

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

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,
Elementary and Secondary Education Act,
Carl D. Perkins, and
State-Funded Educational Programs

Delaware Department of Education

Mark T. Murphy, Secretary of Education

David Blowman, Deputy Secretary of Education

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

Susan Keene Haberstroh, Associate Secretary, Education Supports and Innovative Practices Branch

Michael Watson, Chief Academic Officer, Teaching and Learning

Theresa Vendrzyk Kough, Director, Career and Technical Programs

Verna Thompson, Acting Director, Early Development and Learning Resources

Angeline Wilen, Director, Teacher and Administrator Quality Development

Mary Ann Mieczkowski, Director, Exceptional Children

For further information, contact:

Kim Wells, Education Associate - General Consolidated Application Assistance; Kim.Wells@doe.k12.de.us

Ted Jarrell, Education Associate - Technical Consolidated Application Assistance; Ted.Jarrell@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, gender identity, 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.** Indirect Cost Rates
 - 2.5.** Contact Information
 - 2.6.** Constituency Participation
 - 2.7.** Title I: LEA Support for Local School Planning: Systems, Structures, and Services
 - 2.8.** Title I: Parental and Community Involvement
 - 2.9.** Equitable Services
- 3.** Identification of Needs
 - 3.1.** Title I Data Questions
 - 3.2.** Title I Public School Data
 - 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. Financial Item 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 five 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 Consolidated Grant application represents FY'14 allocation of \$10,874,941.00 including for support of services offered through federal Title I Part A – Making High Poverty Schools Work, \$4,929,086.00, Title II Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment \$1,109,153.00, Title III – Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students \$234,943.00, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3-5) \$98,120.00, Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6-21) \$3,931,089.00, The Perkins Act - supporting career and technical education, \$380,688.00 and the State funded Curriculum and Professional Development \$194,222.00.

The funds serve approximately 21,854 students (15,185 public, 1801 charter and 4868 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 43 additional teachers/school staff, 14.5 staff, 10 administrators for a total of 67.5 additional supports to the Red Clay Consolidated School District. Red Clay is using the funds as part of school improvement support for the district and its schools.

Major Outcomes: The District continues to provide services using a systematic approach offered to all schools by all departments that addresses student achievement deficits. These efforts 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.The increasing the percentage of students who meet or exceed Core Content Standards
- 2.The FAPE provided to special education students
- 3.The improvement of school climate through the prevention of violence and resolution of conflict
- 4.The increase in staff, parent, student and community engagement and awareness that addresses the needs of the district's diverse student population
- 5.How well students develop the aptitudes and skills needed for graduation, post high school success and career development
- 6.The 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 Board approved Red Clay Strategic Plan. The time frame for implementation for the Consolidated Grant is July 1, 2013-December 31, 2014.

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 LEA’s current goals, objectives, strategies, measures and targets.

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

- Group Name:** 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
- Group Name:** 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
- Group Name:** 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
- Group Name:** 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

Group Name: 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;

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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: The US Economy has impacted households - this along with an increase in attendance has produced requests for services that families require to be stable and for children to participate in the educational process (shelter, food, transportation, family literacy, naturalization and residency to name a few).

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

Group Name: 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;

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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;
Group Name:	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)
Group Name:	Baltz Staff
Need:	Create culture of professional sharing of instructional strategies.
Root Cause:	Challenges with adjusting to changes; Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand these challenges and continue to provide effective instruction to eliminate academic disparities
Data Source:	PLC attendance and notes
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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;

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: AIMS - ELL pupils

Need: Middle school ELLs are not making progress toward proficiency in English and math and need to demonstrate a 7% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 24.7% as measured by DCAS).

Root Cause: ELL students require additional academic support to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff align activities to the ELP standards and to address these challenges and provide appropriate supplements to eliminate the academic disparities and linguistic barriers. Students must have language supported opportunities to access core curriculum to meet the minimum score above 5.0 on the WIDA ACCESS or score 3.5 or above on the reading portion of the ACCESS to be considered for partial or full mainstream services.

Data Source: DCAS, ACCESS, WIDA MODEL

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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

Group Name: 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
Group Name:	AIMS - African American Students
Need:	American Black are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 6.5% (minimum) increase in reading proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 31.5% as measured by 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, Achieve 3000
Group Name:	AIMS - All targeted student groups
Need:	32.16% of the student body was suspended in the 2011-12 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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	Warner - Students with identified special needs
Need:	Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate an 8.5% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 9.4% as measured by 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; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction; use of student engagement strategies by staff
Data Source:	DCAS; MAP; DIBELS Next; Ruby Payne; Rtl
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	AIMS - Special Education students
Need:	Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 8% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 12.9% as measured by 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, IEP reports, Achieve 3000
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	AIMS - Low Income Pupils
Need:	Low income pupils are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 6% (minimum) increase in reading proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 34.3% as measured by 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 Achieve 3000
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	Baltz - Low Income Pupils
Need:	Increase Reading proficiency of Low Income Students by 6% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 36.2% as measured by 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.
Data Source:	DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data; DIBELS Next
Group Name:	Baltz - African American Pupils
Need:	Increase Reading and Math proficiency of American Black students by 7% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 30.9% as measured by 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; 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; DIBELS Next
Group Name:	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

Group Name:	Warner - Low Income students
Need:	Increase Reading and Math proficiency of Low Income Students by 7% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 27.2% as measured by DCAS).
Root Cause:	Students currently lack the basic 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; 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.
Data Source:	DCAS; MAP; DIBELS Next; Ruby Payne
Group Name:	Baltz - Hispanic Students
Need:	Increase Reading proficiency of Hispanic students by 6% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 36.6% as measured by DCAS).
Root Cause:	Hispanic 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 continue to provide effective instruction to eliminate academic disparities
Data Source:	DCAS Testing grades 3-5/ MAP and DIBELS NEXT K-2
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	AIMS - Hispanic Students
Need:	Hispanic Students are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 6.5% (minimum) increase in reading proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 32.3% as measured by 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 Achieve 3000
Group Name:	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
Group Name:	Warner - Hispanic students
Need:	Increase Reading and math proficiency of Hispanic students by 6% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 23.6% as measured by DCAS).
Root Cause:	Students currently lack the basic 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; 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. Hispanic 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 continue to provide effective instruction to eliminate academic disparities
Data Source:	DCAS; MAP; DIBELS Next
Group Name:	Warner - African American Students
Need:	Increase Reading and Math proficiency of American Black students by 7% minimum annually through 2016-2017(currently at 28.8% as measured by 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; Teacher's teaching the GLE verbs; continuity and consistency in differentiation of instruction; use of student engagement strategies by staff
Data Source:	DCAS; MAP; DIBELS Next

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-Traditonal Fields

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 35.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditonal 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 (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: 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 (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: 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

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)	

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: K: 84%; Gr1: 73%

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)	

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: College enrollment rate

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: 58.6%

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)	

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: College retention rate
Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 80.0%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
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 (none)
Indicator:
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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 (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)	

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 (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 vacancies filled through the job fair

Start Year: 2010

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - Low Income
Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 20.6
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	27.2%	7/1/2012	36.5%
6/30/2013	33.8%	(none)	
6/30/2014	40.5%	(none)	
6/30/2015	47.1%	(none)	
6/30/2016	53.7%	(none)	
6/30/2017	60.3%	(none)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - African American
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 22.6
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	28.8%	7/1/2012	34.5%
6/30/2013	35.3%	(none)	
6/30/2014	41.8%	(none)	
6/30/2015	48.3%	(none)	
6/30/2016	54.7%	(none)	
6/30/2017	61.2%	(none)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - SWD
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 1.2%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	9.4%	7/1/2012	6%
6/30/2013	17.6%	(none)	
6/30/2014	25.9%	(none)	
6/30/2015	34.1%	(none)	
6/30/2016	42.3%	(none)	
6/30/2017	50.6%	(none)	

Measure: Baltz Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - Hispanic
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 30.8%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	36.6%	7/1/2012	44.5%
6/30/2013	42.3%	(none)	
6/30/2014	48.1%	(none)	
6/30/2015	53.9%	(none)	
6/30/2016	59.6%	(none)	
6/30/2017	65.4%	(none)	

Measure: AIMS Focus School - Community-Based Partners satisfaction survey
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Measure: AIMS Focus School - CBP meetings and/or workshops for parents of AIMS children
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Connections to Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Measure: Baltz Focus School - FCT services provided for parents of Baltz children

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Monthly

Measure: Warner Focus School - # of children served by BioAssessments LLC who show growth

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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 Indicator: (none)
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 Indicator: (none)
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 Indicator: (none)
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 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 (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	Staff & Community Need	(School Administration) Increase teacher effectiveness in classrooms and provide leadership in continuous improvement of instruction.
2	Staff & Community Need	(Instructional Staff) Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
3	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.
4	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
5	Staff & Community Need	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes college and career readiness and inclusiveness
6	Staff & Community Need	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and high achievement
7	Staff & Community Need	(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	Staff & Community Need	(Red Clay PZ School Marbrook) Provide a revised governance structure to facilitate learning and continuous achievement
9	Staff & Community Need	(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	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Staff) Participate in activities to explore, modify and implement with success with similar populations.
2	Staff & Community Need	(Targeted Families) Families need options related to accessing information related to assisting their child and contributing to school success.
3	Student Need	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
4	Staff & Community Need	(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	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

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	Staff & Community Need	(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	Student Need	(Baltz - Hispanic Students) Increase Reading proficiency of Hispanic students by 6% minimum annually through 2016-2017(currently at 36.6% as measured by DCAS).
3	Student Need	(Baltz - African American Pupils) Increase Reading and Math proficiency of American Black students by 7% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 30.9% as measured by DCAS).
4	Student Need	(Baltz - Low Income Pupils) Increase Reading proficiency of Low Income Students by 6% minimum annually through 2016-2017(currently at 36.2% as measured by DCAS).
5	Student Need	(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	Student Need	(Warner - Students with identified special needs) Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate an 8.5% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 9.4% as measured by DCAS).
7	Staff & Community Need	(Warner - Administration - teacher effectiveness) Under 50% of Warner students met standards in reading and math.
8	Student Need	(Warner - African American Students) Increase Reading and Math proficiency of American Black students by 7% minimum annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 28.8% as measured by DCAS).
9	Student Need	(AIMS - ELL pupils) Middle school ELLs are not making progress toward proficiency in English and math and need to demonstrate a 7% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 24.7% as measured by DCAS).
10	Student Need	(AIMS - Special Education students) Students with identified special needs are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 8% (minimum) increase in reading and math proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 12.9% as measured by DCAS).
12	Student Need	(AIMS - Low Income Pupils) Low income pupils are having difficulty meeting ELA and Math standards and need to demonstrate a 6% (minimum) increase in reading proficiency annually through 2016-2017 (currently at 34.3% as measured by DCAS).
13	Student Need	(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)

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 27.4

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 30.1

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 30.7

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 32.4

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

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

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)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - Low Income

Start Year: 2012

Baseline: 20.6

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	27.2%	7/1/2012	36.5%
6/30/2013	33.8%	(none)	
6/30/2014	40.5%	(none)	
6/30/2015	47.1%	(none)	
6/30/2016	53.7%	(none)	
6/30/2017	60.3%	(none)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - African American
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 22.6
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	28.8%	7/1/2012	34.5%
6/30/2013	35.3%	(none)	
6/30/2014	41.8%	(none)	
6/30/2015	48.3%	(none)	
6/30/2016	54.7%	(none)	
6/30/2017	61.2%	(none)	

Measure: Warner Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - SWD
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 1.2%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	9.4%	7/1/2012	6%
6/30/2013	17.6%	(none)	
6/30/2014	25.9%	(none)	
6/30/2015	34.1%	(none)	
6/30/2016	42.3%	(none)	
6/30/2017	50.6%	(none)	

Measure: Baltz Focus School Composite Growth (ELA/Math) - Hispanic
Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 30.8%
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	36.6%	7/1/2012	44.5%
6/30/2013	42.3%	(none)	
6/30/2014	48.1%	(none)	
6/30/2015	53.9%	(none)	
6/30/2016	59.6%	(none)	
6/30/2017	65.4%	(none)	

Measure: AIMS Focus School - Community-Based Partners satisfaction survey
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Measure: AIMS Focus School - CBP meetings and/or workshops for parents of AIMS children
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Connections to Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

Measure: Baltz Focus School - FCT services provided for parents of Baltz children
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Connections to Learning
Period: Monthly

Measure: Warner Focus School - # of children served by BioAssessments LLC who show growth
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Connections to Learning
Period: Semi-Yearly

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 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)
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 Indicator: (none)
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-Traditonal 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-Traditonal 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, Non-Public Sch, MckinneyVento, Nurses, Health/PE	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
Petrucci, Vicki	Supervisor - Special Education Services	302-552-3700	vicki.petrucci@redclay.k12.de.us
Swift, Ann Marie	Literacy Coach, Baltz Elementary	302-651-2695	ann.swift@redclay.k12.de.us
Conway, Judith	Supervisor, Curriculum & Assessment	302-552-3757	judith.conway@redclay.k12.de.us
O'Neill, Amy	Asst. Principal, 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	Manager, Information Technology		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
Wiktorowicz, Heather	Parent, Marbrook Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	302-992-5555	missheatherslc@msn.com

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, School Turnaround	302-552-3700	amy.grundy@redclay.k12.de.us
Tos, Amber	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	amber.tos@redclay.k12.de.us
Fintzel, Evonne	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	302-992-5560	evonne.fintzel@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
Byers, David	AIHS CTE Professional Staff	302-552-3772	
Nash, Pati	Public Information Officer	302-552-3700	pati.nash@redclay.k12.de.us
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	
Gomez, Jennifer	Citibank 809 Baltimore Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 1980		
Johnston, William	JP Morgan Chase & Co - 301 N. Walnut St. - Wilmington, DE. 19801		
Little, Caitlin	University of DE Alumni Student	302-552-3700	

Chris Hewlett, CPA, Chris	Hewlett & Company - 5586 Kirkwood Highway - Wilmington, DE. 19808-5002		
Felix , Cindy	LACC - 403 N. VanBuren Street - Wilmington, DE. 19805		
Hall, Val	PreSchool Teacher/Lit Coach		
Hart, Carolyn	University of DE Alumni FCS Student		
Nolker, Chef David	Culinary Director, DTCC	(302) 453-3757	
Murphy, CJ	WSFS - 7450 Lancaster Pike - Hockessin, DE. 19707		
Larkin, Stacie	Physcial Therapy		
Kerkuca, RN, Barnabas	Registered Nurse		
Pinckney MPT, CCCE, Andrienne	ATI Physical Therapy - 4102 Ogletwon-Stanton Rd. - Ste. B - Newark, DE. 19713		
Finch, Deborah	Parent		
Jones, Norm	Kirkwood Auto Center - 4913 Kirkwood Hwy. - Wilmington, DE. 19808		
Corey, Michael	Clear Channel Radio - 8 Dovetree Dr. - Newark, DE. 19713		
Howe, Todd	Finestationery.com - 201 W. 14th St. - ste. 100 - Wilmington, DE. 19801		
Perrotto, Joseph	DuPont - 974 Centre Road - PO Box 2915 - Bldg. 722 - Rm. - 1016 - Wilm., DE. 19805		
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)		
Wockenfuss, Bill	Array of Monograms - 2015 louisa Dr - Wilmington, DE. 19804		
Hurt, Kelly	Principal - Baltz Elementary	302-992-5560	kelly.hurt@redclay.k12.de.us

Brown, Susan	DE PTA President-Elect (RC Focus School)		
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)		
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)		
Molina, Nelson	Supervisor, ELL Office	(302) 992-1407	Nelson.Molina@redclay.k12.de.us
Green, Taylor	Strategic Plan Coordinator	302-552-3701	taylor.green@redclay.k12.de.us
Lockman, Elizabeth	Parent - Highlands PTA	(302) 651-2715	tizlock@gmail.com
Oboryshko, Mike	Parent - HB DuPont Middle		mike01@seventhtype.com
Jones, Equetta	RCPAC parent	302651-2740	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us
Brown, Susan	President Elect-State PTA	1-856-308-4831	brown.susanj36@gmail.com
DeFilippis , Donna	RCPAC vice president		ddrn67@verizon.net
Lockman, Elizabeth	parent		tizlock@gmail.com
Byers, Dave	AIHS CTE staff	302-552-3701	
Brown, Andrea	AIHS CTE teacher	302-552-3701	
Meanor, Jamie	AIHS CTE teacher	302-552-3701	
Schneider, Charles	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701	
Surma, Nancy	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701	
Tabb, Thomas	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701	
Townsend, Judi	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701	
Werner, John	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701	

