

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

Annual Performance Report

CFDA # 84.235E

PR/Award # H235E140009

Budget Period # 1

Report Type: Annual Performance

PR/Award # H235E140009

Table of Contents

Sl#	Title	Page#
1.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Cover Sheet - Revised 2008 -----	3
2.	Executive_Summary_H235E140009.pdf -----	4
3.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1 -----	6
4.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2 -----	7
5.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3 -----	8
6.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4 -----	9
7.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 5 -----	10
8.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 6 -----	11
9.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 7 -----	12
10.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 8 -----	13
11.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 9 -----	14
12.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 10 -----	15
13.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 11 -----	16
14.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 12 -----	17
15.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C -----	18
16.	Additional_Information_H235E140009.pdf -----	19
17.	Budget_Narrative_H235E140009.pdf -----	21

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

**Check only one box per
Program Office instructions.**

**Annual
Performance
Report** **Final
Performance
Report**

General Information

1. PR/Award #: H235E140009

(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 Characters.)

2. Grantee NCES ID#: 3904693

(See instructions. Up to 12 Characters.)

3. Project Title: Braille Excellence for Students and Teachers (BEST)

(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)

4. Grantee Name: FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.)

5. Grantee Address:

(See instructions.)

Street: 2080 CITYGATE DR

City: COLUMBUS

State: OH Zip: 43219 Zip+4: 3591

6. Project Director:

(See instructions.)

First Name: Paula

Last Name: Mauro

Title: Project Director

Phone #: 6146448465

Fax #: 6146448254

Email Address: pmauro@cisamoh.org

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/01/2014 To: 03/31/2015

*(mm/dd/yyyy)***Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)**

8. Budget Expenditures:

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	0	0
b. Current Budget Period	21,557	0
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>		

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?

 Yes No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?

 Yes No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement:
(mm/dd/yyyy)

From: 07/01/2014 To: 06/30/2015

Approving Federal agency:

 ED Other *(Please specify):* Ohio Department of EducationType of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only):* Provisional Final Other *(Please specify):*

d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that :

 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?**Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)**10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? Yes No N/A**Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)**

11. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes Nob. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? *(mm/dd/yyyy)*

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative: Chris Downey

Title: Grants Manager

Signature:

Date:

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:

Title : Executive Summary

File : [Executive_Summary_H235E140009.pdf](#)



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): H235E140009

(See Instructions)

The Braille Excellence for Students and Teachers (BEST) Grant annual report provides information indicating the extent to which the BEST project met its goals during Project Year 1. The Project focused on three goals:

- Goal 1: Increase the braille competency of Ohio's educators through the provision of high-quality professional development and technical assistance that focuses on results-driven outcomes.
- Goal 2: Increase the knowledge and use/implementation of braille and state-of-the-art technologies of Ohio educators through high quality professional development/learning opportunities and technical assistance that focus on results-driven outcomes.
- Goal 3: Increase the competency of personnel providing quality braille materials for Ohio students who require braille through the provision of high-quality professional development training and technical assistance support.

BEST collects data on each grant activity keyed to a project objective, and then WordFarmers, the grant external evaluator, compiles, analyzes, and interprets the data to determine the effectiveness of the activity and suggests options for improvement for the current project year, or for Year 2 activities. Goal 1 was achieved through the accomplishment of objectives that targeted professional development (PD), technical assistance (TA), and support to educators. The evaluation demonstrated that BEST equaled or exceeded all goal expectations, including those relating to the quality, relevance, and usefulness of PD and TA services. Two objectives defined the work of Goal 2. The evaluator found evidence of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of BEST's work to accomplish these objectives. To accomplish Goal 3, the BEST project addressed three objectives. Similarly, WordFarmers found evidence that BEST accomplished Goal 3. WordFarmers will complete annual reports and a final evaluation at the end of the project summarizing data collected during the applicable reporting period, and BEST will post the report on the [BEST website](#).

The BEST Co-Directors met with WordFarmers and developed a comprehensive evaluation plan for the grant. The Directors developed a table of *BEST Grant Activities 2014-2015 - Project Activities, Timelines, and Agency Responsibility 2014-2015 (Year 1)*. The collaborative partners use this document to organize/report on their work throughout the project year.

The BEST Co-Directors set up [BEST Leadership](#) meetings at the beginning of the grant. The purpose of these meeting was for the collaborative partners to meet throughout the project year to discuss progress towards attaining goals of the grant and delineate agency responsibilities. The partners met in November and February and will continue to meet quarterly.

