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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Date</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2017</td>
<td>Legislative Committee Breakfast at Annual Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2017</td>
<td>Guest Speaker: Dr. William (Brit) Kirwan, Chair of the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 2017</td>
<td>Legislative Positions &amp; Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2017</td>
<td>Commission Recommendations &amp; Legislative Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22, 2018</td>
<td>Budget Highlights &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4-6, 2018</td>
<td>FYI – NSBA Advocacy Institute – Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2018</td>
<td>Bill Status &amp; Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MABE's Legislative Day Luncheon (Date TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2018</td>
<td>Bill Status &amp; Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2018</td>
<td>Bill Status &amp; Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2018</td>
<td>Bill Status &amp; Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 2018</td>
<td>Session Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 13, 2017

Dr. William (Brit) Kirwan, Chair  
Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education  
Room 121, House Office Building  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Dr. Kirwan:

The Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE), representing Maryland’s 24 local boards of education, appreciates the opportunity to voice strong support for meaningful improvements to Maryland’s public school finance system, including substantial funding increases aligned with accountability for successful academic outcomes for all students.

In 2016, the Maryland General Assembly enacted legislation creating the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education; action taken in response to MABE’s adopted legislative priority and the support of a broad coalition of education advocates. The primary charges to the Commission are to review the findings and recommendations of the Study on Adequacy of Funding for Education in the State of Maryland, a study the state commissioned for more than $1 million and conducted by national consultants led by Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA); and to recommend how to update the base funding level for all students and the additional per pupil funding for students with special needs (students receiving special education services, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free and reduced price meals).

Other important Commission charges are to recommend how to provide adequate and equitable funding for programs including prekindergarten, community schools, dual enrollment, and career technology education. Importantly, the Commission must review how local school systems are spending education funds and ensuring that education funds are being spent efficiently and effectively. MABE led the advocacy effort to create the Commission precisely so that the adequacy study and other funding and accountability issues are deliberated and transformed into legislation to update and improve Maryland’s school finance system.

MABE urges the Commission to fulfill its primary charge and address the adequacy study’s overarching finding that there is an enormous statewide funding gap. The Adequacy Study results are clear. Substantially more per pupil funding is required not only to prepare all students to succeed based on higher standards but also to fund new programs such as universal prekindergarten and more robust college and career readiness programs, including dual enrollment, career technology education, and apprenticeship programs. The funding gap is substantial, with the national consultants calling for increases in state funding of nearly $2 billion and increases in local government investments of nearly $1 billion.
MABE joins other education advocates’ alarm at how out of date and inadequate our school finance system has become, though we are not surprised. Maryland’s funding formulas were developed in 1999-2001, and resulted in funding increases that began in 2003, but flattened out by 2008 – a decade ago. Fortunately, we know that during those years of significant funding increases Maryland’s students outperformed the nation and achieved top national rankings. In 2008, a national consulting firm conducted “An Evaluation of the Effect of Increased State Aid to Local School Systems Through the Bridge to Excellence Act” and found that in the years since the implementation of Bridge to Excellence, local school systems “demonstrated substantial improvements in the percentages of their student populations who were proficient in reading and mathematics” (MGT of America, Inc. (Dec. 19, 2008)).

The Bridge to Excellence Act was a nationally recognized success, and the same principles and objectives should be applied to updating and enhancing the state’s public school finance system. Therefore, MABE urges the Commission’s adoption of the primary objectives embedded in this landmark legislation:

1. Standards-based Adequacy – Sufficient state and local funding to enable all students to meet Maryland’s rigorous performance standards;
2. Wealth-based Equity – Allocations of state funding to local school systems based on local wealth;
3. Performance Accountability – Academic accountability through state assessments and local master plans reviewed by the state; and fiscal accountability through state oversight and transparent reporting; and
4. Local Governance – Flexibility for each local board of education to make community-based decisions on how state and local resources should be allocated toward the goal of meeting student performance standards.

As before, achieving funding adequacy will require not only state and local political will, but also the commitment of educators and local school systems to be effective and innovative in educating all students to achieve higher standards. MABE is confident that through incremental implementation of funding recommendations developed by the Commission and enacted by the General Assembly, Maryland can renew its commitment to fulfilling its constitutional mandate to fully fund and support an excellent education for all students in every school.

MABE urges the Commission to adopt recommendations to close the funding gap that now exists between what currently is provided under the Bridge to Excellence funding formulas adopted in 2002, and what school systems should be receiving today. The Commission learned in January of 2017 that public education in Maryland is severely underfunded (Adequacy of Education Funding in Maryland, DLS, Jan. 9, 2017). According to the report, in 2002 the statewide adequacy gap was $1.1 billion. The Bridge to Excellence Act closed this gap by 2008. But by 2015, statewide adequacy was funded at 88% and there was a statewide adequacy gap of $1.6 billion.

Since 2008, when funding adequacy was achieved, the General Assembly has imposed major mandates on local school systems, and the State Board has adopted much higher academic standards. Imposing such programs and standards without commensurate funding increases is not only unsustainable, but also unconstitutional.
Article VIII, Section 1, of the Maryland Constitution mandates that the General Assembly "shall by Law establish throughout the state a thorough and efficient System of Free Public Schools; and shall provide by taxation, or otherwise, for their maintenance." Courts have interpreted this to mean that funding must be sufficient to provide all students with "an adequate education measured by contemporary educational standards" (Hombeck v. Somerset County Board of Education, 295 Md. 597 (1983)); and that if such funding is not provided, the state is failing to meet its constitutional duty to local school systems and students (State Board of Education v. Bradford, et al., 387 Md. 353 (2005)).