Wolski, Stan	AIHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Bowser, Shawn	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Davis, Dante	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Hall, Mike	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Parsons, James	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Wharton, Ray	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Sheehy, Kathy	JDHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Georgsson, Sverrir	CCSA CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Greider, Will	CCSA CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Alexander, Nicol	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Matson, Stephanie	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Craster, James	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Gonzon, Lisa	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Murphy, Michelle	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Reamer, Michael	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Rosato, Julius	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Ryan, Matt	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Sheahan, Rebecca	TMHS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Alexandre , Rich	Conrad SS CTE MS Teacher	302-552-3701
Allen, Renee	Conrad SS CTE HS Teacher	302-552-3701
Brown, Cristin	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Brown, Cristin	Conrad SS CTE BioTech Teacher	302-552-3701
Caligiuri, Kathleen	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Coughlin, Bill	Conrad SS CTE Bio Tech Teacher	302-552-3701
Dowling, Sandra	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
McCurdy, Jeff	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Olejar, Maureen	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Pusey, Katrina	Conrad SS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
King, Bruce	AIMS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701

Barrett, Carolyn	AIMS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Foxwell, Eva	Brandywine SS CTE MS Teacher	302-552-3701
Capuano, Paula	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Daly, Robin	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Wilson, Jermaine	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Collier, Leverett	Skyline MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Hodges, Carole	Skyline MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Frescoln, Kent	Stanton MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Gunia, Arlene	Stanton MS CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Davis, Carmen	The Central School MS - CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Kirk , Barry	The Central School - CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Fox, Ashley	The Central School - CTE Teacher	302-552-3701
Gartley, Karen	UD Soil Testing Prog. - 152 Townsend Hall - 531 S. College Ave. - Newark, DE. 19716-2170	
Cruz, Andy	House Industries - PO Box 166 - Yorklyn, DE. 19736	
Wilke, Andrew	Cover & Assoc. - PO Box 4327 - Greenville, DE. 19807	
Filer, Alan	Doubletree Hotel - 700 N. King St. - Wilmington, DE. 19801	
Stephens, Valerie R.	BAR and Associates - 3410 Old Capital Trail - Wilmington, DE. 19808	
Merritt, Dr. Deanna	Goldey Beacom College - 4701 Limestone Rd - Wilmington, DE. 19808	
Coleman, Hart	Citizens Bank - 1 Germay Drive - Wilmington, DE. 19804	
Hart, Carolyn	2506 McCawber Drive - Wilmington, DE. 19808	
Rosario, Jenifer	LACC - 403 N. VanBuren Street - Wilmington, DE. 19805	
Myers Szczesiak, Heather	4 Gamble Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 19805	

Bryson Jr., Larry	15 Livingston Ave. - Wilmington, DE. 19804		
Fisher, Patrick	315 Champlain Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 19804		
Garrett, Robert	2411 Newport Gap Pike - Wilmington, DE. 19808		
Hall, Richard	508 Defoe Road - Hockessin, DE. 19707		
Brady, Deborah	Principal - Linden Hill Elementary School	302-454-3406	Deborah.Brady@redclay.k12.de.us
Castaneda, Ariadna	Principal Wm. C. Lewis Dual Language Immersion Elementary	302-651-2695	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
Rookard, Sharon	Ed. Associate, CTE/Perkins/Restructuring	302-552-3000	sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us
Smith, Christine	Manager, Human Resources	302-552-3771	Christine.Smith@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	RCPAC President - AI Middle Parent- PTA	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
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 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 must be comprised of business, industry and educational constituents, and representative of all career and technical programs. All members of the Perkins Advisory Committee must be listed in this section along with the program they are representing.

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Email Address</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Perkins</u>
Robert	Garrett	2411 Newport Gap Pike - Wilmington, DE. 19808		Community Member	Business, Finance and Marketing
Andrew	Wilke	Cover & Assoc. - PO Box 4327 - Greenville, DE. 19807		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
James	Parsons	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
John	Werner	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Amy	Grundy	Manager, School Turnaround	amy.grundy@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Jennifer	Gomez	Citibank 809 Baltimore Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 1980		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Susan	Brown	President Elect-State PTA	brown.susanj36@gmail.com	Community Member	
John	Kennedy	Principal, Stanton Middle	john.kennedy@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Theodore	Boyer	Principal - Al DuPont Middle School	Theodore.Boyer@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Kent	Frescoln	Stanton MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Wendy	Freeman	Veteranarian		Business Person	AgriScience
Taylor	Green	Strategic Plan Coordinator	taylor.green@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	
Sverrir	Georgsson	CCSA CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Nicol	Alexander	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	AgriScience

Hugh	Broomall	Deputy Superintendent, Student Support Services	hugh.broomall@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Malik	Stewart	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Gerri	Marshall	Supervisor, Research & Evaluation	Gerri.Marshall@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Will	Greider	CCSA CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
DeMarkus	Kirby	Virginia Tech, Civil Engineering (AIHS Alumni)		Community Member	Technology Education
Dr. Deanna	Merritt	Goldey Beacom College - 4701 Limestone Rd - Wilmington, DE. 19808		Community Member	Family and Consumer Sciences
Mary	Norris	Asst. Superintendent, Special Services	Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Arlene	Gunia	Stanton MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carolyn	Hart	2506 McCawber Drive - Wilmington, DE. 19808		Community Member	Family and Consumer Sciences
Jamie	Meanor	AIHS CTE teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Val	Hall	PreSchool Teacher/Lit Coach		Parent	Family and Consumer Sciences
Chef David	Nolker	Culinary Director, DTCC		Business Person	Family and Consumer Sciences
Sandy	Potter	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Michelle	Murphy	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Hart	Coleman	Citizens Bank - 1 Germay Drive - Wilmington, DE. 19804		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing

Vicki	Petrucci	Supervisor - Special Education Services	vicki.petrucci@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Matt	Ryan	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Jacque	Varsalona	Director of Marketing, Wilmington University		Business Person	Technology Education
Sicily	Bordrick	Parent-Shortlidge (Title 1)	sgbme2@verizon.net	Parent	
Katrina	Pusey	Conrad SS CTE Teacher		Teacher	AgriScience
Patrick	Fisher	315 Champlain Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 19804		Community Member	Technology Education
Chris	Chris Hewlett, CPA	Hewlett & Company - 5586 Kirkwood Highway - Wilmington, DE. 19808-5002		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carolyn	Barrett	AIMS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Nelson	Molina	Supervisor, ELL Office	Nelson.Molina@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Elizabeth	Lockman	Parent - Highlands PTA	tizlock@gmail.com	Parent	
Renee	Allen	Conrad SS CTE HS Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Alan	Filer	Doubletree Hotel - 700 N. King St. - Wilmington, DE. 19801		Business Person	Family and Consumer Sciences
Dave	Byers	AIHS CTE staff		Teacher	Technology Education
Joe	Rappa	AP - AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	joseph.rappa@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
James	Comegys	Director, Curriculum & Instruction	james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Rebecca	Sheahan	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	AgriScience

Karen	Gartley	UD Soil Testing Prog. - 152 Townsend Hall - 531 S. College Ave. - Newark, DE. 19716- 2170		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Abbie	Seifert	School Counselor, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	abbie.seifert@redclay.k1 2.de.us	School Employee	
Andrea	Brown	AIHS CTE teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Andrienne	Pinckney MPT, CCCE	ATI Physical Therapy - 4102 Ogletwon- Stanton Rd. - Ste. B - Newark, DE. 19713		Business Person	Skilled and Technical Science
Larry	Bryson Jr.	15 Livingston Ave. - Wilmington, DE. 19804		Community Member	Skilled and Technical Science
Stan	Wolski	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Stacey	Papa	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	stacey.papa@redclay.k12 .de.us	School Employee	
Judith	Conway	Supervisor, Curriculum & Assessment	judith.conway@redclay.k 12.de.us	Administrator	
Julius	Rosato	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Amy	O'Neill	Asst. Principal, Lewis Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	amy.o'neill@redclay.k12. de.us	School Employee	
Jenifer	Rosario	LACC - 403 N. VanBuren Street - Wilmington, DE. 19805		Community Member	Family and Consumer Sciences
Christine	Miller	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Non-Public Sch, MckinneyVento, Nurses, Health/PE	Christine.Miller@redclay. k12.de.us	Administrator	

Gaysha	Beard	Supervisor - ELA	Gaysha.Bear@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	
Lisa	Gonzon	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Pati	Nash	Public Information Officer	pati.nash@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	Technology Education
Susie	Hessling	Teacher, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	susan.hessling@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Michael	Corey	Clear Channel Radio - 8 Dovetree Dr. - Newark, DE. 19713		Business Person	Technology Education
Dante	Davis	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Bill	Coughlin	Conrad SS CTE Bio Tech Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
CJ	Murphy	WSFS - 7450 Lancaster Pike - Hockessin, DE. 19707		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Kathy	Sheehy	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Christine	Smith	Manager, Human Resources	Christine.Smith@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Jermaine	Wilson	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Kendall	Mobley	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Amber	Tos	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	amber.tos@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Sandra	Dowling	Conrad SS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Wendy	Simione	VCA Hopsital		Business Person	AgriScience
Joseph	Perrotto	DuPont - 974 Centre Road - PO Box 2915 - Bldg. 722 - Rm. - 1016 - Wilm., DE. 19805		Business Person	Technology Education
Judi	Townsend	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences

Charles	Schneider	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Evonne	Fintzel	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	evonne.fintzel@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Mervin	Daugherty	Superintendent	Mervin.Daugherty@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Shawn	Bowser	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Kathleen	Caligiuri	Conrad SS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Michael	Reamer	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Kelly	Hurt	Principal - Baltz Elementary	kelly.hurt@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Cindy	Felix	LACC - 403 N. VanBuren Street - Wilmington, DE. 19805		Business Person	Family and Consumer Sciences
Stacie	Larkin	Physical Therapy		Business Person	Skilled and Technical Science
Ann Marie	Swift	Literacy Coach, Baltz Elementary	ann.swift@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Valerie R.	Stephens	BAR and Associates - 3410 Old Capital Trail - Wilmington, DE. 19808		Business Person	Technology Education
Bruce	King	AIMS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Joseph	Greigg	Parent	Grei181@aol.com	Parent	
Norm	Jones	Kirkwood Auto Center - 4913 Kirkwood Hwy. - Wilmington, DE. 19808		Business Person	Skilled and Technical Science
Deborah	Finch	Parent		Parent	Skilled and Technical Science
Marty	Krajewski	Brandywine Auto Repair		Business Person	Technology Education
Kristine	Bewley	Manager, Information Technology	kristine.bewley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Leverett	Collier	Skyline MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing

Robin	Daly	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Arba	Henry	University of DE		Community Member	AgriScience
Ray	Wharton	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Jeanette	Hayes	Parent		Parent	AgriScience
Christina	Personti	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	christina.personti@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Maureen	Olejar	Conrad SS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Skilled and Technical Science
Donna	DeFilippis	RCPAC vice president	ddrn67@verizon.net	Parent	
Adrienne	Hopson	Librarian, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	adrienne.hopson@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
James	Craster	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Katherine	Wallace	Academic Dean- AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	katherine.wallace@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Stephanie	Matson	TMHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	AgriScience
Richard	Hall	508 Defoe Road - Hockessin, DE. 19707		Community Member	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carmen	Davis	The Central School MS - CTE Teacher		Teacher	AgriScience
Patricia	Seningen	West Chester University, Human Resources		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Sharon	Rookard	Ed. Associate, CTE/Perkins/Restructuring	sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Heather	Myers Szczesiak	4 Gamble Avenue - Wilmington, DE. 19805		Community Member	Technology Education
Equetta	Jones	RCPAC President - AI Middle Parent-PTA	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us	Parent	

William	Johnston	JP Morgan Chase & Co - 301 N. Walnut St. - Wilmington, DE. 19801		Business Person	Business, Finance and Marketing
Paula	Capuano	H.B. duPont MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Ted	Ammann	Asst. Superintendent, District Operations	Ted.Ammann@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Mike	Hall	JDHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Todd	Howe	Finestationery.com - 201 W. 14th St. - ste. 100 - Wilmington, DE. 19801		Business Person	Technology Education
Ashley	Fox	The Central School - CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Bill	Wockenfuss	Array of Monograms - 2015 louisa Dr - Wilmington, DE. 19804		Business Person	Technology Education
Carolyn	Hart	University of DE Alumni FCS Student		Community Member	Family and Consumer Sciences
Lou	Spinelli	DTCC; Automotive Tech		Business Person	Technology Education
Ariadna	Castaneda	Principal Wm. C. Lewis Dual Language Immersion Elementary	Ariadna.Castaneda@redclay.k12.de.us	School Employee	
Andy	Cruz	House Industries - PO Box 166 - Yorklyn, DE. 19736		Business Person	Technology Education
Rich	Alexandre	Conrad SS CTE MS Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Mario	Rivera	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	mario.rivera@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Mike	Oboryshko	parent	Mike@proverb.net	Parent	
Nancy	Surma	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Family and Consumer Sciences
Andrea	Lanciault	Director, Elementary Schools	andrea.lanciault@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Sam	Golder	Director, Secondary Schools	Sam.Golder@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	

Jill	Floore	Chief Finance Officer/Finance	Jill.Floore@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Thomas	Tabb	AIHS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Marcia	Johnson	Principal, Warner Elementary	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	
Julie	Picciotti	Teacher, Stanton Middle (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	julie.picciotti@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	
Barnabas	Kerkuca, RN	Registered Nurse		Business Person	Skilled and Technical Science
Peggy	Vavala	Dupont		Business Person	AgriScience
Eva	Foxwell	Brandywine SS CTE MS Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Barry	Kirk	The Central School - CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Cristin	Brown	Conrad SS CTE BioTech Teacher		Teacher	Technology Education
Carole	Hodges	Skyline MS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing
Jeff	McCurdy	Conrad SS CTE Teacher		Teacher	Business, Finance and Marketing

2.2 Selection of Federal and State Programs

Check all grant programs for which you are applying in this application. Note: If the LEA subsequently un-checks a grant program all budgeted items associated with that grant will be deleted.

<u>Federal</u>		<u>State</u>	
<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 611 (6-21)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 619 (3-5)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title III - Immigrant Students		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Title III - Language Instruction for ELL		

Consolidated Grant Application Submission Deadlines For 2013 - 2014 Consolidated Grant Applications, the following schedule applies: **Grant Submission Dates July 12, 2013 August 16, 2013** If the LEA does not submit an application by the final submission date of August 16, 2013, then an LEA is required to file an extension request. The extension request must include the reason the LEA cannot meet the final submission date requirement. Extensions can only be granted in case of an emergency situation. Every effort needs to be made to meet the August 16, 2013 deadline. If an extension request is denied, DDOE can 1) refuse to reimburse the LEA for any expense incurred before the application is submitted; or 2) formally disapprove the LEA for funding, which triggers the LEA's due process rights in accordance with Section 432 of the General Educational Provisions Act (GEPA). The start date for federal funds is the date of initial submission if the grant is substantially approvable as determined by DDOE. Substantially approvable grants that are submitted prior to July 1 will have a start date of July 1. LEA's whose grants are not considered substantially approvable at the time of initial submission will be contacted by the SEA. Significant revisions will be required and the start date will be set once the grant is submitted in substantially approvable form. **Federal Funds Obligation Date: 08/01/15 (* LEAs with more than \$50,000 in Title I, Part A funds must obligate 85% of these funds by 9/30/14*); Federal Funds Liquidation Date: 11/1/2015; State Funds Start Date: 07/01/13; State Funds End Date 06/30/14. 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

AFTER completing Section 2.2, LEAs must click “Get Default Values” to load program allocations. LEAs must then click edit to assign a program coordinator for each program.

