

Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) Local Education Agency (LEA) Consolidated Grant Application

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,
No Child Left Behind Act of 2002,
Carl D. Perkins, and
State-Funded Educational Programs

Delaware Department of Education

Mark T. Murphy, Secretary of Education

Daniel Cruce, Esq., Deputy Secretary of Education / Chief of Staff

Karen Field Rogers, Associate Secretary, Financial Reform and Resource Management Branch

Linda Rogers, Ed.D., Associate Secretary, Teaching and Learning

Wayne Barton, Director, Teacher and Administrator Quality

Theresa Kough, Director, Career, Technical, and Title I Resources

Jim Lesko, Director, Early Development and Learning Resources

Mary Ann Mieczkowski, Director, Exceptional Children Resources

For further information, contact:

John Hulse, Education Associate - General Consolidated Application Assistance; jhulse@doe.k12.de.us

Ted Jarrell, Education Associate - Technical Consolidated Application Assistance; tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us

Geri Donahue, Administrative Secretary; gdonahue@doe.k12.de.us

Phone 302-857-3320

The Delaware Department of Education is an equal opportunity employer. It does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, age or Vietnam era veteran's status in employment, or its programs or activities. Inquiries should be directed to the Delaware Department of Education, Personnel Office, 401 Federal Street, Suite 2, Dover, DE 19901-3639 (302) 735-4030.

Document # 95-01/12/07/03

Table of Contents

Abstract

- 1.** Success Plan
- 2.** General Information
 - 2.1.** LEA Consolidated Application Planning Team
 - 2.2.** Selection of Federal and State Programs
 - 2.3.** Program Coordinators and Allocations
 - 2.4.** Contact Information
 - 2.5.** Constituency Participation
 - 2.6.** LEA Support for Local School Planning: Systems, Structures, and Services
 - 2.7.** Parental and Community Involvement
 - 2.8.** Equitable Services
- 3.** Identification of Needs
 - 3.1.** Title I Public School Data
 - 3.2.** Title I Data Questions
 - 3.3.** Title I Private School Data
 - 3.4.** Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Program Requirements
 - 3.5.** Children with Disabilities under IDEA - CEIS Services
 - 3.6.** Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth
 - 3.7.** Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals (HQP)
 - 3.8.** Professional Development Plan
 - 3.9.** Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006
 - 3.10.** Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students
- 4.** Budget and Distribution of Funds

- 5. Financial Items
 - 5.1. Maintenance of Effort
 - 5.2. Excess Cost for IDEA
 - 5.3. Excess Cost Questions
 - 5.4. Consolidation of Administrative Funds
- 7. Certification of Compliance and Assurances

Abstract

The Abstract is a brief, precise narrative summary of how this consolidated grant will impact the overall LEA plan for continuous improvement, including goals and objectives, and should include: * Major program outcomes, * The name(s) of school reform models, local innovations, and/or external supports, * A brief description of activities supported by these funds, * Time frames for implementation of these grant activities.

The mission of this district is to provide the environment, resources and commitment necessary to ensure every student succeeds. As a district with rich diversity, we strive to be recognized as a leader in increasing achievement and improving outcomes for all students. The district's Strategic Plan outlines five specific goals that have been identified to have a statistically significant correlation with an outcome that impacts student achievement with positive results. Ultimately, to assure student achievement, district leadership will set high expectations for all, engage in meaningful collaboration, strive for continuous improvement, establish non-negotiable goals for achievement and instruction, create board alignment that supports the District's Strategic Plan and identified goals, monitor achievement and instructional goals, and allocate resources to support the goals for achievement and instruction.

The District's Strategic Plan clearly identifies five goals that serve as the district's path forward and provides the foundation for all district activity:

1. All instructional staff will be engaged in systemic professional development. The district will have highly effective educators in every classroom lead by highly effective administrators. Ultimately, improving instruction is the key to top performance in school systems. Impacting the success is strong leadership, clear instructional priorities, and an investment in high quality professional development. Staff members will be able to provide a learning environment that optimizes the student's potential to learn physically, emotionally and academically. All instructional staff will implement best-in-class talent management/human capital systems and strategies to promote continuous improvement and educator success.
2. All students will read at or above grade level by the end of third grade. The district will promote a culture of continuous improvement rooted in collaboration at all levels of the organization. Staff will accept ownership for individual roles, solve problems cooperatively, and participate in shared decision making continually seeking ways to improve their own performance. District staff will collaborate with others to support the district's efforts to improve student achievement. Students will feel closely connected and valued by adults and will receive support in the areas of behavior, values, and social attitudes. The district will focus on improving assistance to schools by creating high academic environments for all students and investing in professional development for all staff.
3. School will continue to close the achievement gap with a particular focus on English Language Learners and students with disabilities. Every effort will be made to assure all student groups are afforded optimal educational opportunities in order to achieve and succeed at rates much closer to those of their peers. All schools will provide a high-quality educational experience that is rigorous and engaging for all students. Schools will be provided with the appropriate resources, conditions and capacity to foster the highest level of student learning and success, especially in the lowest performing schools.
4. All students will graduate college and career ready. Students will be prepared for success in the 21st Century with skills in communication, collaboration, critical thinking, complex problem solving, evaluating and management. Schools will collaborate with local colleges and universities in order to provide instruction and certification programs that support post-secondary success.
5. Parents and the community will be engaged in the education of students. The district will foster a mindset that encourages strong relationships with our diverse students, families and community partners. Resources, events, and services focus on understanding and supporting the educational needs of all students especially students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Collaboratively identified community services will be targeted to support physical and mental health needs of students and families.

The Red Clay Consolidated District's 2012-13 Consolidated Grant application represents FY'13 allocation of \$11,450,652.00 including for support of services offered through federal Title I Part A – Making High Poverty Schools Work, \$4,918,451.00, Title II Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment \$1,373,583.00, Title III – Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students \$248,410.00, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3-5) \$344,935.00, Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6-21) \$3,940,932.00,, The Perkins Act - supporting career and technical education, \$434,350.00 and the State funded Curriculum and Professional Development \$189,991.00.

The funds serve approximately 24,202 students (16,279 public, 1,805 charter and 6,118 private/non-profit), including special needs and historically under-served populations with targeted allocations for schools with the greatest needs,(six identified by SEA), and children in private, non-public schools that reside in our district. The grant provides 56.5 teachers, 10.5 support staff, 11 administrators for a total of 78 FTE's. Red Clay is using funds as part of school improvement support for the district and its schools.

Major Outcomes: The District continues to restructure district office services to create a systematic approach offered to schools by all departments that addresses student achievement deficits. These efforts will include an analysis of progress towards meeting strategic plan goals, along with the content of the plan itself.

Red Clay is moving towards closing the achievement gap by redesigning its services to schools, especially to the areas with the greatest identified needs. Through these efforts, Red Clay will use grant funds to improve student achievement and identify barriers as measured by district and state academic assessments (DCAS), local assessments of parent and community involvement, the Delaware Student Survey, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, the George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (GW-CEEE) Evaluation of the English Language Learner ,and other available data sources that identify the needs of the district's diverse community. The data will measure:

1. Increasing the percentage of students who meet or exceed Core Content Standards
2. Provide FAPE for special education students
3. Continue, enhance and/or initiate programs to improve school climate through the prevention of violence and resolution of conflict
4. Increase staff/parent/student/community engagement and awareness of the needs of the district's diverse student population
5. Helping students develop the aptitudes and skills needed for graduation, post high school success and career development
6. Providing opportunities for student learning and academic program enhancement through the use of technology
7. Parent satisfaction regarding day-to-day operations and the opportunity in the decision making process

The framework for all activities, innovations and supports is contained within the newly Board approved Red Clay Strategic Plan. The time frame for implementation for the Consolidated Grant is July 1, 2012-December 31, 2013.

1.0 Success Plan

This section is modified by going to the menu bar above and selecting "Success Plan." The Section 1 PDF here is a copy of the Success Plan document developed there.

Please make sure that your Success Plan reflects the current Race to the Top (RTTT) goals and objectives.

Success Plan for: Red Clay District Administration

Years: 2011-2012 to 2013-2014

Mission Statement : The mission of the district is to provide the environment, resources, and commitment necessary to ensure every student succeeds.

Vision Statement : The district will be recognized as a leader in increasing achievement and improving outcomes for all students.

Needs Assessment

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

12 : School Administration

Need: Increase teacher effectiveness in classrooms and provide leadership in continuous improvement of instruction.

Root Cause: Classroom instruction needs to be aligned to DCAS assessment to measure priority GLE's and in coming core curriculum.

Data Source: DCAS II 2010-2011

14 : Instructional Staff

Need: Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment

Root Cause: Professional development opportunities related to diversity and tolerance; experiences with healthy choices

Data Source: Delaware School Survey 2008; classroom walkthroughs

11 : Professional Staff

Need: Participate in activities to explore, modify and implement with success with similar populations.

Root Cause: Strategies can be developed by understanding methods implemented with success at other educational institutions

Data Source: IRA; Staff Survey data; Distinguished Title I

18 : Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language

Need: To use time and operations in a manner that promotes a response to student needs and is inclusive of the school community

Root Cause: Leadership at Lewis had changed repeatedly over the course of the past 5 years, experiencing three different principals, and a lack of an Assistant Principal for the past three years. The school governance structure lacked leadership for curriculum and instruction to ensure fidelity to standards. The data shows a decline in Math and ELA performance of all student groups over a period of time indicating that the instructional model needs to be realigned to meet the diverse needs of the students attending Lewis. The current use of resources (human, time, schedule) does not provide enough a conducive environment for the developmental readiness of students. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools; one that manages and supports all schools in the Partnership Zone has the authority to communicate, mandate and approve necessary corrections in order to achieve the stated outcomes related to student achievement and instruction

Data Source: DPAS II Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data; Time Audit Data; DSC Professional Development Surveys; PLC Minutes

25 : Red Clay Focus School Warner

Need: Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate high reading achievement and fidelity to the instructional program

Root Cause: leaders (in 6 years). Traditionally, Warner was a two (2) administrator building, earning one (1) chief administrator (principal) and a second (2nd) Administrator - Assistant Principal who both shouldered the responsibility for building programming; yet spending the majority of their time handling climate, discipline, and parent relations. This structure does not allow for an intense focus on instruction, especially during the ELA block and prior to the 2011 DCAS assessment, academic scores have been significantly impacted. The school governance lacked leadership for curriculum and instruction to ensure fidelity to standards.

Data Source: DPAS II Administrative Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data;

41 : Warner instructional and administrative staff

Need: With a large % of poor and minority children, Warner students arrive at school with far less exposure to effective instructional technology and 21st century learning than their more affluent, majority group peers.

Root Cause: Lack of adequate instructional technology prior to 2010; Lack of integration of technology into common core; teaching the correct standards; Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic supports to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities.

Data Source: LoTi data; Ruby Payne poverty research; amplification system data

17 : All instructional staff

Need: All teachers K-12 need professional development in translating state standards into classroom lesson, appropriate instructional methodology and assessments.

Root Cause: Instruction must be better aligned with the GLE's; staff need experience teacher the verbs and the rigor required; Staff must have better knowledge and extended practice identifying instructional and assessment strategies that align to standards of student practice

Data Source: DPAS II R; Walkthrough Data; Professional Development Attendance Logs

29 : Baltz Families

Need: High Poverty rates often are a barrier in parent involvement because of transportation, work schedules, parent illiteracy and dysfunction. In order to support parental involvement school needs to be able to address the support of families to social services both inside and outside school.

Root Cause: Programs offered of a social services nature are sometimes not apparent, require transportation or literacy and cannot address needs of "undocumented" residents.

Data Source: Home Visitation Logs, Attendance of Parents at Meetings and Meetings held in conjunction with state social service providers.

24 : Red Clay PZ School Marbrook

Need: Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and continuous achievement

Root Cause: Leadership at Marbrook has been steady for two decades, and has consisted of a traditional principal/assistant principal governance format. The structure creates a void replete of collaboration and the freedom needed to influence planning, curriculum and assessments to ensure fidelity to standards aligned curriculum, instruction and assessment. This has influenced student performance. There's a need for the strategic use of adults to support teacher effectiveness and enhance student learning. Since its Blue Ribbon Award in 2009, student performance at Marbrook has sharply declined. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools.

Data Source: DPAS II Administrative Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data;

39 : Warner Pre-School - 2nd grade students

Need: Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic supports to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities; lack of structured preschool experiences due to poverty and economic situations

Data Source: Ruby Payne poverty data; DCAS/NWEA/DIBELS; Professional Development Attendance Logs

19 : Red Clay PZ School Marbrook

Need: To use resources to promote a school culture that compliments the diverse skill of staff and the needs of the school community

Root Cause: Leadership at Marbrook has been steady for two decades; yet there's a need for the strategic use of adults and time to support teacher effectiveness and enhance student learning. Based on DSTP and DCAS data Marbrook students performed below proficiency level since their 2009 Blue Ribbon award. The current schedule and use of human resources do not ensure that student receive a diverse instructional experience that mirrors their needs. Currently Marbrook's grade level homerooms are not arranged in an aligned fashion and they are not conducive to grade level collaboration. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools; one that manages and supports all schools in the Partnership Zone has the authority to communicate, mandate and approve necessary corrections in order to achieve the stated outcomes related to student achievement and instruction

Data Source: DPAS II Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data; Time Audit Data; DSC Professional Development Surveys; PLC Minutes

22 : Red Clay PZ School Stanton

Need: Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and high achievement

Root Cause: Leadership at Stanton had changed repeatedly over the course of the past three years, experiencing three different principals in the past four years at SMS. Having instability, along with traditional single layer governance - 2 administrator model only further complicates maintaining a focus on academic issues. Stanton's student population arrives with varying degrees of background knowledge, life experiences, and home resources; over 70% of our students participate in the Free and Reduced Price Meal Program. Full participation in the educational process relies on the ability to organize school to effectively meet the needs of children. More than half of our students arrive at Stanton not having met the standards in reading and math in elementary school. In the three years prior, Stanton has seen the impact on its academic scores. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools.

Data Source: DPAS II Administrative Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data;

21 : Red Clay Focus School Warner

Need: To use time and human resources to use time and operations to promote a culture of literacy and responds to the needs of the school community

Root Cause: Since 2006, Warner has experienced four (4) different leaders (in 6 years). The use of time and school structure does not respond to the need for an intense focus on literacy, especially early diagnosis and intervention. The schedule and use of human resources must ensure that student receive time with instructional experiences that mirrors their needs. Warner's grade level homerooms must be organized in a fashion that encourages aligned learning and grade level collaboration. Staff needs experience in learning how to appropriately use interventions and instruct within a time block; as there's also need for increased discussions, data usage and a design to respond to non-academic factors (student transience, discipline, family communications, and counselor support). The district requires a structure to intensify supports on the unique needs of focus schools; to prioritize strategies and activities that will address the diverse needs identified in the Focus areas

Data Source: DPAS II Data; DTSP, DIBELS (Next) and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data; Internal Time Audit; DSC Professional Development Surveys; PLC Minutes; RAP data (cafeteria and recess incidents)

28 : Baltz Staff

Need: Create culture of professional sharing of instructional strategies.

Root Cause: Resistance to Change

Data Source: PLC attendance and notes

16 : Staff implementing the transformation model

Need: Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA and math standards across grade levels.

Root Cause: Some students currently lack the foundation to meet the standards in reading and math; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations. Staff use of appropriate student engagement strategies; their capacity to understand student challenges and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions must be consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DSTP; DCAS; DIBELS Next

23 : Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language

Need: Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and high achievement and fidelity to the adopted language program

Root Cause: Leadership at Lewis had changed repeatedly over the course of the past 5 years, experiencing three different principals, and a lack of an Assistant Principal for the past three years. The Principal was responsible for the administration of the total school program and served as the instructional leader for the staff, students and community. These responsibilities also included climate, planning and parent involvement for a large Spanish Speaking school community. Having instability, along with traditional single layer governance model only further complicates maintaining a focus on academic issues. The school governance structure lacked leadership for curriculum and instruction to ensure fidelity to standards. In the five years prior, Lewis has seen the impact on its academic scores. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools.

Data Source: DPAS II Administrative Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data;

10 : Instructional Staff
Need: Hire and maintain Highly effective teachers
Root Cause: Teachers need peer to peer productive interactions and knowledge of practices that related to Distinguished practice per DPAS II; while new HQT staff members need to become part of the student success focused culture.

Data Source: DEEDS; DPAS II R

42 : Warner - Administration - teacher effectiveness

Need: Under 50% of Warner students met standards in reading and math.

Root Cause: Assuring Classroom instruction is aligned to common core verbs and DCAS assessment; assuring student

Data Source: DPAS II

20 : Red Clay PZ School Stanton

Need: To use time and operations in a manner that promotes college and career readiness and inclusiveness

Root Cause: leadership team needs the autonomy to make changes that will affect school improvement and increase student achievement; including hiring staff and using the school day in relation to needs. Staff needs experience in learning how to appropriately instruct within a time block. The district requires a structure to isolate focus on the unique needs of priority schools; one that manages and supports all schools in the Partnership Zone has the authority to communicate, mandate and approve necessary corrections in order to achieve the stated outcomes related to student achievement and instruction

Data Source: DPAS II Data; DTSP and DCAS; Building Walkthrough Data; Time Audit Data; DSC Professional Development Surveys; PLC Minutes

38 : Warner instructional staff

Need: All teachers K-12 need professional development in translating state standards into classroom lesson, appropriate instructional methodology and assessments.

Root Cause: Instruction must be better aligned with the common core; staff need experience teacher the verbs and the rigor required;

Data Source: Common Core; Consultant Report (Poole/Miller); Professional Development Attendance Logs

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

13 : Targeted Families

Need: Families need options related to accessing information related to assisting their child and contributing to school success.

Root Cause: High Poverty rates, school communication practices and geography can make attending school-related activities to educate parents on instructional strategies they can use to help their child very difficult.

Data Source: SES; Parent Involvement Survey data 2008 – 2011; Harvard Family Research Parent Involvement Data, attendance at Family events 2008 - 2012

Student Needs Assessment

52 : AIMS - Students with an IEP

Need: Children with IEPs in regular standards-based classrooms

Root Cause: staff knowledge and experience with proven supports; integration and access to the general curriculum; professional development, resources and staffing are needed to provide opportunities and educational environments that support inclusion.

Data Source: eSchool data, DCAS; I-Tracker

51 : AIMS - Low Income Students

Need: On 44% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities. Access to core curriculum and supplementary services has not been consistently available for this population.

Data Source: DCAS

44 : AIMS - ELL pupils

Need: ELL students are struggling to meet ELA standards

Root Cause: ELL students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide appropriate supplements to eliminate the academic disparities and linguistic barriers. Students must have language supported opportunities to access core curriculum.

Data Source: DCAS

36 : Warner Elementary Students - Grade 1

Need: Students struggle to matriculate to first grade with appropriate comprehension skills and achievement

Root Cause: Alignment of written, taught and tested curriculum from K -1. Need to assure teachers know how to teach the GLE's.

Data Source: DIBELS; DIBELS Next

56 : AIMS - Special Education Students

Need: Only 47% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations.

Data Source: DCAS

49 : AIMS - Special Education Students

Need: Only 47% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations.

Data Source: DCAS

27 : Baltz - Special Education students

Need: The group needs to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meeting the standard". The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations.

Data Source: DCAS Testing grades 3-5/ MAP and DIBELS K-2

59 : AIMS - Students with an IEP

Need: Children with IEPs in regular standards-based classrooms

Root Cause: staff knowledge and experience with proven supports; integration and access to the general curriculum; professional development, resources and staffing are needed to provide opportunities and educational environments that support inclusion.

Data Source: eSchool data, DCAS; I-Tracker

15 : Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students

Need: Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic supports to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities; lack of structured preschool experiences due to poverty and economic situations

Data Source: Ruby Payne poverty data; DSTP/NWEA/DIBELS NEXT; TOPEL

50 : AIMS - African American Students

Need: Only 44% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. Programs to offer academic and social support to make access to core curriculum have not been consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DCAS

55 : AIMS - Hispanic Students

Need: Only 45% of students in reading met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Hispanic minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DCAS

58 : AIMS - Low Income Students

Need: On 44% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities. Access to core curriculum and supplementary services has not been consistently available for this population.

Data Source: DCAS

53 : AIMS - Special Education Students

Need: 41.4% of the student body was suspended in the 2009-10 school year (in and out of school suspensions)the majority of the incidents were for offensive touching and fighting/disorderly conduct

Root Cause: Students need a safe and orderly school environment to achieve and succeed academically and personally. Disruptive behaviors need to be identified, and addressed. Schools need to provide intervention strategies, alternative programs, parent education opportunities, and classroom management strategies that will create safe, peaceful and productive school environments. Schools need to consistently implement discipline interventions that are fair, consistent and encourage respect. A combination of high poverty households lacking structure, few available role models (specifically male) and the challenges of communicating in English when Spanish is the primary language all contribute to the root cause of code of conduct violations that yield suspensions.

Data Source: Discipline Data, Attendance Data

4 : African American Pupils

Need: Increase reading scores of targeted African American students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. Programs to offer academic and social support to make access to core curriculum have not been consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data, DGS reports

40 : Warner - All Students - Math

Need: Warner had under 50% of students meeting the standard. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: Students currently lack the basic math skills to meet the standards; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction; use of student engagement strategies by staff

Data Source: DCAS; MAP

3 : LEP Students

Need: Increase reading scores of targeted identified Language English Language Proficiency (LEP) students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard)." The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: LEP students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide appropriate supplements to eliminate the academic disparities and linguistic barriers. Students must have language supported opportunities to access core curriculum.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data, ACCESS and LAS, WIDA and GWU study

37 : Warner Kindergarten Students

Need: 5 yr old Students who come from poverty struggle to adjust to structured education (KDG) and lack foundational education skills present in more affluent peers.

Root Cause: 1) Poverty and HS graduation rates (of families) in Attend Zone 2) alignment of written, taught and tested curriculum 3) assure teachers know how to teach the GLE's.

Data Source: DIBELS; Jump Start KDG Data; Registration information

45 : AIMS - Special Education students

Need: Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA standards.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations.

Data Source: DCAS

8 : Low Income Students

Need: Increase Math scores of targeted identified low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, Report Card Data

5 : Low Income Pupils

Need: Increase reading scores of targeted low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities. Access to core curriculum and supplementary services has not been consistently available for this population.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data

1 : Low Income Students

Need: Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA standards.

Root Cause: Some students currently lack the foundation to meet the standards in reading; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction; use of student engagement strategies by staff; staff capacity related to understand the challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions with an understanding of the economic impact on education to help eliminate the academic disparities; access to core curriculum must be consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DSTP; DCAS; CQA

6 : Special Education Students

Need: Increase Math scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in high school but missing the target in both elementary and middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and creates the least restrictive environments for pupil success. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, Report Card Data

47 : AIMS - Low Income Pupils

Need: Low Income Students are struggling to meet ELA standards

Root Cause: Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities. Access to core curriculum and supplementary services has not been consistently available for this population.

Data Source: DCAS

54 : AIMS - Special Education Students

Need: There is a relative difference between regular education and special education students suspensions

Root Cause: Students need a safe and orderly school environment to achieve and succeed academically and personally. Disruptive behaviors need to be identified, and addressed. Schools need to provide intervention strategies, alternative programs, parent education opportunities, and classroom management strategies that will create safe, peaceful and productive school environments. Schools need to consistently implement discipline interventions that are fair, consistent and encourage respect. A combination of high poverty households lacking structure, few available role models (specifically male) and the challenges of communicating in English when Spanish is the primary language all contribute to the root cause of code of conduct violations that yield suspensions.

Data Source: Discipline Data

9 : Red Clay Consolidated School District Students and decision-making

Need: Decrease the suspension rate (in & out) of all students. In 2010-2011, The Suspension rate was higher than the state average.

Root Cause: Students need a safe and orderly school environment to achieve and succeed academically and personally. Disruptive behaviors need to be identified, and addressed. Schools need to provide intervention strategies, alternative programs, parent education opportunities, and classroom management strategies that will create safe, peaceful and productive school environments. Schools need to consistently communicate high behavioral expectations and implement discipline interventions that are fair, consistent and encourage respect. There needs to be support for impulse control related to student responses and school behavior vs. neighborhood or taught behaviors. A combination of high poverty households lacking structure, few available role models (specifically male) and the challenges of communicating in English when Spanish is the primary language all contribute to the root cause of code of conduct violations that yield suspensions.

Data Source: Suspension data; Mentoring reports

32 : Baltz - African American Students

Need: At Baltz for last year African American students met AYP through "Safe Harbor" thus showing growth but not meeting the standard in Math. The group needs to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard".. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DCAS Testing. Common Assessments, RTI Data

46 : AIMS - African American Pupils

Need: African American children are struggling to meet ELA standards

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. Programs to offer academic and social support to make access to core curriculum have not been consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DCAS

31 : Baltz - African American Pupils

Need: At Baltz for last year African American students met AYP through "Safe Harbor" thus showing growth but not meeting the standard in reading. The group needs to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard". The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. Programs to offer academic and social support to make access to core curriculum have not been consistent enough to yield success; lack of parent support, enhancing knowledge of in-home educational support; environmental stressors at home must be acknowledged

Data Source: DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data

7 : Hispanic Students

Need: Increase Math scores of targeted Hispanic students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing. Common Assessments, Report Card Data

35 : Warner - Special Education Students, Hispanic - Math

Need: Student performance needs critical attention as identified by the DSTP and DCAS results. The student group needs to meet the AYP accountability target and their grade level expectations. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and design the least restrictive environments for pupil success.

Data Source: DCAS; MAP

30 : Baltz - Special Education Students

Need: Students who required specialized educational services need to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard". The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DCAS Testing grades 3-5/ MAP and DIBELS K-2

2 : Special Education students

Need: Increase reading scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and create the least restrictive environments for pupil success. Students identified not having regular access to the core curriculum predisposes them to not being able to master the skills according to prioritized grade level expectations.

Data Source: DSTP/DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data

48 : AIMS - Hispanic Students

Need: Only 45% of students in reading met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: Hispanic minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. General access with support to core curriculum has not been consistent.

Data Source: DCAS

33 : Baltz - Targeted Students groups (African Americans & Special Ed Identified)

Need: Students from racial, educational, linguistic and economic minority groups are demonstrating a preparation and an achievement gap, demonstrating similar instructional needs in reading and math.

Root Cause: Students in targeted groups have a variety of external factors that often predispose them to academic challenges. Programs need to address the diversity of each individual learner as a mechanism to make sure each child is being taught the way they learn best. This includes the lack of training for teachers in best strategies for each target group and necessary materials to support those efforts,

Data Source: Growth as measured from Fall to Spring DCAS assessment

57 : AIMS - African American Students

Need: Only 44% of students in math met proficiency on the DCAS

Root Cause: African American minority students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and provide instruction relative to cultural understanding to help eliminate the academic disparities. Programs to offer academic and social support to make access to core curriculum have not been consistent enough to yield success.

Data Source: DCAS

34 : Warner - Special Education students, Hispanic - Reading/ELA

Need: Student performance needs critical attention as identified by the Spring DSTP and DCAS results. The student group needs to meet the AYP accountability target and their grade level expectations. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

Root Cause: Students with identified special needs require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges, eliminate the academic disparities, and learn how to provide the appropriate academic interventions and design the least restrictive environments for pupil success.

Data Source: DCAS; MAP

43 : Warner - All Students - Reading

Need: Warner had under 50% of all students meet the reading standard (DSTP). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts

Root Cause: Students currently lack the foundation to meet the standards in reading; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction; use of student engagement strategies by staff

Data Source: DCAS; MAP

Goals & Objectives

Goal 1: Goal 1: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with rigorous standards, curriculum, and assessments

Objective 1.1: Objective 1: Implement college and career ready standards and assessments

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 1: Support the development of new standards, align curriculum, and conduct assessments (SoW 1)

2 Strategy 2: Build a culture of college- and career-readiness in schools (SoW 2)

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 23.4
DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	56	3/30/2008	24.5
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	27.1
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	37.2

Measure: [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 91
DOE Indicator: [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	96	6/30/2008	91
6/15/2009	96	6/15/2009	45.6
6/16/2010	47.0%	6/16/2010	47.0%
6/30/2011	48%	6/30/2011	48.8
6/30/2012	49%	(none)	
6/30/2013	50%	(none)	
6/30/2014	52%	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 35.8
DOE Indicator: [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	38.5	6/15/2008	35.8
6/30/2009	38.5	6/30/2009	31.5

Measure: % Growth DCAS Reading Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: CS Eval: % of Students that access services and succeed academically (DCAS and Local)
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - ELA

Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 71.8% (2010 DSTP ELA)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - MATH

Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 69.6% (2010 DSTP MATH)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - B/W MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 34.8% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- B/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 32.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 24.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 26.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - ELL/Non - MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 19.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	17% pt gap (2.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	12% pt gap (3% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - ELL/Non - READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 31.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (1.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS MATH - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 53.1 % pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 52.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.3% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: NCLB graduation rate

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: With charters: 87.0%/ without charters: 82.5%

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2011	W/charters:88%; w/o:	(none)	
12/30/2012	W/charters:89%;w/o:	(none)	
12/30/2013	W/charters:90%;w/o:	(none)	
12/30/2014	W/charters:90%;w/o:	(none)	

Measure: SAT Performance: Mean

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: Reading: 483/Math: 484/Writing: 465

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2011	R:460; M:460; W:440	(none)	
12/30/2012	R:480; M:480; W:460	(none)	
12/30/2013	R:490; M:490; W:470	(none)	
12/30/2014	R:500; M:500; W:480	(none)	

Measure: Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 10 schools

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/1/2012	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2013	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2014	Increase by 2 school	(none)	

Measure: Increase in the number of AP exam takers
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 1,017
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/1/2011	1,050	(none)	
8/1/2012	1,075	(none)	
8/1/2013	1,100	(none)	
8/1/2014	1,125	(none)	

Measure: % of AP exams scoring 3+
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 49.4%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/1/2011	51%	(none)	
9/1/2012	55%	(none)	
9/1/2013	57%	(none)	
9/1/2014	60%	(none)	

Measure: Mean score on district common exams(e.g., end of course exams aligned to standards)
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** EL9: 65%;EL10: 60.5%;US:59.9%;Wld:57%;PhS:51.4%;Bi
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	65%	(none)	
7/30/2012	70%	(none)	
7/30/2013	75%	(none)	
7/30/2014	80%	(none)	

Measure: % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** K: 84%; Gr1: 73%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	K: 87%; Gr1: 75%	(none)	
7/30/2012	K: 90%; Gr1: 80%	(none)	
7/30/2013	K: 92%; Gr1: 90%	(none)	
7/30/2014	K: 95%; Gr1: 95%	(none)	

Measure: College enrollment rate
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 58.6%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	60%	(none)	
7/30/2012	63%	(none)	
7/30/2013	67%	(none)	
7/30/2014	70%	(none)	

Measure: College retention rate
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 80.0%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	81%	(none)	
7/30/2012	82%	(none)	
7/30/2013	83%	(none)	
7/30/2014	85%	(none)	

Measure: % of IB participants who attain the IB diploma
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** tbd
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2013	TBD	(none)	
7/30/2014	TBD	(none)	

Goal 2: Goal 2: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with sophisticated data systems and practices

Objective 2.1: Objective 2: Improve access to and use of data systems

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 3: Implement and support improvement of the state longitudinal data system (SoW 3)

Measure(s):

Measure: % Growth DCAS Reading Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative assessments

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % of Middle/grade students with AP potential (all bldgs)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	Top 10% from each 8t	(none)	
6/30/2012	Top 10% from each 7t	(none)	
6/30/2013	Top 10% from each 6t	(none)	
6/30/2014	Top 10% from each 6t	(none)	

Measure: % participation of students taking the SAT

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	5% increase	(none)	
6/30/2012	5% increase	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers utilizing the I-Tracker Pro system
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers self-reporting that they use student data to identify and address student learning need
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** tbd
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers self-reporting that they collaborate with colleagues on student data
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** tbd
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers who are proficient at analyzing student data according to principals, SDTCs, and data

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers improving practice w/ analyzing student data acc to principals, SDTCs, & data coaches

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of educators satisfied with data trainings and collaborative data meetings

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: tbd

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: Satisfaction among longitudinal data system users

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: tbd

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Objective 2.2: Objective 3: Build the capacity to use data

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 4: Ensure implementation of instructional improvement systems (SoW 4)

Measure(s):

Measure: % Growth DCAS Reading Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative assessments

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % of elementary grade students with AP potential (all bldgs)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	Top 10% from each 5t	(none)	
6/30/2012	Top 10% from each 4t	(none)	
6/30/2013	Top 10% from each 4t	(none)	
6/30/2014	Top 10% from each 4t	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - ELA

Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 71.8% (2010 DSTP ELA)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - MATH

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 69.6% (2010 DSTP MATH)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: DCAS growth

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - B/W MATH

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 34.8% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- B/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 32.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 24.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 26.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- ELL/Non - MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 19.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	17% pt gap (2.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	12% pt gap (3% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- ELL/Non - READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 31.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (1.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 53.1 % pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 52.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.3% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 10 schools
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/1/2012	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2013	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2014	Increase by 2 school	(none)	

Measure: % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** K: 84%; Gr1: 73%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	K: 87%; Gr1: 75%	(none)	
7/30/2012	K: 90%; Gr1: 80%	(none)	
7/30/2013	K: 92%; Gr1: 90%	(none)	
7/30/2014	K: 95%; Gr1: 95%	(none)	

Goal 3: Goal 3: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with effective teachers and leaders

Objective 3.1: Objective 4: Improve the effectiveness of educators based on performance

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

- 1 Strategy 5: Use evaluations as a primary factor in educator development, promotion, advancement, retention, and removal (SoW 5)
- 2 Strategy 6: Establish new educator career paths linked to evaluation (SoW 6)

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: Number of teachers completing NBCT

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 53

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	73	(none)	
6/30/2012	93	(none)	
6/30/2013	113	(none)	
6/30/2014	133	(none)	

Objective 3.2: Objective 5: Ensure equitable distribution of effective educators (SoW7)

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 7: Increase the concentration of highly effective teachers and leaders in high-need schools (SoW 7 req.)

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Objective 3.3: Objective 6: Ensure that educators are effectively prepared (SoW9)

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 8: Target recruiting and hiring to the most effective preparation programs (SoW 9 req.)

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of vacancies filled through the job fair
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: District/School Processes
Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/1/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/1/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/1/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/1/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Objective 3.4: Objective 7: Provide effective support to educators

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

- 1 Strategy 9: Adopt a coherent approach to professional development (SoW 10)
- 2 Strategy 10: Accelerate the development of instructional leaders (SoW 11)

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 23.4
DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	56	3/30/2008	24.5
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	27.1
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	37.2

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - ELA
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 71.8% (2010 DSTP ELA)
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - MATH

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 69.6% (2010 DSTP MATH)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: DCAS growth

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - B/W MATH

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 34.8% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- B/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 32.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 24.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 26.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- ELL/Non - MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 19.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	17% pt gap (2.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	12% pt gap (3% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- ELL/Non - READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 31.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (1.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 53.1 % pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 52.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.3% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Goal 4: Goal 4: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with deep support for the lowest-achieving schools

Objective 4.1: Objective 8: Provide deep support to the lowest-achieving schools

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

1 Strategy 12: Provide support to turn around low-achieving schools

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 18.1
DOE Indicator: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	12.8	6/30/2008	18.8
6/30/2009	12.8	6/30/2009	18.9
6/30/2010	12.8	6/30/2010	20.5
9/1/2011	18	9/1/2011	14.3
9/1/2012	16	(none)	
9/1/2013	14	(none)	
9/1/2014	12.8	(none)	

Measure: Out-of-School Suspension Rate (Spec Ed Students)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 23.8
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	12.8	6/15/2009	26.2
6/15/2010	12.8	6/15/2010	24.1
9/1/2011	18	(none)	
9/1/2012	16	(none)	
9/1/2013	14	(none)	
9/1/2014	12.8	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 23.4
DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	56	3/30/2008	24.5
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	27.1
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	37.2

Measure: Community School Evaluation: % of families accessing services
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase o'er ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% increase o'er ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	20% increase o'er ba	(none)	

Measure: % of resolved findings related to state audits
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 100%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: District/School Processes
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2010	100%	4/30/2010	100%
6/30/2011	100%	(none)	

Measure: Attendance rate
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 93.6%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	94%	(none)	
6/30/2012	94.5%	(none)	
6/30/2013	95%	(none)	
6/30/2014	95%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - ELA

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 71.8% (2010 DSTP ELA)

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - MATH

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 69.6% (2010 DSTP MATH)

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with the district's communication practices

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: Avg 4.13 on 5-pt scale

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	4.0 or higher	(none)	
6/30/2013	4.0 or higher	(none)	
6/30/2014	4.0 or higher	(none)	

Measure: Increase in return rate of district's annual parent survey

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Community

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	5 % increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	5 % increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	5 % increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: DCAS growth

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - B/W MATH

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 34.8% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- B/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 32.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (2.0-4.8%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 24.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
- H/W READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 26.0% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	20% pt gap (4.2-6.0%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	17% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	14% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (4% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - ELL/Non - MATH

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 19.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	17% pt gap (2.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	12% pt gap (3% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	10% pt gap (2% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS - ELL/Non - READING

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 31.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30% pt gap (1.1% pt)	(none)	
6/30/2012	25% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	15% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS MATH - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 53.1 % pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re)	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - SPED/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 52.2% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	50% pt gap (2.2-3.1%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	45% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	40% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	35% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
READING - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.1% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (3% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % point reduction in achievement gaps on DCAS
MATH - LI/Non

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 29.3% pt gap

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	25% pt gap (4.1-4.3%)	(none)	
6/30/2012	20% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	
6/30/2014	12% pt gap (5% pt re	(none)	

Measure: % of families accessing services in community schools

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Objective 4.2: PZ Objective 1: To improve student learning by delivering rigorous, relevant and aligned curriculum, instruction and assessment

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Students) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA standards.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(Special Education students) Increase reading scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(LEP Students) Increase reading scores of targeted identified Language English Language Proficiency (LEP) students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard)." The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(African American Pupils) Increase reading scores of targeted African American students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

5	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Pupils) Increase reading scores of targeted low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(Special Education Students) Increase Math scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in high school but missing the target in both elementary and middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
7	<i>Student Need</i>	(Hispanic Students) Increase Math scores of targeted Hispanic students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

8	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Students) Increase Math scores of targeted identified low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
9	<i>Student Need</i>	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
10	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Staff implementing the transformation model) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA and math standards across grade levels.