The Commission has devoted considerable time to research and analysis performed by the Center on International Education Benchmarking of the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE); focusing on NCEE’s “Nine Building Blocks For A World-Class State Education System.” MABE appreciates the value of a gap analysis comparing Maryland to top performing education systems in other states and countries. Not surprisingly, successful systems exist where there are strong supports for children and families before entering school; additional resources for at-risk children; internationally bench-marked standards; highly competent and collaborative teachers and principals; strong career and technology education programs; and strong state oversight. MABE recognizes the merits of pursuing continuous improvement in all of these areas, with one major caveat – the role of local governance.

The Commission recently broached the subject of governance of public education and the role of not only the State Board of Education and the 24 local boards, but also the potential for creating a new state governing body. MABE strongly supports maintaining and strengthening Maryland’s highly successful governance model which features the strong executive function of the State Superintendent; the strong legislative and quasi-judicial functions of the State Board of Education; the governance roles of the 24 local boards of education; and the academic and administrative leadership of the local superintendents. Maryland has a proven track record as the best statewide school system in the nation for many years. MABE sees no rationale for adopting a new governance model, or creating a new board or bureaucracy, when we know that Maryland’s state and local boards of education and educational leaders are capable of achieving excellence when provided constitutionally adequate resources.

Today Maryland stands poised to usher in a new era of school funding reform designed to provide the foundations of the adequate and equitable state and local funding contributions necessary to support 24 world class local school systems throughout Maryland – schools serving more than 870,000 prekindergarten through 12th grade students. Our students deserve bold recommendations for significant funding increases for the base amount of per pupil funding, and increases for targeted funding for students with disabilities, English Learners, and the 45% of our students who are economically disadvantaged. For all students, high quality early learning opportunities are key, and the Commission should recommend a fully funded path forward to expand prekindergarten, including per pupil funding for every full and half-day prekindergarten student enrolled, and a facilities plan to address the influx of 4 year olds eager to learn. In all of these instances, increased local funding, in excess of the minimum maintenance of effort amount carried over from one year to the next, will be essential to achieving state and local adequacy targets and ensuring that all students in every school system receive the world class education envisioned by the Commission.
Thank you for your consideration of the positions and priorities outlined above. Please do not hesitate to contact MABE regarding our focused interest in the success of the Commission's work and the adoption of an enhanced finance system aligned with achieving success for all students.

Sincerely,

Joy Schaefer
President

JS:kwb

Copy to:
  MABE Board of Directors
  Board Presidents/Chairs
  Superintendent of Schools/Chief Executive Officers
  Ms. Frances Hughes Glendening, Executive Director
  Ms. Renee Spence, Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland
# MABE Positions on Education Funding Issues and Recommendations for the Kirwan Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education

September 14, 2017

| 4 Primary Objectives for Maryland’s School Finance System | 1. Standards-based Adequacy – Sufficient state and local funding to enable all students to meet Maryland’s rigorous performance standards;  
2. Wealth-based Equity – Allocations of increased state funding to all local school systems based on local wealth;  
3. Performance Accountability – Academic accountability through state assessments and local master plans reviewed by the state; and fiscal accountability through state oversight and transparent reporting; and  
4. Local Governance – Flexibility for each local board of education to make community-based decisions on how state and local resources should be allocated to meet student performance standards. |
|---|---|
| Adequacy | • MABE urges the Commission to fulfill its primary charge and address the fact that the adequacy study identified an enormous statewide funding gap. The national consultants call for increases in state funding of nearly $2 billion and increases in local government investments of nearly $1 billion.  

• In 2002 the statewide adequacy gap was $1.1 billion. The Bridge to Excellence Act closed this gap by 2008. But by 2015, statewide adequacy was funded at 88% and there was a statewide adequacy gap of $1.6 billion. |
| Equity          | MABE places a high priority on advocating for equity in terms of adjusting state investments to ensure that less wealthy jurisdictions receive sufficient state aid. Equity also applies to school systems with concentrations of special needs students and the role of additional local funding to support targeted services for these students.  
|                | All students, regardless of zip code, must have access to high quality instruction, rigorous learning expectations and standards, and world class learning environments. |
| Accountability | MABE supports strong collaboration between MSDE and local school systems in developing and implementing comprehensive master plans for educational programs, including budgetary alignment and accountability for efficient and effective investments in support of student learning. |
| Local Governance| A basic premise of our nation’s system of public education is that public schools should be governed locally.  
|                | MABE believes that by retaining decision-making authority at the local level, local boards of education can best balance educational practices, available resources to implement those practices, public input, and academic and financial accountability.  
|                | MABE opposes any weakening of local board authority. |
| Prekindergarten | MABE strongly supports remedying the longstanding deficiency in funding provided to local school systems for prekindergarten, by including prekindergarten students in local school system enrollment counts for purposes of state and local funding formulas.  
|                | A school facilities funding plan must accompany any expansion of the availability prekindergarten programs. |
| Special Education| MABE supports the adequacy study recommendation to significantly increase state funding for special education.  
|                | When IDEA, the federal education law, was enacted in 1975, the federal government promised to fund 40 percent of the additional cost of educating children with disabilities; and yet the federal government has failed to adequately fund the mandated programs and services arising under IDEA, never providing more than 15 percent of the additional cost. |
| Wealth & Tax Policy | • MABE supports the current Guaranteed Tax Base Program, and the continuation of this or similar program to reward education effort based on local wealth.  
• MABE supports fully funding the current Geographic Cost of Education Index (GCEI), and the continuation of this or similar program to adjust for variations in local wealth and costs of doing business. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding &amp; Maintenance of Effort (MOE)</td>
<td>• MABE supports consideration of ways to bolster MOE based on inflation, supplemental local per pupil funding for special needs students, and other factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funding & Revenue | • The Maryland Constitution mandates that the General Assembly "shall by Law establish throughout the state a thorough and efficient System of Free Public Schools; and shall provide by taxation, or otherwise, for their maintenance."  
• Courts have interpreted this to mean that funding must be sufficient to provide all students with "an adequate education measured by contemporary educational standards" (Hombeck v. Somerset County Board of Education, 295 Md. 597 (1983)).  
• Courts have held that if adequate funding is not provided, the state is failing to meet its constitutional duty to local school systems and students (State Board of Education v. Bradford, et al., 387 Md. 353 (2005)).  
• Maryland's median income is the highest in the nation, but education spending is 10th highest among states, and only 16th highest when adjusted for regional cost differences. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 14, 2017</td>
<td>Stevensville Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.</td>
<td>610 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevensville, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 28, 2017</td>
<td>LYNX at Frederick High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.</td>
<td>650 Carroll Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday October 12, 2017</td>
<td>Baltimore Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M. to 8:30 P.M. (extended due to large number of public comments)</td>
<td>1400 W. Cold Spring Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday October 25, 2017</td>
<td>Largo High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.</td>
<td>505 Largo Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Marlboro, MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public hearing for parents, students, teachers, and any other interested individuals to share their views on improving the public education system in Maryland.