In addition, BEST held its first [Advisory Board](#) meeting in November 2014 and will hold a second Advisory Board Meeting the end of April 2015.

BEST staff produced a new BEST brochure, vetted the brochure with stakeholders through an on-line survey, printed the new brochure, and posted on the [BEST website](#). Other information about the BEST Grant is available on the [BEST website](#).

Educators can access information about the BEST Grant inservices through our three listservs and now we are also on Facebook and Twitter. We are focusing on developing a Community of Practice centered on braille literacy. Educators can attend our braille courses; follow-up with a blended braille course; learn about the new Unified English Braille (UEB) code at our regional trainings; take a self-paced UEB class listed on our website; read about current posts on our listservs; post information on our listservs; and follow us on Facebook and Twitter.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1.1 Provide professional development to educators.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of PD activities to which educators were invited.	PROJECT	6	/		6	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

During the six months of the reporting period, BEST delivered a total of 6 training sessions at which educators were in attendance. Several of the sessions included both educators and other personnel (as well as some parents). Information about some of these sessions will also be reported in relationship to other objectives. The sessions provided training on BrailleNote, ABBYY, Duxbury (at two levels), Assistive Technologies, and UEB. The project evaluator, in consultation with project staff, developed feedback forms for participants to use in rating the sessions. The feedback forms focused on the three GPRA measure of quality, relevance, and usefulness as well as on increases in participants' learning. In addition, several open-ended questions enabled participants to provide more detail feedback and offer suggestions for improvement. Overall the average rating for quality was 7.30 on an 8-point scale. For relevance it was 7.22, and for usefulness it was 7.36. The average effect size for learning growth across the 4 sessions for which such data were collected was 2.03. The effect size measures were calculated by using paired items eliciting self-ratings of participants' knowledge and skills before and after the training sessions. Paired t-tests measured the significance of the gains from before the training to after the training. The t-statistics from the paired statistics were used to calculate effect sizes for each pair of variables. Effect sizes for each training were averaged and per-training effect sizes across the four trainings were averaged to show the overall effect size.

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1.2 Provide technical assistance and support to educators.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of follow-up sessions.	PROJECT	2	/		2	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The project provided technical assistance as a follow-up to training activities. Two follow-ups occurred after the initial training in the use of ABBYY FineReader. Two more follow-ups are intended after the summer 2015 Braille Immersion Camp and all other summer trainings. Follow-ups assist educators in the use of the software and, when applicable, equipment that permits them to make effective use of the knowledge and skills they obtained during the training. The consultants who provide this type of support to educators provide reports to BEST project staff. The BEST staff record information about these follow-ups in a data base that they update regularly

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1.3 Provide avenues to communicate information and support to educators.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of communication avenues through which the BEST project provides information to members of its Community of Practice.	PROJECT	3	/		3	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The three communication avenues are the CISAM Listservs, the Facebook site, and the Twitter feed. The CISAM Listservs have 466 members and recorded 100 posts during the reporting period. The Facebook site has 56 followers and provided 55 posts during the reporting period. The Twitter feed has 34 followers and recorded 101 posts during the reporting period. By using three different avenues for disseminating information and encouraging dialog, the BEST project expands awareness of the project's professional development and technical assistance services as well as encouraging dialog across a community of practitioners who are concerned to provide high-quality braille to students with visual impairments.

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2.1 Provide high quality professional development training to educators in Ohio serving students who are blind and visually impaired or deafblind to increase their knowledge and use/ implementation of braille and state-of-the-art technologies.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Average rating of the PD quality item on the rating form that participants complete at the end of a training session	PROJECT	8	/		7	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

These data are based on ratings of 6 trainings that educators attended: BrailleNote, ABBYY, Duxbury 1, Duxbury 2, Assistive Technologies, and UEB. Overall in Project Year 1 the BEST staff anticipates holding 18 trainings to which educators will be invited. A number of these trainings will take place during the summer when school-based educators have more time available to attend. The ratings of quality used an 8-point scale with 8 representing extremely high quality. The mean rating of 7.15 represents a quality rating between high and extremely high. Comments from participants supported the quantitative ratings. Participants are uniformly positive in their comments about sessions. The formative feedback they provide is also treated as important information by the project staff. In addition to ratings of quality on feedback instruments, the project will be measuring participants' performance gains in Duxbury trainings through rubrics designed collaboratively by the instructors of the Duxbury training and the project evaluator. The rubrics were developed during the period under review (i.e., the first half of Project Year 1; they will be used in pilot form during the second half of Project Year 1; and revised versions will be used throughout the remaining years of the project.