Strategy(s):

- 1 PZ Strategy 1.1: Provide ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development
- 2 PZ Strategy 1.2: Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, and aligned with state standards
- 3 PZ Strategy 1.3: Promote continuous use of student data (incl. formative, interim, summative to inform and differentiate instruction)
- 4 PZ Strategy 1.4: Use technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 4.3: PZ Objective 2: To accelerate student achievement by recruiting, developing, and retaining great teachers and leaders

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Instructional Staff) Hire and maintain Highly effective teachers
2	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Staff) Participate in activities to explore, modify and implement with success with similar populations.
3	Staff & Community Need	(School Administration) Increase teacher effectiveness in classrooms and provide leadership in continuous improvement of instruction.
4	Staff & Community Need	(Instructional Staff) Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
5	Staff & Community Need	(All instructional staff) All teachers K-12 need professional development in translating state standards into classroom lesson, appropriate instructional methodology and assessments.
6	Staff & Community Need	(Red Clay PZ School Marbrook) To use resources to promote a school culture that compliments the diverse skill of staff and the needs of the school community
7	Staff & Community Need	(Red Clay Focus School Warner) To use time and human resources to use time and operations to promote a culture of literacy and responds to the needs of the school community

Strategy(s):

- 1 PZ Strategy 2.1: Replace the principal
- 2 PZ Strategy 2.2: Use a rigorous, transparent, equitable teacher and principal evaluation system designed with teacher and principal involvement and taking student data into account
- 3 PZ Strategy 2.3: Identify and reward staff who have increased student achievement
- 4 PZ Strategy 2.4: Implement human capital strategies to recruit, develop, evaluate, and retain staff (incl. financial incentives, promotion/growth opportunities)
- 5 PZ Strategy 2.5: Hire Academic Dean to provide additional support specifically in the area of instruction

Measure(s):

Measure: % of classes taught by HQT
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 86
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	91.2
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	94.01
6/30/2011	100	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 84.6
DOE [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	84.6
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	91.2
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	94.5
6/15/2011	100	6/15/2011	94.9
6/15/2012	100	6/15/2012	96.1
6/15/2013	100	(none)	
6/15/2014	100	(none)	

Measure: % of highly effective, effective teacher ratings (summative ev)
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	% of effective teach	(none)	
6/30/2013	% of Highly effectiv	(none)	

Measure: Surveys of professional preparation
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	TBD	(none)	

Measure: Surveys of DEDOE PD model and courses
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	TBD	(none)	

Measure: DPAS II R Formative evaluations
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2012	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % of School Support Team visits to targeted schools
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 100%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/15/2010	100%	12/15/2010	100%
3/31/2011	100%	(none)	
6/30/2011	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of administrators who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers utilizing the I-Tracker Pro system

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers self-reporting that they use student data to identify and address student learning need

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** tbd

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers self-reporting that they collaborate with colleagues on student data

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** tbd

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers who are proficient at analyzing student data according to principals, SDTCs, and data

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers improving practice w/ analyzing student data acc to principals, SDTCs, & data coaches

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of educators satisfied with data trainings and collaborative data meetings

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** tbd

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
7/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK/LEWIS: % of teachers trained and using SIOP strategies

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
10/31/2012	85%	(none)	
2/28/2013	95%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of students demonstrating 10% F-W/W-S growth based on SIOP strategy usage

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of ELL students demonstrating 25% Rdg F-W/W-S growth w/ teacher usage of my sidewalks

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: LEWIS: % of staff using SF reading street

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/31/2012	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: LEWIS: % of students in tiers 2&3 demonstrating 25% or more growth in ELA

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	60%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % of staff trained in teaching in the block schedule

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/31/2012	85%	(none)	
10/31/2012	100%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % of staff trained in Classroom Instruction That Works

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/31/2012	85%	(none)	
10/31/2012	100%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of Dolphin Dugout attendees demonstrating F-W/W-S academic growth

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Objective 4.4: PZ Objective 3: To accelerate student achievement by extending learning time

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Students) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA standards.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(Special Education students) Increase reading scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(LEP Students) Increase reading scores of targeted identified Language English Language Proficiency (LEP) students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard)." The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(African American Pupils) Increase reading scores of targeted African American students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.

5	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Pupils) Increase reading scores of targeted low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels; meeting safe harbor in elementary and meeting the target in high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(Special Education Students) Increase Math scores of targeted identified special education students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in high school but missing the target in both elementary and middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
7	<i>Student Need</i>	(Hispanic Students) Increase Math scores of targeted Hispanic students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

8	<i>Student Need</i>	(Low Income Students) Increase Math scores of targeted identified low income students. The student group needs to meet the accountability score across all grade levels, meeting safe harbor in elementary and high school but not in middle school, as established by their prioritized grade level expectations ("meets the standard"). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
9	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Instructional Staff) Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
10	<i>Student Need</i>	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
11	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Staff implementing the transformation model) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA and math standards across grade levels.
12	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes a response to student needs and is inclusive of the school community
13	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes college and career readiness and inclusiveness
14	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay Focus School Warner) To use time and human resources to use time and operations to promote a culture of literacy and responds to the needs of the school community

Strategy(s):

- 1 PZ Strategy 3.1: Increase learning time

Measure(s):

Measure: % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 10 schools
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/1/2012	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2013	Increase by 2 school	(none)	
9/1/2014	Increase by 2 school	(none)	

Measure: % of school enrolled in summer enrichment programming
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/25/2012	80% total	(none)	
7/30/2013	82% total	(none)	

Measure: %age growth in DCAS reading
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
11/30/2012	TBD	(none)	
3/31/2013	TBD	(none)	
7/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: %age growth in DCAS math
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
11/30/2012	TBD	(none)	
3/31/2013	TBD	(none)	
7/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK/LEWIS: % of teachers trained and using SIOP strategies
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
10/31/2012	85%	(none)	
2/28/2013	95%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of students demonstrating 10% F-W/W-S growth based on SIOP strategy usage
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of ELL students demonstrating 25% Rdg F-W/W-S growth w/ teacher usage of my sidewalks

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: LEWIS: % of staff using SF reading street

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/31/2012	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: LEWIS: % of students in tiers 2&3 demonstrating 25% or more growth in ELA

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	60%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % of staff trained in Classroom Instruction That Works

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/31/2012	85%	(none)	
10/31/2012	100%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of Summer Enrichment attendees demonstrating Jun-Jul academic growth

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/31/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % scale growth (F-W/W-S) for students in Extended day Academy in ELA

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	10%	(none)	
6/30/2013	10%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % scale growth (F-W/W-S) for students in Extended day Academy in Math

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	10%	(none)	
6/30/2013	10%	(none)	

Measure: STANTON: % of ELA classes using Achieve 3000 two times per week in classroom instruction

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/31/2012	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Measure: MARBROOK: % of Dolphin Dugout attendees demonstrating F-W/W-S academic growth

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/1/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2013	100%	(none)	

Objective 4.5: PZ Objective 4: To ensure success by offering programming and supports that meet the unique needs of the student population

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(School Administration) Increase teacher effectiveness in classrooms and provide leadership in continuous improvement of instruction.
2	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Instructional Staff) Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
3	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(All instructional staff) All teachers K-12 need professional development in translating state standards into classroom lesson, appropriate instructional methodology and assessments.
4	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Marbrook) To use resources to promote a school culture that compliments the diverse skill of staff and the needs of the school community
5	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes college and career readiness and inclusiveness
6	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and high achievement
7	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and high achievement and fidelity to the adopted language program
8	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Marbrook) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and continuous achievement
9	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay Focus School Warner) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate high reading achievement and fidelity to the instructional program

Strategy(s):

- 1 PZ Strategy 4.1: Secure sufficient operational flexibility (incl. staffing, calendar/time, budgeting)
- 2 PZ Strategy 4.2: Adopt a new governance structure
- 3 PZ Strategy 4.3: Support flexible operating conditions

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 4.6: PZ Objective 5: To ensure success by establishing and maintaining a positive school climate with strong family and community engagement

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Staff) Participate in activities to explore, modify and implement with success with similar populations.
2	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Targeted Families) Families need options related to accessing information related to assisting their child and contributing to school success.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
4	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes a response to student needs and is inclusive of the school community
5	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Red Clay PZ School Marbrook) To use resources to promote a school culture that compliments the diverse skill of staff and the needs of the school community

Strategy(s):

- 1 PZ Strategy 5.1: Provide for ongoing family and community engagement
- 2 PZ Strategy 5.2: Address all relevant elements of Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement (Social/Emotional Health, School Climate, Health Nutrition and Physical Activity), with supports that are aligned to needs and resources that are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system
- 3 PZ Strategy 5.3: Implement a dress code to create a positive learning environment

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 4.7: Focus School Objective 1: Provide deep support to turnaround Focus Schools

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Baltz Families) High Poverty rates often are a barrier in parent involvement because of transportation, work schedules, parent illiteracy and dysfunction. In order to support parental involvement school needs to be able to address the support of families to social services both inside and outside school.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(Baltz - Special Education Students) Students who required specialized educational services need to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard". The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Baltz - African American Pupils) At Baltz for last year African American students met AYP through "Safe Harbor" thus showing growth but not meeting the standard in reading. The group needs to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard". The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(Baltz - African American Students) At Baltz for last year African American students met AYP through "Safe Harbor" thus showing growth but not meeting the standard in Math. The group needs to meet the accountability score as established by their prioritized grade level expectations to meet the cut score for "meets the standard".. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.

5	<i>Student Need</i>	(Baltz - Targeted Students groups (African Americans & Special Ed Identified)) Students from racial, educational, linguistic and economic minority groups are demonstrating a preparation and an achievement gap, demonstrating similar instructional needs in reading and math.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(Warner - All Students - Math) Warner had under 50% of students meeting the standard. The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Using appropriate computation strategies with understanding (including time and weight), modeling fractions and decimals with situations and pictures, using algebraic reasoning, using basic number properties such as even/odd, multiplication concepts, and writing or describing a simple rule, recognizing and extending a variety of patterns, analyzing properties of simple geometric figures (including angle classification), measuring length or finding the area of simple figures, reading, constructing, and interpreting simple statistical graphs, determining the likelihood of simple events using mathematical reasoning to solve multi-step problems and communicating mathematical arguments.
7	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Warner - Administration - teacher effectiveness) Under 50% of Warner students met standards in reading and math.
8	<i>Student Need</i>	(Warner - All Students - Reading) Warner had under 50% of all students meet the reading standard (DSTP). The following were identified as critical instructional needs: Determining meaning by reading more carefully to retell or restate information from the text, Interpreting meaning by drawing conclusions about the central ideas in a text and understanding why a text was written and extending meaning by drawing conclusions and using critical thinking to connect and synthesize information within and across text, ideas, and concepts
9	<i>Student Need</i>	(AIMS - ELL pupils) ELL students are struggling to meet ELA standards
10	<i>Student Need</i>	(AIMS - Special Education students) Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA standards.
11	<i>Student Need</i>	(AIMS - African American Pupils) African American children are struggling to meet ELA standards
12	<i>Student Need</i>	(AIMS - Low Income Pupils) Low Income Students are struggling to meet ELA standards
13	<i>Student Need</i>	(AIMS - Special Education Students) There is a relative difference between regular education and special education students suspensions

Strategy(s):

- 1 FS Intervention 1 (AIMS): Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
- 2 FS Intervention 3 (AIMS): Partnerships with community
- 3 FS Intervention 1 (Baltz): Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
- 4 FS Intervention 1 (Warner): Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
- 5 FS Intervention 2 (AIMS): Staffing selection and assignment
- 6 FS Intervention 3 (Baltz): Strategies to address social, emotional, and health needs
- 7 FS Intervention 11 (Baltz): Staffing selection and assignment
- 8 FS Intervention 3 (Warner): Strategies to address social, emotional, and health needs

Measure(s):

Measure: % Growth DCAS Reading Targets

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/1/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/15/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative assessments
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/15/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: AIMS - number of reportable offenses (to police department)
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 2 offenses
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2011	0 to 5 total	(none)	
6/30/2012	0 to 5 total	(none)	

Measure: AIMS - [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 44.1
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
5/29/2009	41	(none)	

Measure: AIMS - Measure Name: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	83.3	(none)	

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 27.4

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Measure: AIMS - [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	83.2	(none)	
6/30/2014	100	(none)	

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 30.1

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Measure: Baltz - [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	37.63	(none)	

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 30.7

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Measure: Baltz - [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	39.16	(none)	

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 32.4

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Measure: Warner - % Growth on (ELA) District Formative & Summative

Start Year: 2012

Baseline: 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2013	TBD	(none)	

Measure: Warner - % Growth on (Math) District Formative & Summative

Start Year: 2012

Baseline: 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2012	TBD	(none)	
6/30/2012	TBD	(none)	

Measure: Warner - % of school enrolled in summer enrichment programming

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/25/2012	80%	(none)	
7/30/2013	82%	(none)	

Goal 5: Goal 5: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with active involvement of families and communities

Objective 5.1: Objective 9: Engage families and communities effectively in supporting students' academic success (SoW8)

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

- 1 Strategy 13: Provide ongoing services and opportunities to support and engage students and their families and communities in the educational process

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 18.1
DOE Indicator: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	12.8	6/30/2008	18.8
6/30/2009	12.8	6/30/2009	18.9
6/30/2010	12.8	6/30/2010	20.5
9/1/2011	18	9/1/2011	14.3
9/1/2012	16	(none)	
9/1/2013	14	(none)	
9/1/2014	12.8	(none)	

Measure: Out-of-School Suspension Rate (Spec Ed Students)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 23.8
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	12.8	6/15/2009	26.2
6/15/2010	12.8	6/15/2010	24.1
9/1/2011	18	(none)	
9/1/2012	16	(none)	
9/1/2013	14	(none)	
9/1/2014	12.8	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 23.4
DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	56	3/30/2008	24.5
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	27.1
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	37.2

Measure: Community School Evaluation: % of families accessing services
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase o'er ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	15% increase o'er ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	20% increase o'er ba	(none)	

Measure: Attendance rate
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 93.6%
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	94%	(none)	
6/30/2012	94.5%	(none)	
6/30/2013	95%	(none)	
6/30/2014	95%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - ELA
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 71.8% (2010 DSTP ELA)
DOE Indicator: (none)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects - MATH

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 69.6% (2010 DSTP MATH)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/30/2011	55%	(none)	
6/30/2012	75%	(none)	
6/30/2013	85%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with the district's communication practices

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: Avg 4.13 on 5-pt scale

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	4.0 or higher	(none)	
6/30/2013	4.0 or higher	(none)	
6/30/2014	4.0 or higher	(none)	

Measure: Increase in return rate of district's annual parent survey

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Community

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	5 % increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	5 % increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	5 % increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: % of families accessing services in community schools
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	10% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2012	15% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2013	20% increase over ba	(none)	
6/30/2014	25% increase over ba	(none)	

Measure: Early childhood outcomes
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Semi-Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
7/1/2011	10% increase o'er ba	(none)	
7/1/2012	15% increase o'er ba	(none)	
7/1/2013	20% increase o'er ba	(none)	
7/1/2014	25% increase o'er ba	(none)	

Common Measure Appendix

[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)			
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/11/2011	27.7	6/11/2011	29.6
6/30/2015	55		
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)			
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	20.7	6/30/2011	15.1
6/30/2015	60		
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Science on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Science on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	45.8	6/30/2011	42.2
6/30/2011	45.8	6/30/2011	42.2
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Social Studies on the DCAS (All Students, All Grades)			
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Social Studies on the DCAS (All Students, All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	60.1	6/30/2011	55.0
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)			
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	32.1	6/30/2011	25.1
6/30/2015	55		
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)			
[CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	37.2	6/30/2011	38.8

6/30/2015	55		
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	50	6/30/2011	55.9
6/30/2012	66.5	6/30/2012	68.1
6/30/2013	83.3		
6/30/2014	100		
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2011	49	6/30/2011	55.1
6/30/2012	66.3	6/30/2012	65.8
6/30/2013	83.2		
6/30/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)			
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	69.6
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	70.3
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	69.6
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	75.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	72.7
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	80.0

6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	47.7
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	48.4
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	48.4
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	95.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	94.0
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	94.3
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	58.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	60.3
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	59.0
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		

6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (White - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	83.6
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	84.2
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	83.2
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	57.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	58.4
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	52.4
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	24.7
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	24.5
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	23.9
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	53.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	55.1
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	54.5
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)			
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	73.5
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	74.8
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	71.8
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	87.5
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	81.8
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	75.0
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	56.9
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	57.5
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	53.5
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	93.2
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	91.5
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	89.2
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	59.6
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	63.9
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	59.5
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (White - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	86.2

6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	87.3
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	85.5
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	50.9
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	57.9
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	43.5
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	34.5
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	34.6
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	26.9
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		

[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	57.9
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	60.9
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	56.8

6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)			
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
2/28/2008	95	2/28/2008	86.6
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	88.6
2/28/2010	95		
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)			
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
2/28/2008	95	2/28/2008	77.0
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	75.0
2/28/2010	95		
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)			
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	95	6/30/2008	48.7
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	56.0
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	56.9
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)			
[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	95	6/30/2008	56.7
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	54.3
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	48.3

[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)			
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
2/28/2008	95	2/28/2008	64.6
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	56.5
2/28/2010	95		
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)			
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
2/28/2008	95	2/28/2008	66.0
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	65.4
2/28/2010	95		
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)			
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	95	6/30/2008	52.6
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	52.8
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	56.7
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)			
[CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	95	6/30/2008	42.2
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	43.9
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	38.2
[CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)			
[CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	81	6/30/2008	77.8
6/30/2009	82.5	6/30/2009	82.5
6/30/2010	84	6/30/2010	84.5

[CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	76	6/30/2008	68.8
6/30/2009	78	6/30/2009	59.8
6/30/2010	79	6/30/2010	77.1
[CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)			
[CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	4.8	6/30/2008	6.5
6/30/2009	4.8	6/30/2009	5.3
6/30/2010	4.7	6/30/2010	4.2
[CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	4.8
6/30/2009	6.2	6/30/2009	4.1
6/30/2010	5.6	6/30/2010	6.9
[CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)			
[CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	84.6
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	91.2
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	94.5
6/15/2011	100	6/15/2011	94.9
6/15/2012	100	6/15/2012	96.1
6/15/2013	100		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)			
[CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	12.8	6/30/2008	18.8

6/30/2009	12.8	6/30/2009	19.4
6/30/2010	12.8	6/30/2010	20.5
[CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day			
[CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
3/30/2008	56	3/30/2008	24.5
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	27.1
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	37.2
CTE/Perkins Indicators			
[CM] 1S1 - % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	62	6/15/2008	69.1
6/15/2009	68	6/15/2009	72.3
6/15/2010	68	6/15/2010	71.0
[CM] 1S2 - % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	41	6/15/2008	54.6
6/15/2009	50	6/15/2009	61.9
6/15/2010	50	6/15/2010	63.0
[CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing Technical Skills Assessment			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	69	6/15/2008	85.4
6/15/2009	71	6/15/2009	95.5
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	95.0
[CM] 3S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathway and Graduating			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	66	6/15/2008	76.3
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	88.8
6/10/2010	70	6/10/2010	90.5

[CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE Concentrators)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	81	6/15/2008	81.0
6/15/2009	82.5	6/15/2009	92.0
6/15/2010	84	6/15/2010	95.0
[CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	95	6/15/2008	91.0
6/15/2009	96	6/15/2009	45.6
6/15/2010	52	6/15/2010	47.0
[CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	38	6/15/2008	35.8
6/15/2009	38.5	6/15/2009	31.5
6/15/2010	36.5	6/15/2010	36.0
[CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	20	6/15/2008	25.2
6/15/2009	21	6/15/2009	28.9
6/15/2010	16	6/15/2010	28.0

Success Plan Team Members

Name	Title	Phone	Email
Marshall, Gerri	Supervisor, Research & Evaluation	302-552-3715	Gerri.Marshall@redclay.k12.de.us
Miller, Christine	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Parent Inv, Non-Publics, MckinneyVento, TitleIV	302-552-3815	Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us
Boyer, Theodore	Principal - Al DuPont Middle School	302-651-2690	Theodore.Boyer@redclay.k12.de.us
Hopson, Adrienne	Librarian, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	adrienne.hopson@redclay.k12.de.us
Smith, Elizabeth	Director - Special Education Services	302-552-3700	Elizabeth.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us
Swift, Ann Marie	Literacy Coach, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	ann.swift@redclay.k12.de.us
Qvarnstrom, Jeanne	Supervisor, Curriculum & Assessment	302-552-3757	jeanne.qvarnstrom@redclay.k12.de.us
O'Neill, Amy	Teacher, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	amy.o'neill@redclay.k12.de.us
Willen, Angeline	Manager, Human Resources	302-552-3700	angeline.willen@redclay.k12.de.us
Norris, Mary	Asst. Superintendent, Special Services	302-552-3709	Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us
Kennedy, John	Principal, Stanton Middle	302-992-5540	john.kennedy@redclay.k12.de.us
Seifert, Abbie	School Counselor, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	abbie.seifert@redclay.k12.de.us
Picciotti, Julie	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	julie.picciotti@redclay.k12.de.us
Bewley, Kristine	Data Coordinator		kristine.bewley@redclay.k12.de.us
Mobley, Kendall	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us
Potter, Sandy	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us
Hessling, Susie	Teacher, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	susan.hessling@redclay.k12.de.us
Jones, Equetta	Parent-PTA Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us

Wiktorowicz, Heather	Parent, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	missheatherslc@msn.com
PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team, RCCSD	Marbrook Elementary		
PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team, RCCSD	Stanton Middle		
PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team, RCCSD	Warner Elementary		
Bordrick, Sicily	Parent-Shortlidge (Title 1)	302-651-2710	sgbme2@verizon.net
Lawson, Vicki	Parent	302-239-5039	vlawson@psre.com
Greigg, Joseph	Parent	302-998-8011	Grei181@aol.com
Oboryshko, Mike	parent		Mike@proverb.net
Comegys, James	Director, Curriculum & Instruction	302-552-3700	james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us
Grundy, Amy	Manager, Turnaround School Office	302-552-3700	amy.grundy@redclay.k12.de.us
Johnson, Marcia	Principal, Warner Elementary	302-651-2740	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Castaneda, Ariadna	Manager/Title III, LEP; also Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-1407	Ariadna.Castaneda@redclay.k12.de.us
Floore, Jill	Chief Finance Officer/Finance	302-552-3725	Jill.Floore@redclay.k12.de.us
Golder, Sam	Director, Secondary Schools	302-552-3700	Sam.Golder@redclay.k12.de.us
Lanciault, Andrea	Director, Elementary Schools	302-552-3758	andrea.lanciault@redclay.k12.de.us
Beard, Gaysha	Supervisor - ELA	302-552-3700	Gaysha.B Beard@redclay.k12.de.us
Broomall, Hugh	Deputy Superintendent, Student Support Services	302-552-3700	hugh.broomall@redclay.k12.de.us
Daugherty, Mervin	Superintendent	302-552-3703	Mervin.Daugherty@redclay.k12.de.us
Mobley, Kendall	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us
Potter, Sandy	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us
Hessling, Susie	Teacher, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	susan.hessling@redclay.k12.de.us
Smalley, Amber	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	amber.smalley@redclay.k12.de.us
Cavallaro, Evonne	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	evonne.cavallaro@redclay.k12.de.us

Rivera, Mario	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	mario.rivera@redclay.k12.de.us
Rappa, Joe	AP - AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2690	joseph.rappa@redclay.k12.de.us
Wallace, Katherine	Academic Dean-AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	katherine.wallace@redclay.k12.de.us
Personti, Christina	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	christina.personti@redclay.k12.de.us
Papa, Stacey	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	stacey.papa@redclay.k12.de.us
Stewart, Malik	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	302-552-3700	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us
Comegys, James	Director, Curriculum & Instruction	302-552-3700	james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us
Grundy, Amy	Manager, Turnaround School Office	302-552-3700	amy.grundy@redclay.k12.de.us
Smith, Christine	Manager, Professional Development	302-552-3771	Christine.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us
Rookard, Sharon	Ed. Associate, Restructuring	302-552-3000	sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us
CTE Staff Members, All RCCSD	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs	302-552-3772	
Nash, Pati	Public Information Officer	302-552-3700	pati.nash@redclay.k12.de.us
CTE Staff Members, All RCCSD	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs	302-552-3700	
CTE Staff Members, All RCCSD	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs	302-552-3700	
Ammann, Ted	Asst. Superintendent, District Operations	302-552-3700	Ted.Ammann@redclay.k12.de.us
CTE Staff Members, All RCCSD	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs	302-552-3700	
CTE Staff Members, All RCCSD	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs	302-552-3700	
Henry, Arba	University of DE	302-891-3000	
Freeman, Wendy	Veteranarian	302-552-3700	
Simione, Wendy	VCA Hopsital	302-737-8100	
Vavala, Peggy	Dupont	302-225-3920	
Hayes, Jeanette	Parent	302-552-3700	
Seningen, Patricia	West Chester University, Human Resources	610-436-2800	
Rubenstein, Dana	DE Society of CPA	302-478-7442	
Munson, Kara	WSFS VP, Learning & Talent Dev	302-571-7223	

Little, Caitlin	University of DE Alumni Student	302-552-3700	
Devilme, Serge	BlackRock	1-300-366-101	
Miller, Valerie	LaPetite Academy	877.861.5078	
Hall, Val	PreSchool Teacher		
Hart, Carolyn	University of DE Alumni FCS Student		
Nolker, David	Culinary Director, DTCC	(302) 453-3757	
Thomas, Monica	Physical Therapist		
Larkin, Stacie	Physcial Therapy		
Kerkuca, RN, Barnabas	Registered Nurse		
Welsh, RN, Pat	Registered Nurse		
Finch, Deborah	Parent		
Bisseu, Emily	Registered Nurse		
Prowse, Spencer	Chemical Engineer, DuPont		
Lund, Erin	Wilmington University, Graphic Design	302-356-4636	
Calder, Allison	Area Alliance		
Spinelli, Lou	DTCC; Automotive Tech	302-454-3900	
Krajewski, Marty	Brandywine Auto Repair	(302) 292-2155	
Varsalona, Jacque	Director of Marketing, Wilmington University	302-356-4636	
Kirby, DeMarkus	Virginia Tech, Civil Engineering (AIHS Alumni)		
Pierson, Stephen	3-D Builder		
Hurt, Kelly	Principal - Baltz Elementary	302-992-5560	kelly.hurt@redclay.k12.de.us
Brown, Susan	DE PTA President-Elect (RC Focus School)		
Stewart, Malik	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	302-552-3700	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us
Johnson, Robbie	Dean of Students, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	robbie.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Moffett, Earl	Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus Schol Planning Team)	302-651-2960	earl.moffett@redclay.k12.de.us

Thompson, Laura	Educational Diagnostician, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	laura.thompson@redclay.k12.de.us
Caraballo, Aracelio	ELL Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	aracelio.caraballo@redclay.k12.de.us
Kellems, Kami	Parent Organization Rep., AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)		
Little, Trevor	Assistant Principal, Baltz Elementary	302-992-5560	trevor.little@redclay.k12.de.us
Gardner, Kim	Parent / PTA President, Baltz Elementary (Focus School Planning Team)		
Boyer, Theodore	Principal - Al DuPont Middle School	302-651-2690	Theodore.Boyer@redclay.k12.de.us
Rappa, Joe	AP - AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2690	joseph.rappa@redclay.k12.de.us
Wallace, Katherine	Academic Dean-AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	katherine.wallace@redclay.k12.de.us
Johnson, Robbie	Dean of Students, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	robbie.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Moffett, Earl	Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	earl.moffett@redclay.k12.de.us
Thompson, Laura	Educational Diagnostician, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	laura.thompson@redclay.k12.de.us
Caraballo, Aracelio	ELL Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	302-651-2960	aracelio.caraballo@redclay.k12.de.us
Kellems, Kami	Parent Organization Rep., AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)		
Hurt, Kelly	Principal - Baltz Elementary	302-992-5560	kelly.hurt@redclay.k12.de.us
Little, Trevor	Assistant Principal, Baltz Elementary	302-992-5560	trevor.little@redclay.k12.de.us
Personti, Christina	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	christina.personti@redclay.k12.de.us
Cavallaro, Evonne	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	evonne.cavallaro@redclay.k12.de.us
Smalley, Amber	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	amber.smalley@redclay.k12.de.us
Rivera, Mario	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	mario.rivera@redclay.k12.de.us
Papa, Stacey	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	stacey.papa@redclay.k12.de.us

Gardner, Kim	Parent / PTA President, Baltz Elementary (Focus School Planning Team)		
Johnson, Marcia	Principal, Warner Elementary	302-651-2740	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Conlin, Alice	Academic Dean, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	alice.conlin@redclay.k12.de.us
Mobley, Kendall	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us
Jones, Equetta	Parent-PTA Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us
Cottet, Kim	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kimberly.cottet@redclay.k12.de.us
Potter, Sandy	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us
Stewart, Malik	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	302-552-3700	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us
Brady, Deborah	Principal - Linden Hill Elementary School	302-454-3406	Deborah.Brady@redclay.k12.de.us
Castaneda, Ariadna	Manager/Title III, LEP; also Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-1407	Ariadna.Castaneda@redclay.k12.de.us
Albers, Jodi	Supervisor - Math	302-552-3700	Jodi.Albers@redclay.k12.de.us
Selekman, Aaron	Principal - Mote Elementary School	302-992-5565	Aaron.Selekman@redclay.k12.de.us
Reed, Becky	Supervisor - Social Studies	302-552-3700	Rebecca.Reed@redclay.k12.de.us
Johnson, Dorothy	Principal - Richey Elementary School	302-992-5535	Dorothy.Johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Broomall, Hugh	Deputy Superintendent, Student Support Services	302-552-3700	hugh.broomall@redclay.k12.de.us
Beard, Gaysha	Supervisor - ELA	302-552-3700	Gaysha.Beard@redclay.k12.de.us
Ueltzhoffer, Lisa	Principal - Thomas McKean High School	302-992-5525	Lisa.Ueltzhoffer@redclay.k12.de.us
Ennis, Linda	Principal - Heritage Elementary School	302.454.3424	Linda.Ennis@redclay.k12.de.us
Jones, Equetta	Parent-PTA Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us
Valentine, Antoinette	Parent, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	valentine0129@yahoo.com

Cooper, Pia	Mentoring/ Community Support, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	pia.cooper@redclay.k12.de.us
Courtney, Maribeth	Principal, Lewis Elementary	302-651-2695	maribeth.courtney@redclay.k12.de.us
Johnson, Marcia	Principal, Warner Elementary	302-651-2740	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us
Friend, Larry	Assistant Principal, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	larry.friend@redclay.k12.de.us
Rifenburg, Shane	Academic Dean, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	shane.rifenburg@redclay.k12.de.us
Brown, Valerie	Teacher/ Parent, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	valerie.brown@redclay.k12.de.us
Washington, Shun	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	shun.washington@redclay.k12.de.us
DeBastiani, Annette	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	annette.debastiani@redclay.k12.de.us
McLean, Chimere	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	chimere.mclean@redclay.k12.de.us
Carucci, Denise	Parent, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5540	
Phillips, Melissa	Assistant Principal, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	melissa.phillips@redclay.k12.de.us
Brechemin, Veronica	Literacy Coach, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	veronica.brechemin@redclay.k12.de.us
English-Murray, Chantel	Teacher, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	chantel.english-murray@redclay.k12.de.us
Green, Jennifer	Teacher, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	jennifer.green@redclay.k12.de.us
Szczerba, Jacqueline	Teacher, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	jacqueline.szczerba@redclay.k12.de.us
Valente, Christine	Teacher, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	christine.valente@redclay.k12.de.us
Carducci, Sonja	Parent, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	carrier59@verizon.net
Hudson, Kathryn	School Administrative Manager, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	kathryn.hudson@redclay.k12.de.us

Millhous, Bonnie	Teacher, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	bonnie.millhous@redclay.k12.de.us
Vickers, Janette	Librarian, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	janette.vickers@redclay.k12.de.us
Corwell, Layla	Parent/ Teacher, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2695	layla.corwell@redclay.k12.de.us
Conlin, Alice	Academic Dean, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	alice.conlin@redclay.k12.de.us
Messina, Kait	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kaitlin.messina@redclay.k12.de.us
Cottet, Kim	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-651-2740	kimberly.cottet@redclay.k12.de.us
Hills, Irene	Manager, RTTT	302-552-3746	Irene.Hills@redclay.k12.de.us
Holstein, Bradford	Principal, Marbrook Elementary	302-992-5555	bradford.holstein@redclay.k12.de.us
PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team, RCCSD	Lewis Elementary		
Ammann, Ted	Asst. Superintendent, District Operations	302-892-4721	Ted.Ammann@redclay.k12.de.us
Rookard, Sharon	Ed. Associate, Restructuring	302-552-3000	sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us
Smith, Christine	Manager, Professional Development	302-552-3771	Christine.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us
Stewart, Malik	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	302-552-3700	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us
Zogby, Carolyn	Director, School Turnaround	302-552-3770	Carolyn.Zogby@redclay.k12.de.us
Golder, Sam	Director, Secondary Schools	302-552-3700	Sam.Golder@redclay.k12.de.us
Lanciault, Andrea	Director, Elementary Schools	302-552-3758	andrea.lanciault@redclay.k12.de.us
McGrath, Edward	Supervisor, Science	302-552-3768	edward.mcgrath@redclay.k12.de.us
District Support Team, RCCSD	ESEA School Support	302-552-3700	
Daugherty, Mervin	Superintendent	302-552-3703	Mervin.Daugherty@redclay.k12.de.us
Floore, Jill	Chief Finance Officer/Finance	302-552-3725	Jill.Floore@redclay.k12.de.us

2.1 LEA Consolidated Application Planning Team

Enter your LEA grant planning team information, including administrators, teachers, parents, school nurses, community leaders, school counselors, law enforcement officers, visiting teachers, and others. Parent participation should be across multiple programs. The Perkins Advisory Committee should be comprised of business, industry and educational constituents, and representative of all career and technical programs.