Individuals who wish to testify must sign up by either emailing PreK-12InnovationandExcellenceCommission@mlis.state.md.us or calling Mindy McConville or Kim Landry at (410) 946-5510 or (301) 970-5510 by NOON on the day of the hearing. Please provide the following information:
(1) name and contact information;
(2) location/date of the meeting for which you are signing up; and
(3) if you are speaking on behalf of a group, please include the name of the group.

If you were not able to sign up in advance, signup sheets will be available at the hearing location beginning at 6:00 p.m. Individuals will be called in the order in which they signed up.

Testimony will be limited to approximately 3-5 minutes per person at the Chair’s discretion, so that each person will have an equal opportunity to speak. While it is not necessary to bring a written statement, if you do, please bring 40 copies with you to the hearing. Staff will collect and distribute to the commission members. Please note that the hearing will be recorded and posted to the Commission’s web page. If you are unable to attend but wish to submit written testimony, you may email your testimony to the email address listed above.

For Further Information, Contact: Erika Schissler or Rachel Hise, Dept. of Legislative Services; Telephone: 410-946-5510 or 301-970-5510
Remaining Meetings as of 8/2/17
Subject to Change

All meetings will be held from 9:30am -5pm in Room 120 House Office Building, Annapolis unless noted. Time will be reserved at the end of each meeting for public comment.

Governance and Accountability (Building Block 9)
- Andreas Schleicher, Director of Education and Skills, OECD

Work Session on Building Blocks/Policy Recommendations

Public Hearing 7–9pm Eastern Shore (location TBA)

Public Hearing 7–9pm Western Maryland (location TBA)

Public Hearing 7–9pm Greater Baltimore (location TBA)

Work Session on Building Blocks/Policy Recommendations

Public Hearing 7–9pm Central/Southern Maryland (location TBA)

Work Session on School Finance/Recommendations

Work Session on School Finance/Recommendations

Final Recommendations
- Finalize Policy/Funding Recommendations on Making Maryland a Top Performing System in the World

Weds, August 30, 2017
Thurs, September 14, 2017
Thurs, September 14, 2017
Thurs, September 28, 2017
Thurs, October 12, 2017
Weds, October 25, 2017
Weds, October 25, 2017
Thurs, November 16, 2017
Thurs, November 30, 2017
Weds, December 20, 2017
Maryland Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education
DRAFT
A Vision for a World-Class School System

Maryland students will be among the best students in the world, catching up with the students in the countries with the best education performance in the world by using the same strategies that those countries used to get far ahead of Maryland. No less important, Maryland will substantially close the gap between Maryland’s top-performing students and those who struggle to keep up, by increasing the proportion of formula funding going to schools serving disadvantaged students, strengthening the coordination of social services to students in schools in high-poverty neighborhoods, extending quality early childhood education to more students who need it, providing strong incentives for Maryland’s top teachers and principals to serve in those schools, providing much stronger curriculum support to teachers in those schools designed to help disadvantaged students produce the kind of student work that earn high grades, giving teachers much more time to tutor students who need one-on-one help to catch up and work in teams with disadvantaged students and other teachers to help students who are far behind, focusing state efforts on schools where many students are falling behind and getting them advice and mentoring assistance from some of the best teachers and principals in the state.

To Achieve the Vision....

Maryland will adopt a new 10th grade target for college and career readiness that will create a high bar for all students, but students who have trouble meeting that standard by the end of 10th grade will have two additional years to get there. That target will be based on the literacy required to be successful in the first year of Maryland's open admission post-secondary education institutions. Students who get to this standard by the end of the 10th grade will have access all over Maryland to junior and senior year programs that will prepare them for the most demanding universities in the world, enable them to complete a two-year college associates degree at no cost to the family by the time they graduate high school or go into a demanding career and technical training program in high school that will launch them on a rewarding career at graduation. Schools will be held accountable for their success in getting all students to these standards.

... 

The teaching profession will be transformed to that of a high status profession, accompanied by the expectations that go along with being a highly paid professional, but the overall cost of the system will increase very little after the transition to the new system because the increased cost of teacher compensation will be offset by decreased cost of high teacher turnover, less need for specialists and managers in district central offices.

... 

Teachers will spend less of their time in front of classes teaching but they will have more time to tutor students who need individual help and work with small groups
DRAFT

of students; to work together to improve the curriculum, design highly effective lessons, pinpoint the problems faced by individual students and develop plans for addressing them; all over the world, whenever this has been tried, students perform at much higher levels even with larger classes. Standards for getting into teacher preparation programs and receiving teacher certification will be much higher but this will not result in a shortage of teachers because as standards for getting into teacher education programs go up, very able high school graduates who would not have considered teaching as a career will start applying because they want a professional education that is demanding and in a field that is perceived to be high status.