Federal Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Liquidation Date</u>
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Rookard, Sharon sharon.rookard@redclay.k12.de.us	\$380,688.00	6/30/2015
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 611 (6-21)	Norris, Mary Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	\$3,931,089.00	6/30/2015
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 619 (3-5)	Norris, Mary Mary.Norris@redclay.k12.de.us	\$98,120.00	6/30/2015
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	\$4,929,086.00	6/30/2015
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	Comegys, James james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us	\$1,109,153.00	6/30/2015
Title III - Immigrant Students	Molina, Nelson Nelson.Molina@redclay.k12.de.us	\$2,360.00	6/30/2015
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	Molina, Nelson Nelson.Molina@redclay.k12.de.us	\$232,583.00	6/30/2015

State Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Ending Date</u>
Curriculum and Professional Development	Comegys, James james.comegys@redclay.k12.de.us	\$194,222.00	6/30/2014

2.4 Indirect Cost Rates

LEAs must enter an indirect cost rate for each federal program in the consolidated application below. LEAs may take up to their DDOE approved “Restricted Indirect Cost Rate” for each federal program in this grant for all non-Capital Outlay items. The exceptions are for the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education program and the Title III Language Instruction for ELL program which have maximum allowable rates of 5 and 2 percent respectively. LEAs may not take more than the maximum allowable rate for these programs even if their DDOE approved “Restricted Indirect Cost rate” is above the maximum rates. Click “Update Rates” at the bottom of the screen to apply the rates to this grant.

Program	Indirect Cost Rate (%)	Allowable Indirect Cost Rate (%)
IDEA 611 (6-21)	3.52	3.52
IDEA 619 (3-5)	3.52	3.52
Perkins	3.52	3.52
Title I	3.52	3.52
Title II (Part A)	3.52	3.52
Title III - ELL	2.00	2.00
Title III - Immigrant	2.00	2.00

2.5 Contact Information:

	Name	Title	Phone	Email Address
Primary Contact	Malik Stewart	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	302-552-3700	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us
Summer Contact	Christine Miller	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Non-Public Sch, MckinneyVento, Nurses, Health/PE	302-552-3815	Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us
Business Manager	Jill Floore	Chief Finance Officer/Finance	302-552-3725	Jill.Floore@redclay.k12.de.us
Homeless Liaison	Christine Miller	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Non-Public Sch, MckinneyVento, Nurses, Health/PE	302-552-3815	Christine.Miller@redclay.k12.de.us
Parent Liaison	Christine Miller	Ed. Associate, Federal Programs, Non-Public Sch, MckinneyVento, Nurses, Health/PE	302-552-3815	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.

2.6 Constituency Participation

This section requires the LEA to describe its public process for developing this consolidated application with the involvement of appropriate stakeholders.

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 School staffing discussions, and with the roll out of the district's 5 year strategic plan.

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 (parents and community members), representatives from nonpublic schools, Red Clay Curriculum and Instruction staff, teachers and Red Clay special education staff members.

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 12, 2013. 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, 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.

The process incorporated: Federal & Regulated programs, Curriculum & Instruction, IDEA - special needs, parents, CTE/Perkins Advisory, and Priority and focus school staff/teachers. The 2014 Consolidated Application was developed via a series of meetings related to the strategic plan goals so that the goal outcomes were the focus and the funding used as a vehicle to meet them. This included 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. Here is an example of the planning:

- Every classroom will have a highly effective educator led by highly effective administrators. (Title I, Title II, IDEA, Title III, Carl D. Perkins and Curriculum and PD) We will focus on ensuring that our students are challenged and inspired every day by master educators.
- All students will read at or above grade level by the end of third grade. (Title I, IDEA) A focus on early literacy will help us to fulfill our mission by providing our K-3 teachers with critical, job-embedded professional development opportunities that are designed to improve their instructional practice in the teaching of literacy.
- Schools will continue to close the achievement gap for all students, with a particular focus on our English Language Learners and students with disabilities. (IDEA, Title III, Title I) We will demand high expectations of all students, and provide strong support systems to meet their unique learning needs.
- All students will graduate college- and career-ready. (Carl D. Perkins, Title II, IDEA, Curriculum and PD) In order to compete in the expanding global economy, attain professional success, and achieve personal fulfillment, all Red Clay students must graduate well-prepared for the academic and nonacademic challenges of life after high school.
- Parents and the community will be engaged in the education of students. (IDEA, Title I, and Title III)

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 12, 2013. 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. The 2012-2013 DCAS, DIBELS Next data, along with district assessments, ELL program

review, 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 to ensure alignment with ELL improvement and school turnaround needs. Throughout the school year a series of meetings 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 Strategic Plan Goals. The due date of the final draft to the Superintendent and CFO is the week of July 8, 2013. After review, and any last minute edits the document will be signed and ready for submission by July 12, 2013. Once final approval is received from DE DOE copies of the approved application will be posted on the Red Clay website and made available to the School Board, all Program Managers, Red Clay schools, Parent Advisory Council members, nonpublic schools representatives and district administrators. Regular reviews and focus group sessions will be used to discuss progress in implementing strategies and activities toward meeting the goals

A.2 Record the dates of the Consolidated Application LEA Planning Committee Meetings. [Section 1112(d)(3)]

January 7, 2013 – Title II meeting
January 8, 2013 – Parent Forum discussion
January 10, 2014 – Consolidated Grant planning for the 8.2% sequestration
January 14, 2013 – Parent involvement survey review committee
January 16, 2014 – Consolidated Grant planning for the 8.2% sequestration
January 29, 2014 – Consolidated Grant - 8.2% sequestration discussion with cabinet
– Title III meeting
January 31, 2013 – Kindergarten Transition Team (Title I)
February 11, 2013 – ELL and SWD Parent programming meeting
February 21, 2013 – Kindergarten Transition Team (Title I)
February 27, 2013 – Title II Meeting
February 28, 2013 – Parent involvement survey review committee
March 6, 2013 – Strategic Plan Committee meeting (ELL and SWD focus on inclusion)
March 12, 2013 – Poverty Trainer's meeting
March 15, 2013 – Reading by Grade 3 meeting (IDEA, Title I, ELA and Elementary Schools)
March 18, 2013 – RCPAC: Sequestration update
March 20, 2013 – RCCSD Board Meeting: Federal Programs presentation and Sequestration discussion
March 25, 2013 – Discussion of positions and funding sources
April 8, 2013 – Preliminary budget discussion related to 10% funding safeguard cut
April 10, 2013 – Budget meeting and Staffing discussion
April 11, 2013 – ELL and SWD
April 12, 2013 – Project GLAD Professional Development funding discussion
April 18, 2013 – Kindergarten Transition Meeting (Title I)
April 24, 2013 – Title III, AMAO Improvement Meeting
April 30, 2013 – Board Workshop – Federal Funding
May 2 and 3 – PZ Programming Review
May 6, 2013 – PreK programs
May 8, 2013 – CTE Goal 4 meeting; Goal 2 Title I;
Title II and CPD

Focus School

May 9, 2013 - Homeless/Private Schools

Delaware Grade Level Literacy Campaign

May 10, 2013 – AMAO Improvement

May 13, 2013 – IDEA – SWD

May 14, 2013 – Private Schools

May 15, 2013 – Title III Budget

May 16, 2013 – Title III program and Consolidated Grant

May 17, 2013 – Strategic Planning Summit

May 22, 2013 – Kindergarten Transition

May 23, 2013 – Focus Schools

May 28 and May 29 – Parent Engagement

May 30, 2013 – PreK

May 31, 2013 – Partnership Zone Council

June 4, 2013 – PreK and Budgets

June 7, 2013 – Strategic Plan End of Year Review

June 20, 2013 - Private Schools consultation meeting for all federal programs

- Professional development planning meeting

June 25, 2013 - RC Parent Advisory

June 27, 2013 - Parent University development

June 28, 2013 - Parent University development

July 2, 2013 - Parent University: CCCS and DCAS sessions

2.7 Title I: LEA Support for Local School Planning: Systems, Structures, and Services

The questions in this section require the LEA to describe how it meets the various Title I requirements for LEA level planning, supports, and services for schools and students.

Question A

A.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
- Anecdotal information from Community of Interested Persons Meetings and collaborations with Head Start, Children and Families First, Nemours, Parents As Teachers, and additional area child care agencies
- Teacher and school survey data
- School Climate Survey
- Parent Involvement Survey reports and Parent Forum evaluation document t
- Participation rates in programs (Extracurricular 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.

A.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 Building 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 interventions – such as leveled books; including books with decodable text and high frequency words
 - Social and Emotional supports in the forms of opportunities to meet with clinical professionals and using school based mentors to support literacy goals and to positively reinforce student aspirations and school goals
 - Additional computer support, literacy interventions – such as leveled books; including books with decodable text and high frequency words
 - Sessions for parents and materials for parent education and engagement sessions; this includes sessions for incoming kindergarten children and with Head Start and area care agencies and relative caregivers
 - Yearlong – and summer transition programs to provide kindergarten readiness skills to incoming children and agencies that serve them
 - Refining Title I School-wide plans to ensure that there’s a “whole child” approach 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-kindergarten 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 and public workshops; especially in forums where schools discuss with parents the progress their children are making in meeting academic achievement standards;

Question B

B.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 for our community, the Community of Interested Persons (CoIP); the Superintendent's Parent Council 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 Community and parent-based councils provide opportunities for the district to communicate with its representative communities and school families, provide information related to strategic plan goals and initiatives as well as training. These functions also serve as opportunities to listen to the needs and design strategies 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 Team recommends, suggests and directs the usage and approval of resources in alignment with the data and the recommendations of the Plan Action Teams and 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 (Community supports, Mid Atlantic Equity Consortia, 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
 - Framework for Teaching
 - 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
 - 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.
 - Project GLAD model of language acquisition and literacy to model and promote English language acquisition, academic achievement, and cross-cultural skills.
 - Brain-based education
- College and Career Readiness
 - AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination), a college readiness system for designed to increase schoolwide learning and performance through

effective instruction, meaningful and motivational professional learning to catalyze systemic reform and change.

- CTE and Pathway professional development to ensure that students are exposed to rigorous, 21st century learning and career options
- Parent Engagement:
 - Transition activities for parents of early childhood children, and students with academic, developmental and language
 - Best practices in parent involvement and site visits to expertise
- 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/TWIOF/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.

B.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. In implementing the RTTT parent involvement min-grant, Title I Kindergarten teachers from Red Clay Consolidated School District schools provide structured transition workshops for families and staff members at NCC Head Start and area preK sites; and also offers sessions for families during the year to focus on pre-writing, early literacy, numbers, organization and other skills. Targeted schools, such as Baltz Lewis Dual Language, Marbrook, and Warner provide specific transition activities (ex: ELL family nights, Jump Start, etc.).

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 make the best choices and most effectively be involved with their child’s education.

Special Services:

The Special Services Office works with the Members of Strategic Plan Goal 3, and the Curriculum, Operations and Federal Programs (Title I) Offices to identify, train and place support resources in positions to best meet the needs of children. This may include school psychologists, Family Crisis supports, Educational Diagnosticians, 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).

Question C

C.1 This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support LEA operated infant/toddler and/or preschool programs. Please list the LEA operated infant/toddler and/or pre-school programs (physical locations) the LEA intends to support with Title I funds this school year. Please also list the approximate number of infants/toddlers and preschool children impacted by the use of Title I funds in each location.

Note: All infant/toddler and/or pre-school children should be counted in Title I schoolwide schools.

Example:

LEA Operated Program Location A – 33 children

LEA Operated Program Location B – 25 children

LEA Operated Program Location C – 25 children

-Red Clay Consolidated School District Operated Program Location Baltz– 55 children
-Red Clay Consolidated School District Operated Program Location Mote– 20 children
-Red Clay Consolidated School District Operated Program Location Warner– 60 children

C.2

This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support LEA operated infant/toddler and/or preschool programs.

Of the children listed above, please list the total number of children in each of the following categories:

- 1) Total number of children younger than age 1
- 2) Total number of children age 2 to age 3
- 3) Total number of children age 4 and prior to kindergarten entry

The Red Clay Consolidated School District will serve approximately 135 children – 4 years of age prior to kindergarten entry

C.3

This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support LEA operated infant/toddler and/or preschool programs.
Please describe how the Title I funds will be used to support the LEA operated programs listed above. [Section 1112(b)(1)(K)]

Title I funds will be used to support teacher professional learning opportunities to further prepare children to be grade-level literate by or before grade 3. It will also be used to provide parent involvement opportunities specific to families of Prekindergarten children (school transition, introduction to public schools, partnering with teachers, common core, etc.); and will be provide by district staff, Delaware PTA and Nemours BrightStart! As needed, Title I will be used to provide materials and supports for the Before and after school 21st CCLC programming. This will align extend learning time to the regular day, and give students continual access to effective instructional strategies, high-quality curricula, and highly-qualified and trained professional staff.

Question D

D.1 This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support partnership programs (non-LEA operated) serving infant/toddler and/or pre-school children.

Please list the partner programs (physical locations) serving infant/toddler and/or pre-school children the LEA intends to support with Title I funds this school year. Please also list the approximate number of infants/toddlers and preschool children impacted by the use of Title I funds in each location.

Example:

Partner Program Location A – 33 children

Partner Program Location B – 25 children

Partner Program Location C – 25 children

N/A

D.2

This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support partnership programs (non-LEA operated) serving infant/toddler and/or pre-school children.

Of the children listed above, please list the total number of children in each of the following categories:

1) Total number of children younger than age 1

2) Total number of children age 2 to age 3

3) Total number of children age 4 and prior to kindergarten entry

N/A

D.3 This question should only be completed by LEAs using Title I funds to support partnership programs (non-LEA operated) serving infant/toddler and/or pre-school children.

Please describe how the Title I funds will be used to support the partner programs listed above [Section 1112(b)(1)(K)]

N/A

Question E

E.1 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.

The Red Clay Consolidated School District has three (3) schools, Al DuPont Middle, Baltz Elementary, and Warner Elementary schools identified through the ESEA waiver application process as focus schools. These schools serve between 1,500 and 2,000 students representing a variety of cultural diversity and economic challenge (average Free and reduced lunch percentage is 87.7%). Listed below is the data on the enrollment and the targeted student subgroups (based on the September 30th (2012) count of children:

- Al Middle (461 students total)
 - Low Income (403 students)
 - African American (199 students)
 - Hispanic (194 students)
 - Students with Disabilities (80 students)
 - English Learners (63 students)
- Baltz (634 students total)
 - Low Income (536 students)
 - African American (136 students)
 - Hispanic (332 students)

- Warner (578 students total)
 - Low Income (527 students)
 - African American (446 students)
 - Hispanic (102 students)
 - Students with Disabilities (124 students)

To be named a Focus school – the state identifies schools with regressive patterns of student achievement for multiple years; the identified schools are required to make substantive change. To address the rating, Red Clay has instituted comprehensive and far-reaching strategies to improve outcomes for the students attending these schools. In summary, the focus schools are implementing the following school improvement activities:

- Research based extended day programs
- Social and emotional supports for students with evidenced-based practitioners
- Agreements with community agencies to meet the needs of targeted students and enhance educational opportunities
- Instructional support for students struggling to meet the standard academically

Red Clay will use formative, interim and summative academic, DPAS II-R, social emotional learning data and parent survey data- both qualitative and quantitative- to inform instruction and youth development, including immediate and targeted interventions for struggling students. Although the school improvement actions focus on attaining academic proficiency for students, it does not lose sight of the student as a whole person. By leveraging student strengths and new achievements and by exposing young people to options within and beyond the community, the Red Clay Consolidated School District will afford students the 21st century sensibilities and skills necessary for college and careers and for reaching their own personal goals and potential.

Major outcomes:

- Focus schools will demonstrate a trend of consistently meeting state targets– and reduce the achievement gap
- Professionally, school staff members will be proficient at a minimum
- As elementary children reach the 3rd grade, they will be reading on grade level or better
- Middle school students will be college or career ready
- Parents and communities will express satisfaction and be better able to support students being ready for school

E.2 If the LEA intends to use funds other than Title I funds from this grant to meet all or part of the required set-aside for Focus Schools, please provide the following:

- 1) the amount of other funds to set aside; and
- 2) the source of funds that will be used.

The LEA intends to use Focus School funds for all 3 schools – and in the case of Warner it also intends to use 1003g funds (this is in addition to their Title I part A allocations):
-Focus School funds for year 2 (\$417,627.22 Federal funding and \$244,380.00 state funding = Total funding \$662,007.22
-1003(g) funds for Warner for year 2 (\$277,036.96)

Question F

F.1

The following question should only be answered by LEAs with Title I schools designated as “Priority”. 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. If the LEA intends to set aside any funds to support Title I Priority Schools, please provide the following:

- 1) a list of schools in which the funds will be used; and
- 2) the amount of funds to set aside for each school.