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Email Address</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Programs</u>	<u>Perkins</u>
Gaysha	Beard	Supervisor - ELA	Gaysha.Bead@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Marty	Krajewski	Brandywine Auto Repair		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Deborah	Finch	Parent		Parent	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
Christina	Personti	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	christina.personti@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Sharon	Rookard	Ed. Associate, Restructuring	sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Mary	Norris	Asst. Superintendent, Special Services	Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Immigrant Students, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Stacey	Papa	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	stacey.papa@redclay.k12.de.us	School Employee	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Wendy	Freeman	Veteranarian		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
Mario	Rivera	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	mario.rivera@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	

Katherine	Wallace	Academic Dean- AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	katherine.wallace@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Mervin	Daugherty	Superintendent	Mervin.Daugherty@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Peggy	Vavala	Dupont		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
Lou	Spinelli	DTCC; Automotive Tech		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Sicily	Bordrick	Parent-Shortlidge (Title 1)	sgbme2@verizon.net	Parent	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
Adrienne	Hopson	Librarian, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	adrienne.hopson@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Kristine	Bewley	Data Coordinator	kristine.bewley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Immigrant Students, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Jill	Floore	Chief Finance Officer/Finance	Jill.Floore@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Stacie	Larkin	Physical Therapy		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science

Joe	Rappa	AP - AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	joseph.rappa@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Andrea	Lanciault	Director, Elementary Schools	andrea.lanciault@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Evonne	Cavallaro	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	evonne.cavallaro@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Sam	Golder	Director, Secondary Schools	Sam.Golder@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Pat	Welsh, RN	Registered Nurse		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
Valerie	Miller	LaPetite Academy		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Family and Consumer Sciences
Allison	Calder	Area Alliance		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Jacque	Varsalona	Director of Marketing, Wilmington University		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Equetta	Jones	Parent-PTA Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us	Parent	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
Amy	O'Neill	Teacher, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	amy.o'neill@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Immigrant Students, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Abbie	Seifert	School Counselor, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	abbie.seifert@redclay.k12.de.us	School Employee	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	

Val	Hall	PreSchool Teacher		Parent	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Family and Consumer Sciences
Caitlin	Little	University of DE Alumni Student		Community Member	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing
Stephen	Pierson	3-D Builder		Parent	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Monica	Thomas	Physical Therapist		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
Susie	Hessling	Teacher, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	susan.hessling@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
All RCCSD	CTE Staff Members	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs		Teacher	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Family and Consumer Sciences
Julie	Picciotti	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	julie.picciotti@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Amy	Grundy	Manager, Turnaround School Office	amy.grundy@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Angeline	Willen	Manager, Human Resources	angeline.willen@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Immigrant Students, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Kelly	Hurt	Principal - Baltz Elementary	kelly.hurt@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Kara	Munson	WSFS VP, Learning & Talent Dev		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing
John	Kennedy	Principal, Stanton Middle	john.kennedy@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Dana	Rubenstein	DE Society of CPA		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing

Emily	Bisseu	Registered Nurse		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
DeMarkus	Kirby	Virginia Tech, Civil Engineering (AIHS Alumni)		Community Member	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Marcia	Johnson	Principal, Warner Elementary	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Serge	Devilme	BlackRock		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing
Sandy	Potter	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Barnabas	Kerkuca, RN	Registered Nurse		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
James	Comegys	Director, Curriculum & Instruction	james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Ted	Ammann	Asst. Superintendent, District Operations	Ted.Ammann@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Arba	Henry	University of DE		Community Member	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
David	Nolker	Culinary Director, DTCC		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Family and Consumer Sciences
Spencer	Prowse	Chemical Engineer, DuPont		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
All RCCSD	CTE Staff Members	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs		Teacher	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing
Susan	Brown	DE PTA President-Elect (RC Focus School)		Parent	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	

Elizabeth	Smith	Director - Special Education Services	Elizabeth.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	
Patricia	Seningen	West Chester University, Human Resources		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carolyn	Hart	University of DE Alumni FCS Student		Community Member	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Family and Consumer Sciences
Jeanne	Qvarnstrom	Supervisor, Curriculum & Assessment	jeanne.qvarnstrom@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development,Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Kendall	Mobley	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Amber	Smalley	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	amber.smalley@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Jeanette	Hayes	Parent		Parent	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
Ariadna	Castaneda	Manager/Title III, LEP; also Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	Ariadna.Castaneda@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21),Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Gerri	Marshall	Supervisor, Research & Evaluation	Gerri.Marshall@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary,Curriculum and Professional Development,Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21),Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Immigrant Students,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Theodore	Boyer	Principal - Al DuPont Middle School	Theodore.Boyer@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title III - Immigrant Students,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Erin	Lund	Wilmington University, Graphic Design		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education

Wendy	Simione	VCA Hopsital		Business Person	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
Pati	Nash	Public Information Officer	pati.nash@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
All RCCSD	CTE Staff Members	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs		Teacher	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Technology Education
Ann Marie	Swift	Literacy Coach, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	ann.swift@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21),Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Immigrant Students,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Hugh	Broomall	Deputy Superintendent, Student Support Services	hugh.broomall@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary,Curriculum and Professional Development,Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21),Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	
Kendall	Mobley	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
Joseph	Greigg	Parent	Grei181@aol.com	Parent	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
All RCCSD	CTE Staff Members	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs		Teacher	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	AgriScience
All RCCSD	CTE Staff Members	CTE Professional Staff in 6-12 bldgs		Teacher	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Skilled and Technical Science
Malik	Stewart	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary,Curriculum and Professional Development,Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5),Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21),Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work,Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment,Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	

Christine	Miller	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Parent Inv, Non- Publics, MckinneyVento, TitleIV	Christine.Miller@redclay. k12.de.us	Administrator	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary, Curriculum and Professional Development, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21), Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Immigrant Students, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL
Christine	Smith	Manager, Professional Development	Christine.Smith@redclay. k12.de.us	Administrator	Curriculum and Professional Development, Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work, Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment, Title III - Language Instruction for ELL
Mike	Oboryshko	parent	Mike@proverb.net	Parent	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work
Vicki	Lawson	Parent	vlawson@psre.com	Parent	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work

2.2 Selection of Federal and State Programs

Check all allocated grant programs for which you are applying in this application:

Federal		State	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Curriculum and Professional Development
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work		
	Title I, Part D - Neglected and Delinquent		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment		
	Title III - Immigrant Students		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title III - Language Instruction for ELL		

Consolidated Grant Application Submission Deadlines

All applications are approved by the Secretary of Education. For 2012 - 2013 Consolidated Grant Applications, the following schedule applies:

Grant Submission Dates
DOE Review Dates>
 July 13, 2012
 July 25 and 26, 2012
 August 17, 2012
 August 29 and 30, 2012

If the applicant does not submit an application by August 17, 2012, the LEA must request an extension. Extensions will only be granted in rare instances with good reason. If an extension request is denied, the LEA will lose these funds.

The start date is the final submission date prior to the last program manager's approval.

Consolidated Grant Project Dates: Federal: 07/01/12 - 12/15/13 (* LEAs with more than \$50,000 in Title I, Part A funds must obligate 85% of these funds by 9/30/13*); State: 07/01/12 - 08/15/13

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER: All information contained in the DDOE LEA Consolidated Grant Manual and in the DDOE LEA Consolidated Grant Application is subject to change, depending on receipt of federal US DOE rules and guidance. LEAs may be required to submit amendments that would bring the application into compliance with such documents at any time during the effective dates of the grant.

2.3 Program Coordinators and Allocations

Federal Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Rookard, Sharon sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us	\$434,350.00	12/15/2013
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	Norris, Mary Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	\$344,935.00	12/15/2013
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	Norris, Mary Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	\$3,940,932.00	12/15/2013
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	\$4,918,451.00	12/15/2013
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	Comegys, James james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us	\$1,373,583.00	12/15/2013
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	Castaneda, Ariadna Ariadna.Castaneda@redclay.k12.de.us	\$248,410.00	12/15/2013

State Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Give Back</u>	<u>Amount Requested (After Give Back To State)</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Curriculum and Professional Development	Smith, Christine Christine.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us	\$189,991.00	\$0.00	\$189,991.00	12/15/2013

2.4 Contact Information

Consolidated Grant Coordinator:

Local Education Agency (LEA) Information:

Phone: 3025523700

Fax: 3029927820

Street Address: 1502 Spruce Avenue

Town: Wilmington

State: DE

Zip: 19805

Consolidated Grant Coordinator:

Name: Stewart, Malik

Telephone: 302-552-3700

E-mail: Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us

IMPORTANT: Summer Contact Information (July – August): An LEA representative needs to be available who is authorized to make substantive changes to the grant as well as to make final dollar allocation decisions.

Name: Miller, Christine

Telephone: 302-552-3815

E-mail: Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us

Homeless Liaison: Miller, Christine

Telephone: 302-552-3815

E-mail: Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us

Parent Liaison: Miller, Christine

Telephone: 302-552-3815

E-mail: Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us

IMPORTANT: Summer Contact Information (July - August): An LEA representative needs to be available who is authorized to make substantive changes to the grant as well as to make final dollar allocation decisions.

2.5 Constituency Participation

The Public Process for Developing the Consolidated Application Plan and Review and Public Reporting Requirements

Question A

A.1 Explain the process through which parents, community members, LEA and building administrators, teachers, and students, including representatives of children with disabilities, participate in the planning, design, and review of the LEA Success Plan and this Consolidated Application. [Section 1112(d)(1)]

Coordinated by the Deputy Superintendent and the Office of Federal and Regulated Programs, the Consolidated Grant Application Planning process is organized to maximize time, expertise and input. This started in fall 2010 with a district-wide update to strategic plan goals and continued with the district's monthly staffing meetings and the February 2012 School staffing discussions, and with the revision of the strategic plan in 2011-2012.

The process incorporated: Federal & Regulated programs, Curriculum & Instruction, IDEA - special needs, parents, CTE/Perkins Advisory, and Priority and focus school staff/teachers. The 2013 Consolidated Application was developed via a series of meetings related to staffing and the strategic plan with contributions from Program managers, district and building level administrators, representatives from the Red Clay Parent Advisory Council, representatives from nonpublic schools, Red Clay Curriculum and Instruction staff, teachers and Red Clay special education staff members. Red Clay also received guidance with the redesign of the strategic plan from Distinguished Educators Educationally Speaking, LLC and Mass Insight.

The staffing and planning meetings were a part of a timeline to complete the grant application prior to the DE Department of Education's first deadline, July 13, 2012. Each team had to review information that would contribute to the development of the application. The district has one message: all resources, including the Consolidated Funds will continue support the 5 District Goals. In addition, The Office of Federal and Regulated Programs received support from the New Castle County Title I Consortium, DE DOE, US DOE and the Data Service Center. Once the Consolidated Grant Programs were final, the Grant Development Team worked to complete and submit a draft. 2011-2012 DCAS, DIBELS Next data, along with district assessments, PLC meetings, parent and staff surveys and other program specific data were reviewed to develop plans to support the five (5) district success (strategic) goals.

Planning and information sessions included the Red Clay Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC) to obtain parent input. Ongoing communication with Program Managers at the Department of Education also assisted in the completion of the grant application, including discussions following the approval of Delaware's 2012 ESEA waiver. Throughout the school year a series of meeting were held with leaders from the nonpublic schools to assure ongoing meaningful and timely consultation; viewing the application at the formative level, provided feedback and made recommendations to be included in the application.

The RCCSD Administration reviews the budget document to ensure alignment with the district's new Strategic Plan Goals and focus. The due date of the final draft to the Superintendent and CFO is the week of July 9, 2012. After review, and any last minute edits the document will be signed and ready for submission by July 13, 2012. Once final approval is received from DE DOE copies of the approved application will be distributed to the School Board, all Program Managers, Red Clay schools, Parent Advisory Council members, nonpublic schools representatives and district administrators. It will also be posted on the Red Clay website. Regular reviews and focus group sessions will be used to discuss progress in implementing strategies and activities toward meeting the goals

Question B

B.1 Record the dates of the Consolidated Application LEA Planning Committee Meetings. [Section 1112(d)(3)]

Dates of Meetings:
September – October, 2011: Partnership Zone School Planning
September 16, 2011: Title I Equitable Services Meeting

October 4, 2011: Federal Programs Meeting - Equitable Services
 October 8, 2011 - Perkins Advisory
 October 25, 2011: Title I Coordinators Meeting
 November 2, 2011: Superintendent's Parent Group
 November 4, 2011: Meeting with Gartner Inc., Using data when making decisions
 November 14, 2011: Meeting with DE PTA
 November 17, 2011: Staffing Meeting – Federally funded
 November 28, 2011: Long range strategic planning
 December 2, 2011: Summative Update (Consolidated Grant FY 11)
 December 9, 2011: Strategic Planning focus: Literacy improvement by grade 3 planning
 December 21, 2011: McKinney Vento; District School Success Team
 January 4, 2012: Title I coordinators meeting
 January 9, 2012: Strategic planning team and Poverty discussion
 January 26, 2012 – Federally funded staffing
 January 30, 2012: Federally funded staffing
 January 31, 2012: Summer Enrichment and HQT
 February 3, 2012: Middle School parent engagement
 February 6, 2012: Poverty planning
 February 7, 2012: Federally Funded staffing
 February 7, 2012: Title I vendors meeting
 February 10, 2012: Title I reading support planning
 February 13, 2012: Poverty workshop planning
 February 14, 2012: Staffing Meeting – Highlands, Lewis, Shortlidge, Baltz
 February 15, 2012: Staffing Meeting – Warner, Marbrook, Mote, Richey, Al Middle
 February 22, 2012: Staffing Meeting – Stanton Middle
 February 23, 2012: Staffing Meeting – Richardson Park Elementary
 February 29, 2012 - Title I Staffing meeting
 March 5, 2012: Long Range planning Meeting
 March 6, 2012: Strategic Plan Next Steps meeting
 March 8, 2012: Title I Meaningful Consultation Meeting - Equitable Services
 March 13, 2012: Kindergarten Transition Meeting
 March 13, 2012: Federal Programs Meeting - equitable services
 March 14, 2012: Consolidated Grant and Staffing
 March 16, 2012: Parents As Teachers transition discussion for Schoolwide buildings
 March 20, 2012: Strategic Planning
 March 21, 2012: Staffing Committee Meeting
 March 22, 2012: Title I and Title II funded staff discussion
 March 23, 2012: Transition to kindergarten
 March 29, 2012: Title I staffing and block schedules (middle schools)
 April 2012: Professional Development and Teacher Quality (Title IIA and Curriculum and Professional Development)
 April 2, 2012: Title III funding discussion
 April 3, 2012: Strategic Plan Meeting
 April 5, 2012: Title I and Partnership Zone meeting (Stanton)
 April 17: 1) Consolidated Grant Update; 2)Parent involvement and literacy; 3) Warner 2012-13 planning
 April 23, 2012: District Support Team Meeting

April 24, 2012: Strategic Plan
April 26, 2012: Staffing Committee
April 27, 2012: Offsetting potential federal cuts
May 1, 2012: City of Wilmington Parent planning meeting
May 2, 2012: Superintendent's parent council
May 8 – 10, 2012: Focus School Meeting and Strategic Planning
May 15, 2012: Title III Meeting
May 16, 2012: 1)Title III Improvement Meeting with DEDOE; 2)Targeted Middle School planning
May 17, 2012: 1)Data Meeting regarding the Loti; 2)Kindergarten transitions meeting
May 17, 2012: Meaningful Consultation Meeting - equitable Services
May 18, 2012: District Success Team Meeting
May 24, 2012: 1)Goal #5 Parent and Community Engagement Meeting; 2)Saturday School Meeting
May 29 2012: 1) Strategic Planning Work session; 2)Focus School readiness interviews (data and needs assessment)
May 30, 2012: Strategic Planning connections to the school level success plans
June 2012: Professional Development Discussion (Title IIA and CPD)
June 5, 2012: Parent Engagement Plan
June 19, 2012: Federal Programs meeting for all private schools that have signed Intent to Participate Forms for FY' 13; equitable services to private schools.
June 20, 2012: Focus Schools meeting with DEDOE and AI Middle, Baltz and Warner
June 25, 2012: Focus Schools Meeting with Superintendent
June 26, 2012: Focus School Community Meeting at West End Neighborhood House
July 2, 2012: Consolidated Grant Parent Meeting
July 2, 2012: Focus Schools meeting with DEDOE and AI Middle, Baltz and Warner
July 9, 2012: Focus Schools meeting with DEDOE and AI Middle, Baltz and Warner
July 9, 2012: Consolidated Grant Parent Meeting
July 10, 2012: Focus Schools meeting with DEDOE and AI Middle, Baltz and Warner and Title III Improvement Session

Question C

C.1 How does the LEA provide information on school regulations, activities, testing, and instruction to the parents of students identified as English Language Learners (ELLs)? How does the LEA make written materials accessible and understandable to parents with varying levels of English literacy? [Section 1118(f)]

Red Clay's English Language Learners Office and Assessment Center, is responsible for disseminating all information to our minority language families. During the registration process, parents have the option of selecting all school correspondence in a minority language (Spanish is the primary minority language spoken in the district; the next three languages are Korean, Chinese and Arabic). Through an ELL Online System, schools can request translation services ranging from written materials to services during parent/community events and meetings (interpreters). This process helps the district's ELL Office and Assessment Center ensure that all documents sent to parents regarding school regulations, activities, testing and instruction are translated properly. The schools provide additional data through their needs assessments, and the ELL office works with other offices, such as Federal and Regulated Programs and Special Services to coordinate services for families and students.

District staff uses supplemental translation services to make reasonable and feasible accommodations necessary to improve communication with ELL parents in inviting them to participate in parent meetings, receive information on school regulations, activities, assessments and instructional services and to provide opportunities to support the schools as volunteers. Every effort is made to translate these documents into other minority languages, including phone messages sent through the "Alert Now" system that are also translated into home languages. It is the responsibility of the ELL Office to review all translations to ensure that documents are understandable to people with varying levels of literacy. The ELL Manager participates in the allocation and implementation of federal resources via the Consolidated Grant Application processes, and the office and staff serve as valued resources to families to whom English is a second language. The office also provides workshops in conjunction with district schools and community centers to assist families in comprehending American school policies, regulations, local curricula and other important educational items. In addition, information is shared through parent meetings. Each student's parents receive progress reports throughout the year and individual state assessment scores. Student progress is made available to parents/guardians in a language they understand, unless clearly not feasible. All achievement information on identified ELL students is shared with school administrators, who in turn share this information with their school communities. This information is also addressed in the school success plans. The Special Services Department provides additional assistance to parents of students with disabilities by providing translation services related to the student IEP.

2.6 LEA Support for Local School Planning: Systems, Structures, and Services

Question A

A.1 Identify the schools in the LEA that are currently under improvement and their individual ESEA sanctions. [14 Admin Code 103, Section 7.0] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

A.2 Describe the specific technical assistance that the LEA will provide for each Title I school identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring. [Section 1116(b)(4) and Non-regulatory guidance D-1, D-2, D-3] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

A.3 Describe how the LEA will ensure that each Title I school identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring has or will revise its school success plan to meet the 10 requirements for schools under improvement. [Section 1116(b)(3)(A)] (Please refer to the "Additional Resources" link in the header of this section.) If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

Question B

B.1 Section 1116(b)(10)(A) of the ESEA requires LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to set-aside 20 percent of its Title I, Part A funds to meet the requirements for choice-related transportation and supplemental educational services. An LEA may use other allowable federal, state or local funds to support either Public School Choice Transportation or Supplemental Educational Services to meet all or a portion of the 20 percent set-aside requirement. If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required. If the LEA chooses to use other funds to meet this requirement, list the source(s) of the other funds and the total amount of funds associated with each source of funds. [§200.48(a)(ii)-(iii) of the Title I regulations] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

Question C

C.1 Section 1116(b)(E) of the ESEA requires LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to provide all students with the option to transfer to another public school served by the LEA that has not been identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. Describe the actions the LEA will take to implement the ESEA Choice requirements. [Section 1112(b)(1)(M)]

If no Choice options are available within the LEA, describe how the LEA attempted to establish a cooperative agreement with other LEAs in the area to offer transfer options. [Section 1116(b)(11)] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

C.2 Section 1116(e) of the ESEA requires LEAs with Title I schools identified for phase II of improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring to offer Supplemental Education Services (SES).

Describe the process the LEA will use to implement Supplemental Education Services (SES) during the school year and summer. [Section 1116(e)(1)-(3)] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

C.3 Describe the process the LEA will use to protect the identity of students who are eligible for, or receiving, supplemental education services. [Section 1116(e)(2)(D) and Section 1116(e)(3)(E)] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

Question D

D.1 Each Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring must set aside 10 percent of its funds to address the professional development needs of the school staff. [Section 1116(b)(3)(iii)(I-III)]

Describe how the funds will be used in each Title I school to move the school out of improvement. [Section 1116(b)(3)(iv)] If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

D.2 LEAs in Improvement or Corrective Action are required to set-aside 10 percent of their funds to address the professional development needs of LEA and/or school staff. [Section 1116(c)(7)(iii)]

How will the funds be used in order to move the LEA out of improvement? If Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved, a response to this question is not required.

Delaware's application for ESEA Flexibility is approved; a response to this question is not required.

Question E

E.1 Describe how the LEA uses high-quality academic assessments, if any, that are in addition to the DCAS, that the LEA and schools use to (1) to determine if children served under Title I meet the State Standards, (2) provide information to teachers, parents, and students on progress toward meeting the standards, (3) assist in the diagnosis, teaching and learning in the classroom to best enable children served under Title I to meet the state standards, (4) determine what revisions are needed to the Success Plan to ensure children are meeting the state student academic achievement standards and (5) if applicable, to identify students who may be at risk for reading failure or who are having difficulty reading, through the use of screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based instructional reading assessments, as defined in Reading First [Section 1112(b)(1)(A)(i-iv)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District uses a number of high quality academic assessments in addition to those required for state accountability purposes to determine the success of children in meeting the core content curriculum standards, and to provide information to teachers, parents, and students on student progress in relation to the standards. The assessments provide information to assist in classroom diagnosis, teaching, and learning in ways that best enable low-achieving children served under applicable federal programs to demonstrate progress toward and to meet the state achievement academic standards; to help determine what revisions are needed to strategies so that such children meet the standards; and to effectively identify students who may be at risk for reading failure or who are having difficulty reading, through the use of screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based instructional reading assessments.

These assessments include:

Reading/English Language Arts

- The WIDA ACCESS English language proficiency tests are used to assess listening, speaking, reading and writing proficiency for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in grades K-12.
- Early screening profiles, like ChildFind and Parent Checklists are administered to all preschoolers seeking admission to the all-district kindergarten programs. The data identifies student proficiency in language and cognitive development before they move into kindergarten.
- Literacy: Scott Foresman to provide information about the way children understand core instruction in the classroom. aligned to the state standards so these assessments can give some indication as to the attainment of the GLEs; schools also use STAR reading and use (Dolch) sight word lists to help in the diagnosis of student needs for RTI instruction. We are also adopting more diagnostic assessments this year to inform instruction.
- Benchmark assessments and item banks are available to schools to assist in development of benchmark tests for progress monitoring.
- DIBELS Next - This assesses a student's competence in foundational reading skills; testing oral reading fluency and comprehension. These skills predict later reading success and identify reading support in order to monitor progress.
- Selected Schools use the STAR assessment to determine proficiency with the Accelerated Reader Program.
- Study Island is implemented in targeted schools to identify and target student needs to directly impact instruction.

Mathematics

- Math trailblazers: In the Curriculum Mapping Guides there is a section entitled: "Desired Results assessed". This section identifies specific assessment pages or activities for each Trailblazer unit. Teachers also use Formative Assessment booklets that contain questions for each Trailblazer Unit. These are supposed to be given at the end of the unit.
- Singapore Math: To provide a consistent and strong emphasis on problem solving and model drawing, with a focus on in-depth understanding of the essential math skills recommended by the common core. Singapore establishes a strong foundation of math skills with a lot of repetition.
- Elementary Math: Math probes and DreamBox Learning for K-3 Math to identify individualized math instructional needs. This online learning program lets students work independently, keeping all learners, from struggling to advanced, in their optimal learning zone. DreamBox Learning's rigorous math curriculum is aligned with Common Core State Standards and builds conceptual understanding and fluency in the critical areas of Number and Operations, Place Value, and Number Sense so students have the foundation they need to succeed
- Secondary Math: unit assessments (Quiz/Test/ACE questions; Core questions, common quarterly assessments) and the aligned curricular map identifies what's essential and important

The Red Clay Consolidated School District will continue to monitor previously measured indicators with increased data collection, analysis and monitoring.

Red Clay measures, among others, the following indicators:

- Attendance: K-12 Students each academic year.
- Course Average/report card grades
- Graduation rate: The percent of students who graduate in grade 12 with their cohort.
- Dropout rate: The dropout rate for the district and for individual schools.
- Suspension rate: The suspension rate for the district and for individual schools.
- Retention rates
- Student Perception Survey
- Teacher and school survey data
- School Climate Survey
- Parent Involvement Survey reports
- Participation rates in programs (Extra curricular and academic programs)
- Alcohol, Tobacco, and other drug usage survey
- Nurse's reports and data from auxiliary services such as school psychologists, family crisis therapists, Instructional Support Teams, Counselors, Advisors, Coaches, and Community School centers and supports.
- Administrators and teachers collaboratively analyze individual student and classroom data.

Red Clay Consolidated School District's Office of Research and Evaluation conducts research projects to determine the impact various practices, programs and services have on student achievement. Findings from these projects are used to inform policy making and resource allocation decisions. Research and Evaluation works with various Central Office departments as they plan, implement, monitor and assess the effects of the services they provide to schools and students. Studies and trend analyses are an integral part of determining assistance and the basis for making curricular and instructional decisions at the district, school and classroom level. The results of the assessments and supporting information are analyzed and used to plan instruction and better focus team planning and responses.

E.2 Describe how the LEA will provide additional assistance to individual students assessed as needing help in meeting the State's challenging academic achievement standards. [Section 1112(b)(1)(C)]

- The Red Clay Consolidated School District, along with its school-based Instructional Support and Leadership Teams, identifies the areas where students require additional assistance and outlines a plan of action to ensure that students receive the assistance to compliment the diagnosis. Each school identifies students "at-risk" of failure and uses I-Tracker Pro to record a personal education plan for those students. The plan identifies each student's tier, their area of academic/personal focus, the intervention strategy, the amount of time needed, and the progress that they make toward the goal is updated throughout the year.
- Each school develops an improvement plan to assist students who need additional help in meeting academic achievement standards. The plan is updated annually and presented to the District Office for approval. Individual strategies may include but are not limited to:
 - Tutoring before, during and after school, and Saturday Library/Academy/Literacy. Extended day programming is aligned with the curricular standards to help students to grow towards academic proficiency (this includes after school, Saturday and Summer Enrichment).
 - Small group instruction with focused instructional formats and resources with additional guided reading lessons for at-risk students
 - Additional computer support, literacy kits, Leveled books including books with decodable text and high frequency words
 - Sessions for parents and materials for parent education and engagement sessions
 - Summer transition programs to prepare incoming children for kindergarten
 - Refining Title I School-wide plans to ensure that there's a whollistic focus on Schoolwide needs (reduce segmented programming)
- The district provides pre-kindergarten programs for high poverty and English Language Learner families at targeted schools. Early interventions provide these students an opportunity to enter kindergarten on an academic level more closely aligned with their peers and on grade level. The services targets students who are at-risk, and match them with effective educational staff members. There are also summer extensions for pre-kindergartner students at 3 regional sites, one in the city of Wilmington and another in the county – focusing on serving ELL populations. Schools also implement Jump Start programs, offering entering kindergarten students the opportunity to participate in activities, have their learning levels identified, and receive family supports prior to the start of school.
- RCCSD provides credit recovery grade acceleration through EDOptions program to enable students to complete school requirements.
- RCCSD provides an alternative education setting for students who require a specialized environment to continue and complete their educational goals.
- Supplemental services are provided to assist schools in addressing cognitive and other learning challenges that may inhibit a child's ability to process or participate in 21st century learning. Mentoring, psycho-social supports, counseling and family assistance are a part of this type of intervention.
- Interpreters are utilized when needed at meetings where school teachers and principals discuss with parents the progress their children are making in meeting academic achievement standards; other interpreters in other languages are employed on an "as-needed basis."

Question F

F.1 Describe how the LEA will coordinate services provided under Title I with programs under Title II to provide professional development for teachers and principals, and if appropriate, pupil services personnel, administrators, parents and other staff, including LEA level staff. [Section 1112(b)(D)]

The effectiveness of our school community accounts for the majority of coordinated efforts to improve student achievement. To support educator accountability, Red Clay provides research-based instructional knowledge and resources designed to successfully meet the needs of our district. This provides foundational support for the development of a standards-based education. An area of particular focus is the instructional effectiveness of teachers

of Special Education students and ELL students through differentiated PD in all curricular areas, such as differentiated instruction, instructional accommodations and curricular modifications, new models of support, collaborative teaching, multilevel instruction, understanding of English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards and the connection to common core standards. At the Macro-level, the School Board has an approved policy for standards based education and professional development to align with it. Also at the macro level, the Strategic Planning Action Team recommends, directs the usage of, and approves resources in alignment with the data and the recommendations of district and school sources, including Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), Curriculum Councils, and the Red Clay Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC). PLCs provide job-embedded systems for decision-making and needs assessment at the school levels; and create reports that include data which inform building and systemic needs and success. The Curriculum Councils are composed of teachers and content specialists from all district schools and content areas, and designed to ensure the alignment of the district curricula and professional development to the common core. They review curricular and instructional information and make recommendations related to instructional practice. The RCPAC provides an opportunity for the district to communicate with representative school communities, provide training and an opportunity to design community supports that align with the goals. After the inclusion of stakeholders– the district then considers the usage of all funding sources. Mandatory, district-wide supports are initiated with regular, local resources and then supplemented with federal funds (in accordance with their regulations). At the Macro-level, the Strategic Planning Action Team recommends, directs the usage of, and approves resources in alignment with the data and the recommendations of the supportive groups. This helps to impact the overarching goals and focus the strategies to meet them. It also ensures that the professional development occurs through team planning with support from a variety of sources both traditional (internal school community) and when needed, external (DE DOE Distinguished Educators, Consultants, community partners).

Professional development is at the core of influencing district goals and is research based, ongoing and designed to meet the needs of schools (by helping staff gain knowledge relevant to instructional practices, effective supports and high achievement). The Staff Development is provided through courses, consultants, workshops, distance learning, family workshops and conferences. At the building level, principals, assistant principals, and academic deans support ongoing staff development by using their allocations to continue the knowledge locally. The resources are used to provide EPER for onsite learning after school hours, to send school community members to conferences that relate to identified goals, to bring in national/regional/local expertise, and to provide coverage for adult learning that takes place during the school day.

The Professional Development is then designed to impact the goals of the strategic plan, and the actions are funded with Title II, Curriculum and Professional Development, IDEA, Title III, Title I and other resources. The professional development plan addresses “best practices” for staff development activities derived from a district wide needs assessment. Coordinated Professional development includes:

- Leadership:

- Blueprint (communication, team management, professional feedback) – The Flippen Model

- Staff Performance Appraisal Training related to highly effective instruction

- Professional Learning Communities

- Literacy focus: all K-3 instructional staff use of best teaching practices in early literacy. This includes a four year-long systemic job-embedded professional development to focus on modeled lessons, in- class coaching, feedback, and providing differentiated strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners.

- Embracing Diversity

- Engaging parents and communities as partners in learning

- Understanding the Culture of Poverty – developing a core of certified trainers

- SIOP/TWIOP/ Dual Language programming

- Inclusive Education and best practices for learning challenges

- Stetson Collaborative teaching: crafting clarity related to the multiple support models for students with special needs emphasizing the importance of individual student-centered decisions for assigning supports and services.

- CPI –non-violent crisis intervention training: to significantly reduce classroom incidents and suspensions, create behavioral and crisis response plans, and ensure safe learning environments for teachers and students

- Brain-based education (S.M.A.R.T. Boost Up, Jensen, CHAMPS Leadership Academy)

- Program Management and Compliance

- Using federal resources to support systemic improvement models.

- Operating compliant programs in accordance with regulations
- Informing trends and best practice

Professional development includes Administrators, Teachers, Federally funded personnel (ex: IST, Title I reading and math specialists, and paraprofessionals. PLCs, parents, and Building Leadership Teams. It also includes ongoing training in areas such as DPAS IIR, literacy strategies and curriculum delivery and adaption, inclusive education, and finance. Schools that educate ELL students participate in specific staff development opportunities (ACCESS, SIOP/TWIOP/Dual Language training), and also take part in training to support reading instruction. General education and IDEA-funded personnel collaboratively receive training in co-teachings strategies and transitions (between middle and high schools and select elementary schools). Literacy coaches at each Title I building provide monthly professional development to address reading challenges and also facilitate monthly literacy workshops for parents. Coordination between Carl D. Perkins, Title I, Title II, IDEA, CPD, and Title III includes the following examples: training to serve homeless students; sessions for teachers and families to support an understanding of diversity; 21st century college and career readiness and access; information literacy; supporting high achievement in inclusive settings; integrating technology into professional development within the curricular frameworks, and the use of variety of formats (district wide, site based, individualized, online, and train-the-trainer) to support staff development needs (ex: GPS activities, teacher webpages, flip videos, Inspiration/Kidspiration, Photo Story, SmartBoard lessons, Mimio, Document cameras, iPods/iPads, Google documents, Google calendars, Google email and netbooks).

The resources are also matched to implement:

-Parent education sessions are held at individual schools, regional community locations and the district office, designed to help parents become full partners in their children's education through free courses, family events and activities purposed to equip families with new or additional skills, knowledge and resources. The district identifies needs via the annual district and school parent involvement surveys. Title II, IDEA B, Title I, and Title III funds are coordinated to support professional development and workshops focused on strategies to support instruction at home, (for ELL families), Parent Forums help families understand transitions, IDEA processes, and school laws, pre-school and kindergarten transition, community supports, parent compacts, and AYP.

-To insure our teachers are highly qualified and effective, Title II and Curriculum and Professional Development funds are used to offer support for graduate level courses in curriculum areas that support teaching methods to enhance content delivery.

-All teachers new to the district have New Teacher Induction before beginning their assignment and all teachers with two years or less experience continue to attend monthly trainings throughout the school year. Each newly hired teacher will be assigned a mentor to assist with any areas of need throughout the year.

F.2 Describe how the LEA will coordinate and integrate services provided under Title I with other educational services at the LEA or individual school level, such as : (1) transitional services for students in preschool programs to local elementary schools programs and/or (2) the coordination of programs for ELL students, children with disabilities, migratory children, neglected or delinquent youth, homeless children and immigrant children in order to increase program effectiveness, eliminate duplication, and reduce fragmentation of the instructional program. [Section 1112(b)(1)(E)(i-ii)]

Transitional Services for students in preschool programs to local Elementary programs:

The Red Clay Consolidated School District operates preschool programs in targeted high poverty elementary school buildings (Baltz, Mote, Shortlidge and Warner) and provides uses partnerships with entities such as Parents As Teachers, Pritchett Associates, community agencies and uses the skills of its highly effective Pre K staff to offer Professional development for area preschool centers. This provides onsite opportunities for visits to kindergarten classes, parent meetings, and transition conversations and training sessions between preschool families and the feeder elementary schools. To provide further assistance with the transition process from preschool to kindergarten, all district incoming families are invited to orientations in the spring and the summer in community partner sites, and additional family days are scheduled in summer enrichment sites – this includes transportation. Red Clay works with its community partners to hold conversations related to kindergarten transition. Students and parents are provided a tour of the school to acclimate them to the facilities. This includes collaborating and communicating with Head Start and other providers of early childhood development programs on activities including transfer of records, development of communication channels for teachers and staff, meetings for parents and teachers, transition training, and linking services. The district conducts a “Jump Start to Kindergarten program” targeting low-income preschool children to expose them to kindergarten curriculum and provide families with materials and guidance for home-based supports. This allows incoming children to become comfortable with standards-based learning and gives the families opportunities to visit the school and address screening for educational and connected needs.

Coordination of Programs for specified populations to increase program effectiveness:

Coordination and integration of services at the local educational agency and individual school level are accomplished through the involvement of administrators, staff, and parents. The Federal Programs, Student Services, School Operations, District Operations, Curriculum this includes professional development, curriculum, parent workshops, student assessments and reporting. In addition, monthly administrator meetings involving central office administrators and principals provide a means of keeping an open line of communication between and among programs.

Services for children with limited English are provided using Title I and III funds as well as local monies. Limited English Proficient students are identified using the home language survey and they are served in the regular classroom, as well as with IDEA and Title I supports, and receive supplemental services from speech and reading teachers, technology and an ELL resource teacher funded by local and Title III funds. To help teachers more effectively work with students with limited English proficiency the district's ELL Office supports and trains staff deployed to identified schools, giving the teachers appropriate strategies for helping the students achieve success in the regular classroom. Parents receive information from the teacher about the academic plans for the year, what they expect from the school and the teacher, and how they can most effectively be involved with their child's education.