While it will cost more money to attract top high school graduates into teaching, improve teacher education and pay teachers competitive salaries, as Maryland’s teachers get better and better, Maryland districts will need fewer school administrators and central office specialists and more of Maryland’s tax dollars for education will be spent in the schools and less on the rest of the system.

Maryland will spend more to provide early childhood education, wrap-around social services and extra teachers for disadvantaged children, but many more of those children will arrive at school ready to learn and they will be much more likely to stay on track to be college-and-career-ready than they are now, becoming tax-paying contributors.

Maryland will be spending more to help teachers monitor the progress of every student and make sure that, if a student begins to fall behind, that student gets what he or she needs to catch up quickly, which will save much larger sums that are now spent on special education.

Maryland will spend more to fund a career ladder system for teachers and school leaders, compensating them more as they get better and better at the work and take on more responsibility, but much of that cost will be funded by terminating expenditures on salary increments for taking courses that contribute nothing to the expertise of the teachers and on professional development that has been shown to be very ineffective.

The new school finance system will more fairly distribute the state’s funds to its school districts but it will also constrain how that money is spent by those districts; the districts will have to show that they will spend that money in ways that research shows will get the best results in student performance for the money that is spent.
Potential Framework for Funding and Funding Accountability Decisions

Funding

- Use a combination of APA Adequacy Study recommendations, NCEE recommendations based on benchmark states, and staff options/simulations to update Thornton funding formulas, etc. (see below)
  - Formula funding would be phased in over time (e.g. 6 years) calibrated to the timeline set for the overall Commission policy recommendations to be implemented (e.g. 10 years)

- To the extent possible, develop estimates of the fiscal impact of implementing the Commission's policy recommendations (primarily based on NCEE building blocks) including long-term cost savings that could be reallocated to support the Commission's policy recommendations

- Most of the funding to support the policy recommendations would come from formula funding directed to the LEAs, with release of a portion of the formula funding conditioned on meeting specified requirements/making progress in successfully implementing Commission policy recommendations

- New formula funding for LEAs to be augmented by:
  - Infrastructure/capacity building funding at the State level for MSDE and an independent entity tasked with monitoring implementation of the Commission's recommendations (e.g., develop statewide career ladder framework, increase teacher certification requirements, develop curriculum supports "library," etc.)
  - Competitive grants made to consortia of one or more LEAs and one or more colleges of education to redesign teacher preparation programs and teacher induction programs consistent with the Commission's recommendations, including implementing career ladder for educators and school leaders

Funding Accountability

- Require LEAs to submit Educational Excellence Strategic Plans, which would lay out a plan to fully implement the Commission's policy recommendations by a certain date (e.g., 10 years) and set annual benchmarks to be achieved
  - State would provide technical assistance to LEAs to develop master plans, including a statewide training program that would help educators gain the skills and knowledge needed to understand the new system based on the Commission's
recommendations and to make it work, starting with all local superintendents, then principals and teachers

- Require MSDE, higher education institutions, etc. to develop implementation plans to fully implement the Commission’s policy recommendations by a certain date with benchmarks

- Create an independent entity to review and approve plans before certain LEA funds would be released; annual review of satisfactory progress in order for LEAs to receive a portion of funding each year during phase-in.

- Menu of specific items to be implemented – must do vs. may do; order of implementation; level of flexibility allowed

- Independent entity c/would sunset after 8-10 years after an evaluation of its effectiveness

- MSDE would monitor implementation by school systems and individual schools, and if a system or school is falling behind with little or no signs of improvement, send in a “SWAT inspection team” of experts to review and analyze what is happening in the school and make recommendations for a plan of action to the local superintendent and board of education

- State and local formula funding must follow students down to the school level. MSDE and DLS would review funding data annually to ensure that school systems are allocating funds to the schools in this manner. (As a practical matter, this alone will change dramatically the way funds are spent.)

Funding Decision Points

1. Foundation/Base per pupil amount
   a. Inflation Adjusted
   b. Successful Schools
   c. PI/EB
   d. Other?

2. At-risk formulas
   a. Compensatory Education (Free and Reduced Price Meal)
      i. Lower weight? (per APA recommendation)
      ii. Concentration of poverty index (i.e. higher weight at higher concentrations and lower weight at lower concentrations of poverty)
      iii. Enrollment count – continue to use FRPM or switch to direct certification or some other method (which may affect weight)?
   b. Limited English Proficiency
      i. Lower weight? (per APA rec.)
ii. Concentration index?

c. Special Education
   i. Increase weight? (per APA rec.)
   ii. Blended weight or by intensity level?

3. Prekindergarten Expansion
   a. Full day for low-income 4 year olds (voluntary)
      i. Include in FTE enrollment count?
      ii. Additional weights?
   b. Mixed public/private delivery system w/required level of EXCELS to participate/receive funds
   c. Sliding subsidy based on income with up to 300% of poverty level free?
   d. Expand half day for low-income 3 year olds?

4. Equity Issues
   a. Local wealth calculation
      i. Modify definition? (additive vs. multiplicative)
      ii. NTI – use November date?
      iii. TIF adjustment?
      iv. Other?
   b. At-risk funding floors for State share (40%)
      i. Reduce for wealthier counties?
      ii. Increase for less wealthy counties with high concentration of at-risk students?
   c. GCFI/CWI
      i. Eliminate?
      ii. Switch to CWI?
      iii. State continues to fund both State and local shares?
   d. MOE – require locals to fund local share of at risk formulas?
   e. Guaranteed Tax Base Program – Enhance? (i.e. power equalizer)
   f. Supplemental Grant – continue?
   g. Other?
9 Building Blocks for a World-Class Education System
1. Provide strong supports for children and their families before students arrive at school

- Countries in which young children who come to school healthy, eager to learn and ready to profit from the instruction tend to be countries in which those children do well in school.