The following schools are priority and have the following resources to support their schools (this is in addition to their Title I part A allocations):
-Partnership Zone funding
-1003g funding
-Local support (District operations and Curriculum and instruction support)
Lewis Dual Language Elementary School - \$510,997
Marbrook Elementary School \$463,819

F.2

If the LEA intends to set aside Title I, Part A funds for a subset of schools that it has determined to be low-performing, please provide the following:

- 1) a list of the schools in which the funds will be used;
- 2) a description of the criteria used to identify the schools as low performing; and
- 3) the amount of funds to set aside for each school.

N/A

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

2.8 Title I: Parental and Community Involvement

Section 1118 of the ESEA requires the involvement of parents and communities in regular, two way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities. The questions in this section require the LEA to describe how it meets the various Title I requirements for 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)]

Goal five of the district's Strategic Plan clearly states that every effort will be made to build strong relationships with our diverse 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. Continued efforts to increase family partnerships to support post-secondary success are ongoing.

The District's Red Clay Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC) along with the District's Parent Involvement Liaison suggest, identify and recommend parent engagement activities as they relate to identified student needs. The RCPAC members openly interact with district and building level administrators, Title I staff, and members of school PTAs, PTOs and other school support associations to discuss student and school needs and address strategies to effectively engage parents to assist with addressing the identified needs. The RCPAC hosts monthly informational presentations that are suggested by the members. The presentations are informative, affording the time for members to engage in a Q and A while also providing successful strategies that support students academically and personally.

An annual Family Resource Fair is hosted by the RCPAC in the fall in order to encourage parent and community engagement. 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 individual Red Clay schools and strive to promote student achievement and parental engagement at home, in the school and the community are included in this event. The goal of the Family Resource Fair is to "make your child's education a family project."

From September through May, the RCPAC meets monthly to:

- (a) participate in goal-setting and the planning process
- (b) to review data,
- (c) to develop and maintain the district parental involvement policy
- (d) to gather and analyze feedback from the building-level PTAs, PTOs and other school support associations
- (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.

Since January 2013, the district maintains the first 24/7 educational channel for New Castle County; EDTv, channel 965. A production staff as well as communication pathway staff members at the high schools works collaboratively with community partners to provide continuous viewing of educationally based programs. The aired programs address day to day operations in the district, events in Red Clay schools, strategic plan initiatives and services provided to students, school families and the community. This mass media opportunity affords the district to go live 24/7 with current information, teaching strategies and general updates that keep school families and general community educated and informed.

Departments across the district provide parent education training programs throughout the year that address the various identified needs of the students, parents, schools and the general 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. There are also Strand presentations throughout the school year that are an off-shoot from the monthly forums that are specifically designed to engage parents in a more intimate atmosphere while affording an opportunity to learn more about a particular topic of interest. The goal eventually is to create a Parent University

from the Stands and Parent Forums that will develop a systematic approach to providing parent engagement activities at the district level. 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 but not limited to, the DE State PTA, Learning Link of Delaware, the Parent Information Center of Delaware, Child Find 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 Title I 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 literacy 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 motivated 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 and 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 foster and encourage parent involvement and engagement, they 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, 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 encouraged to designate 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 and learning opportunities that promotes parent knowledge as well as encourages parent involvement and engagement at all levels. Strategies to help students at home and at school to achieve academic and personal success are paramount at monthly RCPAC meetings.

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 parents about designing, implementing and evaluating both the school Compact and the school and district Parent Involvement Policy is conducted each year. The LEA has identified a sub-committee made up exclusively of RCPAC parents representing Title I schools and city schools to address this federal requirement. Subcommittee members work with district and school level personnel to assure parents understand the rights and responsibilities of parents.

In addition, the LEA identifies the need and encourages RCPAC members to attend Delaware State PAC meeting. Information and strategies obtained at these state-wide meetings is shared with the RCPAC members who in turn shares 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.

Professional development training is provided to assist Title I 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 included as a part of the professional development. Partnerships with knowledgeable resource agencies and parent engagement professionals such as but not limited to Learning Link of DE, Children and Families First, 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 cable network broadcast that airs on the district's EDTV channel, 965.
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.

~~Documentation in the binder includes: 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. A copy of the school compact and the school and district Parent Involvement Policy are included in this binder as well as documentation regarding the draft, review and communication of these documents to parents and school families.

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 and that the district's day-to-day operations are in accordance with the policy. 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 Deputy Superintendent.

Based on the comments of the subcommittee additional meetings with key stakeholders may be scheduled with the intent of adjusting service delivery to assure compliance and if necessary, a recommendation for updating 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 Deputy Superintendent, 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 was posted on the district webpage allowing an opportunity for additional public comment. Lastly, the Policy was also reviewed by the District's Board Policy Committee before presentation to the board for approval.

Once the final document was drafted and accepted by the subcommittee, RCPAC and other stakeholders, the Deputy Superintendent presented the policy to the Board requesting a vote and approval. The policy was approved unanimously. The approved policy is posted on the District's website and each school's home webpage. The Policy includes a statement that assures it will be reviewed annually.

B.3 This question should only be completed by LEAs with more than one 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 office of Federal and Regulated Programs along with 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 school Compacts and school level Parent Involvement Policies.

This LEA has a very well established and active district Parent Advisory Council (RCPAC). Each Red Clay school is encouraged 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.

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, each Title I school is to maintain a Title I notebook which includes a section on parent involvement and engagement opportunities. Documentation included but not limited to 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 to assure compliance of all regulations.

Through district meetings and small focus group sessions with the staff in 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 host an informational events 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. All 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.

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 district and building level 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 schools host information evening with staff sharing information and hard copies of the LEA Parent Involvement Policy, the building level Parent Involvement Policy and the building Compact. Information is also provided regarding locating the documents on the district or school website.
3. Discussion of the Policy will be shared with parents during PTA/PTO meetings, school success plan meetings and any other parent organization meetings.
4. RCPAC has a subcommittee that reviews the district parent involvement 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 district policy is scheduled for review and revision during the 2014-15 school year.

Question C

C.1

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

- 1)Written SEA complaint procedure; and [34 CFR Section 299.11(d)]
- 2)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 the district's EDtv channel, 965.

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 the district's EDtv channel, 965.

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 the district's EDtv channel, 965, along with being shared 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 a three year data trend from the Parent Involvement Survey; which reveals that parents increasingly feel they have "been informed of the academic expectations at their child's school (rating 4.43 in 2012; 4.42 in 2013; 4.36 in 2010 on a 5.0 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 districts 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 Title I 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.

D.3 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 by 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 Supervisor 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.

2.9 Equitable Services

The questions in this section ask geographic districts to describe their process for providing equitable services to eligible children in private schools. Unless otherwise specified in the question, the questions apply to the following federal programs: Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A. The questions in this section do not apply to non-geographic districts and charter schools.

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 mailed via registered mail with return receipts to the principals of all non-profit private schools located within the Red Clay feeder inviting them to participate in the Consolidated Grant application.

Private schools currently participating in the FY '13 grant received the packets for their school at the March Federal Programs Meaningful Consultation meeting. Any school not in attendance at the March meeting also receives their packet via US mail.

The packet contains a cover letter, two separate letters of Intent to Participate, and a Confidential Family Survey template used for collecting poverty data. One letter is specifically for participating in the Title I program. The other letter is for the other available programs; Title IIA, Title III, IDEA and the option to participate in any competitive grant awarded to the district throughout the fiscal year.

Each private school has until May 1st to sign and return the Letters of Intent to Participate.

After the initial due date passes for returning the signed Letters of Intent acknowledging the private school's intent to or not to participate, either a second letter or a follow-up phone call or an email is sent extending a second invitation to participate in the federal programs for the upcoming fiscal year to schools that did not respond to the first invitation. The Letters of Intent to Participate explains the various federal programs available, and whether an allocation, resources or both are available. The cover letter that accompanies the Letters invites the participating private schools to a federal program meaningful consultation meeting scheduled during the month of June. The federal programs meaningful consultation meetings (3 annually - October, March and June) are separate and in addition to the county-wide Title I meaningful consultation meetings. The letter also invited schools interested in participating in the Title I program to a county-wide Meaningful Consultation meeting in May.

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 regarding collecting the Letter of Intent for Title I. 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 (those students who reside within a Title I feeder and struggle academically and are at the greatest risk for struggling or failure) will be referred for and receive services depended upon available funding. Copies of Letters of Intent that decline services are also provided to each district validating that all districts attempted to invite any private school in the county that may have students in attendance from each district. Lastly, included in the mailing from the LEA is the template of a Confidential Family Survey. This is the tool that all participating private schools are to use to collect poverty data if the district has not received current poverty data prior to the mailing. All schools that plan to participate in the Title I program must provide poverty data using the Confidential Family Survey in order to calculate a reserve and provide participating schools with an allocation for Title I instructional services, professional development and family involvement.

Title I Part A

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.

Collection of Poverty Data:

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. Currently participating private schools traditionally collect this data during the first week of school with a return date of October 1st to the private school office. The completed Confidential Family Surveys are traditionally turned into 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 must be submitted to the district by May 1. All collected surveys are given to the 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. 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 will be made available to the private schools. This district will have a Title I set-aside for each participating private schools that is determined by the poverty data provide by each school. Allocations are school by school and not pooled.

Set-aside:

There are three separate allocations of the Title I funding; instruction, professional development and parent involvement. The instructional set-aside is used solely for delivery of services to students including tutoring services, supplies and materials. The professional development set-aside is to be available to each school to assist teachers who work directly with students receiving Title I services. The cost per student for the vendor to provide services to each eligible Red Clay student for the 2013-14 is \$831.38. Each individual school's set-aside will determine the number of student who will be able to receive services.

The district uses the following formula for determining each participating school's professional development set-aside and parent involvement set-aside.

(This formula is consistent across the county and is used by all participating New Castle County LEAs and the Smyrna School District.

The total Professional Development set-aside for all participating private schools is divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private schools receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's professional development set-aside. (FY 13 = \$200.76 X students being serviced) The same formula is also used to determine each participating private schools Parent Engagement set-aside. Total Parent Engagement set-aside is divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private schools receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's parent involvement set-aside. (FY 13 = \$77.29 X students being serviced)

Title II Part A

The Title IIA funds provide assistance for preparing, training, recruiting and retaining highly qualified and effective teachers and leaders. The amount of funding available for services to private school personnel is governed by Section 9501 (b) (3), of ESEA which requires equitable services for private school teachers to the extent that the LEA uses its funds for professional development. Per section G-2 in October 2006 Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Non-Regulatory Guidance Red Clay Consolidated School District consulted with private school officials on the method for determining equal expenditures, and the resulting methodology reasonably reflects the relative numbers of students and educational needs of the public and private school students. We consider the allocation for the current year, the total number of participating private school children, public school children and amounts reserved for indirect costs, admin fees and other sources along with the total amount spent in fiscal year 2001 for professional development under the predecessor Eisenhower Professional Development Program and the Class Size Reduction Program. From this, a per pupil allocation is determined and an amount is identified as available to the participating private schools. As agreed upon in meaningful consultation with participating private school principals, the Title IIA allocation is set-aside to be divided among all participating private schools. The total set-aside is divided by the total number of private schools students eligible for services (FY 14 - 4868) at each school to determine a per pupil allocation. The per pupil allocation is then multiplied by the number of students in each school to determine the individual school allocation. In FY 13, the PPA was \$4.91 X students per school. The district has an established protocol for requesting use of funds and reimbursement of funds used for allowable expenses.

Title III Part A

Services are provided to all participating private schools as needed and requested. Contact information for the ELL office staff is provided to all private

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. If the LEA is participating in a consortium, the LEA must describe the consortium process and list the other LEAs participating in the consortium.

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.

Collection of Poverty Data:

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. Traditionally, participating private schools collect this data during the first week of school with a return date of October 1st to the private school office. The completed Confidential Family Surveys are traditionally turned into 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 the 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. 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 will be made available to the private schools. This district will have a Title I set-aside for each participating private schools that is determined by the poverty data provided by each school. Allocations are school by school and not pooled.

Determining Eligibility:

Eligible students are to be identified by the participating private school in order to schedule Title I services. A student must meet both residency and academic eligibility to be referred for services.

Residency Eligibility - The referred student must live within the feeder of a participating Red Clay Title I school. The participating private school must validate addresses of students being referred for services. Any student whose address is not in the feeder of a Title I school will be denied consideration. The district also reviews the addresses before proceeding with consideration for services.

Academic Eligibility - Criteria is determined annually in Meaningful Consultation with principals from participating private schools. Currently to be referred, a student must have a C or below in either or both reading and math and a standardized test score below the 49thile. The student must demonstrate low performance or appear to be at the greatest risk for failure.

Parental Consent for Release and Review of Academic Records:

Before any services are offered to a student, the participating school's principal must obtain a signed parental consent authorizing the school to refer the student for services. The principal or school designee must also complete a Student Referral Form which must include the signature of the principal.

Accompanying the Referral Form is the parent's consent for release form, and the student's most recent report card, standardized test scores and any other documents supporting the recommendation for services.

In the event the principal refers more students than the school's set-aside can fund for delivery of Title I services, all students referred will be priority ranked. The principal will determine the order for offering services to students since the set-aside is a school-by-school and not pooled. Principals will have the final decision on who receives the funding for services. The students will receive a parent consent letter in mid-September inviting them to participate in the Title I program and to receive instructional services.

Set-aside:

There are three separate allocations of the Title I funding; instruction, professional development and parent involvement. The instructional set-aside is used solely for delivery of services to students including tutoring services, supplies and materials. The professional development set-aside is to be available to each school to assist teachers who work directly with students receiving Title I services. The cost per student for the vendor to provide services to each eligible Red Clay student for the 2013-14 is \$831.38. Each individual school's set-aside will determine the number of student who will receive services.

The district uses the following formula for determining each participating school's professional development set-aside and parent involvement set-aside.

(This formula is consistent across the county and is used by all participating NCC LEAs and Smyrna School District.

The total Professional Development set-aside for all participating private schools, divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private school receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's professional development set-aside. (FY 13 - \$200.76 X students being serviced) The same formula is also used to determine each participating private schools Parent Engagement set-aside. The total Parent Engagement Set-aside is divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private school receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's parent involvement set-aside. (FY 13 - \$77.29 X students being serviced)

Service Delivery:

The Title I services provided to private schools students will be consistent with the type of 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 30th 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.

A third party vendor, selected through the bid process provides the Title I services at the participating schools. Per the signed contract, each student is entitled to receive two 45 minute sessions or three 30 minutes session each week. The schedule for delivery of services must be approved by the school principal before the vendor begins any instructional and assessment services. Instructional services will begin at the same time as the Title I program for public school students. There is flexibility if the participating principal requests a later date, but that change must be determined in consultation. Since the funding is available as soon as the Consolidated Grant is processed by the state, the district creates a purchase order to pay for services. All services provided are invoiced by the third party vendor and sent to the LEA the last week of each month.

Throughout the school year, meaningful consultation meetings are held to assure equitable services consistent with the Title I services that are provided to Red Clay Title I schools. Meetings are county-wide and include the Red Clay, Brandywine, Christina, Colonial, Appoquinimink and Smyrna School Districts.

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.
- Academic and Assessment Criteria
- Criteria for Referral for Services
- Processing of Referral Forms for Services
- Timeline for the Referral Process

- Site Visits
- Determining Residency Eligibility
- Scheduling of Services
- Materials and Instructional Supplies (The LEA ensures that the content of all instructional materials, supplies and resources are secular, neutral and non-ideological in accordance with federal regulations.)
- Portfolios
- Student Learning Plans
- Inventory and storage of supplies/materials (All materials and supplies used in the private schools by the vendor will be purchased and labeled property of the LEA.)
- Assessment Tools
- Summer enrichment programs
- Conferences
- Grade spans to be serviced
- Dates of assessment
- Progress reporting and timeline for reporting
- Progress reports to school staff and parents
- Use of facility by vendor
- Start and end date for providing services
- Parent Involvement opportunities
- Title I Tool Kit
- Feedback Surveys – parents, administrators, teachers
- Standardized test scores

Compliance:

To assure compliance of all regulations, public school officials, DE DOE staff who conduct audits as well as US ed. staff may audit the delivery of equitable services to private schools to assure compliance of all federal regulations.