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

5 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2.2 Provide technical assistance and support relating to state-of-the art technologies to educators in school districts by adults who are blind and/or technology experts.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of hours of technical assistance to school districts.	PROJECT	131	/		131	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Technical assistance to school districts assists educators who have completed one or more BEST training sessions to apply what they have learned in their school settings. Because this is the first year of the project, BEST project staff did not have information from a previous year to use as a baseline. Therefore, staff determined that the most reasonable approach would be to list the target number of hours as the same as the actual number of hours of technical assistance. This number will serve as the baseline for gauging performance in Project Year 2. Project staff members track the number of hours of technical assistance service provided to school districts using a database that they update regularly.

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

6 . **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.1 Provide high quality professional development to educators related to the production of braille.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Average rating of the PD quality item on the rating form that participants in sessions relating to braille production complete at the end of a training session	PROJECT	8	/		7	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The training sessions that focused on Braille production were ABBYY, Duxbury 1, and Duxbury 2. Although only 2 training sessions were scheduled for the reporting period, BEST actually held 3 sessions. Quality measures on an 8-point scale were as follow: ABBYY-7.93, Duxbury 1-7.12, and Duxbury 2-6.4. The overall average quality rating for these sessions was 7.14, which was rounded to a whole number (i.e., 7) for the quantitative data portion of the report. Open-ended questions on rating forms elicit feedback that corresponds with the quantitative ratings. Participants, across the board, are highly satisfied with the training they receive from the BEST project. They do provide some formative feedback, often about matters such as the acoustics or temperature in the room where the training is held. This focus on minor details that relate more to the facilities than to the training suggests that participants do not have concerns about the training quality, relevance, or usefulness that they wish to share. The combination of high quantitative ratings, positive qualitative comments, and a lack of substantive formative feedback demonstrates the very high quality of the professional development that BEST provides.

U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

7 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.2 Provide technical assistance to school districts that produce braille for Ohio schools.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The number of visits to school districts with braille production centers.	PROJECT	3	/		3	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Technical assistance to school districts helps them with technologies for braille production that were purchased by the project, through some other external source of funding, or by the school district itself. During the reporting period, the school district to which BEST provided technical assistance had production equipment that they had set up independently; none of the equipment had been set up by BEST. Providing the support needed to keep these technologies in good working order is an important service that BEST provides. Because this is the first year of the project, BEST project staff did not have information from a previous year to use as a baseline. Therefore, staff determined that the most reasonable approach would be to list the target number of hours as the same as the actual number of hours of technical assistance. This number will serve as the baseline for gauging performance in Project Year 2. Project staff members track the number of hours of technical assistance service provided to school districts using a database that they update regularly.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)**8 . Project Objective**

[] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.3 Expand braille production capacities at the local school district level.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of new local braille production centers in school districts.	PROJECT	2	/		0	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The BEST project plans to set up two new school district-based production centers during Project Year 1. The process involves sending out an application form, collecting completed application forms back from interested school districts, vetting the applications, selecting the districts to serve, and setting up the centers in selected districts. Thus far in Project Year 1, several of these activities have taken place. Project staff sent out applications for new production centers to school districts on March 16, 2015. Applications will be vetted and school districts will be selected by June 5, 2015; the centers will be set up in districts in August and September 2015.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)9 . **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.4 Provide training and support to Grafton Braille Service Center (GBSC) Prison Braille Program.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Number of trainings provided to transcribers at GBSC.	PROJECT	2	/		2	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

BEST planned to provide 2 training sessions to braille transcribers at the Grafton Braille Service Center (GBSC). They have already provided training sessions, a follow-up Duxbury training and UEB training. Because the UEB training took place on March 31, 2015, evaluation data have not yet been analyzed and therefore cannot be included in this report. The ratings for the Duxbury training, however, were high. The average rating for quality was 6.2 on an 8-point scale. For relevance, the average rating was 6.8, and the average rating was also 6.8 for usefulness. The average growth relative to the objectives of the training (measured through items measuring knowledge and skill levels before and after the training) was 2.1 (i.e., slightly more than 2 standard deviations). BEST also provided 53 hours of technical assistance to GBSC.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #:

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)10 . **Project Objective**

[] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

GPRA Measure 1: Percentage of PD trainings that equal or exceed a 6 on a measure of quality with a range from 2 (low) to 8 (high).