- Most strong performers have extensive government supports for prenatal care, mother and child nutrition, universal health care, high-quality childcare for working mothers, high-quality preschools and family allowances for families with young children. Countries with higher proportions of women in the paid workforce tend to have the strongest government supports for families with young children.

2. Provide more resources for at-risk students than for others

- Top-performing countries have made explicit decisions to create systems in which all students are educated to standards formerly reserved only for their elites.

- Policymakers in these countries know that if less-advantaged students are going to achieve at league-leading levels they will have to have access to more resources than students who come to school with greater advantages.

- Most of the top-performing countries provide more teachers to harder-to-educate students. Some are even providing strong incentives to their best teachers to work in classes and schools serving students from low-income and minority families.

3. Develop world-class, highly coherent instructional systems

- Top-performing systems typically have well-developed, highly coherent and very demanding instructional systems for all students that incorporate student performance standards, curriculum and assessments, as well as the use of instructional methods appropriate to the goals and standards of instruction.

- Top-performing countries are constantly benchmarking their standards, curricula and assessments to other leading countries.

- The standards might be expressed as stand-alone statements about what students should know and be able to do or might be incorporated in syllabi for courses, which would include all the courses in the core curriculum as well as the native language, (almost always) English, sometimes other foreign languages, mathematics, the sciences, technology, their own history, world history, often geography, music and the arts, and physical education.

- In top-performing countries, the standards for these courses typically emphasize the acquisition of
  - A wide range of complex knowledge,
Deep conceptual understanding of the subjects studied,

The ability to write well,

The ability to synthesize material from many disciplines to address real-world problems, and

Strong analytical capacity and creative and innovative capacity.

Ministry officials develop strong curriculum frameworks designed to specify in some detail what topics are to be taught at which grade levels, subject-by-subject and grade-by-grade.

Though schools are expected to create their own lesson plans, the state provides extensive guidance and curriculum support for teachers. Textbooks follow that guidance closely.

Top-performing systems typically develop one to three summative assessments to be taken by students over the whole course of their school career, taken by all students. These are usually in the form of examinations requiring students to respond with essays, or, in the case of mathematics, by showing how they went about solving multi-step problems.

No top-performing country relies primarily on computer-scored, multiple-choice tests because they do not believe such tests can adequately test for acquisition of the high-level cognitive skills they are aiming for.

Summative assessments are typically used to hold students, not teachers, accountable for their performance; the options available to students as they proceed with their education or enter the workplace are significantly affected by their performance on these exams.

Scores by school are widely published.

The content of the entire examination is typically made public after the exam is given. Also, examples of high-scoring student work are made public in order to provide guidance to teachers and students in the future as to what kind of student work will win high scores.

In some countries, low scores for schools result in visits from expert principals and teachers who develop recommendations to improve the performance of the school.

4. Create clear gateways for students through the system, set to global standards, with no dead ends

Instead of issuing a high school diploma—essentially a certificate of attendance—top-performing countries issue qualifications showing what high school courses the holder has taken and the grades earned in those courses.

Because the state has specified the content of the courses and because the exams are developed and administered by the state, not the school or district, everyone knows just what the student has accomplished.

Students are highly motivated to take the necessary courses and do well in them, whether they want to be a brain surgeon or an auto mechanic.
• Countries with well-developed qualifications systems have arranged them into pathways such that an individual can always go back later and pick up a qualification that he or she missed earlier.

• Successful systems have no dead ends; all paths can be linked up to others so that students can always go further in their education without having to start at the beginning.

• The qualification students receive at the end of a course of study is their ticket of admission to the next stage of their education.

5. Assure an abundant supply of highly qualified teachers

• The top-performing countries believe it will be impossible to deliver to all their students the kind and quality of education formerly reserved for their elites unless they are able to put a very highly qualified teacher in front of all their students.

• Top-performing countries recruit their teachers from the top ranks of high school graduating classes, most in the top third to top quarter, or, in some cases, the top five percent.

• Admissions screens are rigorous and comprehensive and take into account:
  ○ Academic qualifications (class rank, grades, scores on admissions exams)
  ○ Ability to relate well to students (sometimes through observation)

○ Passion for teaching (through interviews with expert educators)

The ratio of applicants to acceptances for entrance into teacher education institutions can be as high as 10 to one.

• A growing number of countries are limiting access to approved programs of teacher education to those offered only by their research institutions.

• Top performers develop very rigorous requirements for mastery of the subject matter the prospective teacher will teach.

• At least a year is given over to mastery of the craft of teaching, either during teacher preparation or the first year of employment as a new teacher serves as an apprentice of a Master Teacher.

• The top-performing systems do not allow, much less encourage, “alternative routes” into teaching that bypass these rigorous requirements.

• Teachers in preparation programs are required to study research methods, enabling them to determine the effectiveness of their own work developing and implementing improved curriculum, instruction and assessment in their schools.

• Instruction for these prospective teachers is emphasized in both diagnosis and prescription as a key part of the teacher preparation curriculum to identify why students are not learning and developing strategies to address the causes.
• Top performers monitor demand for teachers and control supply to assure the efficient provision of first rate teachers in all needed areas.

• Beginning teacher compensation is set to make teaching competitive with high status professionals.

• Very aggressive career ladders are created that increase compensation, responsibility, authority and autonomy, and higher status as teachers progress through their careers.

6. Redesign schools to be places in which teachers will be treated as professionals, with incentives and support to continuously improve their professional practice and the performance of their students

• Improving the competence of currently serving teachers is a priority as depending solely on newly trained teachers results in delayed improvement.

• Career ladders are created that develop the skills of the current teacher workforce and establish a culture and organization that provides strong incentives for teachers to get better and better at the work and supports continuous improvement of the school as a whole.

• The career ladders have multiple levels, each level of which is broken down into several steps. All except those at the top of the career ladders have teacher mentors.