REVISION - Title IIA

Professional Development Set-aside for Title IIA

Process: The following process is used to assure private schools are invited to receive equitable services and participate in the Title IIA program each fiscal year.

- Letter of Intent to Participate –

A.First Mailing – March

B.Second Mailing – May

This communication affords all private schools located within the district boundaries the opportunity to participate in the available federal programs, which includes Title IIA.

•Once schools agree to participate in the Federal Program, the principal is invited to attend the first of three Meaningful Consultation Meetings held each year that affords the participating private schools the opportunity to design a plan for professional development that includes opportunities on and off site, strategies to implement and participate in professional development opportunities and assessing the benefits of the professional development experience. Topics of discussion during the meaningful consultation meeting will include but are not limited to:

A.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the common needs of all participating private schools.

B.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of individual schools.

C.How to use the set-aside funds to get the most training, services and learning opportunities for staff and administration.

D.The creation of a plan that explains how professional development will be implemented.

E.Evaluating the skills/strategies/resources for effectiveness.

F.Determining evaluative measures.

G.Professional development opportunities offered by district staff members that can either be held off site or at a participating private school/s . a

H.Arranging for staff to attend training conducted in Red Clay school or district office.

I.Assessing student, school and community needs.

•Meaningful Consultation Meeting - June

A.Needs Assessment completed by each participating private school

B.Discussion regarding regulations, compliances and protocols for use of federal funds

C.Review of expenditures/reimbursements, and remaining allocation available

D.Discussion of formula for allocating funds to participating schools and an estimated amount of the new FY allocation

E.Introduction of Key Staff - Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Technology staff

F.Allocations

G.Processing reimbursement – proof of payment and attendance by staff

H.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the common needs of all participating private schools.

I.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of individual schools.

J.How to use the set-aside funds to get the most training, services and learning opportunities for staff and administration.

K.The creation of a plan that explains how professional development will be implemented.

L.Evaluating the skills/strategies/resources for effectiveness.

M.Determining evaluative measures.

N.Professional development opportunities offered by district staff members that can either be held off site or at a participating private school/s . a

O.Arranging for staff to attend training conducted in Red Clay school or district office.

P.Assessing student, school and community needs.

•Meaningful Consultation – October

A.Review of expenditures/reimbursements, and remaining allocation available

B. notification of new FY allocation

C.Processing reimbursement – proof of payment and attendance by staff

D.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the common needs of all participating private schools.

E.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of individual schools.

F.How to use the set-aside funds to get the most training, services and learning opportunities for staff and administration.

G.The creation of a plan that explains how professional development will be implemented.

H.Evaluating the skills/strategies/resources for effectiveness.

I.Determining evaluative measures.

J.Professional development opportunities offered by district staff members that can either be held off site or at a participating private school/s . a

K.Arranging for staff to attend training conducted in Red Clay school or district office.

L.Assessing student, school and community needs.

•Meaningful Consultation – March

A.Review of expenditures/reimbursements, and remaining allocation available Distribution of new FY Letter of Intent to Participate for next FY

B.Processing reimbursement – proof of payment and attendance by staff

C.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the common needs of all participating private schools.

D.The availability of professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of individual schools.

E.How to use the set-aside funds to get the most training, services and learning opportunities for staff and administration.

F.The creation of a plan that explains how professional development will be implemented.

G.Evaluating the skills/strategies/resources for effectiveness.

H.Determining evaluative measures.

I.Professional development opportunities offered by district staff members that can either be held off site or at a participating private school/s . a

J.Arranging for staff to attend training conducted in Red Clay school or district office.

K.Assessing student, school and community needs.

A.3 For Title I, Part A, describe the criteria the LEA used to determine which private school students will receive equitable services. If the LEA is pooling funds among schools, the LEA must describe which schools are participating in the pool and the criteria used to determine which private school students will receive equitable services in the pool.

Note: Your response should clearly state that poverty is not a criterion for 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.
- The report card grade must be a C or less. (A or B for students with accommodations may also be considered)
- Identified weaknesses using a standardized referral form that includes a checklist and anecdotal comment must be completed a student can be identified as needing services.
- Technical assistance as needed 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 or be a struggling student to receive services. A student's level of poverty is not the determining factor for participating in the Title I program. Eligible students must reside within the feeder of a participating Title I school and must also demonstrate academic need or evidence of being a struggling student.

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, the 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 each district submits 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, a Letter of Affirmation, submits poverty data and refers academically at risk students who reside within the feeder of a participating Title I school.

A new RFP was designed for the 2013-14 school year. All districts participating in the New Castle County consortium and private school administrators collaboratively drafted the RFP during meaningful consultation with the participating private school principals. 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. A recommendation for a vendor was submitted to each LEA in April, 2013. Each district will create its own contract with the vendor for one year with the option of a rollover for a second year.

During Meaningful Consultation it was agreed that the Title I reserve to pay for services for district students attending participating private schools will be based on the poverty data generated school by school. This district will not be pooling funds to pay for services. Also, this district will not be providing any funding to other districts. Generated set-aside is solely for services to residential and academically eligible students who are attending participating private schools.

Services provided will be either offer two 45-minute sessions, or three 30 minutes sessions weekly from September through May.

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.

Revision:

Participating private schools have multiple options for using their allocated Title IIA funding. During meaningful consultation the schools may request a specific professional development training that addresses core content areas be provided to a group of participating private schools that have identified similar needs. Schools also have the opportunity to request the use of Title IIA funds for specific teacher training opportunities that focus on the core content areas and address the specific needs of their school. Participating private schools also may request to use funding to bring a training program/s on site that will address identified needs of their school/students. Lastly, all participating private schools may request to attend professional development trainings offered by district staff. Private schools may send administrative and instructional staff to sessions held at the district or may request for a district staff member/s to present at their school. Though the LEA makes all final decisions regarding use of school allocations, ongoing meaningful consultation with the participating private school administrators or designees assure the school use the funding to provide top quality professional development.

B.2 Describe the types of services that will be provided to eligible private school students, staff and their families.

Students:

- Private schools were to identify on the Letter of Intent the grade spans 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 per session or three thirty minute sessions each

week)

- Extended school day services (depending on availability of funding)
- Kindergarten students receive a combination of Reading/Math/Readiness instruction.

Instructional Strategies:

- Guided instruction
- Independent practice
- Computer assisted Instruction/practice skills
- Individualized, paired and who group instruction
- Vocabulary oral, choral reading teaching model
- Unit/skill work packets
- Review of core content as requested by the classroom teacher

Assessments

Staff - Professional Development

Through meaningful consultation with all participating private school administrators, professional development opportunities will be offered to staff working directly with students who are receiving Title I services. 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. The allocation for each school is determined using the following formula: The total Professional Development set-aside for all participating private school is divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private school receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's professional development set-aside. (FY 13 = \$200.76 X students being serviced). All participating schools must submit a request and gain approval before any funds are used for services or reimbursement.

Families - 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, use of a parent survey, parent interviews and feedback from participating principals. Parents are invited to participate in an information session to become knowledgeable of all services being provided to the participating private schools. The contracted third party vendors will maintain two-way communication with parents of all participating students regarding services, academic success and assessments. A parent/student engaging summer enrichment activity is provided to all students that participated in the Title I program. The activity program, Think Stretch, engages students and parents in fun filled review, practice and enrichment activities in the area of math and reading. Students also receive an award the following school year if they complete the enrichment activities over the summer.

The allocation for each school is determined using the following formula:

The total Parent Engagement set-aside is divided by the total number of Red Clay students attending participating private schools receiving services on November 30th. This creates the per pupil allocation which is then multiplied by the number of students receiving services in each school to determine each school's parent involvement set-aside. (FY 13 = \$77.29 X students being serviced)

The LEA will communicate with parents as necessary to assure compliance of all federal regulations.

REVISION - Title IIA

Title II, Part A provides funds to increase academic achievement of all students by helping schools and school districts improve teacher and principal quality and ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. Funds are to be used to ensure all students have effective teachers that have subject matter knowledge and teaching skills necessary to help all children achieve high academic standards, regardless of individual learning styles and needs. Participating private schools that receive Title IIA funds are required to have a needs assessment plan for FY '14. Based on the needs assessments, the principals conferred that the FY 14 Title IIA set-aside would be used for the following:

- 1.Provides technical assistance and support for the goals of the Middle States evaluations.
- 2.Provides training opportunities in order to offer specific programs to private school students.
- 3.Provides the opportunity to bring onsite training to staff for instructional areas identified as being of greatest need.

- 4.Provides training to offer AP courses in the secondary schools.
- 5.Affords the opportunity to have teachers meet HQT status.
(Math, Social Studies, Science, ELA and Technology)
- 6.Affords the opportunity to be knowledgeable of current instructional trends and practices to improve student achievement, school climate and parent/community involvement.
- 7.Provides clock hours and learning opportunities to meet DEEDS certification.

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 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 30th 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, assessments and resources are secular, neutral and non-ideological in accordance with federal regulations.

REVISION Title IIA

The LEA ensures that the services provided to participating private schools are equitable in comparison to services provide to Red Clay schools by assuring funds are reserved for professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of the participating private schools. After each private school signs a Letter of Intent to Participate in the month of March and engages in ongoing Meaningful Consultation with the LEA during the month of June, an allocation is determined for each school. During the consultation sessions in June and October the needs of each school are shared and possible professional development opportunities are discussed to address the identified needs. During all consultation sessions, June, October and March the schools are advised of due dates, timelines and the protocols for requesting funds, gaining approval for use of funds and the reimbursement process. Also, during the June consultation meeting the formula used to determine each school's allocation is discussed with all participating private schools. This meeting provides each participating school with an estimated amount so they can begin planning how the funds will be used to provide professional development opportunities to staff at their respected schools. The actual allocation for each school is provided during the October consultation meeting. Schools have from November 1st to December 31st of the following year to use the FY allocation.

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. On going communication via email with school principals.
8. Periodic meetings with the vendor administrative staff.

Revision - Title IIA

Since 2009 the district table of organization includes an Education Associate who has the responsibility for assuring compliance and delivery of equitable services to participating private schools. The Red Clay district has 13 private schools in New Castle County that have generated poverty and are entitled to and received Title I services. Five of those schools are within the Red Clay feeder and also participate in the other federal programs. In addition, eight other private schools located within the district's feeder participate in the other federal programs; Title IIA, Title III, IDEA and any other awarded competitive grant. The Education Associate is responsible for assuring compliance and monitors all services funding by Title IIA. Meaningful consultation meetings are held three times a year to assure the participating private schools have a complete understanding of the acceptable use of funds allocated as well as the professional development opportunities available by the district. Schools also received monthly communication by email reminding them of the procedures, protocols and responsibilities regarding services and funding provided by the federal program/s for which they are participating. Site visits are also made to the participating private schools on an as needed basis to provide technical assistance. Schools may be asked to share and present at an upcoming meaningful consultation meeting. Detail files are kept each fiscal year and are reviewed by the Education Associate, the Supervisor of the Business Office and the Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs.

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 Title I 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 must 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.

Revision - Title IIA

In meaningful consultation with the participating private schools, all schools utilize the Title IIA allocation for teacher training in the core content areas.

Schools either request approval to send teachers to professional development programs off site or request to use funding to pay for a presenter/s to come to their school/s. If a school would request the use of funds for materials, the school would be required to submit a request for funding and receive prior approval from the equitable services manager. All materials would need to be associated with a specific professional development training that was either held off site or as part of an on-site training for staff. The purchase of materials that are not associated with a specific professional development would not be an acceptable use of funding as the district does not utilize Title IIA funds to purchase materials or supplies.

Question D

D.1 List the non-profit private schools participating in Title II, Part A.

All Saints Catholic School
Harvest Christian Academy
Layton Preparatory
Learning Laboratory
Padua Academy
St. Mark HS
Sharon Temple Adventist School
St. Ann School
St. Anthony of Padua School
St. John the Beloved School
The Tatnall School
Ursuline Academy
Wilmington Christian School

D.2 List the non-profit private schools participating in Title III, Part A.

All Saints Catholic School
Harvest Christian Academy
Learning Laboratory
St. Mark HS
Sharon Temple Adventist School
St. Ann School
St. John the Beloved School

3.1 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? 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 (12-13 Sept 30 Data)
<input type="radio"/>	DEDOE-provided % DHSS poverty data (12-13 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) 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 September Active Student report, which included the Free-Reduced Lunch and homeless information as we 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 Elementary Schools) - where the entire building is considered eligible for free and reduced price lunches. All of this data is considered for ranking and allocation purposes.

While the district has one (1) K-5 (non-special/ILC) school it doesn't serve with a free and reduced lunch eligible population between 40-56%, and at the 6-12 level, similar populations ranging from 40% - 65%; 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 86.36% - 94.92%; the additional targeted K-5 school has a similar population of 61.4%); and also targeting middle schools (6-8) with at least 75% free and reduced lunch eligibility (AIMS – 87% and Stanton 82.9% respectively).

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) how the skipped school is 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)

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) how the skipped school is 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 2013-2014 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

<input type="radio"/>	Serving all schools in a grade span equal to or above the LEAs total average poverty rate
<input type="radio"/>	Serving all schools in a grade span equal to or above the average poverty rate of that grade span
<input type="radio"/>	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 Part 2 below)
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Other (Please explain in Part 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 Part 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 Part 1 above, please explain the LEA's threshold for serving schools with Title I funds.

<p>The Red Clay Consolidated School District is serving schools based on the following actions:</p> <p>Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility -</p> <p>1) Grades K-5: 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. Based on the September 2012 Active Student Report from the Data Service Center, Red Clay Consolidated School District's poverty level is 52.8%. The LEA established a threshold of at least 61%; in order to service the highest poverty schools first – and has a single (1) high need school with a poverty rate almost 10% higher than the district average (61.4%); next the district has eight (8) schools with poverty rates over 75% or greater (from 84.5% - 93.4% Schoolwide and includes 2 Partnership Zone/Priority Schools and 2 Focus schools).</p> <p>2) Grades 6-12: Red Clay established a threshold equal to or above the 75% poverty threshold to begin services. For 2012-2013, we are serving A.I. DuPont Middle (87% free and reduced lunch eligible and a focus school) and Stanton Middle (82.4% free and reduced lunch eligible and a Partnership Zone school).</p>
--

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%- or greater depending upon federal sequestration cuts to Title I)
- LEA Instructional Services
- LEA Professional Development
- Focus Schools (5% as needed)
- Preschool Supports
- Administrative Costs

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 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 between 88.5% and greater % poverty (PARTICIPATING)

Category 2: Traditional K-5 and between 80% - 88.4% poverty (PARTICIPATING)

Category 3: Traditional 6-12 and over 75% poverty (for these purposes – over 82%) (PARTICIPATING)

Category 4: Traditional K-5 and between 61% - 79% poverty (PARTICIPATING)

Category 5: Traditional K-5 and under 61% poverty (ranked not participating)

Category 6: Traditional 6 – 12 and under 75 % poverty (ranked not participating)

Category 6: ILC with 35% poverty or greater (ranked 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 and 2; then high poverty middle schools in category 3, and then high poverty elementary schools in category 4. 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.

3.2 Title I Public School Data

LEAs must click “Get Default Values” for a list of schools within the LEA and their associated Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL %) low income data* and their DHSS (DHSS Pov %) low income data. LEAs must click the edit button for each school to: 1) identify each school's Title I status; 2) list the grade span of the school; and 3) enter new poverty data (only if the LEA chooses to use its own poverty data). Note: The FRL % for Provision 2 schools will be listed as the approved Provision 2 rate.