Special Services:

The Special Services Office works with the Curriculum, Operations and Federal Programs (Title I) Offices to identify, train and place support staff in positions to best meet the needs of children. This may include school psychologists, Family Crisis, Therapists, Instructional Support Team Members, and Special Education staff, along with paraprofessionals, community school resources and parent educators. The Office of Research and Evaluation leads each school through analyzing data; supporting teacher work in small collaborative teams to use the data to improve student learning. Additionally, RCCSD offices collaborate to develop school capacity in using their resources to understand and effectively implement appropriate Tier 1, 2, 3 interventions. Instructional Support Teams (IST) aid local data collection and the implementation of the school wide plan; and in cases such as with Richardson Park ILC and Richardson Park Elementary School, the schools share services and resources to help all students excel. The Office also coordinates the Parent Forum series in Title I schools; a series of informational workshops to assist families in obtaining services for their children (these services include transitions).

Other offices:

Breakfast, snack and lunch are also provided through the state Child Nutrition Program and these services support children developmentally. The Office of Human Resources assists with filling vacancies in Title I buildings and supervising protocols for hiring and staff evaluations; the office also coordinates the staffing team which includes all program managers and monthly staffing meetings.

District Services:

Assist with principal mentoring and coordinates auxiliary services to buildings, such as prevention programs, and community-based education supports. These supports include 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and other supportive programs that are part of the school wide plan.

Joint Development:

The Deputy Superintendent leads the Strategic Plan action Team as well as the District School Support Team. The Strategic Planning Team helps to set and clarify the district goals and assists in the translation of the goals to school level success plans and activities. The Support Team focuses on providing resources and advice to targeted schools in an effort to improve performance and put a spotlight on low achievement.

Homeless students who attend Title I Schoolwide schools may have unique challenges that exceed the services offered by the regular Title I programs in the schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in temporary living situations (shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions) may not have a quiet place to study after school and may require extended-school resources within the school day (due to potential transportation challenges); or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services or community school supports. Title I, Part A, in conjunction with a McKinney-Vento subgrant and other programs, allow

students experiencing transition to benefit from and participate in a school's program. The RCCSD Homeless Liaison completes an investigation and then aligns services that are specific to the law and the identified family needs and situation. Homeless resources are linked to the child's educational needs, and may provide needed classroom supplies, transportation as prescribed by the law, and fees to support the student's opportunity to participate in all school activities (eyeglasses; health, nutrition, and other social services; or provide specialized professional development to liaison staff).

F.3 This question should only be completed by LEAs with Title I schools operating preschool programs.

Describe how the LEA will use its Title I, Part A funds to support preschool programs for children, particularly children participating in Early Reading First, or in a Head Start or Even Start program, which services may be provided directly by the local educational agency or through a subcontract with the local Head Start agency designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 641 of the Head Start Act, or an agency operating an Even Start program, an Early Reading First program, or another comparable public early childhood development program. [Section 1112(b)(1)(K)]

To support preschool programs for children, the Red Clay Consolidated School District:

-Operates preschool programs in targeted high poverty elementary school buildings (Baltz, Mote, Shortlidge and Warner) designed to meet the full range of developmental needs of young children, and help children grow and thrive in their academic careers. The services are located within school buildings in areas that meet the same Delaware Office of Child Care Licensing rules that apply to privately licensed settings. The programs were developed in consultation with experts from the University of DE and The DE Division of Youth & Family Services.

-Partners with Parents As Teachers, civic, and health entities/agencies to offer transitional professional development for area preschool centers, including Head Start and Early Head Start agencies. The onsite opportunities focus on standards based instruction and serve families (Head Start, Early Head Start, relative caregivers, Neighborhood care centers, etc.). The district provides opportunities for parent and child playgroups (summer and school year), preschool partnerships for students with identified needs, activity nights, mental health consultation and family forums focusing on health, child (social, physical, and emotional) development and early learning, social service access. This helps Red Clay impact child literacy and parent partnerships before they enter the school, with PAT aligning our services to families with children from birth – 5 (helps children reach their full potential). Parents As Teachers also works very closely with Head Start as well as with other community agencies in helping to have children ready to learn. PAT attends the district's kindergarten readiness sessions, provides guiding information in the homes of students who are about to enter kindergarten, and offers "getting ready for school" classes, held at the elementary schools, for children and their parents.

-Conducts workshops and professional development conducted by the highly effective staff members in the Red Clay preschool sites and from our Literacy Coaches; the workshops for providers and families are scientifically based and developmentally appropriate and aligned to educational performance standards related to school readiness. Jointly develops sessions to enhance literacy knowledge and skills, including phonological awareness, print awareness and skills, and alphabetic knowledge; mathematical skill, science and the arts.

-Provide ABE (adult Basic Education) services to enhance parent literacy and basic educational skills.

-Collaborates with Head Start and other providers of early childhood development programs on activities including transfer of records, development of communication channels for teachers and staff, transition training and other mechanisms to ensure that children participating in Head Start programs make a successful transition to the schools that the children will be attending.

-Conducts periodic screenings include formal hearing and vision tests, speech and language screening, and checks on fine and gross motor skills development.

-Provides itinerant services - Families meet with teachers/therapists in their own community settings. RCCSD also meets with families at Headstart/ECAP to receive services and works with the DE DOE office of Exceptional Children to ensure compliance. This allows pre-school children to be served in the least restrictive setting with their typical peers and peers in the community; provides complex and intense students more intensive therapy needs; and allows for speech language therapists and special education pre-school teachers to provide support and consultation to Headstart, ECAP and other community day care providers.

Question G

G.1 The following question should only be answered by LEAs with Title I schools designated as “Focus”. LEAs with Title I schools designated as “Priority” according to Delaware’s ESEA Flexibility plan may use a portion of their Title I, Part A funds to support these Title I schools. Please indicate if the LEA intends to set aside any funds to support Title I Priority Schools.

<input type="radio"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	No
<input type="radio"/>	N/A

G.2 The following question should only be answered by LEAs with Title I schools designated as “Focus”.

LEAs with Title I schools designated as “Focus” according to Delaware’s ESEA Flexibility plan must set aside a portion of their Title I, Part A funds (between 5 and 20%) to support state approved interventions in these Title I schools. Please indicate the amount the LEA intends to set aside and provide a justification for the amount based on the following factors: 1) the number of Focus

Schools the LEA is required to address; 2) total student enrollment in the school(s); 3) the total number of students in each subgroup that caused the school (s) to be identified; and, 4) the scope of the state approved intervention(s) the LEA proposes to implement in the schools.

Red Clay is setting aside 5% or \$245,922.55 in Title I resources to support focus school initiatives at Al DuPont Middle School, Austin D. Baltz and Emalea P. Warner Elementary Schools. The district has based this amount based on the following considerations:

- In May 2012, Warner Elementary School submitted an application for over \$540,000 in 1003g funds. These funds are slated for intensive school improvement efforts over three years (the majority of funds targeting instruction and professional development), as are focus school funds. District resources have provided Warner with additional early intervention (3rd year of the Pre-K pilot), a transition coordination to address transient students, and an additional (Academic Dean) administrator.

- The district estimates that Baltz Elementary school will demonstrate growth toward making AYP for the second straight year and would look to sustain initiatives that have been successful over the 5 years of change. In addition, District resources are supporting the 2nd phase of Flippen Training at Baltz with Capturing Kids Hearts professional development throughout the year along with early interventions (Pre-K 2nd year of the pilot).

- The district is allocating resources to support a district-wide literacy initiative that will impact all priority and focus schools.

- Al DuPont Middle School is implementing a block schedule to provide greater time and intensive focus on instruction and supplements to core content areas. District Resources have provided the school an additional administrator (Academic Dean) and the initial professional development for instruction in the block schedule.

- A district-wide plan is being developed to address our Title III improvement status. In 2011-12, the district commissioned the George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education to evaluate the EL program and provide a report to guide efforts to address Limited (academic) English Proficiency needs and exposure. The district is has initiated training in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2000) to provide teachers with a well-articulated, practical model of sheltered instruction that facilitates high quality instruction for English Learners in content area teaching. AIMS, Baltz and Warner have all attended SIOP training. In addition, with the support of the Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, the district is developing cultural competence programming for 2012-13.

- Combined, the 3 schools have over \$34,000 remaining in existing 1003(a) and state school improvement funds that must support initial Focus efforts due to early end dates.

Red Clay Consolidated School District believes that the based on the district’s current targeted investment in the Focus schools and specifically in the targeted student populations, that the amount allocated will be sufficient enough to be 50% of the total application costs in year 1 (maximum) and to support initiatives for years two (2) and three (3).

See DDOE's accountability regulations (14 DE. Admin Code § 103) and the ESEA Act (20 U.S.C. § 6316).

2.7 Parental and Community Involvement

Question A

A.1 Describe the parental involvement activities as they relate to students needs that will be implemented at the LEA-wide level. [Section 1118(a)(3)(A)]

It is clearly stated in the district's Strategic Plan that every effort will be made to build strong relationships with the rich diversity of our students, families and community partners. The district holds administrative and instructional staff accountable to parents and will provide them with efficient customer service that supports academic and personal success for their student. Information and resources will be disseminated throughout the year to parents and the community that will encourage engagement opportunities that support student success especially for ELL students and students with disabilities. The district will engage the parent and community partners in literacy initiatives outlined for the students. Also, continued efforts to increase family partnerships to support post-secondary success are ongoing.

The Red Clay Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC) along with the District Parent Involvement Liaison has the primary responsibility for coordinating district-wide parental activities as they relate to identified student needs. The RCPAC interacts primarily with district and building level administrators, Title I staff, and members of school PTAs, PTOs and other school support associations. Events are planned throughout the year that addresses topics recommended by parents as strategies to help students to succeed academically and personally. An annual Family Resource Fair is hosted by the RCPAC in the fall in order to encourage parent engagement and community support. This free, family oriented event provides information and resources about all the services provided by the Red Clay Consolidated School District. outside community agencies that have partnerships with either the district or Red Clay schools and strive to promote student achievement and parental engagement at home, in the school and the community also provide displays and exhibits at the Family Resource Fair. The goal of the Family Resource Fair is to "make your child's education a family project."

From September through May, the RCPAC meets once a month to (a) participate in goal-setting and the planning process district-wide; (b) to review collection and analysis of data, as well as data driven decision making; (c) to develop and maintain the district parental involvement policy context with those developed at the school and district level; (d) to gather and analyze feedback from the building-level PTAs, PTOs and other school support associations relative to the effectiveness of such policies on an annual basis; and (e) to make recommendations for changes or adaptations to the district's RCPAC through utilizing the data from the Parent Involvement Survey (f) and to learn about the day-to-day operations of the district.

The Parent Involvement Liaison organizes the weekly taping of "Red Clay This Week," a local cable network broadcast that airs twice a week to promote communication, parent involvement, and engagement and parent education. These informational tapings are also posted on the parent information page of the Red Clay District website and are intended to serve as a resource tool for parents.

Departments across the district provide parent education training programs throughout the year addressing the various needs of students, parents, schools and community. The department of Special Services holds monthly Parent Forums addressing key concerns of parents regarding supporting student academic and personal success especially for the English Language Learner and the student with disabilities. The Office of ELL also provides parent training opportunities throughout the year in Red Clay schools and local community agencies that focus on specific needs of the ELL student and their family.

Results of the annual Parent Involvement Survey assist in assessing the impact of the LEA. The feedback provided by the surveys facilitates the design of programs and policies.

LEA-wide activities will focus on the district's efforts to impact the student's needs specific for each school and to help parents support these efforts. This will be done by providing the opportunity to receive supplemental assistance from local, regional, state and national organizations and professionals. The district also encourages parents to attend learning experiences provided by nationally acclaimed speakers so the knowledge can be transferred to the local buildings and school families.

Parents are encouraged to participate in training opportunities sponsored by the DE State PTA, Learning Link of Delaware, the Parent Information Center of Delaware and the Delaware State Parent Advisory Council (State PAC).

A.2 This question should only be completed by LEAs with more than one school.

Describe the parental involvement activities as they relate to student needs that will be implemented at the school level. [Section 1118(a)(3)(A)]

Title I staff, as well as the building level instructional leadership team in all schools, along with parents, and administrators work cooperatively to design, develop and implement parent involvement and engagement activities. Activities may be during or extend beyond the student's instructional day. Funding for engagement events may come from a variety of sources depending on the available financial resources for the school. For most schools, the primary funding source is the building allocation/reservation for parental engagement. Data collection and analysis from ongoing assessment of school and student needs provides the justification for the type of parent engagement activities that are organized at each school. Schools may consult with parent involvement specialists and data coaches to help analyze the data from the needs assessments in order to design and organize appropriate parent engagement activities. All participating schools strive to have a positive climate that is welcoming and motivational in order to encourage parental engagement. Building level administrators and teachers meet with parents to develop strategies to create a sense of connectedness at the schools. Schools strive to promote a sense that the family, school and the community work together in order to accomplish the essential goals for students to maintain healthy lifestyles while making safe choices to achieve and succeed academically in order to be successful members of society and positive contributors to the community when they become adults. By establishing school connectedness the needs of the student population is identified and parents recognize their role. Cooperatively and collaboratively all stakeholders work together recognizing that everyone has a vested interest in the student's academic achievement.

When parents are provided with the strategies that fosters and encourage parent involvement and engagement, they will take an active role in the planning, design and evaluation of School Success Plans, Compacts and the Parent Involvement Policy. As a result of their involvement, parents will expect accountability on all levels with results supporting student achievement and meeting student needs.

Parents are encouraged to be involved in their student's school on a regular basis and to attend parent involvement training sessions sponsored by local, state, regional and national organizations that promote parent engagement strategies. Parents are also encouraged to network and partner with families in other schools across the district and throughout the state to create, enhance and promote the involvement of parents in all Red Clay schools. Lastly, parents in all schools are encouraged to be actively involved in the design, development, implementation and evaluation of programs and delivery of services provided to students in all Red Clay schools.

Question B

B.1 Describe how the LEA jointly develops, and distributes to, parents of participating children, a written parent involvement policy that meets the requirements of Section 1118(a)(2) of the ESEA.

The Deputy Superintendent, the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs, the District Parent Involvement Liaison, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Directors of School Operations, the Supervisors for ELA, the Instructional Cadre, building administrators at school-wide Title I schools, Title I teachers, parents of students who attend Title I schools and School Success Plan Team members all in some way provide support and direction regarding the federal requirements for the development, implementation and annual review of Compacts and Parent Involvement Policies.

This LEA has a well-established and active District Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC). Each Red Clay school is to designate at least two parent representatives to serve on the Red Clay Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC). The RCPAC members meet monthly with the District Parent Involvement Liaison to share strategies and also engage in training opportunities that promotes parent involvement and parent engagement. Also, strategies to help students at home and at school to achieve academic and personal success are discussed.

The RCPAC uses a parents teaching parents model that helps to improve the knowledge and skills of each member. This approach in turn helps each RCPAC member to have an increased knowledge base so they can encourage other parents at the schools they represent to take an active role in the planning, decision making and implementation of policies, events and activities. The parents as teachers for other parents model ultimately should result in schools having an increased number of parents being more actively involved in the decision making process at their respective schools.

Professional development opportunities that educate RCPAC members about designing, implementing and evaluating both the school Compact and the school and district Parent Involvement Policy is conducted each year. The LEA and RCPAC have each established a sub-committee made up exclusively of parents representing Title I schools and city schools. These subcommittees work with district personnel to assure parents understand the rights and responsibilities of parents.

In addition, the LEA designates members of RCPAC to represent the district and attend the Delaware State PAC meetings. Information and strategies obtained at these meetings is shared with the RCPAC members and also shared with the PTA, PTO and other school support associations at each individual school. This networking opportunity serves to encourage and improve parental involvement and awareness at each school.

Throughout the school year, regularly scheduled meetings with administration and teachers in Title I schools are conducted by the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs, the Parent Involvement Liaison, and the Supervisors for ELA. Professional development training is provided to assist schools with the development of the school Compact and Parent Involvement Policy. Also, best practices addressing instructional delivery, assessment and engaging parents are shared with all staff. Strategies to be effective communicators with parents and school families are also discussed. Partnerships with knowledgeable resource agencies and parent engagement professionals such as but not limited to Learning Link of DE, Delaware State PTA and the Parent Information Center of Delaware have been established.

The Parent Involvement Policy is made accessible to parents and concerned community members using the following strategies:

1. The policy is posted on the district website with a direct link to it from every school website page.
2. The policy is posted on the school website under district policies.
3. The policy may be printed in the district newsletter that goes to all homes in Red Clay, The Red Clay Record.
4. The information in the policy and how to view the policy is shared during a taping of "Red Clay this Week", a weekly half hour cable network broadcast that airs twice a week.
5. The policy is provided to all RCPAC members in the fall and is included in the manual given to all RCPAC members. (RCPAC members serve as a direct link that keeps the lines of communication open between the school's parents and the district.) Copies of this manual are also provided to principals. (Copies are available in all school offices)

Throughout the school year each Title I school is to maintain a notebook which includes a section on parent involvement and engagement opportunities. Professional development training is provided by the LEA to Title I building staff and administrators to assure a comprehensive and compliant notebook is maintained throughout the year and submitted to the LEA at the close of the academic year. Documentation included but not limited to are meeting agendas, attendance logs, narrative summaries, photos, artifacts from events held at the school for student and parents and the procedural processes incorporated at each school for drafting school specific and authentic documents and assuring compliance of all regulations.

B.2 Describe how the LEA conducts, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the LEA's parental involvement policy. Describe how the LEA will use the results of this evaluation to revise the policy, if necessary [Section 1118(a)(2)(E)].

A subcommittee is formed each year consisting of members from the RCPAC. Their role is to assure the Policy is reviewed annually. Any recommendations, feedback or suggestions from the subcommittee members are provided to the Parent Involvement Liaison. This information is also shared with RCPAC members, the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs and the Assistant Superintendent for Student Support. Based on the comments of the subcommittee additional meetings may be scheduled with the possibility if necessary of updating the policy or implementation of activities during the next school year to assure compliance of the Policy. The District Parent Involvement Policy was recently revised and approved by the board during the 2009-10 school year. A subcommittee drafted the document along with support from the Parent Involvement Liaison, the Assistant Superintendent for Student Support Services, the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs and the District's policy and grant writer. The draft was reviewed numerous times at the monthly RCPAC meetings and was also presented at a monthly board meeting. In addition, on a separate occasion an opportunity was provided for community comment. The document is also posted on the district webpage allowing an opportunity for additional public comment. The Policy was also reviewed by the District's Board Policy Committee. Once the final document was drafted and accepted by the subcommittee, RCPAC and other stakeholders, the Assistant Superintendent for Student Support Services presented the Policy to the Board requesting a vote and approval. The policy is posted on the District's website and each school's home webpage. The Policy includes a statement that it will be reviewed annually.

B.3 Answer only if LEA has more than 1 Title I school.

Describe how the LEA ensures that each Title I school jointly develops with, and distributes to, parents of participating children, a written parent involvement policy and parent-school compact that meets the requirements of Section 1116(b) and (d) of the ESEA. Note: Schools may adopt the LEA policy only if the LEA policy contains the school-level provisions outlined in Section 1118(b) and (d).

The Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs, the district Parent Involvement Liaison, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Supervisors of ELA, building administrators at school-wide Title I schools, Title I teachers and School Success Plan Team members all in some way provide support and direction regarding the federal requirements for the development, implementation and annual review of Compacts and Parent Involvement Policies. This LEA has a very well established and active district Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC). Each Red Clay school is to designate at least two parent representatives to serve on the Red Clay Parent Advisory Council, (RCPAC). The RCPAC members meet monthly with the District Parent Involvement Liaison to share strategies and also engage in training opportunities that promotes parent involvement and parent engagement. Also, strategies to help students at home and at school to achieve academic and personal success are discussed.

The RCPAC uses a parents teaching parents model that helps to improve the knowledge and skills of each member. This approach in turn helps each RCPAC member to have an increased knowledge base so they can encourage other parents at the schools they represent to take an active role in the planning, decision making and implementation of policies, events and activities. The parents as teachers for other parents model ultimately should result with schools having an increased number in parents being more actively involved in the decision making process at their respected schools.

In addition, the LEA designates members of RCPAC to represent the district and attend the Delaware State PAC meetings. Information and strategies obtained at these meetings is shared with the RCPAC members and also shared with the PTA, PTO and other school support associations at each individual school. This networking opportunity serves to encourage and improve parental involvement, engagement and awareness at each school.

Professional development opportunities that educate parents about designing, implementing and evaluating both the school Compact and the school and district Parent Involvement Policy are made available throughout the school year. The LEA has established a sub-committee made-up exclusively of parents representing Title I schools that works with district personnel to assure parents understand the rights and responsibilities of parents whose children attend school-wide Title I programs.

Throughout the school year, regularly scheduled meetings with administration and teachers in Title I schools are conducted by the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs, the Parent Involvement Liaison, and the Supervisors for ELA. Professional Development training is provided to assist school staff with the development of the school Compact and Parent Involvement Policy. Strategies to share this information with parents and school families are also suggested.

Throughout the school year, each Title I school is to maintain a Title I notebook which includes a section on parent involvement and engagement opportunities. Professional development training is provided by the LEA to Title I building staff and administrators to assure a comprehensive and compliant

notebook is maintained throughout the academic year. Documentation included but not limited to are meeting agendas, attendance logs, narrative summaries, photos, artifacts from events held at the school for student and parents and the procedural processes incorporated at each school for drafting school specific and authentic documents and assuring compliance of all regulations.

Through district meetings and small focus group sessions with Title I buildings, the building administrators will develop the capacity to educate parents about the Compact and the Parent Involvement Policies, with the support from the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs, and the district Parent Involvement Liaison. Each year, Title I schools will host an informational event that explains to parents and school families what a school-wide Title I program is and how it serves to help students. Parents are provided with an explanation and a hard copy of both the Compact and Parent Involvement Policy. These documents are designed collaboratively with all stakeholders and target the specific identified needs of the students. The documents will be drafted using a uniform format and will use a language that parents understand. Parents will be encouraged to sign the Compact that may also include the signature of the student, the teacher and the building administrator. This document serves as evidence that the school and home have a sincere commitment to work cooperatively and collaboratively to support each student so they may succeed academically.

Copies of all documents will be kept on file at the school. Each year, a committee which includes parents will review, revise, evaluate and edit the building Compact and Parent Involvement Policy to assure the needs of the school and the students are addressed. This process is also implemented with regard to the district Parent involvement Policy.

The LEA, when applicable, encourages and financially supports parents of Title I students and the RCPAC members who represent Title I schools to attend parent involvement training opportunities. These events may be sponsored by various state, regional and national organizations and other local LEAs to help parents gain a better understanding and knowledge base of the components of a school-wide Title I program.

In addition, regarding dissemination of the Parent Involvement Policy:

1. Schools will print the policy and may include it in their mailing to the parents. (The back to school packet, principal's or parent organization newsletter or other school level distribution to parents)
2. During the fall Title I information evening, staff share information about the LEA Parent Involvement Policy, the building level Parent Involvement Policy and the building Compact. At this informational session for parents, school staff share hard copies as well as provide information regarding locating the document on the district website.
3. Discussion of the Policy may be shared with parents during PTA/PTO or other parent organization meeting.
4. RCPAC has a subcommittee that reviews the policy each year. This subcommittee provides a report of their review to RCPAC members. Members are encouraged to share any information discussed at RCPAC meetings with their school parents. Tentatively, the policy is scheduled for review and revision next year.

Question C

C.1 Describe how and when the LEA distributes the following information to parents of children in Title I schools:

- Written SEA complaint procedure [34 CFR Section 299.11(d)]
- Parents' right to know teacher and paraprofessional qualifications notice [Section 1111(h)(6)(A)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District's Distribution of:
Complaint procedure:

How: Written document is shared at the building level with families; family packets and through the parent meetings to explain Title I, Part A requirements and on the district webpage. It's also shared with RCPAC membership as a part of the monthly meetings and on Red Clay This Week TV Show. Procedure is posted publically

When: At the beginning of the year and throughout the year
Parents Right To Know:

How: Written document is shared at the building level with families and through the parent meetings (opportunities for two-way dialogue) to explain Title I, Part A requirements and on the district webpage. It's also shared with RCPAC membership as a part of the monthly meetings and on Red Clay This Week TV Show. Right to know is posted publically.

When: At the beginning of the year and throughout the school year

Improvement Identification:

How: Written document is shared at the building level with families and through the parent meetings (opportunities for two-way dialogue) to explain Title I, Part A requirements and the communication is posted on the district webpage. Schools also schedule communication sessions prior to the start of school to discuss the identification and invite families to participate in corrective actions and restructuring efforts. The written information is communicated in family home languages and the document is vetted through school parents prior to mailing. The SI information is also shared with RCPAC membership as a part of the monthly meetings and is presented on Red Clay This Week TV Show and with community partners.

When: At the beginning of the year and throughout the school year

C.2 Describe how the LEA ensures that the principal of each Title I school annually attests in writing to meeting the requirements for highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals [Section 1119(i)(1)(2)]

Each school year, the Human Resources and Federal Programs Offices work together to ensure staff at local buildings meet the Requirements of ESEA Section 1119, through the review of files and staff hiring. Principals are instructed to attest annually that their school is in compliance with the ESEA requirements and copies of attestations are:

- oMaintained at each school,
- oMaintained at the school district, and
- oAvailable to the general public on request

C.3 Describe how the LEA disseminates and makes public the results of the LEA progress reviews to staff, parents and the community [Section 1116(a)(1)(C)]

The district's Office of Research and Evaluation provides support for the review of Summative results along with the Office of Federal Programs. Summative progress is shared with staff members prior to the start of school in team meetings for plan verification and revision (as needed). Parents and community members are invited to both regular school-based parent meetings, RCPAC meetings, and school board meetings where the district shares the formative and summative results. The summative progress results are also accessible on the web. The school based meetings are best in communicating and defining summative progress (attempting to define the "why" and explain next steps or expected outcomes).

The district prepares summative results in a variety of understandable formats and languages for all parents, and is providing training for parent leaders in analyzing and communicating results. The Progress is also communicated through the annual parent meetings at each Title 1 building and in communications distributed by improvement school notifications.

While always looking to improve communications, the District's procedures are supported by data from the 2011 Parent Involvement Survey, which revealed that parents feel they have "been informed of the academic expectations at their child's school (rating 4.42 on a 5.00 scale)."

Question D

D.1 Describe how the LEA ensures that Title I schools provide, to each individual parent, timely notice that their child has been taught for four or more weeks by a non-highly qualified teacher (if applicable). [Section 1111(h)(6)(B)(ii)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District works to fill all available positions in accordance with the Requirements of ESEA Section 1119. This includes: hiring teachers and paraprofessionals who have met the highly qualified regulations outlined in state and federal law, and if needed, developing a plan to ensure all teachers are highly qualified.

The District's office of Human resources works with the local building principals and Federal Programs offices to coordinate a process to fill available positions and ensure that both candidates and staff in Title I buildings meet the HQT requirements. At the beginning of each school year, the district notifies parents in a variety of communication methods (in print, verbal in the annual parent meeting, and through the use of the webpage and TV show) that they have the right to request specific information about the professional qualifications of their child's classroom teacher(s). This information includes:

1. Whether the teacher has met state qualifications and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction.
2. Whether the teacher is teaching under emergency or conditional certification.
3. The baccalaureate degree major of the teacher and other graduate certification or degree, and the field of discipline of the certification and/or degree.

The schools, with technical assistance from HR and Federal Programs, provide timely notification if a pupil has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified. This notification is in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Samples of the notification and the Parent's right to know are on the district webpage.

D.2 Describe how the LEA ensures that each Title I school invites parents to an informational meeting to inform them about the school's participation in Title I, Part A and their right to be involved. [Section 1118(c)(1) and (2)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District:

1. uses the notebook collected from the previous school year and reviews the communication strategies between the home and school regarding the Title I program. This includes documentation from informational meetings related to Title I.
2. communicates directly with families using a variety of mediums (web, "Red Clay This Week" weekly broadcast, written notices, and parent event recruitment by parent leaders) throughout the year.
3. meets with families during both the annual parent meeting, ongoing trainings, at their requests, and during parent forums to communicate the school's participation in Title I and their right to be involved.
4. provides each Title I School with a template of the required elements for the informational meeting.
5. monitors the implementation of the meetings and, when requested, provides some of the information during the meetings.
6. presents information related to section 1118(c)(1) and (2) to parent groups, such as Red Clay Parent Advisory Council, Parent Information Center of Delaware, Parents As Teachers and The Learning Link of Delaware.
7. uses data from the annual Parent Involvement Survey to gauge school and family needs related to parent engagement.

Question E

E.1

Describe how parents, students, teachers, and representatives of business and industry, through the Perkins Advisory Committee, were involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Career and Technical Education programs assisted by this grant.

The Perkins Advisory Committee is focused on providing industry-linked programs and services that enable all students to reach their college and career readiness goals in order to achieve a high-quality lifestyle, to be competitive in the global market-place, with 21st century skills and abilities. The Committee serves as a catalyst to build partnerships between businesses, community and schools so as to foster academic achievement and career & technical skills that prepare students for college and the work force. The district level Perkins Advisory Committee meets at least once a year and include a representative number of industry experts, students, parents, k-12 educators, post-secondary educators and other stakeholders. Content specific staff and partners' communication throughout the year as needed. The committee reviews the courses, their content, and the facility/equipment and provides guidance for pathway development, innovation, upgrade, enhancement and implementation.

CTE courses are developed:

- Based on labor market needs
- Industry/community input concerning curriculum, equipment, and facilities
- Availability of resources to start and sustain a program
- Availability of qualified instructors

Every year the school district provides communications to the community indicating the programs that are offered in Career & Technical Education. Academic and industry standards are embedded in CTE courses. The development and on-going monitoring of the programs involve all the partners. On an annual basis, all these representatives are provided with the data on enrollment, pathway completion, graduation rates, follow up, student feedback, and post-high school outcomes. That data helps to drive and tweak our plans for the following year.

2.8 Equitable Services

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA generated funds for equitable services for each eligible federal program including: Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A.

Each year during the month of March, a packet including two Letters of Intent to Participate is sent to the principals of all non-profit private schools located within the Red Clay feeder inviting them to participate in the Consolidated Grant application. One letter is specifically for Title I. The second letter is for Title IIA, III, IDEA and the option to participate in any competitive grant awarded to the district throughout the fiscal year. Each school has until May 1st to sign and return the Letters of Intent to Participate. After the initial due date, a second set of letters and either a follow-up phone call is made or an email is sent extending a second invitation to participate in the federal programs for the upcoming fiscal year. The Letters of Intent to Participate explains the various

federal programs available, and whether an allocation, resources or both are available for the various grants. The cover letter that accompanies the Letters invites the participating private schools to a federal programs meaningful consultation meeting scheduled during the month of June. The federal programs meaningful consultation meetings (3 annually) are separate and in addition to the county-wide Title I meaningful consultation meetings. Because students who are Red Clay residents may attend a private school outside of the Red Clay feeder, the LEAs in New Castle County and the Smyrna School District work collaboratively and copy all signed Letters of Intent to Participate for the Title I program. Each LEA in the NCC consortium (Colonial, Brandywine, Christina, Smyrna, Red Clay and Appoquinimink) provides all participating LEAs with a copy of all the signed Letters of Intent to Participate to assure all residential and academically eligible students will be referred for and receive services pending available funding. Also, included in the mailing from the LEA is the template of a Confidential Family Survey. This is the tool participating private schools are to use to collect poverty data if the district has not received poverty data prior to the mailing. All schools that plan to participate in the Title I program must provide poverty data to calculate a reserve and provide participating schools with an allocation and services.

Title I Part A

All private schools are provided with a Confidential Family Survey template that is to be used to collect poverty data for the participating private school. Most private schools collect this data during the first week of school with a return date of October 1st to the school office. The completed Confidential Family Surveys are due to the feeder LEA by December 15th. The Confidential Family Survey template is a standardized document used by all New Castle County school districts and the Smyrna School District to assure collection and review of poverty data is consistent across the county. All surveys collected for the district are given to Data Service Center for data analysis in order to determine the poverty data for each school where Red Clay students attend. All reports from Data Service Center are provided to the district by June 15th in order to have the data included in the Consolidated Grant. Eligible students are to be identified by the participating schools in order to schedule Title I services to eligible students. A student must meet both residency and academic eligibility to receive services.

Residency Eligibility-The referred student must live within the feeder of a participating Red Clay Title I school.

Academic Eligibility-Determined in Meaningful Consultation with principals from participating private schools, a student must have a C or below in either or both reading and math and a standardized test score below the 49%ile. The student must also have a signed parental consent to refer for services and a completed Referral Form which includes the signature of the principal.

All eligible students will be priority ranked to receive services. This district will pool all allocations and provide services in priority order to the Red Clay students attending private schools within or outside the district's feeder who demonstrate the greatest identified academic needs. A third party vendor provides the Title I services at the participating schools. Each student is entitled to two 45 minute sessions each week.

Title II Part A

2% of the total Title IIA allocation is set-aside for all participating private schools. The total allocated amount is divided by the total number of private schools students eligible for services and reserved for use by the participating schools. The district has an established protocol for requesting, use and if necessary, reimbursement of reserved funds to the schools.

7/30/12 - Revision:

Correct, This process has been in place for many years and is acceptable and understood by all participating privateThe LEA ensures that the services provided to students, teachers and parents in the participating private schools receive are equitable in comparison to the services provided to public school students, staff and families by assuring funds are reserved for instruction, professional development and parent engagement.

Revision, August 13, 2012

Title I Part A

The LEA

calculates the proportion of low income private schools children to the total of all low-income children (public and private) in the participating attendance area. The proportion is then applied to the total set-aside to calculate the amount that must be made available to the private schools. Instructional services will begin at the same time as the Title I program for public school students. The funding is available as soon as the Consolidated Grant is processed and a purchase order is created to pay for services invoiced by the third party vendor that provides the Title I services. The Title I services provided to private schools students will be consistent with the type of supplemental services that are provided to Red Clay Title I schools. The private school program will be designed through ongoing meaningful consultation with participating private school principals. Though the LEA makes the final decisions for all services and maintains control of the funding, all decisions for program design, service delivery, and assessment are made through meaningful consultation.

Principals are expected to sign a Letter of Affirmation by June stating that meaningful consultation was held throughout the year to plan the program and

that all components of the Letter of Affirmation has been discussed. During meaningful consultation meetings the following topics are discussed:

- What services the LEA will offer to eligible private school children;
- The amount of funding available for services
- How and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services;
- How, where and by whom the LEA will provide services to eligible private school children, including a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of services through a contract with a third-party provider;
- How the LEA will assess academically the services to eligible private school children in accordance with Sec. 200.10 of the Title I regulations and how the LEA will use the results of that assessment to improve Title I instructional services;
- The size and scope of the equitable services that the LEA will provide to eligible private school children and, consistent with §200.64, the proportion of funds that will be allocated to provide these services;
- The method or sources of data that the LEA will use under §200.78 to determine the number of private school children from low-income families residing in participating public school attendance areas, including whether the LEA will extrapolate data, if a survey is used;
- The equitable services the LEA will provide to teachers and families of participating private school children;
- If the LEA disagrees with the views of the private school officials on the provisions of services through a contract, the LEA must provide the private schools the reasons in writing why the LEA chooses not to use a contractor.
- The opportunity for the participating private schools to file a formal complaint with the LEA, the state or US Ed.

The Title I services provided to private school students will begin at the same time of year as the services provided to the public school students. The agreed start date is determined in meaningful consultation with the private school principals. All materials and supplies used in the private schools by the vendor will be purchased and labeled property of the LEA. The LEA ensures that the content of all instructional materials, supplies and resources are secular, neutral and non-ideological in accordance with federal regulations. school officials, DE DOE staff who conduct audits as well as US ed. staff auditing delivery of equitable services to private schools.

Title III Part A

Services are provided to all participating private schools as needed and requested. Contact information for the ELL office is provided to all private schools during the Federal Programs Meaningful Consultation Meetings.