• Teachers at the upper levels of the teacher career ladder:
  ○ Serve as mentors to new teachers and others lower on the ladder
  ○ Identify areas in which the curriculum and instruction methods need to be improved
  ○ Lead teams in the process of researching and then developing improved curriculum, lessons, materials and formative assessment techniques.

• Teachers constantly observe each other’s teaching; demonstrate new lessons to their colleagues; critique these lessons; revise them; and implement them once they have demonstrated their worth.

• Teachers meet regularly by grade and by subject to participate in all these processes. The research, development, trial, revision and evaluation process is very disciplined and highly collegial.

• Professional development is an integral part, indeed a result, of how the work of the school gets done. There is wide access to workshops for professional teachers, but this is not a workshop model of professional development.

• The integrity of the whole system depends on the creation of powerful career ladders, which in effect define what it means to have a career in teaching and create an environment in which teachers come to be treated as leaders and as professionals.
• Staffing ratios are similar to those in other countries, but class sizes tend to be larger in the top performers, which makes time—typically 40 percent of the school day—available to teachers to work with one another in teams to design and implement interventions intended to improve the performance of their school and students.

• Teachers use teaching methods that require large class sizes to develop students’ deep understanding of the subject they are studying.

• Staffing ratios are modestly higher in schools serving students from disadvantaged backgrounds and slightly lower in schools serving others.

7. Create an effective system of career and technical education and training

• Healthy, competitive economies that support broadly shared prosperity depend upon an effective system of vocational education and training (VET).

• VET systems risk collapse when enrollment is below 40 percent of all students. Below that point, it is increasingly likely that the VET system will be viewed as a system of last resort for students who have no other option.

• Successful VET systems have no dead ends; they offer viable routes for students enrolled in VET programs to acquire the additional education and training they will need to work in the professions and in senior management if that is what they aspire to.

• Quality training is offered that embeds modern technical skills on state-of-the-art equipment at the hands of teachers and mentors who are deeply versed in the most up-to-date equipment and practices.

• VET students study in settings that have all the attributes of real industry settings, or are offered an opportunity to study in real industrial settings, or both. Students receive a training wage that is increased as their value to their employer increases but is set at a level that makes it attractive for employers to offer apprenticeships.

• Skill standards reflect the state-of-the-art in the industries being trained for and a high level of investment in the education and training of the students.

• The demand of industry for skilled workers in the industries served by the system is matched with the supply being produced.

• Industry is encouraged to involve itself in the provision of the up-to-date equipment and training staff needed to make the system work; the slots available to train students are sufficient to provide apprenticeships to all who need and want them.

• There are standards that employers must meet to offer apprenticeships that guarantee that students will receive the education and training needed to meet agreed industry standards; industry associations provide those services that individual firms cannot.
8. Create a leadership development system that develops leaders at all levels to manage such systems effectively

- Successful systems identify and develop leaders who can
  - Get broad agreement on demanding goals for both the students and the staff;
  - Create and successfully implement effective strategies for achieving those goals;
  - Recruit a highly capable staff, and
  - Organize and manage the school in a way that is designed to incentivize that staff to get better and better at the work and to provide the resources they need to do that, and
  - Create a culture in the school founded on the belief that all students can achieve at high levels of performance, whatever it takes.

- Successful systems seek out and develop school leaders with a combination of strategic skills, self-knowledge, patience, drive, management skill, ethical roots, moral qualities and a strong command of what is known world-wide about managing professionals for high performance.

- Top-performing systems typically:
  - Limit access to the principalship to people who have proven themselves highly effective teachers;
  - Work hard to build a deep pool of candidates for principal positions by grooming capable teachers who appear to have strong leadership potential; they groom them for the principal positions by offering them a succession of progressively demanding opportunities to lead teacher teams in the school;
  - Train principals entirely on the job or in a combination of formal training and on-the-job training, but the training always involves a clinical experience and mentoring by a successful school leader;
  - Provide new school principals with access to a group of experienced peers and mentors who support them in their career growth, guide them toward professional learning opportunities aligned to their aspirations, and help them realize their personal goals and goals for the growth of their students;
  - Provide strong incentives for especially effective principals to take responsibility for mentoring less successful principals; in some cases, the most successful principals are asked to take responsibility for providing guidance to the principals of more than one low-performing school; and
  - Provide principals with opportunities to regularly visit other schools in their district, state or province, and even abroad, in order to learn about successful practices in those schools, districts and countries and adapt their own leadership practice accordingly. This practice is intended to keep leaders learning continuously and to promote a benchmarking culture.
9. Institute a governance system that has the authority and legitimacy to develop coherent, powerful policies and is capable of implementing them at scale

- To develop a modern, high-performance education system with high and internationally competitive levels of student performance and high levels of equity at reasonable cost depends on having an institution comparable to a typical ministry of education in a high-performing country.

- In top-performing systems, either at the state or national level, there is a place where the buck stops that has responsibility for all policymaking or management functions directly related to education and can be held accountable for the design and functioning of the system as a whole.

- In effective systems, education professionals in the ministry are responsible for planning and proposing policies that can then be debated by the responsible elected officials, and are then responsible for carrying out the decisions their legislatures make.
September 12, 2017

Andy Smarick
President, Maryland State Board of Education
208 Columbia Lane
Stevensville, MD 21666

Dear Board President Smarick:

I have reviewed the Maryland Consolidated State Plan (State Plan) created by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) in accordance with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I commend you and the members of State Board of Education (Board) for your hard work and dedication to the State Plan. I know that members of the Board made it a priority to participate in listening tours across the state to hear feedback from students, parents, and educators; and to work with stakeholder groups and advocates to gather input on how to best craft a State Plan designed to close achievement gaps and promote strong student performance.

