the public school accreditation process) every three years to help guide the schools' improvement and strategic development efforts. Maryland will work with the charter school community and LEA authorizers to develop these standards as the backbone of charter school development, application, and renewal processes.
- Maryland will share these standards, learning experiences, and self-assessments with LEAs, with the goal of serving as a vehicle for learning and possible replication.

- One charter school in two different LEAs will be selected to pilot the self assessment process using the developed Quality Standards. One school will pilot in year 2 and the other will pilot in year 3. One of the schools will be a K- 8 school and the second one will be a high school.
- The State will partner with two school systems that have the greatest number low-performing schools and provide an incentive for these systems to convert two of their schools in restructuring to charter schools. The school systems will be able to secure charter school operators with proven success to re-open the schools as public charter schools by 2012-2013 after thoughtful planning with the operator, the LEA, the Breakthrough Center (described in Section (E)(2)), and the school community.
- The State will identify four high performing charter schools to initiate a partnership with the four schools in restructuring selected by the two LEAs. The partnership will provide mentoring and coaching on implement of successful practices.
- Maryland will strengthen the charter school authorizing processes by adopting a State Board Policy that will provide clear guidance on the mission of charter schools in Maryland and will serve to improve upon the charter school application process.
- Maryland will coordinate this effort through the Office of School Innovation as well as the Breakthrough Center (described in Section E) as part of the state's strategy to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
<p>The following requested personnel will be hired as a full time employee to support the management of the project:</p> <p><u>Education Program Specialist (1):</u></p> <p>The Specialist will be responsible for the planning, coordination and management of the project and related contractual services.</p>	1 @ 1.0	\$73,674	\$303,654
<p>The State Director of the Office of School Innovations will also be providing oversight and support to the project. This Office is responsible for providing leadership to the development of charter schools in Maryland. Her salary is funded by the State of Maryland.</p>	n/a	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual

personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
In order to fully implement all of the strategies in this grant proposal, the Project Director and Education Specialist will travel extensively across the State of Maryland to coordinate project activities, provide technical assistance and conduct onsite program evaluation activities.	Approx. 8 trips/year = 32	\$77	\$2,464

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
The Education Specialist will need a computer to effectively perform required activities. The cost of computers is to be based on the MSDE current procurement contract.	\$1,500	Computer	\$1,500

5) Supplies

Office supplies calculations are based on current MSDE cost estimates. These funds will support the expenses involved in the management of the project including office supplies, mailing supplies, copying supplies and other materials that will be used to support the delivery of technical assistance. \$494 per person for four years = \$1,976

6) Contractual

Contracted services are required for the development, dissemination and implementation of charter school quality standards. Specifically, the contract work will include:

- Coordinate and support the committee work of stakeholders' charged with the development of charter school quality standards,
- Develop training manuals,
- Develop self assessment processes and related tools.
- Align all current processes and resources to the new quality standards including charter school policies, manuals, charter school application processes and the model

performance contract.

The majority of this work is planned in years one and two.

Year 1: \$150,000

Year 2: \$75,000

Year 3: \$37,500

Year 4: \$37,500

Total: \$300,000

The basis used for determining the cost of the contract / equipment amount was from the program manager's past experience with similar contracts / purchases.

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

Not applicable

8) Other

Four high performing charter schools will be selected to form a three year partnership with the four low-performing public schools as they transition from low performing public schools in restructuring and reopen as charter schools. The partnership will provide coaching and mentoring on the implementation of successful practices. Each of the four high performing charter schools will receive a grant of \$250,000 over the three-year partnership. In addition, the four schools will receive an allocation of \$200,000 over the course of the partnership to be used as a resource to support partnership activities and to support the study, publication and dissemination of partnership successes. **The selection will be made based upon an examination and analysis of performance outcomes for the last three years as well as the results of interviews and site visits that will be conducted. A team from the Offices of School Innovations, School Improvement and the Breakthrough Center will collaboratively select participants.**

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$231,994	\$557,081	\$521,200	\$522,852	\$1,833,127

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually

assessable).

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The State will partner with the two school systems that have the greatest number low-performing schools (both are participating LEAs). The school systems will be selected through our accountability system, which examines performance results to determine the number of schools that have not met adequate yearly progress repeatedly. As stated above, there will be several Department offices involved in this project: The Offices of School Innovations, School Improvement, and the Breakthrough Center.

There are two initiatives proposed for this section:

The first initiative Proposes to implement a pilot of a self assessment process aligned to the new charter school quality standards. Two charter schools will be selected from two different LEAs and provided with a sub-grant in the amount of \$50,000 each. The participating charter schools will submit a budget in the amount of the sub-grant.

The second initiative will also provide sub-grants to two participating school systems annually in the amount of \$150,000 each to support school improvement activities. An annual plan supported by the budget for the sub-grant will be required.

The proposed budget supports a total amount of funds for each sub-grant. The plans and budgets submitted by each participant will include a total budget to be awarded annually or in phases. Initiative one is a onetime sub-grant for a year. The second initiative spreads the sub-grant allocation over four years which will constitute a different phase for each year of the sub-grant. Sub-grantees will be required to submit budget amendments for approval of any changes that may be proposed during the four year period.

Due to the fact that the funds requested will be awarded to participants via sub-grants, we do not believe that funds will remain unexpended.