A.2 Describe the LEAs process for designing, implementing and evaluating programs for eligible private school students, staff and their families in consultation with private school officials

Regularly scheduled Meaningful Consultation Meetings with private school administrators determines the following:

- academic and assessment criteria
- criteria for referral for services
- process for referral for services
- timeline for referral process
- determining residency eligibility – how to determine if a student resides within a Title I feeder school to be eligible
- scheduling of services
- materials and instructional supplies and materials
- site visits
- portfolios
- conferences
- two way communication between parents and vendor staff
- two way communication between district and the LEAs
- grade spans to be served
- assessment tools
- dates of assessment
- progress reporting and timeline for providing progress reports to school staff and parents
- use of facilities by vendors
- standardized test scores and other school assessment tools to determine student needs
- end of year report by vendors
- feedback surveys provided to private school administrators, teachers and parents
- start and end date for providing services
- professional development opportunities
- parent involvement opportunities
- availability of the Title I Toolkit for Equitable Services as a resource and reference for Private Schools

A.3 For Title I, Part A, describe the criteria the LEA used to determine which private school students will receive equitable services. [Section 1120(b)(1)(A) and Section B.4 of non-regulatory guidance]

- Referral to the US Ed. Private School Services Toolkit was used as the starting point to determine assessment criteria, content areas, grade spans and other related concerns related to providing equitable services to private schools.
- During meaningful consultation it was decided that the standardized test school must be 49%ile or below.
- Report card grade must be a C or less. (A or B for students with accommodations would also be considered)
- Identified weaknesses using a standardized referral form that includes a checklist and anecdotal comments
- Guidance from DE DOE
- Collaboration with all Title I coordinators in New Castle County and Smyrna School District

***A student must reside within the feeder of a Title I school in order to be eligible for services. A student may not just demonstrate academic need to receive services.

Question B

B.1 Describe who will provide services to eligible private school students, staff and their families.

An RFP is designed by DSC for the Colonial and Red Clay School Districts to select a 3rd party vendor to provide services. After reviewing all bids submitted Title I coordinators from the Colonial and Red Clay districts along with DSC staff and the Title I coordinators from the other districts participating in the New Castle County consortium rate the bids using a rubric and submit a recommendation for selection of a vendor to DSC and the Chief Financial Officers.

All other NCC districts traditionally piggyback and sign a contract with the vendor approved by the Red Clay and Colonial School Boards. The contract with the vendor is for one year with an option to roll over for an additional year. The vendor will provide services to all participating private schools in New Castle County who sign a Letter of Intent, submit poverty data and identified academically at risk students who reside within the feeder of a participating Title I school.

A new RFP was designed for the 2011-12 school year. All districts participating in the New Castle County consortium and private school administrators collaboratively drafted the RFP during meaningful consultation. The vendor was selected after all bids were reviewed and rated using a rubric. Only LEA staff and DSC staff served on the bid review committee.

During Meaningful Consultation it was agreed that the district pool the Title I reserve to pay for Title I services to district students attending participating private schools.

This district will not provide funding to other districts.

Services provided will be 45-minute sessions, offered two times a week.

Content areas could be math, reading or both. (Kindergarten students receive a blend of reading, math and readiness skills.)

All districts in New Castle County and Smyrna School District work cooperatively and collaboratively to provide services to all eligible students receiving services no matter what district the private school is located.

B.2 Describe the types of services that will be provided to eligible private school students, staff and their families.

- Kindergarten students receive a combination of Reading/Math/Readiness instruction.
- Private schools were to identify on the Letter of Intent the grades they wish to have services provided.
- K-8 grade levels – Reading, Math or both (a minimum of 2 times per week during a 45 minute or more session)
- Extended school day services (depending on availability of funding)
- Summer school services (depending on availability of funding)

Instructional Strategies:

- Guided instruction
- Independent practice
- Computer assisted Instruction/practice skills
- Pair activities
- Vocabulary oral, choral reading teaching model
- Unit/skill work packets
- Review of core content as requested by the classroom teacher

Parent Involvement

Custom based training for parents to meet the needs of participating students will be provided to all parents. Parent input for programs is determined through two-way communication with the parents, parent surveys and parent interviews. Parents are invited to participate in an information session to become knowledgeable of all services being provided to the participating private schools. Third party vendors will maintain two-way communication with parents of all participating students regarding services, academic success and assessments. The LEA will communicate with parents as necessary to assure compliance of all federal regulations.

Professional Development

Through meaningful consultation with all participating private school administrators professional development opportunities will be offered to staff working with Title I students. Professional development may be offered by the third party vendor, the LEA or other agencies/resources that address the needs of the private school Title I students.

B.3 Describe how the LEA ensures that the services are equitable in comparison to the services provided to public school students, staff and families, and are provided in a timely manner, are secular, neutral and non-ideological.

The LEA ensures that the services provided to students, teachers and parents in the participating private schools receive are equitable in comparison to the services provided to public school students, staff and families by assuring funds are reserved for instruction, professional development and parent engagement. The LEA calculates the proportion of low income private schools children to the total of all low-income children (public and private) in the participating attendance area. The proportion is then applied to the total set-aside to calculate the amount that must be made available to the private schools. Instructional services will begin at the same time as the Title I program for public school students. The funding is available as soon as the Consolidated Grant is processed and a purchase order is created to pay for services invoiced by the third party vendor that provides the Title I services. The Title I services provided to private schools students will be consistent with the type of supplemental services that are provided to Red Clay Title I schools. The private school program will be designed through ongoing meaningful consultation with participating private school principals. Though the LEA makes the final decisions for all services and maintains control of the funding, all decisions for program design, service delivery, and assessment are made through meaningful consultation. Principals are expected to sign a Letter of Affirmation by June stating that meaningful consultation was held throughout the year to plan the program and that all components of the Letter of Affirmation has been discussed. During meaningful consultation meetings the following topics are discussed:

- What services the LEA will offer to eligible private school children;
- The amount of funding available for services
- How and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services;
- How, where and by whom the LEA will provide services to eligible private school children, including a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of services through a contract with a third-party provider;
- How the LEA will assess academically the services to eligible private school children in accordance with Sec. 200.10 of the Title I regulations and how the LEA will use the results of that assessment to improve Title I instructional services;
- The size and scope of the equitable services that the LEA will provide to eligible private school children and, consistent with §200.64, the proportion of funds that will be allocated to provide these services;
- The method or sources of data that the LEA will use under §200.78 to determine the number of private school children from low-income families residing in participating public school attendance areas, including whether the LEA will extrapolate data, if a survey is used;
- The equitable services the LEA will provide to teachers and families of participating private school children;
- If the LEA disagrees with the views of the private school officials on the provisions of services through a contract, the LEA must provide the private schools the reasons in writing why the LEA chooses not to use a contractor.
- The opportunity for the participating private schools to file a formal complaint with the LEA, the state or US Ed.

The Title I services provided to private school students will begin at the same time of year as the services provided to the public school students. The agreed start date is determined in meaningful consultation with the private school principals. All materials and supplies used in the private schools by the vendor will be purchased and labeled property of the LEA. The LEA ensures that the content of all instructional materials, supplies and resources are secular, neutral and non-ideological in accordance with federal regulations.

Question C

C.1 Describe the process the LEA uses to monitor the provision of services to eligible private school students, staff and their families.

1. A site visit observation form is used by all NCC Title I coordinators
2. Multiple visits are made to schools throughout the year by the LEA Title I Coordinator
3. Each vendor has a designated Title I project coordinator who serves as a liaison with the private schools, the vendor staff and the LEAs.
4. Monthly documentation includes but not limited to:
 - Record of student services provided monthly
 - Invoicing
 - Assessments
 - Professional development
 - Parent Communication
 - Teacher/Vendor Staff communication
 - Discharge from services
 - Portfolio updates
 - Inventory of supplies and materials
 - Schedule of services
 - Ongoing email/and or communication with schools/vendor/vendor staff
5. Satisfaction surveys are completed by the parents, principals and school staff.
6. Meaningful Consultation Meetings are held throughout the year.
7. One going communication via email with school principals.
8. Periodic meetings with the vendor administrative staff.

C.2 Describe the LEAs process for ensuring that allowable materials, equipment, and/or property are purchased and properly maintained and accounted for by the LEA.

DE DOE provided technical assistance to the LEAs regarding supplies and materials. (Guidance provided by email correspondence, professional development, resources on the state website and by phone communication)

Since 2009-10 this LEA has contracted with Back to Basics Learning Dynamics, Inc. as the service provider. Any materials/supplies released to the LEA by the previous vendor Catapult, and were purchased prior to 2009 were/are labeled property of NCC Title I schools.

Materials purchased as of 2009 are identified with a label stating: Property of Red Clay Consolidated School District with a line to note the year of the purchase.

An inventory is kept at the LEA of all supplies and materials purchased.

Private Schools are encouraged to provide textbooks and instructional materials to be used for re-teaching.

Supplemental materials may be approved and purchased by the LEA to be used in the private schools by the vendors.

Supplies and materials may also be purchased to assist with record keeping tasks and for storage of materials/supplies.

Requisitions are processed using the First State Financial program and are charged to the appropriate budget.

Question D

D.1 List the non-profit private schools participating in Title II, Part A.

All Saints Catholic School
St. Ann Elementary School
St. Anthony of Padua Elementary School
Padua Academy
St. Mark High School
Salesianum School
The Tatnall School
Wilmington Christian School
St. John the Beloved School
Ursuline Academy
Harvest Christian Academy
Sharon Temple Adventist School
Learning Laboratory

D.2 List the non-profit private schools participating in Title III, Part A.

All Saints Catholic School
St. Ann Elementary School
St. Anthony of Padua Elementary School
St. Mark High School
St. John the Beloved Elementary School
Ursuline Academy
Harvest Christian Academy
Sharon Temple Adventist School
Learning Laboratory

3.1 Title I Public School Data

Identify each school's Title I status in the Title I status column.

Public Schools

School	Title I Status	Grade Span	Total Enrollment	% FRL	% Exp Pov	# of LEAPov	# of Homeless
A I duPont High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	09-12	1254	41.95	47.77	41.70	14
A I duPont Middle	Schoolwide	6-8	541	84.84	88.54	83.90	11
Baltz Elem	Schoolwide	BK-05	532	75.75	85.34	100.00	18
Brandywine Springs	Not Eligible	KN-08	1088	15.44	19.49	15.00	4
Calloway Sch of the Arts	Not Eligible	6-12	876	12.44	16.67	12.20	0
Central School	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	166	81.33	87.35	81.30	7
Conrad Schools of Science	Not Eligible	6-12	966	33.85	38.51	33.50	4
Dickinson High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	09-12	618	60.68	68.12	58.80	18
First State School	Not Eligible	Ungraded	18	16.67	61.11	16.70	2
Forest Oak Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	KN-5	536	45.90	53.36	46.40	13
H B duPont Middle	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	6-8	855	43.51	47.02	41.00	8
Heritage Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	572	30.59	38.29	30.40	0
Highlands Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	367	84.74	86.65	83.40	7
Lewis Dual Language Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	475	85.89	91.79	100.00	15
Linden Hill Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	822	12.77	18.61	12.40	2
Marbrook Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	548	83.58	85.77	83.30	5
McKean High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	9-12	897	64.33	69.68	64.00	11
Meadowood Program	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	133	50.38	91.73	50.30	2
Mote Elem	Schoolwide	BK-5	555	88.65	90.45	100.00	6
North Star Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	735	3.95	6.12	4.20	1
Richardson Park Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	455	77.14	84.62	100.00	13
Richardson Park Lrng Cntr	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	322	59.94	70.19	60.30	14
Richey Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	402	62.19	66.92	61.70	6
Shortlidge Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	311	92.28	94.53	100.00	10

Skyline Middle	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	6-8	791	39.82	46.02	39.50	9
Stanton Middle	Schoolwide	6-8	713	77.14	81.63	76.20	10
Warner Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	555	88.83	92.43	100.00	28

3.2 Title I Data Questions

Please answer the following questions regarding school Title I designations.

Question A

A.1 What source of data was used to determine the Title I Status of the LEA's schools? (Please note the LEA must use the same data set for all schools) [Section 1112(b)(1)(G)]

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> | DEDOE-provided % free and reduced lunch data (11-12 Sept 30 Data) |
| <input type="radio"/> | DEDOE-provided % expanded poverty data (11-12 Sept 30 Data) |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | New LEA-provided data (NOTE: LEAs may use this option if they are experiencing feeder pattern changes or if they have access to more timely poverty data) |

A.2 If new LEA-provided data was used, please explain why this method was chosen and how the poverty data was obtained. [Section 1112(b)(1)(G)]

The LEA used student poverty data provided from e-school plus (free and reduced lunch data based on the September 30th count from the previous year) is used to determine eligibility; this data was reviewed by the Data Service Center, the Federal and Regulated Programs Office, and the Office of Technology Management. The district chose to use the February 2012 Active Student report, which included the Free-Reduced Lunch and homeless information. Red Clay found these numbers to be a more accurate representation of district poverty levels as they currently exist. In addition, we also take into account the USDA Provision 2 schools (Baltz, Lewis, Richardson Park, Shortlidge, Warner, and Mote (newly approved) Elementary Schools) - where the entire building is considered eligible for free and reduced price lunches, and for ranking and allocation purposes, are also considered 100% high poverty schools.

While the district has a single K-5 (non-special/ILC) school it doesn't serve with a free and reduced lunch eligible population of 46%, and at the 6-12 level, similar populations ranging from 40% - 64%; we've decided to prioritize our resources impact children prior to high school, focusing on K-5 schools with significant populations in poverty (K-5: 8 out of the 9 schools served have free and reduced lunch populations ranging from 83% - 100%; the additional targeted K-5 school has a similar population of 62%); and also targeting middle schools (6-8) with at least 75% free and reduced lunch eligibility.

Question B

B.1 Is the LEA serving all schools with poverty rates of 75 percent and above (based on the data source chosen above)? If no, please provide a brief explanation as to 1) why the school was skipped and how the school meets the comparability requirements and 2) is the skipped school receiving supplemental funds from other state and local sources that either meets or exceeds the amount that would have been provided with Title I, Part A funds AND is being spent in accordance with the Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide program requirements? [Section 1113(b)(D)]

The LEA is serving its traditional public schools with poverty levels at/above 75%; however the LEA is not serving its ungraded schools, which include Richardson Park Intensive Learning Center (ILC), Central School ILC, First State School and Meadowood School. Of these three, only Central ILC has a poverty rate of/above 75%.

The Central School Intensive Learning Center (ILC) serves students with specialized and exceptional educational needs and as a result, it receives tuition funds that far exceed the amount they would have received in Title I, Part A funds. In addition, some of the pupils return to their traditional district grade-level schools during the school year and graduate with that class.

The district's comparability report will reflect the LEA not only meeting the required average student: staff ratio for schools serving these students, but also providing instruction in accordance with laws for students who require special and specific accommodations to meet their identified needs**(per guidance from The Delaware Dept. Of Education - KW/TJ 2011)

B.2 Is the LEA electing not to serve or "Skipping" any other eligible schools that have a higher percentage of children from low income families than the schools that are being served? If yes, please provide a brief explanation as to 1) why the school was skipped and how the school meets the comparability requirements and 2) is the skipped school receiving supplemental funds from other state and local sources that either meets or exceeds the amount that would have been provided with Title I, Part A funds AND is being spent in accordance with the Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide program requirements? [Section 1113(b)(D)]

N/A - In accordance with Section 1120A(c)(5)(B) of the ESEA, the Red Clay Consolidated School District will demonstrate comparability for its schools that serve pupils with identified and documented special needs, including: Richardson Park ILC, Central School ILC, First State School and Meadowood School by estimating the number of staff the school would have received if it were not a school serving students with disabilities. We will use the standard unit count ratios provided by the Department in preparing the estimates.

The RCCSD comparability process will be implemented and the 2012-2013 calculations will be submitted to the Department in November using the ratios provided by the Department and in accordance with the grade configurations at the school levels.

Question C

C.1 What is the LEA's threshold for serving schools (or schools within a grade span) with Title I funds? [Section 1113(a)(2)(3)(B)]

- LEA has only one school which is eligible to receive Title I, Part A funds according to Section 1124(b) of the ESEA.
- Serving all schools with poverty rates equal to or above 35%
- Serving all schools equal to or above the LEAs total average poverty rate
- Serving all schools in a grade span equal to or above the LEAs total average poverty rate
- Serving all schools in a grade span equal to or above the average poverty rate of that grade span

- Serving all schools with a poverty rate equal to or above X% as determined by the LEA NOTE: poverty rate must be equal to or above the LEA's total average poverty or 35% (whichever is lower) if using a district wide ranking, or if ranking by grade span, equal to or above the average rate of that grade span or 35% (whichever is lower). (Please see C-2 below)
- Other (Please explain in C-3 below)

C.2 If "Serving all schools with a poverty rate equal to or above X% as determined by the LEA" was selected in C-1 above, what is the % threshold is the LEA using to serve schools with Title I funds.

N/A

C.3 If "Other" was selected in C-1 above, please explain the LEA's threshold for serving schools with Title I funds.

The Red Clay Consolidated School District is serving schools based on the following actions:
 Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility - Red Clay is serving schools equal to or above the LEAs total average poverty rate as measured by the % of free and reduced lunch students. The LEA's level is 50.2% - it established a threshold of at least 60%.

- 1) Grades K-5 with 100% poverty: The Red Clay Consolidated School district is prioritizing services to 6 schools (Warner, Shortlidge, Lewis, Richardson Park Elementary and now Mote) with free and reduced lunch levels of 100%;
- 2) Grades K – 5 with 75% - 99% poverty: Red Clay has another tier of children from 2 schools (Highlands and Marbrook) that it serves secondly;
- 3) Grades 6 – 12 with 75% poverty or greater: For 2012-2013, we are serving 2 schools - A.I. DuPont Middle (84% free and reduced lunch eligible and a focus school) and Stanton Middle (76% free and reduced lunch eligible and a Partnership Zone school).
- 4) Grades K – 5 with poverty at the district average/threshold - 75% - Red Clay is serving a single (1) high need school with a poverty rate 10% higher than the district average of 50.2%, Richey Elementary School (61.7%) as measured by the % of free and reduced lunch students.

Question D

D.1 This question should only be completed by LEAs with more than one school.

Please describe the methodology used to determine the per-pupil amount (PPA) for each participating Title I school. Note: LEAs with an enrollment of less than 1,000 or LEAs with only one school per grade span are not required to allocate funds to schools in rank order.

Once Red Clay receives its allocation amount, it makes a decision on the following District-resource reserves:

- Homeless Services
- Parental involvement (1%-1.5%)
- Instructional Services
- Focus Schools (5%)

It then has an amount to allocate to its eligible and participating schools. Red Clay decides to identify eligible schools with attendance areas at or above 35% poverty (Poverty in this case is equivalent with free and reduced price lunch eligible) and ranks them by both grade-levels and educational designation/purpose. In ranking, it establishes categories for schools to determine participation and allocations:

Category 1: Traditional K-5 and 100% Poverty (participating)

Category 2: Traditional K-5 and greater than 75% poverty, but less than 100% poverty (participating)

Category 3: Traditional 6-8 and greater than 75% poverty (participating)

Category 4: Traditional K-5 and greater than district poverty average/ threshold, but less than 75% poverty (participating)

Category 5: Traditional K-5 and greater than 35% poverty, but less than 60% poverty (ranked not participating)

Category 6: Traditional 6-12 greater than 35% poverty, but less than 75% poverty (ranked not participating)

Category 7: ILC with 35% poverty or greater (ranked not participating)

Category 8: Traditional k-12 schools with less than 35% poverty (not participating)

Once the participating public school attendance areas and categories have been established, Red Clay uses the remaining funds (after reservations) to calculate a PPA for each participating public school category – using the total number of children from low-income families residing in each attendance area to allocate funds for each participating school. Red Clay allocates resources within each category in decreasing rank order of poverty; starting with the categories above 75 percent poverty – prioritizing early intervention and elementary schools in categories 1 – 2; then high poverty middle schools in category 3, and high poverty elementary schools that are under 75% poverty but above the district threshold. From these PPA amounts, Red Clay reserves funds for the private school children (calculated for low-income private school students residing in the attendance areas of eligible category 1-4 schools) to provide equitable services to eligible private school participants. The LEA adjusts the PPA until all the resources (after the set-asides) have been expended.

3.3 Title I Private School Data

LEAs must provide equitable services to children attending non-public schools who reside in their eligible attendance areas. LEAs must list each eligible non-public school, the Title I participating status of the school, the grade span, and the number of low-income students who reside in the LEA's attendance area and the number of students who will be served based on educational need according to multiple, educationally-related, objective criteria established by the LEA.

Private Schools

School	Title I Status	Grade Span	# Low Income	# Ed Deprived
All Saints Catholic Schoo	Participating Private School	K-8	29	4
Harvest Academy Wilm	Participating Private School	K-8	7	5
Holy Angels	Participating Private School	K-8	3	0
Our Lady of Fatima	Participating Private School	k-8	5	2
Saint Mary's Early Ed Pro	Participating Private School	k	1	0
Serviam Girls Academy	Participating Private School	5-8	3	0
St. Ann	Participating Private School	k-8	18	11
St. Anthony of Padua	Participating Private School	k-8	18	15
St. Elizabeth's Elem	Participating Private School	k-8	24	7
St. John Beloved	Participating Private School	k-8	11	5
St. Michael's Day	Participating Private School	k-1	3	3
St. Peter's Cathedra	Participating Private School	k-8	41	6

3.4 Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Program Requirements

Question A

A.1 This question should only be completed by LEAs operating Title I Schoolwide programs. If all LEA Title I programs are Targeted Assistance, please move to Question B.

Explain how the LEA will ensure the Schoolwide program meets the 10 Requirements of Schoolwide Programs. [Section 1114(b)(1) (See the "Additional Resources" link above for this section.)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District does the following to ensure that we meet the 10 requirements (through the Federal and Regulated Programs Office):

- Regular meetings with Title I buildings to review each of the components and provide assistance on a school basis or a district basis (per the need);
- Monthly - bi-monthly Title I principal meetings to review and provide support for each component;
- The use of a school-based binder to capture artifacts from each component to assist with guidance, documentation, and monitoring visits from the District office, State or Federal officials;
- Consultant support with specific Title I Part A components related to Schoolwide programs (e.g. parental engagement, kindergarten transition, etc.);
- A schedule to monitor each Title I building and to review components;
- Meetings and discussions with Title I-funded staff to discuss the components and provide support with program implementation;
- Educational opportunities for schools, such as (not limited to) The National Title I conference (which has multiple sessions on Schoolwide programs); International Reading Association; Math Supervisor's conference; National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators; Ruby Payne, ASCD, NABE (bilingualism) and guidance related to Schoolwide Program implementation

A.2 Describe how each school operating a Schoolwide program will annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the Schoolwide program to determine whether the program was effective. [34 CFR Section 200.26(c)]

In RCCSD all eleven (11) buildings operate as Schoolwide Title I comprehensive programs. Schools use data received from the Office of Research and Evaluation to develop reports and document progress toward the objectives and support the analysis of program effectiveness. Based on the feedback from their teams (Building Leadership, Professional learning Community, and other related teams) and information from monitoring during the year (academics, climate and DPASII-R), along with parent satisfaction surveys, schools work with the Federal Programs Office to amend their plans as needed. Plans are to align to the RCCSD 5 Strategic Goals.

Through monthly principal meetings, and working with individual school teams throughout the year, the district provides examples/models of effectiveness and supports revisions and provides assistance and guidance with the evaluation. A part of the regular monthly schedule includes a Day devoted to data review (Data Day), which is an opportunity for schools to review data and strategies with their school teams and to make adjustments/identify more targeted research based actions and present these plans to district administration during the August – June school year calendar.

Once the plans and actions are approved, the schools use their regular (monthly at a minimum) building-level team meetings to review plan implementation and to adjustments to plans during the year. These meetings provide a continuum of review related to the strategies impacting academic, behavior, and survey data.

A.3 Please provide a general description of the different types of services that will be provided in the LEAs Title I Schoolwide School(s). (Note: LEAs are not required to specifically outline each service provided in each Title I Schoolwide school) [Section 1112(b)(1)(I)]

Listed below is a general description of the Title I Schoolwide services from the RCCSD schools:

- I CARE Now Parent Engagement and character education program to enable families, schools, and communities to simultaneously teach, reinforce, and model good character;
- Full service Community School model and related emotional, social and mental health services to address barriers to learning for participating students and families;
- Research based Prekindergarten program to provide curriculum based instruction for high poverty school communities;
- Research based instructional and intervention strategies; example: the SIOP and TWIOP Models based on current knowledge and research-based practices for promoting learning with all students, especially English Learners (ELLs); Responsive classroom, research-backed approach to elementary education to increase academic achievement, decreases problem behaviors, improves social skills, and lead to more high-quality instruction; Stetson Associates strategies
- The Block Schedule for core academic subjects to provide extensive time for learning
- Professional Development related to literacy, cultural supports, communication and other targeted areas.
- Research-proven Dual language programming;
- Extended day academic program supports: afterschool academies targeting need and Saturday Literacy/Library;
- Parent resource centers;
- Student transitions between school levels;
- Family Engagement classes to support learning at home related to literacy and readiness;

Question B

B.1 This question should only be completed by LEAs operating Targeted Assistance programs.

Explain the LEA's procedures for identifying Title I Targeted Assistance program participants. The procedures must be uniformly applied for all students at a grade level in the LEA. [Section 1112(b)(1)(H)]

N/A all 11 schools are schoolwide programs

B.2 Explain how the LEA has 1) given primary consideration to using Title I Targeted Assistance program funds to provide extended learning time, such as an extended school year, before- and after-school, and summer programs and opportunities; 2) helped provide an accelerated, high-quality curriculum, including applied learning; 3) minimized removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours for instruction; and 4) ensured that personnel providing Targeted Assistance services are integrated into the regular school program and overall school planning, professional development and improvement efforts. [Section 1115(c)(i)-(iii) and Section 1115(d)]

N/A all 11 schools are schoolwide programs

B.3 Please provide a general description of the types of services that will be provided in the LEAs Title I Targeted Assistance school(s). (Note: LEAs are not required to specifically outline each service provided in each Title I Targeted Assistance school) [Section 1112(b)(1)(I)]

N/A all 11 schools are schoolwide programs

3.5 Children with Disabilities under IDEA - CEIS Services

Question A

A.1 For LEAs providing Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS) under IDEA, explain how the LEA will develop and implement its CEIS system to provide coordinated, early intervening services for students in grades K-12 who are not identified as needing special education, but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment. (20 U.S.C. §1413(f) and 34 C.F.R. §226).

Instructional consultation teams will work in three elementary schools to problem-solve with teachers to provide early intervention services to students who are not identified for special education but need academic and/or behavior support. Instructional consultants will partner with teachers to conduct curriculum-based or functional behavior assessments, identify students' specific skill needs, and choose appropriate intervention strategies. Teachers will implement these strategies, monitor progress of interventions through data collection and graphing, and revise instruction or intervention strategies as necessary for students with academic problems and/or at risk for behavior failure.

All Red Clay Consolidated School District's instructional support teams(IST) will have the opportunity to participate in curriculum-based assessment and progress monitoring and will apply these skills to instructional problem solving and collaboration across all grade levels to support all students in the general education population who need academic or behavior support. The goal of this professional development is to reduce identification of students in general, and in particular, to reduce the over identification of minority students for special education services.

Professional development for teachers in specific reading interventions will be provided concurrently to general and special education teachers.

Eight Red Clay Schools will continue to implement School-wide Positive Behavior Support programs with the addition of two new schools. Representative teams from two schools that have implemented School-wide PBS programs will continue to participate in professional development and receive coaching and technical assistance to implement targeted and individual PBS support strategies with any student who demonstrates greater incidences of office discipline referral and/or suspension. In addition, every elementary school must have a School-wide behavior support/discipline program that encompasses the key features of a research-based behavior support system (i.e. PBS, Responsive Classroom).

Both School-wide and Targeted PBS teams will use data disaggregated by student sub-groups to implement strategies to reduce over-representation of minority students in high-incidence office referral and suspension categories.

A.2 Please check one:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | CEIS is required. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CEIS is voluntary. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CEIS is not being used. |

3.6 Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth

Question A

A.1 A child or youth who is homeless is automatically eligible to receive Title I services. ESEA requires that LEAs reserve a portion of their Title I, Part A funds as necessary to provide services to homeless students and youth attending non-Title I participating schools. Services provided must be comparable to those provided to students in Title I participating schools.

Specify:

- * the amount of Title I, Part A funds that have been reserved, how the amount was determined,
- * the projected types of costs and services that these funds would support, and
- * an approximate number of homeless students and youth the LEA expect to assist with these Title I reserved funds.

A reserve of \$10,000 has been set-aside to be used to assist students who are homeless or living in transition and attend non-Title I schools. The amount reserved this year was based on the reserve from the previous year and the amount requested from the McKinney-Vento FY'13 grant. The reserve will provide funding to assist students in need of clothing and uniforms, items for personal hygiene and basic needs, food, school supplies, school fees and provides academic support by affording the opportunity for tutoring and attendance at summer school. The district expects to serve about 300 students living in transition who attend non-Title I schools.

7/30/12 - Revision

The set-aside in the Consolidated Grant is to be used to assist any student that attends a non-Title I school who experiences homelessness during the school year. None of the five high schools in Red Clay are Title I schools yet these schools often have students who are unaccompanied youth or who experience some type of homelessness or transitional living arrangement. (45 students identified during the 2011-12 school year) Many of these students receive failing grades and in most cases do not get the necessary course credit/s needed for graduation. The availability of the set-aside assures that payment can be made for any student who experiences either homelessness or lives in transition to attend summer school in order to complete any course work they did not successfully complete or failed during the school year. It affords students an opportunity for credit recovery in order to graduate.

3.7 Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals (HQP)

Question A

A.1 Sections A and B: Content Areas of Need Within Schools If your district or charter school did not have 100% HQT classes in the 2010 – 2011 school year, answer questions A-1 to B-2. If your district or charter school had 100% HQT classes in the 2010 – 2011 school year, answer question B-3. The questions in this section are about the ESEA content areas of need within individual schools in a district or the charter school. Under ESEA, the core academic content areas are: English, Reading/language arts, Mathematics, Science, Foreign languages, Arts (defined in Delaware as music and art), History, Civics/government, Economics, Geography. Elementary school teachers meet the HQT requirement as elementary generalists. The ESEA legislation partitions social studies into four discrete fields. Delaware considers social studies a core content area and teachers of social studies classes must meet the highly qualified teacher requirement. [A.1] What are the ESEA content areas of need within the schools of your district or in the charter school? That is, which ESEA content areas have the largest number of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers and in which schools are these classes? Use the most recent HQT data in answering the questions in this section. Be specific in your response.

From 2011 HQ data, fully certified ELL teachers continue to be an area of need. While most are HQ as elementary generalists and/or secondary content areas, they have emergency certificates for ELL and moving toward full certification. Impacted schools include Heritage, Richey, Marbrook, Mote, Warner, AI DuPont Middle, Conrad, Central and AI DuPont High School.

The Central School, a restrictive placement center for special education students, continues to be in need of certified special education teachers in most content areas.

A similar problem at AI DuPont Middle and Stanton Middle exists in that some teachers are teaching out of HQ fields. Content areas of need in those schools include English, science, math, reading and social studies. AI DuPont High School also has teachers who are certified in special education but lack HQ content expertise.

A.2

In your district or charter school, what factors contribute to the identified ESEA content areas with the largest number of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers within the identified schools? Or, put another way, what are the reasons why these specific content areas in these specific schools are taught more frequently than other areas or in other schools by teachers who are not yet highly qualified? Use the HQT data and the last available kicker list to assist you in your analyses. For example, some content areas may have more uncertified or not fully certified teachers whereas for other content areas, the reasons center on the demonstration of subject matter competence.

Factors include chronic shortages of special education and ELL certified teachers; local hiring policy constraints that require late hiring versus other local districts; and master schedule constraints, particularly at the secondary level, that result in "leftover" sections in one or more subject areas. In 2012, parent refusals of ELL services have impacted schools such as Richey, Warner, Heritage and Lewis. In these cases, parents declined entrance into established ELL programs at Marbrook, Mote, or Baltz and elected for their children to attend the regular feeder pattern schools. Other reasons include mainstreaming, monitoring, and tutoring/pull-out services of ELL-identified students.

The Central School, a restrictive placement center for special education students, continues to be in need of certified special education teachers. As with ELL issues, some are certified and HQ in content but lack permanent special education certification. Those teachers are also teaching with emergency certificates and have plans in place for becoming HQ. Other fully certified Central teachers are teaching out of HQ content area due to master schedule and unit constraints. Those teachers will either be reassigned within Central or sit for Praxis II examination.

A similar problem at Al DuPont Middle exists in that some teachers are teaching out of HQ fields in part due to lack of qualified applicants and master schedule constraints. They, too will be reassigned or take Praxis II. Content areas of need in those schools include English, science, math, reading and social studies. Al DuPont High School also has teachers who are certified in special education but lack HQ content expertise. Again, reassignment, college coursework, or Praxis II examination are the recommended plans for those teachers.

Question B

B.1 Based on your analysis, what actions/strategies is your district/charter school taking (and/or planning to take) to increase the number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the identified ESEA content area of need within the identified schools? The response is to be specific to the content areas identified within the identified schools.

The district plans to support non-HQ teachers with systemic training with accessing and answering the DEEDS survey, meetings with non-HQ teachers, Praxis II training, and Praxis II materials. Regular education teachers will be encouraged and supported to cross-certify in special education as well. All non-HQ teachers are required to submit an individualized plan for how they will become HQ. Additional focus will be provided on trouble-shooting building scheduling issues that cause teachers to be placed in non-HQ assignments. During the staffing period, regular reporting from district personnel to building administration on student scheduling and teacher quality status will inform hiring decisions. An updated electronic job application provides building administrators with improved information concerning quality status of applicants. A priority of the HR office will be to carefully screen candidates for quality status prior to offers of employment. Teachers may not transfer to positions for which they are not highly qualified. Teachers who are on temporary contracts and are not HQ in the field in which they are teaching may not have their contract extended. Teachers who are not highly qualified may also be "excessed" from their building. In addition, this year Red Clay held its 2nd annual early (May) job fair. Approximately 30 teachers were hired, all of them HQ in their fields.

B.2 Why does the district/charter school believe that the actions/strategies described in B.1 will result in increasing the number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the identified ESEA content areas of need within the identified schools?

Cite specific evidence, reasons, and/or past experiences relative to increasing HQT classes in the specific content areas within the specific schools.

This plan has been in place for 5 years. Each year we have made significant progress in reducing the number of teachers who do not meet highly qualified criteria. In 2008, 84.6% of all classes were taught by HQ teachers. In 2009, 91.2% of all classes were taught by HQ teachers. 2010 data indicated that 94.5% of all classes were taught by HQ staff. For 2011, the percentage was 94.9 and in 2012 Red Clay topped the state average, improving to 96% . Stanton and HB DuPont Middle Schools improved by 6% in serving students with disabilities at 93.3 for SY 2011; HB improved to 97% and Stanton to 95% for 2012. Marbrook improved ELL access by 5% in 2011 and stands at 95.4% for 2012.

B.3 If your district/charter school had 100% HQT classes last year, what specific steps, actions, and decisions did you make to meet this goal? How do you plan to maintain 100% HQT classes?

n/a – did not meet 100% HQT

Question C

C.1 Section C: Meeting the 100% HQT Classes Requirement and Title I Hiring Requirements

[C.1] The ESEA requirement is that all classes of core academic content areas were to be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

If your district/charter school has not yet met this requirement for two consecutive years (2009-2010 and 2010-2011), respond to this question:

What specific actions/strategies has your district/charter school taken (or plans to take) to meet the 100% HQT classes requirement?

Be certain to address all initiatives, including:

Praxis II support for teachers (describe all forms of support)
Teacher assignment/reassignment
Hiring practices for new teachers
Collaboration with school leaders about meeting the 100% HQT classes requirement.

The district continues to support non-HQ teachers with systemic training with accessing and answering the DEEDS survey, meetings with non-HQ teachers, Praxis II training, Praxis II materials, and partnership with the University of Delaware Teacher Quality Center. Regular education teachers will be encouraged and supported to cross-certify in special education as well. All non-HQ teachers are required to submit an individualized plan for how they will become HQ. During the staffing period, regular reporting from district personnel to building administration on student scheduling and teacher quality status will inform hiring decisions. A priority of the HR office will be to carefully screen candidates for quality status prior to offers of employment. An updated electronic job application provides building administrators with improved information concerning quality status of applicants. Teachers may not transfer to positions for which they are not highly qualified. Teachers who are on temporary contracts and are not HQ in the field in which they are teaching may not have their contract extended. Teachers who are not highly qualified may also be "excessed". In addition, this year the district held its second annual early (May) job fair. Approximately 30 teachers were hired, all of them HQ in their fields.