As you know, ESSA was signed by President Obama on December 10, 2015. This bipartisan measure reauthorizes the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the federal education law that reflects this country’s longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students. Under ESSA, Maryland was given the opportunity to effect significant improvements in our education system. I wrote to you in November, February, and August stressing the importance of creating a plan that is driven by accountability and prioritizes better academic outcomes for Maryland students.

Unfortunately, due to the decision of the Maryland General Assembly to overturn my veto of the misleadingly-titled “Protect Our Schools Act” (Chapter 29 of the Acts of 2017) I cannot in good conscience sign the State Plan. I strongly believe that this misguided legislation dramatically limited the ability of the Board to include the type of educational reforms anticipated by ESSA, and therefore, I do not believe it represents enough of a positive step forward for Maryland students.

Chapter 29 stymies any attempt to hold schools accountable for student performance and includes provisions aimed at preserving the status quo in failing schools. It identifies no
evidence-based intervention strategies to address our lowest performing schools. Because your hands are tied, Maryland is missing out on the opportunity ESSA gives us to move beyond outdated processes and procedures and toward evidence-based, innovative strategies that are producing successful results across the country.

I trust that the State Board of Education will continue to develop and implement innovative approaches that will provide an exceptional education for all Maryland’s students regardless of where they happen to live.

Again, I appreciate your diligent efforts to craft a State Plan to improve education in Maryland to the extent possible under the law, and I know many of you share in my regret that the law adopted by the General Assembly did not allow the type of innovation and reform we had hoped for.

Thank you for your continued service to the children of Maryland.

Sincerely,

Larry Hogan
Governor

cc: Betsy DeVos, United States Secretary of Education
    Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor
    Matthew Clark, Chief of Staff
    Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools
September 13, 2017

Secretary Betsy DeVos
United States Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Secretary DeVos:

Enclosed is a letter I sent to the Maryland State Board of Education on September 12, 2017 explaining why I did not sign the Maryland Consolidated State Plan created by the Maryland State Department of Education and the State Board of Education in accordance with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I understand you will be reviewing the state plans in the coming weeks, and I wanted to share my decision and reasoning with you directly.

I am confident the members of the Board and the Department worked diligently to create the best ESSA plan possible under the impossible circumstances imposed by the Maryland General Assembly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Larry Hogan
Governor

Enclosure:
September 12, 2017 ESSA Letter to Maryland State Board of Education
21st Century School Facilities Commission
2017 Interim Schedule and Work plan

All meetings will be held in Room 120 House Office Building, Annapolis.

**Full Commission Meetings**

Work Session
- Committees Report to Full Commission

Decision Meeting
- Commission will vote on final report

**November 14, 10 am**

**December 14, 1 pm**

**Subcommittee Meetings**

Funding Subcommittee
- September 21st from 10am–12pm
- October 12th from 10am–12pm

Process, Procedure, and Education Specifications Subcommittee
- October 3rd from 1pm–3pm
- October 17th from 10am–12pm
21st Century School Facilities Commission

Each Commissioner has been assigned to a subcommittee. As chair Martin Knott will be a voting member on both subcommittees. Commissioners may attend all subcommittee meetings, but will only be allowed to vote in their assigned subcommittee.

- **Funding Subcommittee**
  - Chaired by Treasurer Kopp
  - Sen. Andrew Serafini
  - Brian Gibbons
  - Rich Resnick
  - Mel Franklin
  - Jan Gardner
  - Warner Sumpter
  - Gary Brennan
  - Del. Adrienne Jones
  - Sen. Ed DeGrange
  - John Bohanan
  - Galen Clagett
  - Martin Knott

- **Process, Procedure and Education Specifications Subcommittee**
  - Co-Chair Dr. Kevin Maxwell
  - Co-Chair Dr. Terri Alban
  - Del. Jeff Ghrist
  - Del. Aruna Miller
  - Alex Szachnowicz
  - Donna Edwards
  - Steve Baldwin
  - Judy J. Davis
  - Kathleen Sherrill
  - Rowena Shurn
  - Sen. Nancy King
  - Barbara Hoffman
  - Jan Holt
  - Andrew Roud
  - Don Manekin
  - Pless Jones
  - Martin Knott
Adequacy Standards & Facilities Assessments
Essential Tools for a State

Bob Gorrell, Director
Public School Construction Program
staff to the
Interagency Committee on School Construction

Interagency Committee on School Construction
Dr. Karen Salmon, Chair
September 27, 2017
The Mandate

Maryland Constitution, Article VIII:

"[The State] . . . shall by Law establish throughout the State a thorough and efficient System of Free Public Schools; and shall provide by taxation, or otherwise, for their maintenance."

Education System = Programs + Facilities
Why is the need a pressing one?

• Between 1972 and 2018, Maryland's capital expenditures on school facilities
  – $7.8 billion

• Condition of Maryland's K-12 facilities
  – Not measured

• Average age of Maryland's K-12 facilities
  – 2005: 24 years old
  – 2016: 29 years old
What the average age of our LEAs looks like
2005 - 2017
Maryland has been proactive

- 1972: GAM established IAC and PSCP to manage a capital grant program that continues today along with 10 other programs and initiatives intended to improve school facilities.
- 1979: Hughes Task Force Report recommended that statewide priorities be established to determine categories for funding.
- 2004: Kopp Commission recommended
  - Regular surveys by the state of the condition of each school facility;
  - “Minimum facility standards;” and
  - State funding sufficient to bridge the gap between counties’ capacity to fund capital investment and the assessed capital needs.
- Public School Facilities Act of 2004 required that facility condition surveys be conducted at least every 4 years.
Objective

- Utilize limited State and Local funding to achieve the most efficient educational facilities that are free of educational support deficiencies;
- Generate the greatest functional improvement with the least possible total cost of ownership;
- Equalize opportunities for all students; and,
- Ensure our schools are fiscally sustainable.