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
100 % and 100% actual performance	GPRA		100 / 100	100		100 / 100	100

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

GPRA measures were implicated in several of the Program Measures, but the BEST project also kept track separately of three additional GPRA measures, one relating to project quality, one to project relevance, and one to project usefulness. The measures focused on the percentage of PD trainings that were of ?high? quality, relevance, and usefulness as indicated by their receiving ratings that equaled or exceeded the cut-off of 6 out of 8 on an 8-point scale. The target of 100% represented a high bar for the project to reach; but all PD trainings did achieve average quality, relevance, and usefulness ratings that exceeded 6 on the 8-point scale. In Project Year 1, BEST met the 100% target for each of these measures.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)**11 . Project Objective**

[] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

GRPA Measure 2: Percentage of PD trainings that equal or exceed a 6 on a measure of relevance with a range from 2 (low) to 8 (high).

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
100 % and 100% actual performance	GPRA		100 / 100	100		100 / 100	100

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

GPRA measures were implicated in several of the Program Measures, but the BEST project also kept track separately of three additional GPRA measures, one relating to project quality, one to project relevance, and one to project usefulness. The measures focused on the percentage of PD trainings that were of ?high? quality, relevance, and usefulness as indicated by their receiving ratings that equaled or exceeded the cut-off of 6 out of 8 on an 8-point scale. The target of 100% represented a high bar for the project to reach; but all PD trainings did achieve average quality, relevance, and usefulness ratings that exceeded 6 on the 8-point scale. In Project Year 1, BEST met the 100% target for each of these measures.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: H235E140009

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)**12 . Project Objective**

[] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

GRPA Measure 3: Percentage of PD trainings that equal or exceed a 6 on a measure of usefulness with a range from 2 (low) to 8 (high).

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
100% and 100% actual performance	GPRA		100 / 100	100		100 / 100	100

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

GPRA measures were implicated in several of the Program Measures, but the BEST project also kept track separately of three additional GPRA measures, one relating to project quality, one to project relevance, and one to project usefulness. The measures focused on the percentage of PD trainings that were of "high" quality, relevance, and usefulness as indicated by their receiving ratings that equaled or exceeded the cut-off of 6 out of 8 on an 8-point scale. The target of 100% represented a high bar for the project to reach; but all PD trainings did achieve average quality, relevance, and usefulness ratings that exceeded 6 on the 8-point scale. In Project Year 1, BEST met the 100% target for each of these measures.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: **H235E140009**

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Budget Narrative H235E140009

File : [Budget Narrative_H235E140009.pdf](#)

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Additional Information H235E140009

File : [Additional Information_H235E140009.pdf](#)

Additional Information – Braille Excellence for Students and Teachers (BEST) PR/Award #:

H235E140009

The collaborative partners for the BEST Grant are:

- American Council of the Blind of Ohio (ACBO),
- Center for Instructional Supports and Accessible Materials (CISAM),
- Ohio Center for Deafblind Education (OCDBE), and
- Ohio State School for the Blind (OSSB).

There are changes on the BEST Leadership Team and the BEST Advisory Board due to the recent death of Cynthia Johnson, OSSB Superintendent. A superintendent has not been hired to replace Ms. Johnson. An Interim Superintendent has been appointed; however, she is a principal at the Ohio School for the Deaf. BEST will invite the new Ohio State School for the Blind Superintendent as the representative on these boards once that person is hired. We have representation from OSSB staff on the committees and as presenters and trainers, so we feel the grant will still be well represented.

Cynthia Nicole Morris is a Co-Director for the BEST Grant. Mrs. Morris will be moving to West Virginia and no longer a part of the CISAM Project after June 30, 2015. Paula Mauro will continue to be the Director of the BEST Grant and BEST will not appoint another Co-Director since Ms. Mauro is still directing the grant.

CISAM hired a Professional Development Consultant, Matthew Wilson, in October 2014 and he is working on setting up the Professional Development Activities associated with the grant. He attends the BEST Leadership Team Meetings and the BEST Advisory Board Meetings.