Public Schools

School	Title I Status	Grade Span	Total	FRL %	DHSS Pov %	New Pov %
A I duPont High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	09-12	1172	44.03	40.53	44.70
A I duPont Middle	Schoolwide	6-8	469	86.35	75.69	87.00
Baltz Elem	Schoolwide	BK-05	612	80.00	81.05	85.60
Brandywine Springs	Not Eligible	KN-08	1090	16.33	17.25	16.40
Calloway Sch of the Arts	Not Eligible	6-12	897	12.15	13.94	12.30
Central School	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	176	84.09	80.68	83.00
Conrad Schools of Science	Not Eligible	6-12	1082	32.53	26.43	32.40
Dickinson High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	09-12	726	62.40	56.61	62.90
First State School	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	18	33.33	83.33	33.30
Forest Oak Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	KN-5	543	53.22	50.28	54.10
H B duPont Middle	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	6-8	826	48.43	45.28	48.40
Heritage Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	598	32.61	34.11	33.10
Highlands Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	350	84.29	77.71	84.50
Lewis Dual Language Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	473	87.00	85.20	87.30
Linden Hill Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	881	13.73	17.25	14.00
Marbrook Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	548	84.49	76.09	84.60
McKean High	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	9-12	864	64.81	57.99	65.60
Meadowood Program	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	138	54.35	86.23	54.30
Mote Elem	Schoolwide	BK-5	602	87.00	77.57	85.90
North Star Elem	Not Eligible	KN-5	751	5.73	6.79	5.70
Richardson Park Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	437	86.00	76.66	87.50
Richardson Park Lrng Cntr	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	Ungraded	268	85.00	66.04	67.20

Richey Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	402	61.19	55.47	61.40
Shortlidge Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	317	87.00	89.59	89.60
Skyline Middle	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	6-8	826	41.53	38.38	41.60
Stanton Middle	Schoolwide	6-8	690	82.61	71.30	82.60
Warner Elem	Schoolwide	KN-5	541	88.00	89.65	93.40

3.3 Title I Private School Data

LEAs must provide equitable services to eligible children attending non-profit private schools who reside in the attendance zones of its public schools that are participating in Title I. LEAs must list each participating non-profit private school and the number of low income private school students in each school that generated funding from your LEA only (regardless of where the school is located). The number of low income private school students listed in this section should equal the total number of low income private school students in each LEA's Title I spreadsheet. If the LEA is pooling funds, the LEA must also list participating non-profit private schools that will participate in the pool, even if they do not have any low income students to contribute funds to the pool.

Private Schools

School	Status	Grade Span	# Low Income
All Saints Catholic Schoo	Participating Private School	k-8	31
Harvest Academy Wilm	Participating Private School	k-8	1
Holy Angels	Participating Private School	k-8	2
Nativity Preparatory	Participating Private School	5-8	3
Serviam Girls Academy	Participating Private School	5-8	4
St. Ann	Participating Private School	k-8	6
St. Anthony of Padua	Participating Private School	k-8	15
St. Elizabeth's Elem	Participating Private School	k-8	19
St. John Beloved	Participating Private School	k-8	4
St. Michael's Day	Participating Private School	k-2	2
St. Peter's Cathedra	Participating Private School	k-5	43
Urban Promise	Participating Private School	5-8	2

Total: 132

3.4 Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Program Requirements

LEAs have two options for how they can deliver services to eligible children in Title I schools. Targeted Assistance schools provide services only to students who have been identified as being most at-risk of not meeting the State's challenging standards. Schoolwide schools use Title I funds to meet the needs of all students in the school, as determined through a comprehensive needs assessment. Individual students are not identified as eligible to participate in schoolwide schools. A school must have 40% poverty or higher (or an approved ED Flex waiver) to operate a schoolwide program. LEAs operating schoolwide programs must answer questions A1-A3. LEAs operating Targeted Assistance programs must answer questions B1-B3.

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)]

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);
- Discussions with Title I Building Leadership Teams to review success plans 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;
- District-directed Title I Kindergarten Transition Team to provide district-wide activities for incoming families at Title I schools and NCC Head Start
- 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;
- Provide a guidance document that exemplifies the content required, along with non-examples, for the components;
- 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, Project GLAD 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. Schools also maintain a portfolio (binder) which houses artifacts related to reach of the 10 components (specific to the school). These portfolios are used for district, state and federal auditing purposes along with references for program improvements.

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, enrichment and Saturday Literacy/Library;
- Parent resources that include: Parent literacy training; family resource centers and technology
- Student transitions between school levels (kindergarten transition team workshops for families, child care agencies and NCC Head Start);
- Counseling supportive services

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

Under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), if a State identifies significant disproportionality, the LEA must use the maximum amount (15 percent) of the total of IDEA 3-5 and IDEA 6 – 21 funds allowable for comprehensive CEIS for children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, for children in those groups that were “significantly overidentified.”

Question A

A.1 Please indicate which of following applies to your LEA regarding Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS) utilizing IDEA funds:

<input checked="" type="radio"/>	CEIS is required.
<input type="radio"/>	CEIS is voluntary.
<input type="radio"/>	CEIS is not being used.

A.2 For LEAs utilizing IDEA funds for Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS), 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). If using IDEA funds for CEIS, please note the following reporting requirement: The regulations require, in 34 CFR §300.226(d), each LEA that implements CEIS to report to the State on the number of children who received CEIS and the number of those children who subsequently received special education and related services under Part B during the preceding two-year period (i.e., the two years after the child has received CEIS).

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 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.

3.6 Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth

According to Title I, Part A, each LEA must set-aside funds as necessary to provide services to homeless children who are attending elementary, middle, or high schools that are not Title I, Part A schools. In determining the set-aside amount, LEAs should allow for the provision of services to meet the unique needs of homeless students who attend Title I, Part A schools that are above and beyond services provided through the regular Title I, Part A programs at those schools, in addition to the provision of services to homeless students who do not attend Title I, Part A schools. [20 USC 6313(c)(3)(A), 2001]

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:

- 1) the amount of Title I, Part A funds that have been reserved, how the amount was determined;
- 2) the projected types of costs and services that these funds would support; and
- 3) an approximate number of homeless students and youth the LEA expect to assist with these Title I reserved funds.

A reserve of \$5,000 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 of the set-aside this year was determined by requesting equal amounts from the FY '14 Consolidated Grant and the FY 14 McKinney-Vento grant.

Based on the amount of prior expenditures, ideally to meet the needs of Red Clay students living in transition or who are homeless, \$10,000.00 is a sufficient amount to address the needs of these students.

The set-aside will provide funding to assist students in need of clothing and uniforms, items for personal hygiene and basic needs, food, school supplies, school fees, transportation and provides academic support by affording the opportunity for tutoring, attendance at summer school and participation in credit recovery programs. Funds will also be used for staff training, informational resources, and professional development.

The district expects to serve at least 300 students living in transition or who are homeless attending non-Title I schools and 500 students overall enrolled in all 27 Red Clay schools.

REVISION:

The set-aside for transportation pertains to purchasing DART cards to assist parents with transporting students to and from school while transportation is being arranged by the department of transportation. Also, the DART cards are used to assist parents with getting to and from school for meetings, or other school related activity designed for parents. DART cards are also provided to secondary school students who may need to participate in extended day activities. The set-aside is not intended to be used to transport student to and from school.

3.7 Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals (HQP)

Section 2122 of the ESEA requires LEAs to conduct a needs assessment for professional development and hiring. This assessment shall be conducted with the involvement of teachers, including those teachers participating in programs under Title I Part A. The assessment shall take into account activities needed: (1) for teachers to prepare students to meet challenging Common Core academic achievement standards; and (2) to give principals the instructional leadership skills to support teachers.

Question A

A.1 Hiring Needs Assessment:

Describe the teacher and principal hiring needs-assessment process for your LEA. [Section 2122 (c)(1) and (2)]

District Management holds individual meetings with principals in late winter to discuss: terminations for cause, programming changes and/or expansion, projected needs due to attrition, unit count projections, and implications of federal policy (i.e. sequestration). Present are representatives from the following departments: Title 1, Special Education, Directors of Schools, and Human Resources. For interview committees, the participants include teachers from the local buildings. This summer, this included teachers from RPLC, Baltz, and staff from Warner and Mote on interviews for Title I PreK positions.

A.2 List the findings from the hiring needs assessment described above.

Vacancies were determined for multiple areas to include special education, elementary and secondary core content.

School	Position
District	Itinerant Strings
BSS	Music
Heritage	Music
Lewis	Lit coach
Lewis	Elem ELL
Lewis	Elem
Marbrook	Elem ELL
Mote	Elem
AIMS	ELA
HBMS	ELA
Stanton	ELA 2 positions
Stanton	Voc (Tech)
AIHS	Spanish
CCSA	.5Spanish/.5Math
JDHS	Biology
JDHS	Math
McKean	Ag Sci
McKean	Science
McKean	.5 spec ed

A.3 Describe the LEA's plan to recruit highly qualified teachers. What specific strategies does your LEA use to staff high-needs schools? [Section 2123(a) (2) and (4)]

School and district staff participated in multiple job fairs this spring and improved efforts to recruit at HBCU (historically black colleges and universities) and to discuss potential partnerships for candidate recruitment. HR uses website and newspaper advertising to include Philadelphia and Baltimore markets. In addition, Stanton Middle School hired a Teach For America (TFA) candidate for English and Thomas McKean High School hired a TFA candidate for science. In the Spring, a team of district and building administrators attended the local TFA job fair. The job fairs and the partnerships were at no cost and the news advertisements are from local funds. In addition, Red Clay Consolidated:

- Created procedures that require experienced candidates to submit recent evidence of effective performance evaluation prior to selection(implementation summer 2013)
- Creation of partnerships with area universities for student teacher placement, professional development and university training for existing Red Clay staff. University students in education majors are placed in the same building in Red Clay throughout the practicum and student teaching experiences. This allows both the student teacher and the principal to determine whether the student teacher is a potential fit for that building.

Question B

B.1 Which of the following activities will the LEA be implementing using all or a portion of its Title II A funds? (Check all that apply).
[Section 2123 (a) and 3/4/10 US DOE memo on Section 2113(c)]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Develop and implement mechanisms to effectively recruit and retain highly qualified teachers (HQT), specialists in core academic subjects, and principals.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Develop and implement initiatives to retain highly qualified teachers and principals, particularly in schools with a high percentage of low-achieving students.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide scholarships, signing bonuses, or other financial incentives, such as differential pay, for teachers in academic subjects in which there is a shortage of HQT.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recruit and hire HQT to reduce class size, particularly in the early grades.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recruit and hire HQT, including teachers who become highly qualified through alternative routes, and special education teachers.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide incentives, including financial incentives, to retain teachers who have a record of helping low-achieving students improve their academic achievement.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide incentives, including financial incentives, to principals with a record of improving academic achievement of all students, but particularly students from economically disadvantaged families, students from racial and ethnic minority groups, and students with disabilities.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carry out teacher advancement initiatives that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths (such as paths to becoming a career teacher, mentor teacher, or exemplary teacher) and pay differentiation. An evaluation system could play a role in such an effort.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide activities designed to improve the quality of principals and superintendents, including the development and support of academies to help talented aspiring or current principals and superintendents become outstanding managers and educational leaders. An evaluation system could play a role in such an effort.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provide activities that ensure teachers are able to use challenging State academic content standards and assessments to improve instructional practices and improve student academic achievement. An evaluation system could play a role in such an effort.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The LEA will not be using Title IIA funds for any of the above activities.

B.2 If the LEA is using other funds to support any of the activities above, list the activities and the other funding sources that will be used.

State CPD (Curriculum and Professional Development) funding is used to reimburse teachers for Praxis II examination in critical shortage areas. Local funds money is used to support aspiring leader cohorts. Travel costs for job fairs are supported by local funds (HR budget). Stipends for career ladder positions (such as Lead teacher) are supported locally. Mentoring positions are supported by state funding.

Question C

C.1 This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects.

Teacher Quality Needs Assessment:

By the end of the 2005-2006 school year, all classes of core academic subjects were to be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Under ESEA, the core academic subjects are:

English

Reading/language arts

Mathematics

Science

Foreign languages

Art

Music

Social Studies (History, Civics/government, Economics, Geography)

Elementary school teachers meet the HQT requirement as Elementary Generalists.

In your LEA, which ESEA academic subjects have the largest number of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers? In which schools are these classes? Please be specific using final HQT data and your year-end kicker list. [Section 2122 (b)(3)(A)]

From 2013 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 Mote, Al DuPont Middle, Conrad, Central and Al 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 Al DuPont 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. Al DuPont High School also has teachers who are certified in special education but lack HQ content expertise.

C.2 This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects.

Based on the analysis above, why are the teachers of these classes not yet highly qualified?

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.

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 AI 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. AI 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 D

D.1

This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects.

Equity Data:

Refer to your final HQT data showing the following student characteristics:

English language learners (ELL)

Students with disabilities (SWD)

Race/ethnicity

Low income

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 your final HQT data to answer questions in this section, and be specific in your response. [Section 2122 (9)]

2012 HQ data shows that while 99% of white students have access to highly qualified teachers, 97.8% of blacks had access. In 2013, black access decreased to 95.7%, compared to 98.4% for white students. Overall Hispanic data was not provided by DeDOE again this year.

Gaps exist for ELL students (91.4%), and students with disabilities (90.4%). Schools with gaps of 5% or more for ELL students include AI High, Central, Conrad, Marbrook and Mote.

Schools with gaps of 5% or more for students with disabilities decreased and include AI High, AI Middle, Conrad, and HB Middle.

For the third year in a row, (0) zero schools show gaps of 5% or more in black vs. white access for 2013.

Low income students: Gaps of 5% or more exist at Central and Conrad.

D.2

This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects.

If there is no disparity based on final HQT data, skip to Question E.

In your LEA, what factors contribute to the disparities in student access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers? What are the reasons why these student sub-groups 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.

D.3

This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects.

Based on your needs assessment, what is your strategy to retain and attract highly effective teachers in schools with the largest disparities in relation to student achievement? The response is to be specific to compensation reform and teacher identification/placement as it relates to a DPAS II rating of Highly Effective or Ineffective.

The District's Strategic Plan contains goals and activities designed to develop highly effective teachers and principals within our high-needs schools. This includes resources such as high-quality professional development, lead teachers for PD and novice educator development and targeted recruitment. The district continues to contract with Teach for America (TFA) and recruit from Alternative Routes programs as well aggressively recruit minority and Spanish-speaking candidates.

Question E

E.1 This question should only be answered by LEAs with non-highly qualified teachers in core subject areas.

Title I, Part A Highly Qualified Requirements:

Title I, Part A requires 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 or a program supported with Title I funds.

Describe the process for developing individual highly qualified plans with your teachers and the responsibility of the teachers, including consequences for not following through with the plan. [Section 1119 (a)(1) and (3)]

The district continues to support non-HQ teachers in accessing and answering the DEEDS survey and Praxis II materials and testing. 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".

E.2

Title I, Part A Paraprofessional Requirements:

Title I, Part A requires that all instructional paraeducators in Title I schoolwide programs and in programs supported with Title I funds meet the highly qualified requirement by:

Holding an Associate's or higher degree,

Having at least two years of study at an institution of higher education, OR

Passing the ParaPro test.

NOTE: All non-highly qualified instructional paraeducators working in Title I schools must be reassigned to either a non-Title I school OR be reassigned as a service paraeducator until they become highly qualified.

How does the district/charter school ensure that it meets this federal requirement? Be specific in your response. [Section 1119 (c)(1) and (2) and (f)]

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

Section 3.8 elaborates on the needs assessment, goal setting, and professional development that is required for Title IIA funds. LEAs may list up to six (6) professional development priorities. Please ensure that ALL subsections are labeled and answered in each section.

Question A

A.1 Describe your needs-assessment process including listing the names, position, and school assignment of all those involved. Your team should include teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents.

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; DCAS 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; Red Clay Consolidated Administration: Director of Curriculum and Instruction (James Comegys); Supervisor of Special Education Services (Vicki Petrucci); Supervisors of Curriculum Content Areas (ELA – Dr. Gaysha Beard/Dominic Russo, Math – Jodi Albers, Social Studies – Rebecca Reed, Science – Edward McGrath); Supervisor of Library Media and the Arts - Dr. Judith Conway; Manager of Race To The Top (Dr. Ken Goodwin); Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs (Malik Stewart); Education Associate for Parent Involvement, Non-Publics and McKinney-Vento (Christine Miller), Education Associate for Perkins and Restructuring (Sharon Rookard); Instructional Cadre (ELA – Amy Kalafut; Math – Louis Mingione, Shirl Ellison, Eric Shane; Educational Technology: Karen Amman and Vicki Green); principals; parents and families and Community of Interested Persons (our Community-based PLC).