Prioritization and resource allocation is necessary when resources are limited.
The Primary Purpose of School Facilities

To provide healthy and safe physical environments that support the effective delivery of education programs that meet Maryland's education standards.

Standard term in the field:  
*Educationally Adequate Facilities*
Facilities Need Good Measures

1. Facilities Educational Adequacy is the defined measure of ability to support the programs.
2. The Facilities Condition Index (FCI) is the common measure of the overall bricks and mortar condition of a facility.
3. Weighting of the above two measures prioritizes what matters e.g. basic housing of students in healthy and safe environments.

"If You're Not Keeping Score, You're Just Practicing"*
Vince Lombardi, former head coach of the Green Bay Packers
The Essential Tools

1. Adequacy standards
2. Facilities assessments
3. Weighting and Ranking of relative need

= Prioritization of funding based on need

Maximize the functionality of each facility

Minimize the total cost of ownership of each facility
Maryland

- Lacks standards for educational facility adequacy
- Does not comprehensively assess the condition or educational suitability of all of its K-12 facilities against such standards
- By leveraging the scale of the State, for pennies on the dollar, we can uniformly and frequently assess and report the sufficiency of its school facilities.
- Ranking needs can support prioritized spending for greatest-bang-for-the-buck.
Determining Adequacy

- For learning,
  we measure each student’s knowledge and skills against *standards*.

- To support learning,
  we measure a facility’s adequacy
  (*physical condition + educational suitability*)
  against *standards*.
Facilities Adequacy Standards Scope

A definition of the physical attributes of a school facility necessary to sufficiently support the educational programs of the facility.

1) Healthy and safe environment; with
2) the number and size of the spaces; and with the
3) specific attributes that combined are sufficient to support the intended educational programs.

① Existing (or missing) facilities are measured for deficiency against the Facilities Adequacy Standards.
Facilities Condition Index (FCI)

- The FCI as a tool was first published in 1991 by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). The formula is:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Repair Cost of Building Systems}}{(\text{percentage life remaining of each building system} \times \text{system cost})} = \frac{\text{Total Replacement Cost of Existing Facility}}{}
\]

- Lower FCI is better and 0% FCI = brand new perfectly designed and built facility
- Total Repair Cost (numerator) cannot exceed Total Replacement Cost.

② Facilities building systems are measured for remaining life and cost to make like-new.
Weighted For Functional Relevancy =
The Weighted Maryland Condition Index

- Life, safety, and health deficiencies  x 3.5
- Unhoused students  x 3.0
- Deficiencies that can put a facility out of service  x 1.5
- Aged but functional components  x 0.25

\[
wMDCI = \frac{\text{Total weighted cost to address deficiencies}}{\text{Replacement cost of like facility}}\]
Prioritization

1. **Assess** each facility’s deviation from the adequacy standards (condition + suitability);
2. **Weight** the deficiencies based on a weighting scale;
3. **Calculate** the weighted Maryland Facility Condition Index (**wMDCI**) for each school facility;
4. **Rank** every school facility’s deviation from adequacy against all other school facilities;
5. **Prioritize** state funding to the facilities with the greatest need.
The Benefits

State funding
• Goes to the greatest need first;
• Generates the greatest relative improvement;
• Goes the farthest towards eliminating inadequacy; and so
• Gets the greatest “bang for the state buck.”
Prioritization, part 2

Funding allocations can then be further prioritized to LEAs with:

- A ready and available matching share;
- The capacity and ability to quickly move projects forward;
- Good stewardship of their facilities through effective and timely maintenance.
New Mexico’s wNMCI
Top 17 Schools from Preliminary 2017 Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Gross Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>wNMCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alamogordo</td>
<td>High Rolls Mountain Park ES</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>60.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State Chartered Schools</td>
<td>(P) La Academia Dolores Huerta Charter School</td>
<td>12,483</td>
<td>60.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Clayton HS</td>
<td>104,051</td>
<td>58.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alamogordo</td>
<td>Holloman ES - FKA Holloman Primary</td>
<td>68,871</td>
<td>58.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Raton</td>
<td>Longfellow ES</td>
<td>32,844</td>
<td>55.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Central Consolidated</td>
<td>Newcomb ES</td>
<td>67,465</td>
<td>54.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>Mesa MS</td>
<td>68,543</td>
<td>52.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mountainair</td>
<td>Mountainair ES</td>
<td>42,859</td>
<td>51.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Belen</td>
<td>Jaramillo ES</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>46.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>Washington Avenue ES</td>
<td>41,991</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>S. Y. Jackson ES</td>
<td>57,265</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Santa Rosa HS</td>
<td>113,129</td>
<td>44.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gallup McKinley</td>
<td>Rocky View ES</td>
<td>51,768</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gallup McKinley</td>
<td>Red Rock ES</td>
<td>51,788</td>
<td>43.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Santa Rosa ES</td>
<td>59,276</td>
<td>42.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>Roswell HS</td>
<td>248,428</td>
<td>42.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>Petroglyph ES</td>
<td>78,739</td>
<td>40.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Statewide Average wNMCI: 16.79% Average FCI: 32.70% Average wNMCI of Top 30: 47.94%

Lower is better
The Payoff

Annual Facilities Condition Index (FCI)* for All New Mexico Schools

71% FCI in 2001

Stable ~36% FCI

MARYLAND
Next Steps for Maryland

1) Adopt adequacy standards and a facilities weighted conditions assessment process – the wMDCI;

2) Conduct facilities-adequacy assessments;

3) Rank all PreK-12 facilities using the wMDCI;

4) Create a prioritized list of school facility needs, ranked by greatest impact; and

5) Create a predictable funding stream for facilities management support at the state level (up-to 1.25% of total annual capital outlay).
Questions / Discussion

and Thank You!