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
One charter school in two different LEAs will be selected to pilot the self assessment process using the developed Quality Standards. One school will	Pilot the self assessment process	\$50,000	2	\$100,000

pilot in year 2 and the other will pilot in year 3. One of the schools will be a K- 8 school and the second one will be a high school. Each school will receive \$50,000 as an incentive to pilot the assessment.				
---	--	--	--	--

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
2	<p>A partnership initiative between the Maryland State Department of Education and two of the States lowest performing school systems will encourage the use of charter schools as a viable option for schools in restructuring. Each of the two school systems will each identify two schools in restructuring that will reopen as charter schools. Participating school systems will receive an incentive grant of \$600,000 to support activities related to the closing and conversion of these two schools in restructuring to charter schools</p> <p>The four schools in restructuring will reopen as charter schools and will participate in a three year partnership with a high performing charter schools to replicate successful charter school practices that will increase student achievement. These schools will also qualify for the Charter School Program Grant and the incentive award offered to schools in restructuring that convert into charter schools.</p>	300,000/year x 4 years	\$1,200,000

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$541,975	\$966,859	\$931,179	\$880,036	\$3,323,049

Project #: 54/79 Project Name: Implement Statewide Centralized Student Transcript System Associated with Criteria: Invitational Priority 4 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	468,000	669,000	-	-	1,137,000
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	468,000	669,000	-	-	1,137,000
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	468,000	669,000	-	-	1,137,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: # 54/79

Project Title: Implement Statewide, Centralized Student Transcript System

Criteria:

- **Priority 4 Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems**

Project Description:

Solution Overview: This is a 2 year project to implement a statewide, centralized transcript system capable of supporting national standards that will provide Maryland's schools with the ability to efficiently produce, maintain, and transmit student transcripts.

Type of Project: Implementation of the NTC transcript service that integrates with states MLDS system and existing limited within-state transcript system.

Benefits:

- Use of IES/SCED standardized courses and grades to promote national standardization
- Using a standard data translation engine allowing schools to exchange academic records/transcripts with institutions that use other course and grade data standards
- Savings of several million dollars a year in time and money by reducing mail and labor costs for producing over 500,000 transcripts a year for Maryland students applying to higher education institutions
- Ability to send electronic K12 transcripts to colleges rapidly improving services to students applying for admission to higher education institutions
- Transcript history and maintenance for students

Participants: Maryland State Department of Education and LEAs

Funding: This funding request is new and is not funded by any other source. The funding for this project will support the educational improvement and testing reforms presented in this Race to the Top grant.

Year by Year Description:

Overview: This is a 2 year development and upgrade project for the EIS system. Year 1 is focused on project planning, procurement of resources and beginning of development. Year 2 is full year of development, testing, and rollout of the system to the LEAs.

Year 1: Project Planning, Procurement, Requirements, Initiate Development

1. Project planning and management

2. Meet and coordinate with LEAs to plan implementation of centralized system
3. Define transcripts layout standards and processes
4. Define implementation plan to implement the NTC system
5. Define integration of current Maryland electronic system into NTC system

Year 2: Development, Testing, and Implementation

1. Update all student and grade data in the MLDS from LEAs
2. Convert each LEA and MLDS data to NTC transcript system
3. Pilot system
4. Develop online school counselor training and system documentation
5. Train all HS counselors in state via webinar and online training system
6. Go Live
7. Web-surveys to evaluate success of implementation and satisfaction with system

Year 3: NA

Year 4: NA

Details by Category:

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Not Applicable	# @ ??%	\$	\$
All personnel are contractual, not permanent State staff. Personnel costs are estimated to rise by 2% annually throughout the grant period.			

2) Fringe Benefits

All requested positions to be funded through Race to the Top grant will be contractual personnel. The State fringe benefit package does not apply. The percentage used throughout the application, 7.75%, represents the costs of Social Security and Workers' Compensation.

3) Travel

Travel:	# of Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
NOT APPLICABLE			

4) Equipment

Equipment: means any equipment item or furnishing having a probable useful life in excess of one

year and a procurement cost of \$100 or more per unit, such as, furniture, machinery, instruments and other apparatus. It also includes sensitive items having a procurement cost of \$50 or more and a useful life of one year or more.

Equipment Item	Cost of Item	Item Description	Totals
NOT APPLICABLE			

5) Supplies

NOT APPLICABLE

6) Contractual

This is a fixed price contract for software process services and for data conversion implementation services. Conversion Cost is to convert LEA and MLDS data to the NTSC system. Total cost: \$1,110,000. **The Department contracted with a project manager with experience in implementation of IT projects and longitudinal data systems in other states as well as experience with Maryland's longitudinal data system. The estimated hours for completion of the project, estimated cost per hour, and estimated cost of necessary equipment are projected based upon this experience.**

In all applicable procurements the State has and will abide by 34 CFR Parts 74.4 – 74.48 and Part 80.36

7) Training Stipends

NOT APPLICABLE

8) Other

NOT APPLICABLE

9) Total Direct Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$468,000	\$669,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,137,000

10) Indirect Costs

Maryland's approved Indirect Cost agreement negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education allows application of a rate of **12.4%** on restricted funds. To allow the maximum use of grant funding toward program operations, and minimize indirect costs, **Maryland is opting not to apply the rate against sub-grants, equipment, or contracts (contract costs are usually assessable).**

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Not applicable.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
NOT APPLICABLE				\$

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
		\$/year x # years	\$

13) Total Costs

Project Year 1	Project Yr. 2	Project Yr 3	Project Yr 4	Total
\$468,000	\$669,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,137,000