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 SchollaA.I. High
Amy HobbsMcKean
Holly SchnittingerMcKean
Ana ViscaraConrad
Jeanna EmerickBrandywine Springs
Joslyn MorrisCab Calloway

Gina TravaliniDickinson
Christine WallaceA.I. High
Julie LeasureConrad

Art Council

David Kelleher, Co-chairBrandywine Springs
Greg ThompsonA.I. High
Carolyn CzipothMote
Rich HanelCab Calloway
Toniann DegregoryCab Calloway
Colleen ZufeltH.B. du Pont
Cheryl WeischelShortlidge
Beth EgglestonMcKean
Megan CovertDickinson
Christina BartnikRichey

Mixed Councils Membership

Performing Arts Council

Pam Letts, Co-ChairH.B. du Pont
Sheila CassidyDickinson
Steven FackenthallRichardson Park
Sue PeoTraveling Music Teacher
Jessica PrinceStanton
Patrick HealyConrad
Maureen MurphyLinden Hill
Jennifer GreenMarbrook
Marty LassmanCab Calloway
Carlton CannonCab Calloway
Leslie GrantBrandywine Springs

Librarians

Janet Dean, Co-Chair Cabinet SeatConrad
Mary TiseCab Calloway
Suzanne SmithA.I. High
Susan WhiteA.I. Middle
Adrienne HopsonWarner
Joan MarchH.B. du Pont
Jennifer MinchiniNorth Star
Debbie MarinelliLinden Hill
Janette VickersLewis
Mary DorrellSkyline
Debbie SuppleeDickinson

Social Studies

BaltzJeffTwardus
BrandywineJillSzymanski
Forest OakKellyHurt
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 List the data sources that were analyzed during the needs-assessment process (e.g. DPAS II evaluations, DCAS, LEA and School Success Plans, etc.).

During the Needs Assessment process, the district reviews the following data:

These assessments include:

- Reading/English Language Arts: DCAS ELA; Scott Foresman assessments; STAR reading assessments; Benchmark assessments and item banks; DIBELS Next - foundational reading skills; testing oral reading fluency and comprehension.
- Early screening: ChildFind and Parent Checklists (proficiency in language and cognitive development before kindergarten).
- ELL Data: The WIDA ACCESS English language proficiency results (listening, speaking, reading and writing proficiency for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in grades K-12).
- Mathematics: DCAS Math; Math trailblazers Formative Assessment; Singapore Math; DreamBox Learning for K-3 Math to identify individualized math instructional needs;
- DPAS II Evaluations
- School Success Plans
- PLC and Building Leadership Team Data
- 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 and Retention rates
- Teacher, school and Student Perception Survey
- Youth Risk Behavior data

- McKinney Vento – Student displacement data
- CTE/Perkins data and industry information
- information from Community of Interested Persons Meetings and collaborations with Head Start, Children and Families First, Nemours, Parents As Teachers, and additional area child care agencies
- School Climate Survey
- Parent Involvement Surveys and Parent Forum evaluation documents
- Participation rates in programs (Extracurricular 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.

A.3 List the findings from the needs-assessment process described in A.1.

The results revealed the following:

The greatest performance challenges for Red Clay are overall reading proficiency (all grades, all subgroups), overall math proficiency (all grades, all subgroups), Special Education (math), and ELL (math). Through our needs analysis we identified our performance challenges based on the gap in reading performance on DIBELS and DCAS with a focus on early grades and targeted schools, achievement gaps among subgroups and their reference groups (especially with Special Education and ELL students), performance on DCAS overall, and in high-need schools. Similarly, there are significant gaps between African American, Hispanic, and Caucasian students in other key indicators including graduation rates, suspension rates, SAT scores, and AP scores. The root causes of our performance challenges are multi-faceted, and each one of the activities is integral to district's emphasis on increasing the quality of education provided to all of our learners. The district has identified the following factors as contributing to our performance challenges:

- A need to enhance systemic professional development for all educators. In order to deliver a consistent, research-based education to our students, our educators must be equipped with the tools and knowledge necessary to meet the learning needs of all types of learners. The district will implement a systemic professional development plan with training linked to specific skills and expectations. The effectiveness of the training will be regularly reviewed and the district will prioritize those offerings that prove to have the highest impact.
- Limited educational opportunities and services for our neediest learners. Due to resource constraints for the families of our neediest learners, Red Clay must enhance its programs for targeted populations on a large scale to improve academic achievement throughout Red Clay. Our reading data indicates a need to provide comprehensive PD related to: Students with Disabilities, ELLs/Diversity, literacy, educating students in poverty/experiencing homelessness (Red Clay has over 52% of its students receiving free and reduced price lunches), and interventions that align to CCCS and impact student growth. This also includes developing the capacity of our families and communities (through ongoing learning) to assist us in addressing our needs and meeting our academic and related goals.
- A need for rigorous advanced coursework and targeted support for secondary students. A major emphasis of the district's plan is college- and career-readiness for all students. This will require adult learning aligned with the CCCS, and with regard to career/industry readiness, STEM/IB programs, transitions between middle and high school levels, AP programs, and initiatives to ensure that all students to graduate high school with the skills necessary to succeed academically and professionally.
- A need for curriculum alignment and standards-based instruction. A focus on inclusionary practices will support our struggling learners, especially as rigorous instruction aligned to common core standards is implemented for all students. The district will focus on professional development to have instructional practices, supports, and academic structures align with the common core standards, along with a continual system to monitor instructional practices in the district and provide professional development in areas of need.

Question B

B.1 Describe how teachers and principals will be provided with professional development opportunities aligned to your needs assessment and related to student learning needs including, but not limited to, professional development opportunities aligned to rigorous national college-and-career ready standards.

Talent management (often described as human capital management) is the organizing principle for the district's approach to fulfilling this objective. To this end we develop training plans and professional development based on both teacher performance and student achievement. Because the effectiveness of staff (specifically, educators) accounts for the majority of school-driven improvements in student achievement, accurately defining criteria for effectiveness in collaboration with labor, assessing effectiveness, and using those assessments to drive personnel decisions is critical for school and district improvement. The strategies outlined here include developing and implementing several foundational elements of a good talent management system:

- Clear and rigorous definitions of educator effectiveness. Using DPAS II as an anchor, we've raised our expectations for what constitutes an effective teacher and an effective leader through publicized reports, personnel training, and collaboration with the state development coaches. Leader goals are aligned to the strategic plan outcomes and will hold all accountable.
- Accurate data about the effectiveness of the existing pool of educators. Red Clay audits its evaluation results annually to measure how well they correlate to student achievement results, and identify the conditions and services needed to improve student performance. Clear, specific, and easily understood goals are defined for all existing and new professional pathway programs. (Examples include improving retention of high-performing teachers, improving placement of effective teachers in high-need settings, and creating opportunities for effective teachers to assume more responsibilities while continuing to

teach). We also revisit our existing professional pathway/professional development programs and determine whether they are contributing to increased teacher and school leader effectiveness and modify as needed. Through systemic professional development we're able to provide needs-based professional development. Existing pathways include all leadership positions (e.g., department chairs, curriculum heads, teacher leaders). The district also targets professional development focused on coaching strategies for new teacher leaders and expanding leadership responsibilities for more seasoned teacher leaders.

- Specific, targeted deployment of personnel. The District School Support Team will be assigned to schools and use a walkthrough tool and school targets to measure improvement in performance and implementation of DPAS II. The District's leadership cohort is creating the next generation of school leaders, providing aspirants with a year-long opportunity to develop theoretical concepts and leadership skills while concurrently applying this knowledge in school settings. In addition:

- 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.

- 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.

- Present Social Studies Coalition professional development related to Common Core State Standards.

B.2 List and describe how the district allocates time for professional development. State the total average number of hours each teacher and principal is expected to participate in professional development and describe how it is structured (i.e. all teachers will participate in 90-minutes of collaborative planning each week and participate in at least one 60 minute all-staff training each month for a total of 7 hours per month of professional development time).

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

Question C

C.1

List your PRIORITY ONE professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

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.

Rationale and Citations: School improvement begins and ends with outstanding classroom teaching. Students must be challenged and inspired every day by master teachers and dedicated paraprofessionals who adapt instruction to the needs of each learner, so that all children reach their full potential—from struggling students in need of additional support to students performing at the most advanced levels in need of additional challenge. 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.

Participants: Building level instructional staff/ district support/cadre; CTE staff, IDEA/PBS/IST staff; Reading and Literacy staff; District Administrators

Funding sources: Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, IDEA, Curriculum/Professional Development; School Improvement (State/ Federal).

The

C.2 PRIORITY ONE: Check all that apply to this activity.

x	Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
x	Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
x	Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
x	Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education

X	Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
X	Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction
X	Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

Question D

D.1

PRIORITY ONE: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (from 99% to 100% by Spring 2014) 2) % of administrators who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (maintain 100% through June 2014)

D.2

PRIORITY ONE: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

- 1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.
- 2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

- 1) % of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase) by June 2014
- 2) Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 20 schools to 22 in 2013-2014) by June 2014
- 3) % children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 50.8% to 65%) by June 2014
- 4) Early childhood outcomes (10% increase over baseline) by June 2014
- 5) Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with their school's communication practices (maintaining 4.0 rating or better on a 5.0 scale) by July 2014
- 6) % reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (35% to 15%) by July 2014
- 7) Out of School Suspension rate decrease by 8% points (from 13.4% to 12%) by June 2014

Question E

E.1

List your PRIORITY TWO professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

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.

Rationale: When educators are organized communally, the difference can be tremendous for both educators and for students. 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.

For staff:

- reduction of isolation of teachers.
- increased commitment to the mission and goals of the school and increased vigor in working to strengthen the mission.
- shared responsibility for the total development of students and collective responsibility for students' success.
- powerful learning that defines good teaching and classroom practice and that creates new knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learners.
- increased meaning and understanding of the content that teachers teach and the roles they play in helping all students achieve expectations.
- higher likelihood that teachers will be well informed, professionally renewed, and inspired to inspire students.
- more satisfaction, higher morale, and lower rates of absenteeism.
- significant advances in adapting teaching to the students, accomplished more quickly than in traditional schools.
- commitment to making significant and lasting changes and higher likelihood of undertaking fundamental systemic change.

For students, the results include:

- decreased dropout rate and fewer classes "skipped".
- lower rates of absenteeism.
- increased learning that is distributed more equitably in the smaller high schools.
- greater academic gains in math, science, history, and reading than in traditional schools.
- smaller achievement gaps between students from different backgrounds.

Participants: 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

E.2 PRIORITY TWO: 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="radio"/> | Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning |
| <input type="radio"/> | Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction |
| <input type="radio"/> | Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills |

Question F

F.1

PRIORITY TWO: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective)
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

- | |
|--|
| 1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (from 99% to 100% by Spring 2014)
2) % of administrators who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (by June 2014, maintain 100%)
3) % of teacher self-reporting that they collaborate with colleagues on student data (from 86% to 90%)
4) % of teachers self-reporting that they use student data to identify and address student learning needs (92.4% to 95%) |
|--|

F.2

PRIORITY TWO: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

- 1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.
- 2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

- | |
|--|
| % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS (Formative: Winter and Summative: Spring from 77% to 90% by June 2014)
% of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase by June 2014)
Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 20 schools in 2010 to 22 in 2013-2014)
% children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 50.8% to 65%)
% meets standard on DCAS Reading (68% to 80% Spring 2014)
% meets standard on DCAS Mathematics (66% to 70% Spring 2014) |
|--|

Question G

G.1

List your PRIORITY THREE professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

Activity: Provide all K–3 teachers with critical, job-embedded professional development opportunities designed to improve instructional practice in the teaching of literacy. Goal 2 of District Strategic Plan

Rationale: Reading is fundamental. If a student cannot read by the end of third grade, his or her chances of graduating from high school are substantially diminished. Research indicates that excellent early instruction in reading, coupled with the provision of highly effective early intervention programs, can prevent reading failure. In order to ensure that every student succeeds in the later grades, it is imperative to ensure reading success from the start of our students' educational experience. The district is also providing Parent classes focused on Reading and student behavior supports from grades PK - 5 and for Administrator's, the Operations Dept. provides PD in literacy skills through the Leadership Academy. 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).

Participants: Building level K-3 teaching staff/teams and related support personnel (e.g. paraprofessionals).

Sources: Title I, Professional Development; Curriculum and Instruction

G.2 PRIORITY THREE: 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 checked="" 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

Question H

H.1

PRIORITY THREE: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

% of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (from 99% to 100% by Spring 2014)
--

H.2

PRIORITY THREE: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

- 1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.
- 2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

% of preschool students scoring average or higher on early childhood outcome measures (TOPEL Literacy; from 91% to maintaining 90% or better by Spring 2014) % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS (Kindergarten - 70% to 90% by Spring 2014) % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS (Grade 1 71% to 80% by Spring 2014) % point reduction in low-income-non low-income achievement gaps on DCAS (Reading - from 35% to a 12% gap by Spring 2014) % meets standard on DCAS Reading Grade 4(from 39% to 55% by Spring 2014)

Question I

I.1

List your PRIORITY FOUR professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

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.

Rationale: We believe that all children can learn. Our Strategic Plan demands high expectations of all students, and provides strong support systems designed to meet their unique learning needs. Goal 3 will help support our vision and mission by increasing achievement and improving outcomes for all students—particularly those identified as ELLs and SWDs, two of our largest populations with significant disparities in educational achievement and attainment. The district is also providing Parent classes focused on Reading and student behavior supports from grades PK - 5 and the Office of ELL and Curriculum will provide professional development for Administrators, schools and communities to support SWD and ELs. Citations: Dan Reschle; federal requirement per IDEA 2004; Dean, C., et. al. (2012). Classroom Instruction That Works; Barley, Z., Lauer, P. A., Arens, S. A., Aphrop, 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).

Participants: Building level instructional staff/ district support/cadre

Resources: IDEA B; Title II, Part A, Title III, Curriculum and Professional Development

I.2 PRIORITY FOUR: 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 checked="" 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

Question J

J.1

PRIORITY FOUR: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

% of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (from 99% to 100% by June 2014)
--

J.2

PRIORITY FOUR: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

- 1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.
- 2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

% reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (Math from 38 to 15% by June 2014) % reduction in Black-White achievement gaps on DCAS (Reading from 35% to 15% by June 2014) % reduction in ELL - non ELL achievement gaps on DCAS (Math from 39% - 50% by June 2014) % reduction in ELL - non ELL achievement gaps on DCAS (Reading 18% - 25% by June 2014) % reduction in Student with Disabilities - without achievement gaps on DCAS (Math from 57% to 25% by June 2014) % reduction in Student with Disabilities - without achievement gaps on DCAS (Reading from 57% to 25% by June 2014) Maintain favorable parent satisfaction with their school's communication practices (effectively communicates across class, language, and cultural difference (currently 4.3/ 5 pt scale - maintain a min. of 4.0 or greater)

Question K

K.1

List your PRIORITY FIVE professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

Activity: Differentiating Instruction - Educators, parents/guardians and students learning and working together to create a climate for learning (positive school climate; supportive learning environments).

Rationale: To support K-12 students developing the skills, knowledge and dispositions that provide the foundation for school success and the ability to love, work and become an engaged and effective citizen, research and best practices from character education, school reform, social-emotional learning, community schooling, pro-social education, risk-prevention and health/mental-health promotion, have indicated that educators, parents/guardians, students and community leaders need to focus on Instruction

that intentionally promotes students and their own social, emotional, ethical and civic capacities and dispositions and School wide improvement efforts that work together to create a climate for learning (positive school climate; supportive learning environments).

Citations: 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.

Participants: Administrators; Building level instructional staff; District support/cadre;McKinney Vento Coordinators

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, IDEA, School Improvement (State and Federal), tech refresh

K.2 PRIORITY FIVE: 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 checked="" 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

Question L

L.1

PRIORITY FIVE: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective)
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

1) % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (from 99% to 100% by Spring 2014) 2) % of administrators who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II (by June 2014, maintain 100%)
3) % of teacher self-reporting that they collaborate with colleagues on student data (from 86% to 90%)
4) % of teachers self-reporting that they use student data to identify and address student learning needs (92.4% to 95%)

L.2

PRIORITY FIVE: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

- 1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.
- 2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

% of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS (Formative: Winter and Summative: Spring from 77% to 90% by June 2014)
% of students meeting or exceeding the standard in DCAS tested subjects (15% increase by June 2014)
Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets (from 20 schools in 2010 to 22 in 2013-2014)
% children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside regular class 80%+ of day (from 50.8% to 65%)
% meets standard on DCAS Reading (68% to 80% Spring 2014)
% meets standard on DCAS Mathematics (66% to 70% Spring 2014)
Out-of-school suspension rate (All (from 13.4% to 12% by December 2014)
Out-of-school suspension rate (SWD (from 25.3% to 12% by December 2014)
Attendance rate (maintaining a min. of 93.7%)
% of targeted families accessing services in community schools (53% in 2013, a 15% min. increase in June 2014)

Question M

M.1

List your PRIORITY SIX professional development activity in alignment to the needs-assessment findings described in Sections A1-A3. Then, state the following:

- 1) Describe the activity.
- 2) Describe the rationale and research basis for the activity and why the activity is expected to improve student academic achievement.
- 3) State who will participate in this professional development by listing which teachers, descriptive group of teachers (e.g. Instructional Coaches, math teachers), paraprofessionals and/or principals will be chosen/designated to participate in this professional development activity.
- 4) List the source(s) of funds to support this activity.