C.2 If you have teachers who are not yet highly qualified for their scheduled classes, describe the process for developing the plan with the teachers; the available options for meeting the HQT requirement; the responsibility of the district/charter, including support for the teacher and monitoring; and the responsibility of the teacher, including consequences for not following the plan.

Teachers identified through the DEEDS survey as not being HQ have the option of taking college courses or the Praxis II examination to achieve highly qualified status. The district provides financial support through the purchase of Praxis II study materials and reimbursement of Praxis fees for successful examination. Once identified as not HQ, a form is sent to the principal and teacher indicating areas of need for HQ and options for compliance, to include scheduling attendance at a praxis examination or restricting teacher scheduling to areas of highly qualified status. Teachers may not transfer to positions for which they are not highly qualified. Teachers who are on temporary contracts and are not HQ in the field in which they are teaching may not have their contract extended. Teachers who are not highly qualified may also be "excessed" from their building.

C.3 The ESEA/Title I requirement is that all teachers hired after the first day of the 2002 – 2003 school year were to be highly qualified at the time of hire if they were to be placed in a Title I school-wide school or a program supported with Title I funds.

All districts and charter schools, please respond to this question. Describe how your district/charter school assures that it meets this federal requirement. Be specific in your response

Based on staffing projections, highly qualified teachers are employed where available. However, for staff hired as a result of September 30th enrollment increases, staffing is restricted by the available applicant pool at that time.

Question D

D.3 Based on your analysis, what actions/strategies is your district/charter school taking (and/or planning to take) to increase the access of student sub-groups to classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the schools that have the largest disparities? The response is to be specific to the identified student sub-group disparities within the identified schools.

The district monitors and works with all teachers to complete the DEEDS survey and to complete requirements, such as praxis examination. Principals use priority scheduling to ensure that highly qualified teachers work with sub-groups as much as possible. During the staffing period, regular reporting from district personnel to building administration on student scheduling and teacher quality status will inform hiring decisions.

An updated job application provides building administrators with improved information concerning quality status of applicants. Teachers may not transfer to positions for which they are not highly qualified. Teachers who are on temporary contracts and are not HQ in the field in which they are teaching may not have their contract extended. Teachers who are not highly qualified may also be "excessed" from their building. Early hiring practices have been instituted.

D.1 Sections D and E: Equity Data

If your district or charter school has not yet met the 100% HQT classes requirement, answer questions D-1 to E-1. To answer these questions, refer to the most recent HQT class analyses by these student characteristics:

English language learners (ELL)

Students with disabilities (SWD)

Race/ethnicity

Low income.

You will see an overall analysis for each student characteristic and an analysis by school for each student characteristic.

[D.1] Which student subgroups, if any, show a disparity in access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers? That is, which student sub-groups are assigned at a higher rate to classes not taught by highly qualified teachers and in which schools are these classes?

Use the most recent HQT data in answering the questions in this section. Be specific in your response.

2011 HQ data shows that while 96% of white students have access to highly qualified teachers, 95.3% of blacks had access. In 2012, black access rose to 97.8%. Overall Hispanic data was not provided by DEDOE again this year. Gaps exist for ELL students (93.7%), and students with disabilities (93.9%). However, these are improvements over 2011. Schools with gaps of 5% or more for students with disabilities include AI Middle, Conrad, Dickinson, McKean and the Central School. In marked contrast to 2010, (0) zero schools show gaps of 5% or more in black vs. white access again for 2012.

D.2 In your district or charter school, what factors contribute to the disparities in student access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers within the identified schools? Or, put another way, what are the reasons why these student sub-groups in these specific schools are taught more frequently by teachers who are not yet highly qualified?

Factors include chronic shortages of special education and ELL certified teachers; local hiring policy constraints that require relatively late hiring as compared to other local districts; and master schedule constraints, particularly at the secondary level, that result in “leftover” sections in one or more subject areas.

It should be noted that some of the non-HQ teachers in special education and ELL programs are highly qualified in content, but lack the specialized certificate for their areas and are therefore deemed not HQ. Those teachers are enrolled in critical needs programs or other programs designed to provide them with the specialized certificate and have emergency certification.

Question E

E.1] Why does the district/charter school believe that the actions/strategies described in D-3 will result in increasing the access of student sub-groups to classes taught by highly qualified teachers within the identified schools?

Cite specific evidence, reasons, and/or past experiences relative to increasing student sub-group access to HQT classes within the identified schools.

This plan has been in place for 5 years. In 2007, 85.5% of low SES students had access to HQ teachers and 80.4% of special education students had access to HQ special education teachers. In 2008, low SES access increased to 87% and 83% of special education students had access to HQ teachers. In 2009, low SES access increased to 90.1%; 86.3% of special education students had access. In 2012, access for special education students has risen to 93.9%. For 2010, low SES access increased to 94.3%; in 2011, that rose to 94.6% and to 97.4% in 2012. It should be noted that gap between non- and low-income students in Red Clay now stands at 1.5%.

Progress in every sub-group except students with disabilities is noted over 2010 data. 2011 HQ data shows that while 96% of white students have access to highly qualified teachers, 95.3% of blacks had access. The racial gap in 2012 is 1.2%. Overall Hispanic data was not provided by DEDOE this year. Gaps exist for ELL students (93.7%), and students with disabilities (93.9%). Schools with gaps of 5% or more for students with disabilities include Lewis, AI Middle, Conrad, Dickinson, AI High and the Central School. In marked contrast to 2010, (0) zero schools show gaps of 5% or more in black vs. white access again in 2012.

Each year we have made significant progress in reducing the number of teachers who do not meet highly qualified criteria.

The number of non-HQ ELL and special education teachers at some of the identified schools is slowly increasing as those teachers complete coursework and other requirements for full certification. For example, the number of ELL students with an HQ teacher at Baltz improved from 86.9 to 97.6% this year and to virtually 100% (99.3) in 2012. At Highlands, the number of special education students with an HQ teacher improved from 84.7% to 92% in 2011 and to 98.9% in 2012. Likewise, Marbrook improved from 86.2% to 91.2% in 2011 and to 95.4% in 2012. Stanton improved from 87% to 93.3%; for 2012% less than one-half of a percentage point gap exists. Additional focus will be provided on trouble-shooting building scheduling issues that cause teachers to be placed in non-HQ assignments.

Question F

F.1 Section F: Student Access to Classes Taught by Experienced Highly Qualified Teachers

All districts and charter schools, please answer these questions.

[F.1] Do the district/charter school data show differences in the percent of HQT classes by the teachers' years of experience? Experienced teachers have three or more years of teaching experience. Refer to the most recent HQT data.

In 2009, 94% of teachers with more than 3 years' experience were HQ. 76.3% of those with less than 3 years' experience were HQ. For 2010, 95.3% of experienced teachers were HQ; less experienced teachers rose to 89.7% HQ. For 2011, 95.9% of experienced teachers were HQ and less experienced rose to 92.6%. For 2012, experienced teachers' HQ status rose to 97.1% and inexperienced dropped to 88.5%.

F.2 If differences exist, what actions/strategies is the district/charter school taking (or planning to take) to make certain that all students have access to experienced highly qualified teachers?

The Manager of Human Resources or designee will meet with principals to discuss scheduling priorities to address these needs. The district monitors and works with all teachers to complete the DEEDS survey and to complete requirements, such as Praxis examination. Principals use priority scheduling to ensure that experienced, highly qualified teachers work with sub-groups as much as possible. Early hiring practices have been instituted.

Question G

G.1 Section G: Meeting the 100% Highly Qualified Requirement for Title I Instructional Paraeducators

The ESEA/Title I requires that all instructional paraprofessionals in schoolwide programs and in programs supported with Title I funds (such as in a targeted assistance school) to meet the highly qualified requirement, either:

- * Completed at least two years of study at an institution of higher education, OR
- * Obtained an associate's or higher degree, OR
- * Passed the ParaPro test.

Please be aware that all non-highly qualified instructional paraeducators working in schoolwide schools (or in a program supported with Title I funds in a targeted assistance school) must be re-assigned to either a non-Title I school OR to a program not supported with Title I funds in a targeted assistance Title I school OR be reassigned as a service paraeducator until they become highly qualified.

[G.1] How does the district/charter school assure that it meets this federal requirement? Be specific in your response.

The district only hires Paraprofessionals who are highly qualified. Based on staffing projections and building allocations (per pupil allocations), buildings are allocated fiscal and human resources. When a school earns enough resources for a Paraprofessional, the district employs and places only highly qualified paraprofessionals in the Title I buildings.

Currently, there are four (4) Title I buildings that use their Title I, Part A resources to support 1 Highly Qualified Para per site (four Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals total). In the case of professional leave, or a new hire, the district would place a candidate who meets the HQ requirements in a vacancy (This would be a requirement for the application process).

3.8 Professional Development Plan

Question A

A.1 Describe how district and school professional development needs are determined, which data are analyzed, and who is involved in the needs-assessment process. List the names, position, and school assignment of teachers involved in the needs assessment process.

The District uses the following sources to determine professional development needs: A council system has been implemented to ensure that all students achieve success. This system drives professional development. Councils, consisting of teacher representatives and content supervisor, are created for all content areas. Based on data, students' needs are brought forward by teachers to the council. Issues are researched and discussed. In order for an item to move forward to the Curriculum Cabinet, councils need a supermajority vote of 75% or greater. The cabinet will assess the request based on research, then vote to move the item forward.

A supermajority vote of at least 75 % must occur before items are moved to our Superintendent or Board. Information used by councils driving professional development includes annual needs assessment survey; individual workshop evaluation surveys; parent surveys; DPAS II; DSTP Instructional Needs Indicator reports – all grades; PSAT data; DIBELS data; DCAS benchmarks; the annual evaluation of the consolidated programs, as well as information from local audits/reports. Trends from these data sources are analyzed and needs projected from that data. In addition, the district analyzes data from the schools under improvement, as well as the students who have not met standard and the subjects that are a cause for concern/focus. We also review past PD offerings and their impact. Staff involved in the collection of this data includes classroom teachers; Director of Curriculum and Instruction; Director of Special Education Services; Supervisors of Curriculum Content Areas; Supervisor of Curriculum and Assessment; Manager of Professional Development; Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs; Education Associate for Parent Involvement, Non-Publics and McKinney-Vento, Education Associate for Perkins and Restructuring; instructional cadre; principals; parents and families. Staff input includes the following committees:

Health and PE council
Rhawn Short – RPLC
Jacklyn Bain – Mote Elementary
Patricia Seeman – JDHS
James Campbell – McKean
Lee Raymond – McKean
Laura Kaiser – Stanton
Christopher Wells – Stanton

World Language
Jennifer Short, Co-Chair Dickinson
Pam Scholla A.I. High
Amy Hobbs McKean
Holly Schnittinger McKean
Ana Viscara Conrad
Jeanna Emerick Brandywine Springs
Joslyn Morris Cab Calloway
Gina Travalini Dickinson
Christine Wallace A.I. High
Julie Leasure Conrad

Art Council

David Kelleher, Co-chair Brandywine Springs
Greg Thompson A.I. High
Carolyn Czipoth Mote
Rich Hanel Cab Calloway
Toniann Degregory Cab Calloway
Colleen Zufelt H.B. du Pont
Cheryl Weischel Shortlidge
Beth Eggleston McKean
Megan Covert Dickinson
Christina Bartnik Richey

Mixed Councils Membership

Performing Arts Council

Pam Letts, Co-Chair H.B. du Pont
Sheila Cassidy Dickinson
Steven Fackenthal Richardson Park
Sue Peo Traveling Music Teacher
Jessica Prince Stanton
Patrick Healy Conrad
Maureen Murphy Linden Hill
Jennifer Green Marbrook
Marty Lassman Cab Calloway
Carlton Cannon Cab Calloway
Leslie Grant Brandywine Springs

Librarians

Janet Dean, Co-Chair Cabinet Seat Conrad
Mary Tise Cab Calloway
Suzanne Smith A.I. High
Susan White A.I. Middle
Adrienne Hopson Warner
Joan March H.B. du Pont
Jennifer Minchini North Star
Debbie Marinelli Linden Hill
Janette Vickers Lewis
Mary Dorrell Skyline
Debbie Supplee Dickinson

Social Studies

Baltz Jeff Twardus
Brandywine Jill Szymanski
Forest Oak Kelly Hurtt

HeritageJenniferSmith
HighlandsStellaEvans
LewisSusanPalmer
Linden HillTinaWindsor
MarbrookChantelEnglish-Murray
MoteVirginiaSylvester
North StarKristinBecker**
Richardson Park ElizabethGarrett
Richardson Park LCErinVenturato
ShortlidgeRaymondRissmiller
WarnerDianeMahotiere

Al duPont MiddleJamesLindell
HBMSMaureenGreenly
SkylineRobertLingenfelter
StantonChristinaTarrant
Cab CallowayHollyGolder
Conrad BarbaraPrillaman
Al duPont HighCristinaKalesse
CentralSarahLucas
DickinsonRichardCini
McKeanHildaKoach
First State AliceBeckman
FirstMadelynnLemon
**Council Co-Chair

Math Council:
BowersJaniceH.B. duPont Middle
BrownKarenConrad School
CochranPamMcKean High
ConnollyLeeAnnSkyline Middle
DeNardoCynthiaStanton Middle
DidionLisaRichardson Park L.C.
EdlerSaraMarbrook Elementary
FullertonAthenaNorth Star Elementary
GallagherJackieForest Oak
GormelyKathyHighlands Elementary
HarringtonJenniferCab Calloway
IsrailovaLarisaMote Elementary
LemonMadelynnFirst State
MahotiereDianeWarner Elementary
MalatestaLindaA.I. duPont High
MaloneyHollyBrandywine Springs School
MasonEricaHeritage Elementary
MatthiasJohnLinden Hill Elementary
McIlvainKelleyHeritage Elementary

MoffettEarl A.I. duPont Middle
ReitemeyerMichaelDickinson High
RissmillerRayShortlidge Academy
ShackelfordEllenRichey Elementary
Shaw-Williamson EdnaCentral School
ThorpWayne Baltz Elementary

A.2

State the average number of hours each teacher is expected to participate in professional development and describe how that professional development is structured (i.e. All teachers will participate in a content area PLC for 90 minutes every other week, a grade-level PLC for 90 minutes every other week, and at least one 60 minute large-group LFS training session each month.).

Red Clay teachers participate in grade level PLCs for 90 minutes/ week every week; they focus on the following topics:
1) Grade level/subject level collaboration meeting based on student data to improve student achievement; 2) School meetings; 3) Grade level/subject level collaboration meetings based on instructional practices to improve achievement; 4) Building Leadership Teams participating in monthly meetings and turn around to staff members. The district and individual buildings use 8 in-service days per year to communicate broader topics in large Audience formats. Those initiatives and topics are then handled differentially through PLCS, BLTS and faculty meetings

A.3 Describe how all teachers will be provided professional development opportunities directly related to student learning needs as identified by multiple sources of data, including but not limited to DPAS II evaluations, DCAS, and LEA and School Success Plans.

- All K-3 teachers will receive job-embedded, systematic professional development over the next 4 years. The following year the professional development will focus on “Quality Reading Instruction”. Teachers will receive monthly training focusing on various aspects of reading instruction in grade level teams. Opportunities for ongoing and differentiated professional development will occur by the use of building literacy coaches.
- All ELA teachers, K-12, will receive ongoing training on the Common Core State Standards, and participate in discussions regarding student and curriculum expectations. Instructional materials will be evaluated to ensure that teachers have quality resources to delivery standard-based instruction.
- All math teachers will receive training in the new Common Core standards. Grade level teacher leaders will be trained on learning progressions and targeted instruction regarding smarter balance items. Teacher leaders will share the training through building level professional learning communities. Middle school Geometry teachers will receive course to support the transfer of geometry from the high school to the middle level.
- Partner with the Christina School District and the Delaware Center for Teacher Education to carry out USDOE’s Teaching American History Grant – Freedom Project. American history teachers lack adequate preparation in their subject area. The project includes four 2-day American history workshops and two week-long summer institutes with field trips for two cohorts of 25 teachers and administrators, who will work in professional learning communities and lesson study teams. Cohort A will learn about events through the Civil War, while Cohort B will focus on post-Civil War history. Participating and non-participating teachers have opportunities throughout the school year to participate in evening and day long seminars with presentations from noted authors of history. These seminars are in addition to the workshops and institutes and are open to all Red Clay Consolidated School District teachers and administrators.
- Partner with the Delaware Center for Teacher Education. The DCTE will provide professional development workshops for secondary social studies teachers with the focus of supporting the Common Core State Standards – Literacy through social studies lessons, with a focus on informational text. Trainings include materials that support reading and writing in the content areas. Supervisor of Social Studies will present information to administrators during the summer (2012).
- Participate in workshops provided by the Social Studies Coalition of Delaware. The SSCD provides one day workshops throughout the school year targeted for K-12 teachers of social studies. SSCD workshops present new Delaware Recommended Curriculum Model Units, which are required curricula in the Red Clay Consolidated School District. Workshops are held during the school day and substitute teachers are used to provide classroom coverage for the participants. Participants will share strategies and information with like staff (grade level) through collaboration meetings such as Professional Learning Communities meetings and Social Studies Curriculum Council meetings.
- Offer additional professional development opportunities to K-12 social studies teachers. Several sessions will be available for curriculum revision, adaption and/or creation. These sessions are voluntary and usually are held during the summer.

Question B

B.1 List your priority one professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Training in best practices to provide highly effective teachers and administrators in every building and to support the district mission and vision that all children can achieve at high levels. Specific activities include but are not limited to supporting inclusive education, creation of STEM programs, vertical articulation in content areas, brain-based learning, parent engagement, character education and support personnel training to target students identified as "at-risk." Goal 1 of District Strategic Plan.

-Citations: ESEA of 1965(2001); IDEA of 2004; Baker, E. T., Wang, M. C., "Ensuring Academic Success: The Real Issue in Educating English Language Learners" by Tim Boals [Midwest Educational Research Journal 14.4 (Fall 2001), 3-8]; Jensen, E. (2006) Enriching the Brain. Jossey-Bass. Wiley Imprint, San Francisco; Journal of STEM education; National Center for Children In Poverty; Dean, C., Hubbell, E.R., Pitler, H., and Stone, B. (2012). Classroom Instruction That Works.

-Funding sources: Title I; Title II; IDEA; RTTT; Curriculum/Professional Development; School Improvement (State/ Federal).

-The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Building level instructional staff/ district support/cadre

B.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills |

B.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

- | |
|---|
| 1) % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11) |
| 2) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase) |
| 3) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 10 schools in 2010 to 12 in 2011-2012) |
| 4) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 40% to 50%) |
| 5) Early childhood outcomes (10% increase over baseline) |
| 6) Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with their school’s communication practices (maintaining 4.0 rating or better on a 5.0 scale) |
| 7) % reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (since 2008-09) (from 30% to 25%) |
| 8) Out of School Suspension rate decrease by 8% points (from 24.1 to 16) |

Question C

C.1 List your priority two professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Continued development of sustained professional learning communities with regular follow-up to include participant/presenter feedback and artifacts of implementation. Priorities include content expertise, instructional strategies and effective classroom management techniques. Related to Goal 1 of District Strategic Plan. - Citation- NCLB definition Measures- DOE common (DSTP custom: 2ND Grade MAP data; outcome data from collaborative learning teams; pre/post-testing on student subsets from collaborative teams. ESEA - Professional Development Section (9101(34); JoEllen Killien/National Staff Development Council; Rich DuFour - The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Building level teaching staff/teams - Funding Sources: Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Curriculum and Professional Development Funds; Race To The Top Funds
--

C.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills |

C.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11) 2) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase) 3) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 10 schools in 2010 to 12 in 2011-2012) 4) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 40% to 50%) |
|---|

Question D

D.1 List your priority three professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

<p>Preparing teachers to achieve the goal of all students reading at or above grade level by the end of third grade. Goal 2 of District Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Citations (Fountas, I., Pinnell, G. Guided Reading: Good First Teaching For All Children (1996); Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement: Improving the Reading Achievement of America's Children: 10 Research-Based Principles (1998); National Institute of Child Health and Human Development: Report of the National Reading Panel (2006).</p> <p>The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Building level K-3 teaching staff/teams and related support personnel (e.g. paraprofessionals).</p> <p>Funding Source: Title I; RTTT; Title IIA; Title III; IDEA; Ed Jobs and Curriculum and PD</p>
--

D.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills |

D.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

- | |
|---|
| 1) % of teachers who receive a “satisfactory” or “effective” on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11)
2) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase)
3) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 10 schools in 2010 to 12 in 2011-2012)
4) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 40% to 50%) |
|---|

Question E

E.1 List your priority four professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Training and implementation designed to improve access to grade-level curriculum and reduce achievement gaps for special education and ELL students. Professional Development focused on high quality, culturally responsive instruction, assessment and evidence-based intervention to contribute to meaningful identification of learning/behavioral problems, improve instructional quality, provide all students with the best opportunities to succeed in school. Goal 3 of District Strategic Plan.

Citation: Dan Reschle; federal requirement per IDEA 2004; Dean, C., et. al. (2012). Classroom Instruction That Works; Barley, Z., Lauer, P. A., Arens, S. A., Apthrop, H. S., Englert, K. S., Snow, D., Haager, Diane et al. Evidence-Based Reading Practices for Response to Intervention, Brooks Publishing, 2007; Acosta, B., George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education. Evaluation of English Language Learner Programs in Red Clay Consolidated School District (2012).

The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Building level instructional staff/ district support/cadre

Funding sources: IDEA B; RTTT; Title III; State ELL Supports; Title II; Title I; School improvement resoruces (Focus, PZ funds)

E.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills |

E.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

- 1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11)
- 2) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase)
- 3) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 10 schools in 2010 to 12 in 2011-2012)
- 4) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 40% to 50%)
- 5) Early childhood outcomes (10% increase over baseline)
- 6) Out of School Suspension rate decrease by 8% points (from 24.1 to 16)
- 7) % reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (since 2008-09) (from 30% to 25%)

Question F

F.1 List your priority five professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Differentiate instruction to improve student academic and health outcomes including use of appropriate instructional technology and wellness-related activities.

Citation: Tomlinson, C. A. (2003a). Differentiating instruction for academic diversity. In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), Classroom teaching skills, 7th ed (pp 149-180); Neubecker, M. (2003) Simulation as an instructional tool. Encyclopedia of Educational Technology. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University; Ó Murchú, D. (2003): Mentoring, Technology and the 21st Century's New Perspectives, Challenges and Possibilities for Educators. Second Global Conference, Virtual Learning Hobgood, B., Thibault, M., RCCSD board policy on community wellness; 2004 WIC Reauthorization/U.S. Congress; DeDOE Recommended Curriculum: health and physical education standards; Jensen, E. (2006) Enriching the Brain.

The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Building level instructional staff/ district support/cadre

Funding sources: Title I; RTTT; PZ; Title II; CPD; IDEA; School Improvement (PZ, Focus, and 1003g along with State and Federal); tech refresh

F.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
- Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning

- Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

F.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

- 1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11)
- 2) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase)
- 3) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 10 schools in 2010 to 12 in 2011-2012)
- 4) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 40% to 50%)
- 5) Early childhood outcomes (10% increase over baseline)
- 6) Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with their school's communication practices (maintaining 4.0 rating or better on a 5.0 scale)
- 7) % reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (since 2008-09) (from 30% to 25%)
- 8) Measures- custom: Fitnessgram data

Question G

G.1 List your priority six professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research). Also, describe which teachers will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity. List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Assistance to teachers in meeting HQ requirements: provide resources to prepare for Praxis examination and reimbursement for Praxis fees. In 2008, 84.6% of all classes were taught by HQ teachers. The district's 2010 data indicated that 94.5% of all classes were taught by HQ staff. 2011 indicated 94.9%; Red Clay data for 2012 indicates 96% of all classes were taught by HQ staff.

Citations: ESEA of 1965; Title IX, Section 9101; DEEDS data; Measure: DOE common HQT measure

The teachers designated to participate in this professional development activity: Teachers who have not met HQT requirements

Funding Sources: Title II, Part A; Curriculum and Professional Development Funds

G.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
- Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education

- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
- Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

G.3

List the specific educator outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component IV will improve from 95% effective to 85% highly effective and 15% effective. Evaluation: Formative = fall and spring walkthroughs; Summative = spring DPAS II data) List the specific student outcomes (measures and targets) intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for special education students will increase from x% to y% by June 2012. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data)

Specific educator outcomes - per the approved District Strategic Plan (Race To The Top application):

- 1)% of vacancies filled through the job fair: 74.3% (42 out of 56.5 positions)
- 2)% of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (baseline determined in 2010-11)
- 3)% of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase)
- 4)% of teachers who meet HQT requirements (from 95% to 100%)

Question H

H.1 ESEA requires that LEAs failing to meet the 100% HQT goal and annual yearly progress for three consecutive years must enter into an agreement with the State on the use of the LEA's funds to meet these goals. (§2141) If your LEA has not met 100% HQT and AYP requirements for three consecutive years, please answer the following statements: Describe how the LEA will target Title II, Part A funds to address issues specifically preventing the meeting of the HQT and AYP goals. Describe how professional development strategies and activities based on scientifically-based research will ensure both these goals will be met.

(If applicable): Talent management is the organizing principle for the district's approach to fulfilling this objective. The effectiveness of educators accounts for the majority of school-driven improvements in student achievement. In order for educators to be held accountable for the achievement of students, they must be given research-based instructional tools designed to successfully meet the needs of our district. The activities outlined in this objective provide foundational support for the development of a standards-based education. The standards-based education is supported by Red Clay Consolidated School District Board of Education Policy 7001 (approved in January 2010) and affirmed in a resolution from the board (SY 2009-10).

1) Targeting funds related to Title II, Part A: An area of particular focus is to enhance the instructional effectiveness of teachers of Special Education students and ELL students through differentiated PD in all curricular areas, such as differentiated instruction, instructional accommodations and curricular modifications, new models of support, collaborative teaching, multi-level instruction, understanding of English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards and the connection to common core standards, and paraprofessional training. In addition, the district will focus on literacy proficiency in the elementary grades for all children, especially those in our high poverty schools. Supporting district-wide professional learning in inclusive educational practices and policies will help to develop a systemic focus on articulating appropriate supports for academic achievement that also align with the Core Content Curriculum Standards and growth assessments.

2) Strategies based on research: Research shows that effective teachers are a key to student success. The Red Clay Consolidated School District is focused on providing highly effective, coherent professional development (PD) to all instructional staff and increasing the effectiveness of building administrators as instructional leaders, both in an effort to address systemic academic issues. The focus on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), academic rigor, differentiated instruction, and cultural sensitivity are essential to address the district's performance challenges. To continue to address the root causes for the achievement gap, there's a need for increased use of evidenced based inclusive practices, brain-based and differentiated instructional strategies and effective collaborative planning processes. Effective use of these instructional and planning strategies will directly impact student achievement. The district will examine which professional development opportunities demonstrate the highest impact on teacher effectiveness and student achievement by reviewing professional development surveys and input from the PD committee, along with monitoring the impact through administrative classroom visits, and academic data. Our work in this area will impact our identified needs and Common Measures by first clearly identifying student learning strengths and weaknesses. Once these areas are clearly identified, the School Data and Test Coordinators (in conjunction with the DDOE data coaches) will facilitate the conversations necessary among professional staff to address individual student needs. The data will drive the professional development programs established through our Curriculum and Instruction Department. Building Leadership Teams are comprised of key educators who assist in ensuring the district's professional development plan is delivered to all educators.

3) Building Leadership Teams (NSDC, 2001) will be a driving force behind district and school initiatives by promoting collaboration between team members and department members through professional learning communities and common planning. They will gain knowledge and expertise through the district's Leadership Academy and will be responsible for turning around training to all staff in their buildings, providing for a systemic professional development program in the district. Building Leadership Teams will learn, practice, demonstrate, reflect upon, share, and turnaround research-based instructional strategies and practices that will improve all students' literacy and learning in all content areas. They will support a framework for student achievement focused on understanding how students learn, the culture, and content, with instructional strategies designed to meet the needs of diverse learners. Building Leadership Teams help to create a nurturing learning environment where all staff have common goals and use a common language and where students can achieve to their fullest potential.

A systemic professional development plan comprised of high-impact professional development offerings will provide a coherent approach to increasing the talent level of our educational staff and raising expectations to a level which will translate into increased student achievement for all. This focus on professional development to increase the talent level of our educators will be supported by ensuring novice school leaders and school leaders at high-need schools participate in the state's instructional leadership training program.

(Smylie, M.A., Allensworth, E., Greenberg, R.C., Harris, R., Luppescu, S., "Teacher Professional Development in Chicago: Supporting Effective Practice," Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2001; (Collins, J. (2001). Good to great: Why some companies make the leap and others don't. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.); Stein, M. K., & D'Amico, L. (2002). Inquiry at the crossroads of policy and learning: A study of a district-wide literacy initiative. Teachers College Record, 104, 1313–1344.; National Staff Development Council Standards for Staff Development)

3.9 Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006

Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this statute must respond to the requirements listed below, referencing core indicators where applicable. The eligible recipients do not have to use federal funds as a way to meet these requirements, but the following requirements must be met.

Question A

A.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to strengthen the academic and career and technical skills of students in CTE programs.

We have high expectations for all CTE programs, staff and students using meaningful collaboration with higher education, business and industry to support continuous improvement within our diverse community. Perkins funds will be used to purchase new materials, resources, and equipment as well as enhance, innovate, upgrade and implement new pathways/facilities to support the integration of academic content and CTE content with an emphasis on STEM – Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics. CTE workshops and available conferences will be supported by Perkins resources. The upgrade of the pathway/facilities to industry standard will focus on college and career readiness, as well as leadership and employability skills.

A.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide students with strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of an industry.

Our focus on all programs and facilities to commercial grade, state of the art industry standard provides an instructional environment to prepare students for employment. Supporting a variety of activities to provide different perspectives to business and industry as well as participation in local, state and national conferences to compete and develop leadership skills and engaging students in job shading, internships and employment opportunities to provide first hand experience. We believe by upgrading our facilities to commercial and industrial grade will make them inviting to both traditional and non-traditional students.

A.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to develop, improve, or expand the use of technology in CTE.

Technology upgrades are on a regular schedule to ensure that the instructional experience in both teaching & learning emulates work place facilities and job requirements. Particular attention will be given the newly approved pathways and the priority areas of our 3 – 5 year plan for CTE in Red Clay, individual 3 year CTE plans and recommendations of our CTE advisory Council. All CTE staff are encouraged to research and present the latest technology for their area to enhance instruction and the experience for the student.

Question B

B.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used for inservice and professional development for those involved in integrated CTE programs.

Perkins funds will be used to provide professional development to all CTE staff in the knowledge and skills of their area to support the state standards, district initiatives and industry standards. We will focus on the integration of reading and math strategies as they relate to the technical content and support student achievement. Areas such as summarization, critical details, problem solving and technical vocabulary building will be the focus. We will provide professional development to the staff of the new programs, innovated, enhanced and upgraded programs. We will provide professional development to support the continued implementation of STEM as a focused area. Based on the pathway completion, graduation rates, academic attainment targets, and the non-traditional participation data will help us prioritize the professional development.

B.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to develop and implement evaluations of the CTE programs.

We will continue to research and evaluate third party industry developed assessment as well as partnering with local higher education and business industry to develop appropriate assessments. We are researching a process to work with not only local post-secondary education facilities but also business and industry to capture placement of our students after graduation.

B.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to initiate, improve, expand, and modernize quality CTE programs.

We continue to evaluate each of our CTE programs and their facilities and continue to implement our 5 year district CTE plan. Each CTE program/facility will be upgraded, enhanced, innovated or replaced if necessary so that all CTE pathways meet education, business and industry standards and prepare our students to be career and college ready. We are continuing our work on upgrades, enhancements and new implementation of CTE programs in our high schools and planning for implementation of STEM into our middle schools. We will continue efforts in the implementation of our Engineering programs, system control & robotics as well as all CTE content areas to identify and include STEM components in our programs. Current and new pathways have been approved by the state and are an integral part of the restructuring plans of each school and the district's 5 year plan to improve the quality of CTE at all schools.

Question C

C.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide services and activities that are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective.

Working closely with the state as we develop new programs and as we evaluate current programs our 5 year CTE plan has us focusing on very specific areas for each year of the 5year plan, collaborating with post-secondary, business and industry partners for additional support and other resources.

Our goal is to provide CTE programs for all students that prepare them to be part of a global workforce. Offer only programs that develop career and college readiness, employability skills and leadership skills for high demand, high skill and high wage jobs.

C.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide activities to prepare special populations for high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations that will lead to self-sufficiency.

All Perkins supported CTE programs in Red Clay have an open enrollment policy which guaranties special populations the same opportunities to prepare themselves for career and college readiness. We work closely through advisement, mentoring and the students' SSP to ensure they are aware of and explore CTE options and make successful choices in CTE to prepare them for career and college readiness.

C.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to foster enrollment of students (male or female) in pathways that are non-traditional for their gender.

In Red Clay, Perkins funding provides the opportunities to enhance each of our programs to business and industry standards, we market the CTE programs to all students as well as maintain an open enrollment policy. We work with students and their SSP to make appropriate choices for success. The district develops partnerships with business and industry to present all career possibilities to all students and we also allow for job site visits and guest speakers and provide positive encouragement.

Question D

D.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to assist non-traditional students to complete the pathways in which they are enrolled.

We maintain an open enrollment policy, provide marketing materials and resources, tutoring service if needed and maintain an instructional setting they supports independent choice and opportunity for all students. Provide professional development to any staff in this area as needed.

We believe by upgrading our facilities to business and industrial standard will make them inviting to both traditional and non-traditional students.

D.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to ensure that disproportionate enrollment by gender, race and ethnicity is not caused by any type of discrimination or "tracking".

Having an open enrollment policy and monitoring the programs to ensure the policy is in place as well as maintaining an environment of student success for all CTE students.

D.3 How are federal and state funds being directed to ensure that all required Perkins targets are met? What specifically is being done to meet the targets that were not met this past year?

Having stated earlier, CTE is a district priority: we have high expectations for all CTE programs, staff and students and use meaningful collaboration with higher education, business and industry to support continuous improvement within our diverse community. The Perkins data is an integral part of our decision making process for the academic success of all CTE students and is included in our strategic plan. Our schools under improvement have placed CTE as an area of support to enhance the student's academic achievement; this focus being integral to Thomas McKean and John Dickinson High Schools both showing continual improvements academically. With the improvement of our CTE programs, integration of the academic courses, and marketing our program to all students, particularly the non-traditional we will have created an atmosphere that is inviting for all students to succeed. By placing CTE as a district priority and developing a 5 year CTE plan we stay focused on the data and providing quality CTE programs for all students which supports their academic achievement to be college and career ready as they leave Red Clay.

1S1 - Academic Attainment in Reading/Language Arts:

- All instructional improvements are focused on closing the achievement gap. Our schools under improvement have placed CTE as an area of support to enhance the student's academic achievement; this includes: paraprofessionals, tutoring and the usage of credit recovery to increase the support for reading/language arts skills for CTE students.

- In addition, via a 5 year plan all CTE courses are being aligned to the core for academic purposes and CTE participates in a curriculum council (re: RCCSD RTTT plan years 2 – 4) to make targeted decisions related to funding.

- Working with the Central School to ensure CTE alignment to help students with identified special needs develop necessary skills for academic and technical success.

Note: all Red Clay Consolidated School District High Schools met AYP and DEDOE has admitted that they've incorrectly calculated the graduation rates for RCCSD students.

2S1 - Technical Skill Attainment:

- Improving facilities, programs and curriculum via the CTE curriculum council

- Designing course curriculum content according to identified academic and technical standards.

- Funding content area professional development for targeted CTE areas and instructors

- .28 CTE Supervisor/Ed Associate funded to lead CTE teachers with curriculum integration strategies

- Involve businesses in the design and delivery of course content to students. Enlist business representatives to serve on advisory committee.

- Inviting business and industry representatives to visit your classroom and to be involved in evaluating classroom projects and presentations

- Complete all the requirements to ensure that programs are state approved.

6S2 - Nontraditional Completion:

- Facilities upgrades are business-like and appropriate creating and inviting atmosphere for all students and having a district goal focused on closing the achievement gap.