During the school year, the BEST Grant contracts with the Ohio State School for the Blind Student Concessions to provide working lunches during the trainings for the BEST Grant

workshop attendees. OSSB Student Concessions is a vocational program that trains high school students with visual impairments in the food service business. In the program students:

- Order food items
- Take inventory
- Process billing and statements using a computer
- Prepare menus and food – lunches and dinners
- Deliver prepared food to the customer
- Prepare food set-up and takedown onsite

BEST provides accessible formats of all handouts at all professional development activities when needed – large print, braille, digital, or audio depending on the needs of the participants. BEST posts information on the website so that other agencies have access to the information and the ability to replicate the grant activities.

After the collection and analysis of all data, a BEST Year 1 Annual Performance Evaluation Report will be written by WordFarmers and posted by BEST on the [BEST website](#).



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)

PR/Award #:H235E140009

Budget Narrative: Braille Excellence for Students and Teachers (BEST) Grant

Total Expenditures for the Project Period **10/1/14 – 3/31/15**

Personnel	\$	0
Fringe Benefits	\$	0
Travel	\$	2,336.09
Equipment	\$	0
Supplies	\$	7,454.31
Contractual	\$	18,644.14
Construction		0
Total Direct Costs	\$	28,434.54
Indirect Costs	\$	1,054.55
Total Expenditures	\$	29,489.09

Twenty-seven percent (27%) of the grant has been expended. Due to the late notification of the grant, we were not able to schedule inservice until later in the grant cycle. We are not allowed to commit to trainers until we have funding. We have 13 trainings scheduled between now and the end of the grant. Four of the trainings are weeklong inservice and one is a 7-week course. We also have scheduled to install two local braille production centers in school districts. We will be providing technical assistance and support until the end of the grant cycle.

BEST will encumber/obligate all of the funds by 9/30/2015.

Personnel and Fringe

No personnel and fringe costs were requested for this grant.

Travel

Expended: \$2,336.09

Remaining: \$2,677.91

\$714 was moved from contractual to travel.

The remaining travel expenses are budgeted for travel to the following events:

Director's Travel	\$1,476.01
BEST Secretary Travel to BEST Courses/Conferences	\$ 124.63
PD Consultant's Travel	\$ 675.68
TA Consultant's Travel	\$ 401.59
Total:	\$2,677.91

Equipment

Expended: \$0 Remaining: \$4,600

BEST will spend the remaining funds setting up two local braille production centers.

Supplies

Expended: \$7,454.31 Remaining: \$15,613.69

Funds are budgeted to purchase:

- Local Braille Production Centers (LBPCs) supplies: scanners, Duxbury and scanning software
- Literary and Nemeth Textbooks and course supplies for the four week-long braille and Nemeth courses
- Software for Scanning Inservice
- Tactile graphics supplies, spines, and microcapsule paper for prison braille program
- Office supplies for inservice meetings
- Speakers and microphones for online courses
- Student materials and instructor manuals for braille courses
- Student manuals and instructor manuals for UEB courses

All funds will be expended/obligated by September 30, 2015

Contractual

Expended: \$18,644.14 Remaining: \$50,795.38

\$714 was moved from contractual to travel.

Funds are budgeted to implement the following trainings and activities:

Family Conference – May 2, 2015	\$ 5,067.35
Summer Braille Courses June & July 2015	\$14,000.00
Tuition for Summer Braille Courses	\$10,500.00

Basic Braille Blended Course	\$ 3,458.68
Statewide Scanning Training	\$ 738.72
External Evaluaton by WordFarmers	\$ 4,500.00
BEST Technical Assistance Consultants Support and Training	\$ 8,355.87
Duxbury I and II Trainings	\$ 4,174.76
	<u>\$50,795.38</u>

All funds will be expended/obligated by September 30, 2015.

Construction

No construction costs were requested in this grant.

Indirect Costs

Expended: \$1,054.55 Remaining: \$5,654.93

All funds in this category will be expended and/or obligated by 9/30/15.

Name of Institution/Organization

Educational Service Center of Central Ohio

Pr/Award Number H235E140009

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel		\$0				
2. Fringe Benefits		\$0				
3. Travel		\$4,300				
4. Equipment		\$4,600				
5. Supplies		\$23,068				
6. Contractual		\$70,153				
7. Construction		\$0				
8. Other		\$0				
9. Total Direct Costs (Lines 1-8)		\$102,121				
10. Indirect Costs		\$6,710				
11. Training Stipends		\$0				
12. Total Costs (Lines 9-11)		\$108,831				

SECTION C – BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)