- 5 year district plan for CTE

- Working with Director of Secondary Schools to support transitions from middle to high school

- Involve women-owned and minority-owned businesses in all phases of planning and implementation

5S1 - Secondary Placement

- Work with a Data Service Center to conduct follow-up surveys; and additional staff time to administer CTE follow-up surveys, and to record, retrieve, and analyze the data

- Partnership with DTCC to align students with skills center and post-high school employment

- Professional development with Director of District Services to support guidance counselors

- using Career Cruising in area high schools

6S1 - Nontraditional Participation

- Advisory support and area partnerships focus on nontraditional enrollment

- Working with Director of Secondary Schools to support transitions from middle to high school

- Communicate with students/parents about non-traditional careers/CTE options

- Involve women-owned and minority-owned businesses in all phases of planning and implementation

3.10 Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students

Question A

A.1 Describe the research-based high quality language programs and activities proposed to be developed, implemented, and administered under the subgrant to increase the English proficiency of limited English proficient children and student academic achievement in the core academic subjects: [Section 3116(b)(1)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District provides programs incorporating English Language Development to help students learn English and Academic Instruction in English to help students master the core content standards. In meeting the different academic needs of a diverse ELL population, Red Clay offers diverse instructional programming; all students are able to participate in the regular classroom, but are also afforded specialized programs to fit their needs. For students whose primary language of dominance is Spanish, there is a bilingual program which includes a dual language program. There is also a Structured English Immersion program. For students whose primary language is not Spanish, the district is able to offer an ESL pull-out program. There is also an ESL sheltered program that is offered at the high school level for all students regardless of their home language. The Structured English Immersion programs provide instruction primarily in English, and include a sequential ELD program and sheltered English content with primary language support as needed. The English Language Mainstream programs provide instruction in English targeted to grade level standards. Students are provided appropriate additional services to ensure access to the core curriculum.

A.2 Describe the high-quality professional development to classroom teachers - including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instruction programs - principals, administrators, and other school personnel that are designed to improve the instruction and assessment of limited English proficient children: [Section 3115(2)(d)]

ELL teachers and instructional aides have the opportunity to participate in all district professional development opportunities. The ELL Office also offers specialized after-school and summer workshops on specific strategies to help ELLs in the classroom. There are workshops related to the Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) and how to accommodate for ELLs. There are presentations to the clerical staff on how to correctly and more effectively register students, and what to do if we encounter issues regarding ELLs. There has been a presentation to all district principals about ELLs in Red Clay to create a better awareness of what the program entails. At least twice during the year, the Manager of the ELL Office has meetings with all the ELL staff that includes some kind of professional development on the agenda. This year, teachers and instructional aides were introduced to a KIVA session. There are many other after-school professional development opportunities directed towards all teachers and instructional aides. Some of these included a six-part series which focused on What's Different About Teaching Reading to Students Learning English? The series included topics such as: Increasing Student Interaction in the Classroom; Beginning Reading; Vocabulary Development; Differentiation of Content Material; Content Area Reading; Academic Language. Key to the RCCSD professional development program is the initiation of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and Two-Way Immersion Observation Protocol (TWIOP), to provide teachers with a well-articulated, practical model of sheltered instruction. The intent of the model is to facilitate high quality instruction for English Learners in content area teaching. The models are based on current knowledge and research-based practices for promoting learning with all students, especially English Learners (ELs). Critical features of high quality instruction for ELs are embedded within the models. The models can be viewed as umbrellas under which other programs developed for improving instruction can reside.

A.3 Describe one or more methods or forms of instruction to be used in the programs and activities to assist limited English proficient children to attain English proficiency and meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. [Section 3115(f)(1) and Section 3116(b)(6)]

In Red Clay, all students may participate in the regular classroom, but the district also provides specialized programs to meet their needs. For students whose primary language is Spanish, there is a bilingual program which includes a dual language program at the Lewis Dual Language Magnet School. For students whose primary language is other than Spanish, the district offers an ESL pull-out program.
For Pk – 5: Structured English Immersion, Dual Language (at William C. Lewis Magnet), ESL pull out; Grades 6th – 8th: Structured English Immersion
Grades 9 – 12: ESL Sheltered program for all students regardless of their home language;
Kdg – 12: regular classroom.

Question B

B.1 Describe how the LEA will use the subgrant funds to meet all annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) as established in Delaware's Title III Accountability Model: [Section 3116(b)(2)]

The District will use Title III funds to provide the following supplemental services to implement the recommendations of the GW-CEEE review, targeting services for EL students and families, including:

- Hire and retain educational bilingual personnel with expertise in working with ELs; adapt curricular guidance and provide supplemental instructional resources to support academic language and ensure access to content instruction (Instructional Program Design/ Instructional Implementation and Personnel recommendations from GWU-CEEE).
- Contracted translation services, to support an outreach plan that is culturally and linguistically responsive (Parent and community outreach and Instructional Program Design/ Instructional Implementation from GWU-CEEE).
- Contracted services, to assist ELs to provide tutorial programs that align with students' linguistic and academic needs (Instructional Program Design/ Instructional Implementation from GWU-CEEE).
- Contracted services for state assessment proctors to assist with formative assessments to measure the progress of ELs in each of the content areas; monitor and systematically evaluate programs and services for ELs (Assessment and Accountability from GWU-CEEE).
- Professional Development to provide ongoing, job-embedded training for the staff related to working with ELs and addressing the achievement gap and to address cultural responsiveness with the families of ELs (Professional Development and Parent and community outreach from GWU-CEEE).
- Parent training sessions to support EL families and ensure access to content culturally and linguistically appropriate resources (Parent and Community Outreach from GWU-CEEE).

B.2 If the LEA has failed to meet AMAO's for 2 consecutive years, describe the improvement plan that will ensure the LEA meets the objective, specifically addressing the factors that prevented the LEA from achieving such objectives. [Section 3122(b)(2)]

The Red Clay Consolidated School District, has taken the following actions to meet all AMAOs:

- Commissioned a comprehensive external evaluation to determine the extent to which the Red Clay Consolidated District (RCCSD, the District) is meeting its goals for English Language learners(ELs), as well as to assess the quality of its programs and services for this population. This evaluation was performed by The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (GW-CEEE) to assist the RCCSD leaders in making decisions about program reforms.
- District level consideration for using GW-CEEE's Promoting Excellence Appraisal System (PEAS), a research-based framework for appraising programs for ELs.
- Develop a vision for pupil achievement, as outlined in the local strategic goal #3 – reducing the achievement gap between identified subpopulations. This is a shared focus among district offices and resources. The district is developing cohesive and consistent programming to ensure ELs' access to academic

content instruction and academic language development in all core content areas

- Establish a sustained, district-wide commitment to providing teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to close the achievement gaps among all ELs and SWDs Provide job-embedded, and ongoing professional development to ensure that the staff that work with ELs. This PD is designed to ensure that the instructional program design/ and implementation affect more inclusive classrooms for ELLs, and create a culture of collaboration. The training was initiated with Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and Two Way Immersion Observation Protocol (TWIOP) and will be sustained with support from multiple district offices.

- Restructure the Dual Language program at William C. Lewis Elementary School to align with evidence-based practices seen nationally to ensure that staff effectively advances student achievement to promote a shared understanding and commitment regarding the goals of two-way immersion programs. The program will include a curriculum that promotes the development of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and cross-cultural competencies for both groups of students; professional development for teachers to implement strategies to meet these goals and make academic content instruction accessible to both groups of students; coordination and scheduling to ensure ELLs receive explicit instruction in the development of academic language in Spanish and English; revised eligibility guidelines to ensure students who enter the program after Grade 1 have the requisite literacy and academic proficiency in Spanish to benefit from the program; and consistent engagement of the parents of both Spanish-speaking students and English-speaking parents in understanding and supporting the goals of the program. The ELL Office needs to organize targeted professional sessions to support the growth of the English language learners in terms of progress in language acquisition and academic achievement in content standards (AMAO 3and AYP).

Purpose:

The participants will be receiving information about:

- 1.Myths about language acquisition and legal aspects of ELLs and services for school administrators
- 2.Project GLAD for school leaders
- 3.data-driven decisions based on The ACCESS levels of proficiency for teachers and administrators

Needs and activities:

- 1.Myths about language acquisition and legal aspects of services for ELLs for school administrators

To accomplish this goal, a national presenter will be invited to talk to school administrators about real expectations regarding language acquisition for ELLs in the United States and the legal implications if services are not provided to ELLs.

- 2.Project GLAD for school leaders

School administrators will be invited to participate in a leadership team session. This session will provide participants with tools to plan for a possible focus school to implement effective strategies to gain language acquisition growth among ELLs.

- 3.data-driven decisions based on The ACCESS levels of proficiency for teachers and administrators

This PD session (s) will be delivered during the Professional Learning Communities meetings. The purpose is to train teachers and administrators on how to use the ACCESS data to differentiate instruction while promoting growth in ELLs in the 3-4 ACCESS levels. This will also include webinar follow up session to keep creating capacity on how to interpret and use ACCESS data.

This work will be supported with a combination of resoruces (including Titles I, IIA, and III)

B.3 Describe how the LEA will promote parental and community participation in programs for limited English proficient children in consultation with teachers, school administrators, and parents: [Section 3116 (b)(4)]

Develop a district-wide outreach plan that integrates culturally and linguistically responsive approaches to EL parent and community involvement as a part of Goals 3 and 5 of the Red Clay Strategic Plan.

- Providing opportunities for schools to share strategies for increasing parent involvement for families of ELs. Leverage local efforts by particular schools that have been successful at recruiting parents of ELs, and „scale up? these programs to other schools.
- Support schools to assess and address barriers (e.g., transportation, child care) that prevent EL parent involvement and then develop and implement strategies to mitigate these challenges.
- identifying and aligning targeted community organizations in efforts to help meet outcomes;
- Working with schools that enroll ELs to develop and implement a family outreach plan to forge partnerships with EL parents and their communities.

Potential goals would include increasing the involvement of parents of ELs in school decision-making bodies, supporting leadership development, and partnering with parents in culturally responsive ways.

- Working with the Mid Atlantic Equity Center to assist schools in creating a welcoming environment for culturally and linguistically diverse families (e.g., training front office staff, and affirming students? cultural and linguistic heritages throughout classroom and school displays, newsletters, assemblies, and other school-wide communications).
- Working with schools to ensure that all parents, including those who speak low incidence languages, receive appropriate translation and interpretation services; and in specific cases identifying a school-based liaison to support registration, transition and placement.

Question C

C.1 Describe how immigrant increase funds, if received, will be used for activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth: [Section 3115(e)(1)(A-G)]

Not Applicable

4.0 Budget and Distribution of Funds

BEFORE you begin to add budgeted items, please make sure your Success Plan has been updated to reflect the Race to the Top (RTTT) goals, objectives, and strategies.

Budgeted Item Detail

Federal Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Professional: Administration	Hire 1 FTE Manager Federal and Regulated Programs and School Improvement (MJS; RCCSD- Baltz Admin .8 Title I, .2 Title II) *				\$97,690.40	\$24,422.60		\$122,113.00
		Hire 1 FTE Elementary ELA Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .75 Title I, .25 Title II)G.B. *				\$85,179.00	\$28,393.00		\$113,572.00
		Hire 1 FTE Secondary ELA Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .35 Title I, .65 Title II)D.R. *				\$38,521.00	\$71,539.00		\$110,060.00
		Hire 1 FTE Math Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .6 Title I, .4 Title II) J.A. *				\$70,747.80	\$47,165.20		\$117,913.00
		Hire 1 FTE Social Studies Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) R.R. *				\$36,603.15	\$85,407.35		\$122,010.50
		Hire 1 FTE Science Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) E.McG. *				\$49,009.17	\$73,513.75		\$122,522.92
		Hire 1 FTE Secretary for Federal and Regulated Programs and School Improvement (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .8 Title I, .2 Title II)M.S. *				\$38,182.40	\$9,545.60		\$47,728.00
		Hire 1 FTE Student Data Auditor (RCCSD-BSS Admin; .5 Title II, .5 Title II) *				\$28,292.94	\$28,292.94		\$56,585.88
		Hire 1 FTE Education Associate for Parent Inv./McKinney-Vento/Private School Services (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .8 Title I, .2 Title II) C.T.M. *				\$83,636.80	\$21,311.33		\$104,948.13

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Professional: Administration	Hire .72 Restructuring Ed Associate for school reform S.Rook. *					\$76,026.24		\$76,026.24
		Hire 1 FTE DPAS II/CCS (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; .6 Title I, .4 Title II)Ch.C. *				\$73,608.00	\$49,072.00		\$122,680.00
		Hire 1 FTE Instructional Supervisor, Special Education Program to provide research-based best practices information and guidance to district (effective accommodations, modifications to curriculum and instructional strategies) to increase student achievement for the purpose of educating and maintaining IDEA services and/or programs. (K.B. RCCSD- Baltz Admin, .6 IDEA 6-21, .2 Title I, .2 Title II)K.Br. *		\$66,036.00		\$22,012.00	\$22,012.00		\$110,060.00
		Hire 1 FTE Compliance Supervisor, Special Education Program to manage Special Education /IDEA compliance and provide information and guidance to district to insure compliance. (V.P. RCCSD -Baltz Admin) *		\$110,060.00					\$110,060.00
		Hire .28 FTE Career Tech Associate RCCSD- Baltz Admin (.142 IDEA 6-21 - providing Career Pathway support to Central ILC and .138 Perkins - this is within the 5% allowable for Administrative cost (S.Rook is responsible for the Perkins resources to support our goals, implementation and compliance of the these funds and the coordination with the state's Perkins Plan, state CTE funds, regulations and procedures) *		\$14,994.06	\$15,125.42				\$30,119.48

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Professional: Administration	Hire 1 FTE Inclusion/PBS Coordinator (S.K. RCCSD-Baltz Admin) with a focus on students with special needs *		\$71,454.00					\$71,454.00
		Hire E Special Services Vocational Coordinator (C.S. RCCSD- Baltz Admin) *		\$89,184.00					\$89,184.00
		Hire 1 FTE District Educational Diagnostician (A.O. RCCSD- Baltz Admin) *		\$90,148.00					\$90,148.00
		Hire a 2 month data IEPPlus position for summer support (C.B. RCCSD- Baltz Admin (salary costs through July and August - est. \$578.95/day x 20 days) *		\$11,579.00					\$11,579.00
		Hire 1 FTE Autism Liaison (D.G. RCCSD- Baltz Admin) *		\$82,554.00					\$82,554.00
		Hire 1.5 FTE Childfind Coordinators (K.K & M.S .75 IDEA 6-21, .75 IDEA 3-5) *	\$61,140.00	\$61,140.00					\$122,280.00
		Account Total	\$61,140.00	\$597,149.06	\$15,125.42	\$623,482.66	\$536,701.01		\$1,833,598.15
	Professional: Instruction	Hire 3 FTE Math Instructional Cadre (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; 2 @ .7 Title I, .3 Title II and 1 @ .3 Title I, .7 Title II) - PD Priority 2,3,4 and 5 (L.M.; S.E.; E.S.) *				\$127,639.51	\$102,275.79		\$229,915.30
		Hire 1 FTE ELA Instructional Cadre (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) PD priority 2,3,4 and 5 (A.K.) *				\$22,015.36	\$51,369.16		\$73,384.52
		Hire 1 FTE Science Instructional Cadre (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) PD priority 2,3,4, and 5 (K.M.) *				\$26,087.49	\$60,870.81		\$86,958.30

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Professional: Instruction	Hire 27 FTE Title I teachers to support standards based instruction in content areas-reading and math (4 @ Warner, 4 @ Lewis, 4 @ Baltz, 3 @ Richardson Park, 2 @ Marbrook, 2 @ Mote, 2 @ Shortlidge, 2 @ AIMS, 2 @ Stanton, 1 @ Highlands, 1 @ Richey) and 3 paraprofessional (1 @ each Highlands, Richardson Park and Mote) *				\$1,897,240.43			\$1,897,240.43
		Hire 3.5 FTE ELL Paraprofessionals from Title III (.7 @ Marbrook, Lewis, Baltz, Mote and Dickinson) *						\$95,616.88	\$95,616.88
		Hire 1 FTE Special Education Lead Teacher (T.A. Early Years) *		\$75,115.00					\$75,115.00
		Hire 1 FTE Early Childhood Special Education Teacher (L.L.) *		\$47,979.00					\$47,979.00
		CEIS: Hire 5.5 Instructional Support Team Facilitators (TBD .5 @ each Highlands, Lewis, Shortlidge, Baltz, Richardson Park ES, Marbrook, Richey, Mote, AIMS and 1 @ Warner) *		\$352,244.50					\$352,244.50
		Hire 1 FTE Early Childhood Special Educators (A.M. RCCSD) *	\$44,120.88						\$44,120.88
		Hire 2 FTE Early Childhood Paraprofessionals(L.K & S.T) *	\$63,717.00						\$63,717.00
		Hire 7 IDEA Support Team Facilitators to support students with identified needs(TBD .5 @ each Heritage, Forest Oak, Linden Hill, North Star, AIMS, Stanton,and 1 @ each Brandywine Springs, DHS, MHS, AIHS) *		\$507,120.00					\$507,120.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	EPER for Teachers to participate in planning sessions with Mid Atlantic Equity Center to implement a winter-spring parent education series for ELL buildings to address college and career readiness (4 days x \$27/hr x 8 FTE (Baltz, Mote, Marbrook, Lewis, AIHS, Conrad, McKean HS, Dickinson HS) x 3 hrs: \$2,592 TOTAL) *						\$2,592.00	\$2,592.00
		EPER for Reading Specialists/Teachers and ELA Cadre to develop and implement parent and community outreach that is culturally and linguistically responsive with a focus on family literacy skills at targeted ELL buildings (proposed: Lewis, Mote, Marbrook, Baltz, Conrad (6 FTEx\$27/hr x 3hrs x 5 sessions: \$2,430) *						\$2,430.00	\$2,430.00
		EPER - Staff Development, curriculum & program development, professional development for CTE staff to evaluate, align, and upgrade the middle CTE program opportunity at each of our middle schools(\$27/hr EPER x 8 staff x 45-50 hours; not the exceed \$10,500) Red Clay Middle Schools- AIMS, Brandywine Springs, CCSA, Conrad, HBMS, Skyline and Stanton. *			\$7,701.19				\$7,701.19
		Pay EPER for homebound instruction *		\$60,000.00					\$60,000.00
		Pay EPER for homebound instructional services at hospitals and treatment centers *		\$45,000.00					\$45,000.00
		EPER for Extended School Year Staff (ESY) to work with students with identified needs (\$27/ hr x 370.37 hrs est.) *		\$10,000.00					\$10,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	EPER for teachers to maintain the required program components of IDEA related to FAPE, IEP, LRE, appropriate evaluation, Parent & Student involvement in decisionmaking, procedural safeguards (IDEA 3-5 \$27/hr x 37.5 hr per wk x 2 staff x 4.5 weeks = 9112.5; IDEA 6-21 \$27/hr x 259.2 est. hours: \$7000) *	\$9,112.50	\$7,000.00					\$16,112.50
		Professional development activities related to PD priorities 1,2,3,4 and 5 that improve the knowledge of teachers and principals regarding effective instructional practices that involve collaborative groups; Address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with special needs and with limited English proficiency; Provide training in improving student behavior in the classroom and identifying early and appropriate interventions; enable teachers and principals to involve parents in their children's education, especially parents of limited English proficient and immigrant children; and provide training on how to use data and assessment to improve classroom practice and student learning *		\$45,000.00					\$45,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	Professional Development activities - PD priorities 1,2,3,4 and 5 that improve the knowledge of teachers and principals regarding effective instructional practices that involve collaborative groups; Address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with special needs and with limited English proficiency; Provide training in improving student behavior in the classroom and identifying early and appropriate interventions; enable teachers and principals to involve parents in their children's education, especially parents of limited English proficient and immigrant children; and provide training on how to use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning. (EPER for staff members) *				\$7,780.29	\$58,796.27		\$66,576.56
		EPER for ELL staff to provide translation services for EL families that attend the Parent Forum sessions held at Al Middle School for district families from October 2012 – May 2013 (\$50x8 sessions: \$400) *						\$400.00	\$400.00
		Account Total	\$9,112.50	\$167,000.00	\$7,701.19	\$47,527.85	\$58,796.27	\$5,422.00	\$295,559.81
	Support Staff	Saturday Library: Hourly fees for custodial staff to support Saturday workshops and maintenance (4 hrs/day at 4 sites for 6 days (1 day/month) *				\$3,104.64			\$3,104.64
		Account Total				\$3,104.64			\$3,104.64

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Salaries	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	\$130,135.99	\$1,004,630.48	\$7,790.74	\$1,375,123.85	\$374,324.22	\$97,514.10	\$2,989,519.38
		Account Total	\$130,135.99	\$1,004,630.48	\$7,790.74	\$1,375,123.85	\$374,324.22	\$97,514.10	\$2,989,519.38
		Classification Total	\$308,226.37	\$2,836,421.04	\$30,617.35	\$4,122,221.79	\$1,184,337.26	\$198,552.98	\$8,680,376.79
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Create contract for Technical Support with PCSI; 1 yr @ \$30,000 Title I, \$30,000 Title II (PD priorities 2 and 5); the prorated amount of the contracted allocation reflects a proportional dedication to Title IIA and Title IA teacher professional development activities and support; PCSI will support hardware purchased by and for Title IIA activities per the allocated amount and the same for Title IA activities per the allocated amount. *				\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00		\$60,000.00
		Contract with Comcast to produce and broadcast Red Clay This Week parent information education series *				\$13,428.85			\$13,428.85

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Registration for 4 FTE staff to Nashville, TN to go to National Title I Conference and to visit Nashville Parent University to provide ongoing support to RCCSD schools with high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards, and advance parent engagement (5 FTE x Registration fees (\$525): \$5,280 total) *				\$2,100.00			\$2,100.00
		Registration fee for 1 FTE staff to Washington, DC to attend National Federal Education Program Administrators conference and provide ongoing support related to using federal education funds to advance strategic plan goals (1 FTE x Registration fees (\$395): \$395 total) *				\$395.00			\$395.00
		Registration for 4 FTE to Lancaster, PA to attend the Family Involvement Conference and provide ongoing support locally to impact parent engagement (2 FTE @ Title I, 2 FTE @ Title II x Registration fees (\$200): \$800 total, \$400 each program) PD Priorities 1,4,5 *				\$400.00	\$400.00		\$800.00
		Agreement/MOU with Wesley College to provide Parent Education Certificate courses for Title I buildings (8 schools x \$1450/school for the certificate: \$11,600 TOTAL) *				\$11,600.00			\$11,600.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Refreshments for ELL evening/weekend family/parent education series developed with MAEC to address college and career readiness (6 monthly sessions x est. \$400/session with local food service agency): \$2400) *						\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00
		Refreshments for parent and community outreach that is culturally and linguistically responsive with a focus on early literacy and family literacy at targeted ELL buildings (5 sessions x est. \$400/session with a local food agency): \$2000 *						\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
		Contract with a National Expert to provide targeted professional sessions to support data-driven decisions based on The ACCESS levels of proficiency for teachers and administrators - the PD sessions will be delivered during PLCs to train teachers and administrators on how to use the ACCESS data to differentiate instruction while promoting growth in ELLs in the 3-4 ACCESS levels. (AMAO 3and AYP) (1 year of support @ \$3,500/ yr for all expenses: Title IIA:\$3100 Title III:\$400). *					\$3,100.00	\$400.00	\$3,500.00
		(Title III) Registration for 4 FTE District Administrators to attend the Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) conference and provide ongoing support in locally targeted schools through PLCs and BLTs (4 FTE x \$250: \$1000 in registration fees total) *					\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Contract with a National Expert to provide targeted professional sessions to school leaders to support data-driven strategies for language acquisition and Myths about language acquisition/legal aspects for ELLs to support PLCs and promote academic growth. (AMAO 3and AYP) (1 year of PD for leaders @ \$4,000/ yr for all expenses: Title IIA:\$4000). *					\$4,000.00		\$4,000.00
	Account Total					\$57,923.85	\$38,500.00	\$4,800.00	\$101,223.85
	Professional: Instruction	Set aside Title IIA funds for non-profit, private schools allocation (Contract w/educational services vendors for 1 school year) *					\$29,355.01		\$29,355.01
		Set aside Title I fund for non-profit, private schools allocation (Contract w/educational services vendors for 1 school year of tutoring (\$80,122.42 est.); and costs for PD: \$9837.63; Parent involvement: \$3787.42; LEA Inst.: \$1711.77) *				\$90,073.50			\$90,073.50
		Reservation of 5% of the RCCSD Title I amount to support Focus School plans to incorporate interventions that directly address the reason the schools were identified. *				\$232,058.90			\$232,058.90
		Contract with Technical Assistance provider to support Title I Schoolwide programs and communities with the kindergarten transition to set the course for successful school career, and strengthen schools', families', and students' learning by decreasing environmental barriers. *				\$16,561.00			\$16,561.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Saturday Library: Contract with DE Museum of Natural History Science Outreach (\$150/day for 6 days at 4 regional sites) *				\$900.00			\$900.00
		Provide substitute coverage for Quality Reading Instruction for PD for K-3 teachers in high poverty schools (\$105/hr x 95 subs) *				\$9,975.00			\$9,975.00
		Registration for 2 FTE to Houston, TX to attend the Understanding the Culture of Poverty Training Certification workshop and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools to impact equity, achievement and parent engagement (1 FTE Title, 1 FTE Title II each x Registration fees (\$795 total each Total : \$1590) PD Priorities 2,3,4,5 *					\$1,590.00		\$1,590.00
		Registration for 5 FTE staff to Denver, CO to attend National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (NCSM) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement locally (5 FTE x Registration fees (\$210): \$1,050 total) PD Priorities 1,2,4 *					\$1,050.00		\$1,050.00
		Registration for 4 FTE staff to San Antonio, TX to attend International Reading Association Conference (IRA) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement related to reading on grade level by 3rd grade: (4 FTE x Registration fees (\$300): \$1,200 total) PD Priorities 1,2,3,4 (4 staff Title II) *					\$1,200.00		\$1,200.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Registration for 4 staff to Chicago, Ill to attend Assn. Supervision of Curriculum and Development (ASCD) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement related to highly effective educators and leaders: (4 FTE x Registration fees (\$259): \$1036 total) PD Priorities 1,2,3,4 *					\$1,036.00		\$1,036.00
		Registration for 2 FTE to Orlando, FL to attend the NABE annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the RCCSD improvement plan (2 FTE x \$345 Registration fees (\$690 total) *						\$690.00	\$690.00
		Registration for 2 FTE to Orlando, FL to attend model school site visits during the NABE annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the RCCSD improvement plan (2 FTE x \$50 school site visit registration fees (\$100 total) *						\$100.00	\$100.00
		Translation Services for RCCSD written and printed materials (Intelligo services \$22,016.93 annually x 1 calendar yr.) *						\$22,016.93	\$22,016.93
		After school services – supplemental tutoring, for identified English Language Learners (maximum \$1,000/month x 10 months with Community Educational Agency) *						\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Registration for 2 FTE to attend the WIDA (Boston, MA)conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the RCCSD improvement plan and achievement gap efforts (\$800 Registration fees total) *						\$800.00	\$800.00
		Contract proctors for administration of the state assessment *						\$430.00	\$430.00
		Registration fees for CTE and CTSO conferences to improve program delivery (DECA, BPA, TSA, FCCLA, FFA) and staff professional conferences as requested (ex, ITEEA, NTSA) PD Priorities 1,2,4 and 5) *			\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		Contract for substitutes to support PD activities and staff attending CTE and CTSO conferences (ITEEA, NTSA, ACTE, BPA, DECA, FCCLA, FFA, HOSA, Skills USA, TSA) to improve program delivery to be shared/transferred through PLCs, BLTs, CTE content session, and CTSO meetings. *			\$20,000.00				\$20,000.00
		Learning Link of Delaware's Home-school communication pilot (6 sessions (1 county and 1 city) x \$800/session: \$4,800) *				\$4,800.00			\$4,800.00
		Contract for Assistive Technology support with Therapy Services of DE., Inc. (approved bid for services est. costs @ \$ 11,905.36/ mo. min.) *		\$130,959.00					\$130,959.00
		Contract for translation/interpreter services(based on approved bid for services est. costs @ \$8000/ mo. min.) *		\$80,000.00					\$80,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract for OT/PT/AT/SLP for Parentally Place Private School Students (base upon approved bid (est. costs of \$8000/mo min.) *		\$80,000.00					\$80,000.00
		Contract for ESY bus transportation(based on approved bid for services est. min. costs @ \$500/mo. x 10 months) *		\$5,000.00					\$5,000.00
		Contract with Achieve3000 to support CEIS by providing differentiated online instruction to improve students' reading and writing,and prepare them for college and career success (est. costs \$4200/ mo. min.) *		\$42,000.00					\$42,000.00
		Contract for OT/PT/AT/SLT Services for public school students (vendor(s) to be decided based upon successful bid est. costs based on prior years' svcs (est. costs average min. \$50,000 x 10 months) *		\$500,000.00					\$500,000.00
		Account Total		\$837,959.00	\$30,000.00	\$354,368.40	\$34,231.01	\$34,036.93	\$1,290,595.34
	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	Audit Fee for federal grant *		\$4,086.15	\$402.19	\$5,099.69	\$1,395.48		\$10,983.51

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Contracted Services	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	Set aside Perkins funds Provide substitute with approved Sub agency to provide coverage(\$105/hr x estimated 200 subs days over the course of the school year: \$21,000)so that RCCSD CTE staff can collaborate in specific CTE content areas to develop specific options in addressing Academic Attainment and Pathway Completion; development Academic Attainment (1S1), Technical Skill Attainment (2S1), Secondary Placement (5S1) and Pathway Completion (6S1,6S2). The learning will be transferred through PLC's, BLT, grade level/content teams and school sessions to ID impact related to goals. (PD priorities 1,2,4 and 5) *			\$20,000.00				\$20,000.00
		Refreshments for planning teams to develop evening parent education workshops for ELL families to address college and career readiness and early literacy (est. 5 sessions x \$200/session with local food service agency): \$1000) *						\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
		Account Total		\$4,086.15	\$20,402.19	\$5,099.69	\$1,395.48	\$1,000.00	\$31,983.51
		Classification Total		\$842,045.15	\$50,402.19	\$417,391.94	\$74,126.49	\$39,836.93	\$1,423,802.70
Travel	Professional: Instruction	Mileage for School Support Team and Cadre to district schools (est. costs of .40/ mile x 25,000 miles) directly related to Title IIA funded professional development and technical support by individuals paid with an equally pro-rated amount of Title IIA funds *					\$10,000.00		\$10,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Travel	Professional: Instruction	Travel for 2 FTE to Houston, TX to attend the Understanding the Culture of Poverty Training Certification workshop and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools to impact equity, achievement and parent engagement (1 FTE 2 @ flight (\$440);4 days @ hotel (\$876); pkg (\$50); meals (\$240); shuttle (\$50): \$1,656 Total: \$3312) PD Priorities 2,3,4,5 *					\$3,312.00		\$3,312.00
		Travel for 5 staff to Denver, CO to attend National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (NCSM) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement locally 5 FTE x flight (\$375);3 days @ hotel (\$900); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$22.80): \$7,699 total) PD Priorities 1,2,4 *					\$7,699.00		\$7,699.00
		Travel for 4 staff to San Antonio, TX to attend International Reading Association Conference (IRA) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement related to reading on grade level by 3rd grade: (2 Title I, 4 Title II) 6 FTE x flight (\$400);4 days @ hotel (\$956); pkg (\$50); meals (\$240); shuttle (\$34): \$6,720 total) *					\$6,720.00		\$6,720.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Travel	Professional: Instruction	Travel for 4 staff to Chicago, Ill to attend Assn. Supervision of Curriculum and Development (ASCD) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement related to highly effective educators and leaders: 4 FTE x flight (\$380);3 days @ hotel (\$720); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$55): \$5,588 total) PD Priorities 1,2,3,4 *					\$5,588.00		\$5,588.00
		Travel for 2 FTE to Orlando, FL to attend the NABE annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the RCCSD improvement plan (2 FTE x flight (\$220);3 days @ hotel (\$540); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192): \$2,004 total) *						\$2,004.00	\$2,004.00
		Provide support for Staff to travel and participate in CTE and CTSO conferences and provide ongoing support to RCCSD schools with college and career readiness programming *			\$15,000.00				\$15,000.00
		Mileage for Homebound Instruction(based on est. travel costs to support students with special needs (@ .40/mix 10,000 miles) *		\$3,500.00					\$3,500.00
		Travel for 2 FTE to Boston, MA to attend the WIDA data and standards conference and provide ongoing support AMAO improvement locally and impact achievement gap efforts (est. 2 FTE x plane travel (\$253);2 days @ hotel (\$220); pkg (\$24); meals (\$96); cab: \$40): \$1,266 total) *						\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00
		Account Total		\$3,500.00	\$15,000.00		\$33,319.00	\$3,270.00	\$55,089.00

Travel	Professional: Administration	Mileage for School Support Team and Cadre to assist targeted schools- Mileage for School Support Team and Cadre to district schools (est. costs of .40/ mile x 50,000 miles) directly related to Title IA funded professional development and technical support by individuals paid with an equally pro-rated amount of Title IA funds *				\$20,000.00			\$20,000.00
		Travel for 3 staff to Nashville, TN to attend National Title I Conference and provide ongoing support to RCCSD schools with high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards: 3 FTE x flight (\$360); 4 days @ hotel (\$836); pkg (\$100); meals (\$384); shuttle (\$80): \$3,520 total) *				\$5,280.00			\$5,280.00
		Travel for 1 FTE staff to Nashville, TN to attend National Title I Conference and to visit Nashville Parent University to provide ongoing support to RCCSD schools with high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards, and advance parent engagement (1 FTE x flight (\$360) @ 5 days hotel (\$1045); pkg (\$50) + meals (\$192); shuttle (\$40): \$1,687 total) *				\$1,687.00			\$1,687.00
		Travel for 1 FTE staff to Washington, DC to attend National Federal Education Program Administrators conference and provide ongoing support related to using federal education funds to advance strategic plan goals (1FTE x train (\$68) @ 4 days x hotel (\$800);				\$1,148.00			\$1,148.00

Travel	Professional: Administration	pkg (\$48); meals (\$192); cab (\$40) (\$1,148 total) *				\$1,148.00			\$1,148.00
		Travel for 4 FTE to Lancaster, PA to attend the Family Involvement Conference and provide ongoing support locally to impact parent engagement (2 FTE @ Title I, 2 FTE @ Title II x mileage (\$.40/mi x 106mi:\$42.40(\$169.60); 3 days @hotel (\$2,364); meals (\$768); (\$3,301.60 total, \$1650 each program) PD Priorities 1,4,5 *				\$1,650.80	\$1,650.80		\$3,301.60
		Mileage for administration and IDEA/special services program monitoring support students with special needs and programming to support students with special needs (@.40/mi x 30,000 miles) *		\$12,000.00					\$12,000.00
		Travel for 4 FTE to California to attend the Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) conference and provide ongoing support in locally targeted schools through PLCs and BLTs (4 FTE x Hotel: \$190x4=\$760; Airfare: 400x4=\$1,600; Meals: \$71x4=\$284: \$2644) *					\$2,644.00		\$2,644.00
		Account Total		\$12,000.00		\$29,765.80	\$4,294.80		\$46,060.60
		Classification Total		\$15,500.00	\$15,000.00	\$29,765.80	\$37,613.80	\$3,270.00	\$101,149.60
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Identify and purchase supplemental interventions for academically at risk students attending Title I schools *				\$5,000.00			\$5,000.00
		Provide materials for district parent engagement activities related to Red Clay PAC(\$250 per month x 8 months) *				\$2,000.00			\$2,000.00
		Set aside funds for local school parent engagement activities (95% of 1% set aside) *				\$43,742.07			\$43,742.07

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Provide materials for district parent engagement activities (%5 of 1% set aside) *				\$2,302.22			\$2,302.22
		Set aside funds to support the needs of students experiencing transitions (McKinney-Vento support) *				\$10,000.00			\$10,000.00
		Purchase CTE resources, supplies and materials specific to the major and minor CTE upgrade and enhancement projects being worked on during this school year(continued enhancement and upgrade of our Engineering and Digital Imaging & Media pathways at all appropriate high schools, TMHS – Culinary, Early Child Care and Audio, Radio & Video Design & Engineering pathways, AIDHS - Business, Finance & Marketing)They are NOT being used for consumable supplies and materials. *			\$36,000.00				\$36,000.00
		Purchase materials and supplies to support the specialized needs of students (materials to be purchased and costs adjusted based on the ID needs of children - est. 2400 students x \$6.08/student: \$14,595.81 min.) *		\$14,595.81					\$14,595.81
		Purchase testing protocols for special education servicesprotocols will be determined based on individual needs and based on previous years expenditures we estimate \$10,000 min.) *		\$10,000.00					\$10,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Purchase Early childhood testing protocols supplies and materials (ex: Psychologists testing protocols and materials est: \$4000; Office supplies for Child Find 4 year olds: est. costs \$650(envelopes, paper, pencils, screeners' supplies);Speech therapists testing kits (PLS -5) and protocols: \$3000; adaptive educational supplies for identified 3-5 year olds est. costs \$9600) **	\$17,245.41						\$17,245.41
		Instructional materials for after school programming for students who did not meet standard. (\$500/school @ 11 schools: \$5500) *				\$5,500.00			\$5,500.00
		Account Total	\$17,245.41	\$24,595.81	\$36,000.00	\$68,544.29			\$146,385.51
	Professional: Administration	Purchase administrative supplies and subscriptions (Title I Newsletter, Ed Week, etc) for the Federal and Regulated Programs Office *				\$3,000.00			\$3,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Administration	Additional/supplemental resources for Federal program administration/AMAO monitoring: (The Administrator's Guide to Federal Programs for English Learners \$250 x 2 copies (\$500); "English Learners and Civil Rights: Growing Concern for a Growing Population," (\$30x10: \$300); ED 101: Q&As for ESEA Program Administrators (\$70x2: \$140); Serving Your English Learners with Federal Funds: How to Avoid the Supplanting Trap (\$79x2: \$158); EDGAR-Plus (\$60/copyx2: \$120); The Do's and Don'ts of Education Compliance: Audits, Monitoring and Enforcement (\$58/copy x2: \$116); supplemental materials to plan and document AMAO improvement meetings and monitoring of requirements: Binders (\$24); highlighters (\$5); Planning notebooks (\$15); flash drives (\$5.10x3: \$15.30) (est. costs of \$59.30) 1393.30 TOTAL. *						\$1,393.30	\$1,393.30

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Administration	Provide materials to support Perkins Advisory Council meetings to support 1S, 2S1, 6S1, 6S2, 5S1 (\$6000 x 1 district wide, \$400 x 10 school level mtg per year) For DOE: CTE Advisory Council Meetings are on October 5th, 2012 and February 15th, 2013. The CTE staff and stakeholders from Business, Industry, our Community, Higher Education and Parents will work together specifically focusing on the individual CTE plans for each of our programs in all content areas. The cost of the facility, lunch and resource items needed for the session. Using these two dates we will not need funds for substitutes for our CTE staff; We have 53 CTE staff each invite 1-2 Business partners (53-106), a building administrator for each secondary school (11), district administrators (7-12) and DOE Education Associates (6). *			\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		Materials to support participants in the targeted professional sessions to support data-driven decisions based on The ACCESS levels of proficiency for teachers and administrators - the PD sessions will be delivered during PLCs to train teachers and administrators on how to use the ACCESS data to differentiate instruction while promoting growth in ELLs in the 3-4 ACCESS levels. (AMAO 3and AYP) (est. 30 participants x \$16.20 in material costs est \$486 (\$495.72 with IC). *						\$486.00	\$486.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Administration	Account Total			\$10,000.00	\$3,000.00		\$1,879.30	\$14,879.30
		Classification Total	\$17,245.41	\$24,595.81	\$46,000.00	\$71,544.29		\$1,879.30	\$161,264.81
Capital Outlay	Capital Outlay	Upgrade, enhancement and innovation of CTE programs/facilities to bring our facilities to education, business and industry standards – TMHS – Culinary facility – complete upgrade and enhancement to a commercial state of the art facility, TMHS – Communication Center – complete upgrade and enhancement to a state of the art facility, CSS – Middle School Tech Ed lab and Health Science PT & CNA – upgrade, continued enhancements of our engineering facilities and digital media facilities. All BIDs for architect/designer, contractors, and the CTE Perkins followed state bid regulations and were handled by Data Service Center and are on file.			\$285,229.48				\$285,229.48
		Account Total			\$285,229.48				\$285,229.48
	Maintenance of Plant		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$285,229.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$285,229.48
	Federal		\$325,471.78	\$3,718,562.00	\$427,249.02	\$4,640,923.82	\$1,296,077.55	\$243,539.21	\$10,651,823.38
	* - Allow Indirect Cost Total			0		2	5		38

State Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	Professional Development	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Purchase training materials for Praxis preparation- HQ/HE teachers (PD Priority 1: \$500 for booklets and ETS resources, etc) *	\$500.00	\$500.00
		Reimburse PRAXIS registration fees for teachers who qualify as HQT (PD Priority 1 est. costs \$100 x 10 teachers) *	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
		Provide resources to recruit Highly Qualified and Highly Effective teacher candidates (PD Priority 1: cost associated with recruitment services and periodicals, journals, job fair) *	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
		Account Total	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Classification Total			\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract for substitutes for teachers to receive professional development related to PD priorities 2, 3, 4, and 5 *	\$30,000.02	\$30,000.02
		Account Total	\$30,000.02	\$30,000.02
		Classification Total	\$30,000.02	\$30,000.02
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	Provide EPER for Professional Development Workshops for staff related to PD priorities 2,3,4,5 *	\$91,286.85	\$91,286.85
		Pay EPER for instructional technology workshops related to PD priorities 2, 3, 4, and 5 *	\$30,000.01	\$30,000.01
		Account Total	\$121,286.86	\$121,286.86
	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)	Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00

		Professiona l Developme nt	Total	
Salaries	Students (with WC and UI)	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	OEC	Total OECs	\$36,204.12	\$36,204.12
	Account Total	\$36,204.12	\$36,204.12	
	Classification Total	\$157,490.98	\$157,490.98	
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Classification Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	
State Total		\$189,991.00	\$189,991.00	

OEC Summary

Program	FICA	Medicare	Pension	Workman's Comp	Unemployment	Health Ins. \ Non Taxed Benefits	Total OEC Cost
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	\$1,415.25	\$330.99	\$4,629.24	\$399.46	\$38.80	\$977.00	\$7,790.74
Curriculum and Professional Development	\$7,519.78	\$1,758.66	\$24,596.97	\$2,122.52	\$206.19	\$0.00	\$36,204.12
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	\$11,041.60	\$2,582.31	\$36,116.73	\$3,116.59	\$302.76	\$76,976.00	\$130,135.99
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	\$113,571.03	\$26,560.96	\$371,487.11	\$32,056.32	\$3,114.01	\$457,841.05	\$1,004,630.48
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	\$170,320.06	\$39,832.90	\$557,111.42	\$48,074.23	\$4,670.08	\$555,115.16	\$1,375,123.85
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	\$50,220.81	\$11,745.20	\$164,270.64	\$14,175.24	\$1,377.02	\$132,535.31	\$374,324.22
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	\$6,264.41	\$1,465.07	\$20,490.68	\$1,768.18	\$171.76	\$67,354.00	\$97,514.10
Totals	\$360,352.94	\$84,276.09	\$1,178,702.79	\$101,712.54	\$9,880.62	\$1,290,798.52	\$3,025,723.50

Indirect Cost Summary

Program	Total Direct Program Charges	Indirect Cost Rate	Indirect Cost Billable
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	\$142,019.54	5.00 %	\$7,100.98
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	\$325,471.78	5.98 %	\$19,463.22
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	\$3,718,562.00	5.98 %	\$222,370.00
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	\$4,640,923.82	5.98 %	\$277,527.18
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	\$1,296,077.55	5.98 %	\$77,505.45
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	\$243,539.21	2.00 %	\$4,870.79
Totals	\$10,556,584.90		\$608,837.62

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: IDEA 3-5

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$61,140.00				\$37,494.29			\$98,634.29
Instruction	200	\$116,950.38			\$17,245.41	\$92,641.70			\$226,837.49
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$18,431.94			\$1,031.28				\$19,463.22
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$196,522.32			\$18,276.69	\$130,135.99			\$344,935.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: IDEA 6-21

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$597,149.06		\$12,000.00		\$307,992.04			\$917,141.10
Instruction	200	\$1,234,641.50	\$837,959.00	\$3,500.00	\$24,595.81	\$696,638.44			\$2,797,334.75
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$169,617.97	\$54,440.45	\$926.90	\$1,470.83				\$226,456.15
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$2,001,408.53	\$892,399.45	\$16,426.90	\$26,066.64	\$1,004,630.48			\$3,940,932.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD _____

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: Perkins

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT: _____
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO _____

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$15,125.42			\$10,000.00	\$5,491.94			\$30,617.36
Instruction	200	\$7,701.19	\$30,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$2,298.80			\$90,999.99
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$1,530.87	\$22,922.30	\$750.00	\$2,300.00				\$27,503.17
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200						\$285,229.48		\$285,229.48
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$24,357.48	\$52,922.30	\$15,750.00	\$48,300.00	\$7,790.74	\$285,229.48		\$434,350.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: Title I

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$623,482.66	\$57,923.85	\$29,765.80	\$3,000.00	\$299,064.95			\$1,013,237.26
Instruction	200	\$2,123,615.28	\$354,368.40		\$68,544.29	\$1,076,058.90			\$3,622,586.87
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$246,508.83	\$30,059.72	\$1,779.99	\$4,278.33				\$282,626.87
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$2,993,606.77	\$442,351.97	\$31,545.79	\$75,822.62	\$1,375,123.85			\$4,918,451.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD _____

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: Title II (Part A)

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT: _____
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO _____

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$536,701.01	\$38,500.00	\$4,294.80		\$243,525.77			\$823,021.58
Instruction	200	\$273,312.03	\$34,231.01	\$33,319.00		\$130,798.45			\$471,660.49
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$70,823.38	\$5,828.24	\$2,249.31					\$78,900.93
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$880,836.42	\$78,559.25	\$39,863.11		\$374,324.22			\$1,373,583.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD _____

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

PROJECT TITLE: Title III - ELL

BEGINNING: 7/13/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind _____
Cost 2nd Yr: 0.00
Number Exceeds: 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT: _____
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO _____

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Classification	Account	Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay			
Administration	100		\$4,800.00		\$1,879.30				\$6,679.30	
Instruction	200	\$101,038.88	\$34,036.93	\$3,270.00		\$97,514.10			\$235,859.91	
Attendance Service	300									
Health Services	400									
Pupil Transportation Services	500									
Operation of Plant	600									
Maintenance of Plant	700									
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$3,971.06	\$1,796.74	\$65.40	\$37.59				\$5,870.79	
Food Services	900									
Student Body Activities	1000									
Community Service	1100									
Capital Outlay	1200									
Total Expenditures	19000									
Total Budget		\$105,009.94	\$40,633.67	\$3,335.40	\$1,916.89	\$97,514.10			\$248,410.00	

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH
BUDGET REPORT OF STATE FUNDS

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
 as an Application Budget:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY:

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

PROJECT TITLE: Professional Development

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 12/15/2013

FUND & LINE: _____

For subgrants of State funds, no annual or final expenditure report is required. Prior notification of intent to amend is required when exceeding approved budget amounts by \$1,000 or 5% whichever is greater. This budget form is required for planning purposes only and is to accompany a subgrant application for State funds when application for such funds is required

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$121,286.86	\$30,000.02		\$2,500.00	\$36,204.12			\$189,991.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800								
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$121,286.86	\$30,000.02		\$2,500.00	\$36,204.12			\$189,991.00

DATE: 7/13/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Stewart, Malik

Distribution of funds chart: LEA Wide

Federal Funding	IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Professional Development
Administration Cost	117072.80	985949.69	32570.53	1050534.46	860157.28	2441.17	
CEIS		44511.60					
Homeless				10598.00			
Instruction	227862.20	1209827.39	370279.48	53946.34		33095.87	189991.00
Parent Involvement		84784.00		73003.35	2173.44	11669.27	
PPPS		84784.00					
Professional Development		61926.76	31499.99	310034.27	480141.84	5860.92	
Focus Schools				245936.02			
Total LEA-wide Funding	344935.00	2471783.44	434350.00	1744052.44	1342472.56	53067.23	189991.00
Total Allocation	344935.00	3940932.00	434350.00	4918451.00	1373583.00	248410.00	189991.00
Percent of Allocation	1.00	0.63	1.00	0.35	0.98	0.21	1.00

Distribution of School-level funds

Source of funds - Description	IDEA 6-21		Title I		Title III - ELL	Title II (Part A)
	CEIS	Instruction	Instruction	Parent Involvement	Instruction	Instruction
Forest Oak Elem		61527.80				
Heritage Elem		61527.80				
Highlands Elem	66720.72		130050.00	2817.38		
Lewis Dual Language Elem	40344.73		351708.00	4364.17	41284.30	
Shortlidge Elem	40344.73		250054.00	3102.80		
Linden Hill Elem		44504.82				
Baltz Elem	49125.95		433328.00	5376.96	36474.34	
Richardson Park Elem	57962.20		353192.00	4382.59		
Marbrook Elem	62114.75		192525.00	4170.82	39320.63	
Richey Elem	66720.72		89509.84	2283.36		
Brandywine Springs		84652.74				
Mote Elem	46991.54		425908.00	5284.88	38532.57	
Warner Elem	108712.69		440006.00	5459.82		
North Star Elem		58216.77				
A I duPont Middle	58881.48		165760.00	4124.79		
H B duPont Middle		58775.50				
Skyline Middle		53958.98				
Stanton Middle		53958.98	200540.00	4990.26		
Conrad Schools of Science		44504.82				
Calloway Sch of the Arts		55519.53				
Dickinson High		100973.90			39730.93	
A I duPont High		73877.50				
McKean High		119229.91				
Private Schools			95459.89			31110.44

Source of funds - Description	IDEA 6-21		Title I		Title III - ELL	Title II (Part A)
	CEIS	Instruction	Instruction	Parent Involvement	Instruction	Instruction
Total School Funding	597919.51	871229.05	3128040.73	46357.83	195342.77	31110.44
Total Program Allocation	3940932.00	3940932.00	4918451.00	4918451.00	248410.00	1373583.00
Percent of Allocation	0.15	0.22	0.64	0.01	0.79	0.02

5.1 Maintenance of Effort

Refer to Section 14501 of ESEA, 20 U.S.C. §8891 and OMB Circular A-87
 Retrieve Data from the Annual Financial Statement for Fiscal Year 2011 and Fiscal Year 2010

Instruction	FY2011		FY2010	
Total Expenditures (line 1999)	\$205,839,374.00		\$214,001,107.00	
Less:				
Instate Tuition (line 0152)	\$11,794,922.00		\$20,330,012.00	
Capital Outlay (line 0170, 0270, 0370, 0470, 0570, 0670, 0770, 0870, 0970)	\$105,831.00		\$104,313.00	
Community Services (line 1299)	\$0.00		\$0.00	
Adult Education (line 1399)	\$886,439.00		\$921,587.00	
Facilities Acquisition (line 1499)	\$7,558,592.00		\$4,234,850.00	
Debt Service (line 1599)	\$7,649,470.00	\$27,995,254.00	\$21,820,923.00	\$47,411,685.00
Subtotal	\$177,844,120.00		\$166,589,422.00	
Less:				
Federal Expenditures (line 3999 less Adult Basic Ed)	\$22,963,055.00		\$20,173,937.00	
Subtotal	\$154,881,065.00		\$146,415,485.00	
Divided By:				
September 30 Enrollment	15954		15756	
Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2006	\$9,707.98		\$9,292.68	
Less: Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2010 (in block)	\$9,292.68			
Total increase/(decrease)	\$415.30			

5.2 Excess Cost for IDEA

IDEA Excess Cost	FY2011	FY2010	Difference
Regular Units	\$749.44	\$738.51	
Special Units	\$311.54	\$278.95	
% of Spec to Reg	\$41.57	\$37.77	
98% of the above	\$40.74	\$37.02	
0115 prorated for spec ed	\$20,406,488.37	\$17,839,145.77	\$2,567,342.60
0116 Cafeteria Expenses	\$635,675.59	\$562,580.72	\$73,094.87
0139 prorated for spec ed	\$11,474,731.44	\$9,179,160.83	\$2,295,570.61
0165 prorated for spec ed	\$1,206,454.60	\$1,077,172.42	\$129,282.18
0186 prorated for spec ed	\$2,754,497.40	\$2,145,034.68	\$609,462.72
0181 Private Placement	\$0.00	\$74,101.58	(\$74,101.58)
0183 Academic Excellence Allotment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
0150/0152/0153 Transportation	\$2,267,397.13	\$1,982,550.20	\$284,846.93
0159 Energy	\$882,877.56	\$837,432.20	\$45,445.36
Subtotal State Funds Expended	\$39,628,122.09	\$33,697,178.40	\$5,930,943.69
8000 Local funds prorated for spec ed	\$21,723,390.95	\$18,993,081.38	\$2,730,309.57
8200 Tuition	\$1,018,587.39	\$714,097.29	\$304,490.10
Subtotal Local Funds Expended	\$22,741,978.34	\$19,707,178.67	\$3,034,799.67
Total Funds Expended	\$62,370,100.43	\$53,404,357.07	\$8,965,743.36

5.3 Excess Cost Questions

Question A

A.1 Are there any adjustments to be made to any of the prepopulated figures in Section 5.1 or 5.2? If so, what are the corrected figures?

N/A

A.2 Please explain any decrease in the funding for the per-student expenditures from 2010 to 2011 shown in Section 5.1 or any decrease in the maintenance of effort from 2010 to 2011 shown in Section 5.2.

N/A

5.4 Consolidation of Administrative Funds

Check one of the following statements:

- + The LEA is consolidating administrative funds for IASA programs (Titles I, II, IV, and V)

These funds are included in the consolidated administrative costs:

- + Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work
- + Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment
- Title III - Language Instruction for ELL
- Title III - Immigrant Students

OR

The LEA is not consolidating administrative funds for IASA programs (Titles I, II, IV, and V)

LEA Grant Application 2012 - 2013 : Compliance Signatures

District: Red Clay Consolidated School District

Chief School Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief school officer of the LEA. I am authorized to apply for the funds identified in this Consolidated Application. I am also authorized to obligate the LEA to conduct any program or activity approved under this Consolidated Application in accordance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, program assurances, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.
2. I have read this Consolidated Application. The information contained in it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. The LEA is applying for funding under the programs indicated in Section 1 of this Consolidated Application.
3. I have also read the attached Assurances for FY09. I understand that those Assurances are incorporated into and made a part of this Consolidated Application as though they were fully set out in this Consolidated Application with regard to those programs for which funding is sought.
4. The LEA and each of its schools, programs, and other administrative units, will conduct the programs and activities for which funding is sought in this Consolidated Application as represented in this Consolidated Application. Further, the LEA and each of its schools, programs and other administrative units, will comply with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.
5. I understand that compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09 and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application, is a condition of receipt of federal and state funding. I understand that such compliance continues through the duration of the funding period, including any extensions to that period.
6. I understand that state and federal funding may be withheld, terminated and recovered, and future funding denied, if the LEA fails to comply with applicable federal and state requirements as promised in this Certification.

Chief School Officer: Daugherty, Mervin **Approval Date:** Friday, July 13, 2012

Signature: _____

Chief Financial Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

- 1. I am the chief financial officer of the LEA and I am authorized to submit the budget and financial information contained in this Consolidated Application on its behalf.
- 2. I have read this Consolidated Application and specifically read and reviewed the budget and financial information contained in or made part of the Consolidated Application. The information contained in the Consolidated Application it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
- 3. The LEA is applying for funding under the following programs:

Federal Programs

State Programs

Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Curriculum and Professional Development
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	

4. I have reviewed and approved the submission of the budgets for each of these programs.

Chief Financial Officer: Floore, Jill **Approval Date:** Friday, July 13, 2012

Signature: _____

Federal Programs

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Dale Matusevich	9/25/2012

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Verna Thompson	9/9/2012

Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Theodore Jarrell	9/26/2012
Kimberly Wells	8/9/2012
Dennis Rozumalski	9/21/2012

Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Maria Degnats	9/21/2012
Wendy Modzelewski	9/24/2012

Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Mike Fitzgerald	9/25/2012

Title III - Language Instruction for ELL

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Terry Richard	9/21/2012

State Programs

Curriculum and Professional Development

Initial Approvals

Program Manager

Wendy Modzelewski

Approval Date

7/24/2012

Finance

Federal Programs

Eulinda DiPietro

Approval Date

9/26/2012

State Programs

Leah Jenkins

Approval Date

9/5/2012

Director(s)

Director

Angeline Willen

James Lesko

Theresa Kough

Mary Ann Mieczkowski

Title

Approval Date

9/26/2012

9/26/2012

9/26/2012

9/26/2012

Secretaries

Secretary

Mary Ann Mieczkowski

Susan Haberstroh

Mark Murphy

Title

Associate Secretary

Associate Secretary

Secretary

Approval Date

9/26/2012

9/27/2012

10/1/2012

Application Comments

LEA Grant Application: Red Clay - 2013

1.0 Success Plan

From Terry Richard at Sep 21 2012 2:39PM

With the clarification provided by Nelson Molina regarding the budgeted item for translation services, the item is approved. Future translation services that include the translation of student handbooks in the vendor contract will not be approved.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 25 2012 4:16PM*

* Thank you -

2.8 Equitable Services

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 22 2012 10:41AM

2.8-A1 – Title IIA - It is assumed that the 2% set aside indicated fulfills the federally required “equitable participation.” If this is incorrect, please notify the DDOE.

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:35AM

Please describe in A1 how the PPA generated by eligible private school students is the same as the PPA of students in the district school of residence. I see an explanation in B3 of this section that does meet this requirement. Please include it in A1 as well.

3.2 Title I Data Questions

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:36AM

In the spreadsheet and questions B1, C3, D1 you have described and implemented a PPA structure where Stanton MS and AI DuPont MS receive a PPA that is lower than Richey ES. Since the percent poverty of Richey is below 75% and percent poverty at the middle schools is 75% or above, the structure is not allowable. No school that is below 75% can be funded at a higher PPA than a school that is 75% or above even across grade spans. Please relook at your PPAs and make the necessary adjustments.

3.3 Title I Private School Data

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:36AM

The number of poverty students listed in the grant is 173. The number of poverty students listed in the spreadsheet is 104. Please resolve the discrepancy.

** From Theodore Jarrell at Sep 25 2012 3:41PM*

* This discrepancy between the spreadsheet and section 3.3 still exists with the spreadsheet showing 104 low income private school students and 173 in section 3.3. Please resolve.

3.6 Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth

From Dennis Rozumalski at Jul 25 2012 10:29AM

Please clarify use of set-aside funds in 3.6 for summer school.

3.8 Professional Development Plan

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 22 2012 10:40AM

3.8-A1 - List the names, position, and school assignment of teachers involved.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 22 2012 10:40AM

3.8-A2 – District PD days have not been indicated in this section. Are they included in the PD process?

3.9 Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 5:25PM

Targets for 1S1, 2S1, 6S2 not met in 2010-11 and 5S1, 6S1 where not met for 2 consecutive years. Please share in more detail plans for the use of federal and state funds to be directed to specifically meet the targets that were not met this past year.

4.0 Budget and Distribution of Funds

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 6:52PM

Please share specific budgetary details and a description of the duties for the “Hire .28 FTE Career Tech Associate” for career pathway support.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:48PM*

* This item is within the 5% allowable for Administrative cost – the individual is responsible for the Perkins section of our Consolidated Grant, implementation and compliance of the these funds and the coordination with the state’s Perkins Plan, state CTE funds, regulations and procedures.

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 6:53PM

Please share specific budgetary details on the expenditures for the intended “Staff Development of our Middle School CTE programs for developing a CTE based STEM class/opportunity at each of our middle schools.”

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:49PM*

* “Staff Development, curriculum & program development, professional development for CTE staff to evaluate, align, and upgrade the middle CTE program opportunity at each of our middle schools.”

All of our middle schools are in need of evaluating their CTE offerings and assessing the alignment to our high school CTE programs paying particular attention to those programs that have been upgraded, enhanced, innovated and newly added to our High school CTE departments. CTE staff both middle & high school (53 total staff) will be an integral part of this process – researching options, curriculum and program development. Red Clay has a strong focus on Career & Technical Education and feels our middle school CTE courses are the best way to prepare our students for the transition to our high school CTE pathways. We want to improve, expand and implement middle school offering that support and align to our high school CTE pathways. Professional development opportunities through potential confe

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 6:55PM

Please share specific budgetary details for the “Set aside Perkins funds (EPER) for staff professional development related to CTE staff Academic Attainment and Pathway Completion.”

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:49PM*

* This item is substitute cost not EPER so our CTE staff can collaborate in specific CTE content areas to develop specific options in addressing Academic Attainment and Pathway Completion. Throughout our district plan we focuses on CTE and academic achievement we are supporting our staff in continually evaluating their programs to support students in both academic attainment and pathway completion. Completed

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 6:59PM

No Perkins funds may be used for CTSO travel, except for Advisor CTSO travel. Please revise budget allocation.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:50PM*

* We have addressed this by removing the word student from the application and will not use Perkins funds for student travel to CTSO conferences.

However we will continue our discussion will USED and DEDOE to get clear guidance on this matter.

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 7:01PM

Please share specific budgetary details by school, program and item(s) for the "Purchase CTE resources, supplies and materials"

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:50PM*

* Completed. The items purchased under supplies and materials are specific to the major and minor CTE upgrade and enhancement projects being worked on during this school year. They are not being used for consumable supplies and materials.

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 7:02PM

Please share specific budgetary details and items for the planed use of funds to "Provide materials to support Perkins Advisory Council meetings."

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:51PM*

* Completed. Red Clay will hold two district CTE Advisory Council Meetings during this school year October 5th, 2012 and February 15th, 2013. The CTE staff and stakeholders from Business, Industry, our Community, Higher Education and Parents will work together specifically focusing on the individual CTE plans for each of our programs in all content areas. The cost of the facility, lunch and resource items needed for the session. Using these two dates we will not need funds for substitute for our CTE staff.

We have 53 CTE staff each invite 1-2 Business partners (53-106), a building administrator for each secondary school (11), district administrators (7-12) and DOE Education Associates (6).

From Mike Fitzgerald at Jul 19 2012 7:03PM

Please share specific budgetary details by school, program and item(s) for the "Upgrade, enhancement and innovation of CTE programs"

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:51PM*

* Completed. TMHS – Culinary facility – complete upgrade and enhancement to a commercial state of the art facility, TMHS – Communication Center –complete upgrade and enhancement to a state of the art facility, CSS – Middle School Tech Ed lab and Health Science PT & CNA – upgrade, continued enhancements of our engineering facilities and digital media facilities.

NOTE: All BIDs for architect/designer, contractors, and the CTE Perkins followed state bid regulations and were handled by Data Service Center and are on file. Commercial grade equipment meeting business & industry standards – this is not a complete list for the facilities mentioned above – Ovens, stove, grill, fryer, refrigerators, freezers, warming racks, prep stations, dishwashing station, clean-up areas, instructional technology – Camera, tri-caster, remote recording equipment, editing software, microphones, AES Introduction to Health Science curriculum, Pitsco Synergistic STEM modules, Franuc Robotics equipment, et.al.

Red

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:12PM

IDEA CEIS funds - The district triggered disproportionality on the Annual Performance Report; therefore, the district is required to use IDEA funds to provide Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS). Any LEA that is found to have significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is required to reserve the maximum amount of funds under section 613(f) of the IDEA (15 percent) for comprehensive CEIS. The current calculations show an overspending in the amount of \$58014.85. Please correct the CEIS spending amounts.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:17PM

IDEA (6-21) Budget Item Hire 1 FTE Inclusion/PBS Coordinator...IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:20PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Hire 2 FTE School Based Specialists...IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:21PM

LEA Consolidated Grant: [2012-2013] Red Clay

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Hire a 2 month data IEPplus position for summer support...please provide name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:27PM

IDEA (6-21) For all budget items where staff positions are being purchased please provide the name of the person being hired for the specific position.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:02PM

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:31PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract for OT/PT/AT/SLP for Parentally Placed Private School Students...please list vendor, type of service, and show fee/daily rate or number of days.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:33PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item EPER for Extended School Year Staff...please give name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days used to determine allocation.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:01PM

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:34PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract for ESY bus transportation...please list vendor and show fee/daily rate or number of days.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:02PM

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 2:37PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Purchase materials and supplies to support the specialized needs of students...please list items, description, quantity, unit price, school, and program, as applicable. Also provide clarification these resources will be used by student with disabilities.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:02PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusевич at Jul 24 2012 2:41PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract with Achieve3000 to support CEIS...please provide specific budgetary details.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:03PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusевич at Jul 24 2012 2:44PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Purchase testing protocols for special education services...please list items, description, quantity, unit price.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:03PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusевич at Jul 24 2012 2:47PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Mileage for administration and IDEA/Special services program monitoring...please list the mileage reimbursement rate and calculation used to determine the allocated funds.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:03PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusевич at Jul 24 2012 2:51PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item EPER for teachers to maintain the required program components...please give name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days. Also provide more clarification as to the purpose of EPER.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:04PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusевич at Jul 24 2012 2:57PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item CEIS: Hire 6 Instructional Support Team Facilitators...CEIS funds must be used for students who are not yet identified as having disabilities. Please provide clarification funds will be used for students not yet identified for special education.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:05PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:01PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Hire 8 Instructional Support Team Facilitators.....IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:06PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:05PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Hire 1 FTE Instructional Support Team and Homeless Coordinator...please provide clarification of these roles. IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Not all students deemed homeless are students with disabilities. This allocation may not be an appropriate use of funds.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:06PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:06PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract for OT/PT/AT/SLT Services for public school students...please list vendor, type of service, and show fee/daily rate or number of days.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:06PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:08PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract for Assistive Technology support...please list vendor, type of service, and show fee/daily rate or number of days.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:03PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:10PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Contract for translation/interpreter services...please list vendor, type of service, and show fee/daily rate or number of days.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:03PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:12PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Pay EPER for homebound instruction...please give name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days used to determine allocation. Reminder, IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:05PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:15PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Pay EPER for homebound instructional services at hospitals and treatment centers...please give name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days used to determine allocation.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:05PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:16PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Mileage for Homebound Instruction...please list the mileage reimbursement rate and calculation used to determine the allocated funds. Reminder, IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:04PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Dale Matusevich at Jul 24 2012 3:38PM

IDEA (6-21) For Budget Item Professional development activities related to PD priorities 1,2,3,4 and 5 that improve the knowledge of teachers and principals...since this activity is listed as EPER (salaries) please give name, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days and provide calculation used to determine the allocated funds. Reminder, IDEA (6-21) funds can only be used for instructional supports for children who have a diagnosed disability. Clarification is needed that the funds will be used for students with special needs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:02PM*

* completed - per your guidance on 9.7.12

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2012 9:29PM

Budgeted Item: Translation Services for RCCSD written and printed materials (Intelligo services \$22,016.93 annually x 1 calendar yr.

District wide translation of written/printed materials is not an allowable expense from Title III funds as the district is required to provide under Office of Civil Rights and IDEA.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:59PM*

* Intellego services were an approved cost by DEDOE in FY 12 and years prior - it is a bid to provide services allowed with Title III funds (ex: Title III funds may be used to provide family literacy, parent outreach, and training activities); this is not supplanting.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 24 2012 10:10PM

Title IIA Budget - NOTE: ALL Salaries paid with Title IIA funds may be required to demonstrate that the prorated amount of the individual's salary reflects a proportional dedication to Title IIA teacher professional development activities. Title IIA funds may be used for the delivery of PD but may NOT be used for curriculum development.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:54PM*

* Title IIA Funds have always been used to supplement the curriculum with HQ PD; this was explained during the FY11 application as well.

From Terry Richard at Jul 25 2012 8:09PM

Provide detailed explanation of materials to be translated, purpose of translated materials and distribution of translated materials and at which schools translated materials will be used.

Budgeted Item: Translation Services for RCCSD written and printed materials (Intelligo services \$22,016.93 annually x 1 calendar yr.)

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:56PM*

* completed

From Terry Richard at Jul 25 2012 8:12PM

Provide detailed explanation of materials to be purchased, including number of units, price per unit.

Budgeted Item: Additional/supplemental resources for Federal program administration (\$1000 ELL program materials)

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:55PM*

* completed -

From Terry Richard at Jul 25 2012 8:16PM

Identify the 15 FTE for whom a \$7,000+ training is provided.

Budgeted Item: EPER for Teachers to participate in the Mid Atlantic Equity Center's Understanding Diversity training; to address achievement gaps and enhance communication with families (15 FTE slots x \$27/hr x 2 hr

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:55PM*

* Mid Atlantic Equity Center is doing a PD for ELL families, we no longer need this amount - it was removed in Aug. 2012

From Verna Thompson at Jul 27 2012 10:41AM

IDEA (3-5) "Purchase early childhood testing protocols: supplies and materials." More information is needed including a list of items, quantity and cost per item.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:53PM*

* completed

From Verna Thompson at Jul 27 2012 10:41AM

IDEA (3-5) "EPER for teachers to maintain the required program requirements." More information is needed on the job responsibility, number of hours, rate of pay and staff names if appropriate.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:52PM*

* completed

From Maria Degnats at Jul 31 2012 10:43AM

Hire Ed .72 Restructuring Associate for School Reform - how does this relate to HQT or Professional Development under Title II?

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:52PM*

* Completed - job description sent in August 2012.

* * *From Maria Degnats at Sep 13 2012 11:55AM*

* * got it- thanks

From Maria Degnats at Jul 31 2012 11:00AM

General Note:Per US DOE June 2012: Funds may be used for conference fees and travel expenses (transportation, per diem, and lodging) if reasonable and necessary. Funds may not be used for food for conference attendees unless doing so is necessary to accomplish legitimate meeting or conference business. A working lunch is an example of a cost for food that might be allowable if attendance at the lunch is needed to ensure full participation by attendees in essential discussions concerning the conference and to achieve goals and objectives of the project.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:52PM*

* Completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:37AM

The parent involvement amount to the LEA in the grant does not match the amount the spreadsheet. Please resolve the discrepancy.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:45PM*

* completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:37AM

I do not see budgeted item showing an LEA parent involvement amount set aside for private schools. I think I see why this is happening in your final budget. Please contact me so we can talk through it.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:45PM*

* completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:37AM

The amount of funds for LEA instruction in the spreadsheet does not match the amount in the grant. The difference is very small. Please take a look as you are revising your budget.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:45PM

* completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:37AM

I do not see budgeted item showing an LEA instruction amount set aside for private schools. I think I see why this is happening in your final budget. Please contact me so we can talk through it.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:46PM

* completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:38AM

I do not see budgeted item showing an LEA professional development amount set aside for private schools. I think I see why this is happening in your final budget. Please contact me so we can talk through it.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:46PM

* completed

From Theodore Jarrell at Aug 10 2012 10:38AM

Please provide approximate number of hours and average hourly rate for the budgeted item "Staff EPER for tutoring program for students who did not meet standard in reading or math. District will determine allocations by building need."

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:46PM

* completed

From Wendy Modzelewski at Aug 30 2012 2:40PM

Title IIA Budget – ALL Salaries paid with Title IIA funds may be required to demonstrate that the prorated amount of the individual's salary reflects a proportional dedication to Title IIA teacher professional development activities. Title IIA funds may be used for the delivery of PD but may NOT be used for curriculum development. Please modify the expenditure descriptions to reflect an understanding of this requirement if this is the intent or change the expenditure. Please identify these individuals.

* From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:09PM

* Title IIA are used for the delivery of PD and NOT for curriculum development

From Wendy Modzelewski at Aug 30 2012 2:40PM

Title IIA Budget – Technical Support (please provide a name) – Salaries paid with Title IIA funds may be required to demonstrate that the prorated amount of the individual salary reflects a proportional dedication to Title IIA teacher professional development activities. This individual may support hardware purchased by and for Title IIA activities ONLY. Please modify the description to reflect an understanding of this requirement if this was the intent.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:00PM*

* completed - all federal funds are supplemental

From Wendy Modzelewski at Aug 30 2012 2:41PM

Title IIA Budget – Mileage for School Support Team and Cadre- Expenses paid with Title IIA funds must be directly related to Title IIA funded professional development. These individuals must be paid with an equally pro-rated amount of Title IIA funds. Please modify the description to reflect an understanding of this requirement if this was the intent.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:46PM*

* completed - all federal funds are supplemental

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 3:00PM*

* completed - all federal funds are supplemental

From Wendy Modzelewski at Aug 30 2012 2:41PM

Title IIA Budget – Parent/McKinney-Vento Ed Associate – please describe the activities of this individual that will align to the requirements of Title IIA.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 11 2012 2:47PM*

* completed - all federal funds are supplemental and aligned; this staffer provides PD in accordance with Connections To Learning issues to allow access to CCCS