--

M.2 PRIORITY SIX: Check all that apply to this activity.

<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to help teachers effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction
<input type="radio"/>	Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

Question N

N.1

PRIORITY SIX: List the specific educator outcomes, including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development. Describe how you will evaluate the outcome. If using DPAS II, for example, you could use the following:

- 1) Overall growth in DPAS II scores (i.e. ELA teacher performance on the DPAS II Summative Performance Rating will improve from 10% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 15% Highly Effective to 0% Needs Improvement, 75% Effective, and 25% Highly Effective)
 - 2) DPAS Components I-IV individually (i.e. Math teacher performance on DPAS II Component 3: Instruction will improve from 5% Basic and 95% Proficient to 35% Distinguished and 65% Proficient.
 - 3) OR a combination of DPAS components I-IV (Social Studies teacher performance on DPAS II Component 1: Planning and Preparation and Component 3: Instruction, on average, will improve from 10% Basic and 90% Proficient to 85% Distinguished and 15% Proficient.
- Note: Please reserve student growth as a measure of student academic achievement in part 2 below.

--

N.2

PRIORITY SIX: Provide a description of how the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement that includes the following:

1) A list of the specific student outcome(s), including quantifiable measures and targets, intended as a result of this professional development.

2) A description of how you will evaluate each outcome. (i.e. DCAS Math proficiency for all students will increase from x% to y% by June 2014. Evaluation: Formative: fall and winter DCAS data; Summative = spring DCAS data.

--

3.9 Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006

Eligible recipients must first satisfy the required activities for uses of Perkins funds before any expenditure of funds are permitted for permissive activities [Sec. 135(c)]. The Sec. 135(b) required activities (questions C.1 through F.3) do not need to be exclusively satisfied through the use of Perkins funds. Some required activities may be accomplished through existing, general fund supported programs and policies; some required activities may be accomplished through support from other federal, state or local funding sources; or some required activities may require the use of Perkins funds as the sole funding source.

Question A

A.1 Is the LEA participating in a consortium?

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

A.2 If the LEA is participating in a consortium, list the names of the LEAs in the consortium.

N/A

A.3

If the LEA is participating in a consortium, list the name of the LEA that will serve as the fiscal agent for the consortium.

Note: The fiscal agent must:

- 1) update its Success Plan to address the Perkins measures and targets for all LEAs in the consortium;
- 2) respond to all questions in this section of the grant on behalf of all LEAs in the consortium; and
- 3) complete the budget in this grant on behalf of all LEAs in the consortium.

--

Question B

B.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 Red Clay CTE 5 year plan is continuously shared with all stakeholders and ongoing updates and progress is reviewed at all meetings. Each CTE staff/program maintain a list of stakeholders which include representation from Business, Industry, Post secondary, Parents, Students, Building Administration and District Administration. During the course of the school year an open exchange of communication with this group is recorded, 4 of our 5 district Strategic Plan Goals drive the on going improvement of our CTE programs and our stakeholder balance this with their input. The focus is for continuously improve of our CTE Programs and Facilities as well as to allow our student to prepare for success as they enter the work force or post secondary education. We invite our stakeholders to two annual meetings one in the fall and one in the spring. The information gleaned from this process is reflected in the working 3 year plan of each of the CTE programs, which feed into this application process. Records of this process are filed in the office of CTE.

B.2 List dates of Perkins Advisory Committee meetings.

1st Meeting – October 5th, 2012, 2nd Meeting – February 15th, 2013 and Individual communication & interaction recorded by CTE staff and submitted to the Red Clay CTE office

Question C

C.1 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to strengthen the academic and career and technical skills of students participating in career and technical education programs, by strengthening the academic and career and technical education components of such programs through the integration of academics with career and technical education programs through a coherent sequence of courses, such as career and technical programs of study described in section 122(c)(1)(A), to ensure learning in:

(A) the core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965); and

(B) career and technical education subjects. [Section 135(b)(1)]

We have high expectations for all CTE programs, staff and students focusing on academic achievement and technical skill development. 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.

As part of our plan to improve and meet our Perkins targets we will work directly with staff, guidance and administration to have an understanding of the data and what is needed to help our students succeed and improve our data. The integration of the CTE content standards, academic content standards and business & industry standards establish a challenging and rigorous teaching and learning environment for student success. High expectations are set for all students and CTE is an integral part of our District's Strategic Plan (Goal #4 College and Career Readiness).

C.2 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to link career and technical education at the secondary level and career and technical education at the postsecondary level, including by offering the relevant elements of not less than 1 career and technical program of study described in section 122(c)(1)(A). [Section 135(b)(2)]

We will work directly with CTE staff, guidance, and administration to have an understanding of each of the pathways and develop a Program of Study for each. Our plan is to seek guidance from the DOE CTE Ed. Associates of each content area, TECH PREP, higher education, and provide professional develop and work sessions to complete. (BFM Program of Study for AIDHS)

C.3 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to provide students with strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of an industry, which may include work based learning experiences. [Section 135(b)(3)]

Our focus on improving all programs and facilities to commercial grade, state of the art industry standard facilities 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.

As per DE DOE direction after their Federal Audit we do NOT use Perkins funds for student travel – we do use Perkins funds for CTE staff traveling with CTE students.

Question D

D.1

Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to develop, improve, or expand the use of technology in career and technical education, which may include:

- (A) training of career and technical education teachers, faculty, and administrators to use technology, which may include distance learning;
- (B) providing career and technical education students with the academic and career and technical skills (including the mathematics and science knowledge that provides a strong basis for such skills) that lead to entry into the technology fields; or
- (C) encouraging schools to collaborate with technology industries to offer voluntary internships and mentoring programs, including programs that improve the mathematics and science knowledge of students. [Section 135(b)(4)]

Instructional 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 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. Our focus is to use industry standard technology appropriate to the specific content area.

D.2

Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to provide professional development programs that are consistent with section 122 to secondary teachers, faculty, administrators, and career guidance and academic counselors who are involved in integrated career and technical education programs, including:

- (A) training on—
 - (i) effective integration and use of challenging academic and career and technical education provided jointly with academic teachers to the extent practicable;
 - (ii) effective teaching skills based on research that includes promising practices;
 - (iii) effective practices to improve parental and community involvement; and
 - (iv) effective use of scientifically based research and data to improve instruction
- (B) support of education programs for teachers of career and technical education in public schools and other public school personnel who are involved in the direct delivery of educational services to career and technical education students, to ensure that such teachers and personnel stay current with all aspects of an industry;
- (C) internship programs that provide relevant business experience; and
- (D) programs designed to train teachers specifically in the effective use and application of technology to improve instruction. [Section 135(b)(5)]

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.

As part of our plan to improve and meet our Perkins target, based on the pathway completion, graduation rates, academic attainment targets, and the non-traditional participation data will help us prioritize the professional development.

CTE staff participates in ALL instructional teaching & learning professional development with the complete school staff and are held to the same high expectation of implementation as all other staff.

D.3 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to develop and implement evaluations of the career and technical education programs carried out with funds under this title. [Section 135(b)(6)]

We will continue to research and evaluate third party industry developed assessment as well as partnering with local higher education, business and 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, also having CTE as a district priority allows continual focus on the quality of our CTE.

Question E

E.1 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to initiate, improve, expand, and modernize quality career and technical education programs, including relevant technology. [Section 135(b)(7)]

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 plans of each school and the district's 5 year plan to improve the quality of CTE at all schools.

E.2 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to provide services and activities that are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective. [Section 135(b)(8)]

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.

E.3 Explain how Perkins 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. [Section 135(b)(9)]

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.

Question F

F.1 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to promote preparation for non-traditional fields. [Section 134(b)(10)]

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.

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.

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

F.2 Explain how Perkins or other funds will be used to provide career guidance and academic counseling to career and technical education students, including linkages to future education and training opportunities. [Section 134(b)(11)]

As part of our plan to improve and meet our targets; we will include and provide professional develop to our guidance staff and building administration. With an increased understanding of all aspects of CTE we enable our guidance staff to support the success of our students. As stated - Red Clay has placed CTE as integral part of Goal #4 of our Strategic Plan – “All students will graduate College and Career Ready.” We maintain an open enrollment policy to all CTE courses & pathways. Students are mentored in advisory programs, the SSP process and with our guidance staff support ALL students have equal opportunity to participate in our CTE programs. Our focus as a district on CTE allows us to continually evaluate the CTE programs to insure equal opportunity for all students. So we are encouraging ALL students to challenge themselves as well as taking academic courses that are appropriate for success in the specific CTE pathway the student has selected. Additional training/professional development will be provided specifically to our guidance staff to support students’ success and to meet the Perkins targets as well as the Program of Study work as we move forward.

F.3 Explain how federal, state and/or local funds are being directed to ensure that all required Perkins targets are met. Explain the specific strategies/activities to be implemented to meet each missed target.

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 coming out of 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. There will be training sessions for all Secondary Principals, all secondary guidance and all CTE staff will be conducted to ensure understanding of the Perkins targets and data collection process. Training sessions by schools to evaluate their data and develop goals for improving data will be held and a check system to monitor their success. We believe the improvements in our CTE facilities and the high expectations placed on our CTE programs by our Red Clay Strategic Plan will have an impact on helping meet these targets.

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

The questions in this section require the LEA to describe how it will serve limited English proficient children in accordance with the various requirements in Title III Public Law Sections 3115, 3116, 3122.

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 while providing academic instruction in English to support 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 and are also afforded specialized programs to fit their needs. For students whose primary language is Spanish, there is a bilingual program which includes a two-way dual language program. First, there is also a Structured English Immersion program at three (3) elementary campus, more details below. Second, for students whose primary language is not Spanish, the district offers an ESL pull-out program. There is also an ESL sheltered program that is offered at three (3) high schools for all students regardless of their home language. Third, 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; this approach is available in elementary, middle and high schools. Finally, 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)]

School staffs that work with ELLs. Administrators, teachers and instructional aides have the opportunity to participate in all district professional development opportunities. The ELL Office also offers specialized workshops on specific strategies to help ELLs in the classroom. There are workshops related to language acquisition and literacy, the WIDA standards and Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) and how to accommodate for ELLs. There is training for clerical staff on how to correctly and more effectively register students, and what to do if we encounter issues regarding ELLs. Presentations are available to all district principals about inclusion and ELLs in Red Clay to create a better awareness of what is required and how to align with the RC Strategic Plan. Goal 3. This year, schools were introduced to Project GLAD™, an instructional model with clear, practical strategies promoting positive, effective interactions among students and between teachers and students. The strategies and model promote English language acquisition, academic achievement, and cross-cultural skills.

Also, key to the RCCSD professional development program is the continuation 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. The list below includes the 2013-14 school year professional development that will be available regarding different aspects of ELL services and legal implications. The PD plan includes Administrators, teachers, coaches/specialist, district central level staff, secretaries, etc.

- ELL legal implications
- ELL Program
- ELL New Teacher Orientation
- ELL Program and Strategies
- SIOP
- ELL-Registration Secretary PD
- ELL DCAS Accommodations
- ELL data digging
- Classroom Instruction that Works with ELLs-Session I
- ELLs framework and best practices based on research- based
- ELL DCAS Accommodations
- Classroom Instruction that Works with ELLs-Session II
- WIDA-ACCESS assessment accountability for school principals
- SIOP (4 sessions)
- SIOP (2 sessions)
- Imagine Learning
- SIOP Compass
- ELL program

A.3 Describe the ESL program model (i.e., pull-out, push-in, sheltered English immersion, dual language, etc.) that is provided at each campus within the district, and the names of the certified ESL or certified bilingual teachers actively providing ELL services at each campus.

In Red Clay, all the ELL students receive quality instruction with high academic expectations to meet their needs. Below there are more details of the ELL instructional programs and the schools where the services are provided:

Two-Way Bilingual /Dual (W.C. Lewis Elementary)

English and Spanish-speaking students are provided integrated language and academic instruction with the goals of high academic achievement, first and second language proficiency, and cross-cultural understanding. Language learning is integrated with content instruction. Academic subjects are taught to all students through both English and the other language (Spanish). The program starts in Kindergarten and continues through the end of elementary school.

Structured English Immersion: (Mote, Baltz, Marbrook, Conrad, AIMS)

ELLs are taught subject matter in English by content licensed teachers who are also licensed in ESL or bilingual education. The teacher is proficient or has receptive skills in the students' home language(s) or first language of the student and uses sheltered instructional techniques. No ESL instruction is provided in this model. The goal is fluency in English, so that the ELLs are ready for the mainstream classrooms and achieve academic success. Most of the instruction is in English, however, the academic setting and the instruction are adjusted to the proficiency level of the students to make content comprehensible.

ESL – Sheltered Instruction (SI) (AIHS, McKean, Dickinson)

It is an approach for teaching language and content to English language learners, particularly as schools prepare students to achieve high academic standards. In SI, academic subjects (e.g. science, social studies) are taught using English as a medium of instruction. In SI, teachers use the core curriculum but modify it to meet the language development needs of ELLs. Specific strategies are used to teach a particular content area to make it comprehensible to students and that promote their English language development. SI uses many of the strategies found in high quality instruction for native English speakers, but it is characterized by careful attention to ELLs' distinctive second language development needs. The SI model integrates content area objectives and language development objectives, providing instruction that meets the unique needs of ELLs enrolled in grade-level content courses.

For non-Spanish-speaking students:

English as a second language – Pull Out (Kn – 8th)

For the language minority population that is very diverse and represents many different languages, our ESL pull-out can accommodate students from different language backgrounds in the same class (7 or less) , and teachers/mentors do not need to be proficient in the home language(s) of their students. In an ESL pull-out program students spend part of the school day in a mainstream classroom, but are pulled out for a portion of each day to receive instruction in English as a second language.

For Spanish-speaking students:

Two-Way Bilingual /Dual (W.C. Lewis Elementary)

Structured English Immersion: (Mote, Baltz, Marbrook, Conrad, AIMS)

ESL – Sheltered Instruction (SI) (AIHS, McKean, Dickinson)

For non-Spanish-speaking students:

English as a second language – Pull Out (Kn – 8th)

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 AMAO Improvement plan, based on the GW-CEEE review, targeting services for EL students and families, including:

- SLOP and ELL best practices for teachers and administrators at Stanton, A.I. H.S, A.I. M.S, Dickinson HS
 - SLOP PD (2 sessions) for Brandywine, Forest Oak, H.B, Linden Hill, North Star, Richardson Park, Richey, Shortlidge, Skyline,
 - Teacher Compass for administrators and teachers: Marbrook, Baltz, Lewis and Linden Hill
 - “What is different about teaching Reading to ELLs”: provided by the Center for Applied Linguistics. Participants: Literacy coaches from Marbrook, Lewis, Mote, Baltz, elementary and Secondary Literacy Supervisors.
 - SLOP for Mote (4 sessions) and for Baltz elementary (1 session)
 - ELL PD for administrators: Classroom Instruction that Works with ELLs
 - ELL PD for administrators (Legal)
 - Parent training sessions to support EL families and ensure access to content culturally and linguistically appropriate resources: Vision & Mission and ELL Program (Parent and Community Outreach from GWU-CEEE).
 - Provide translation and interpretation support for various school activities and meetings (\$50,000 local ELL funds \$20,000 Title III)
- More details about the above supplemental services can be found in the Red Clay 2013-2014 Improvement Plan submitted to DOE on 05/24/2013

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 submitted an Improvement Plan to the DOE on 05/24/2013. Red Clay CSD is awaiting input from DOE ELL Representative to proceed with implementation and recommendations.

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 Consortium, Inc. (MAEC) to create a welcoming environment for culturally and linguistically diverse families (e.g., training counselors, 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 This question should only be answered by LEA receiving Title III funds for Immigrant Students.

Describe how immigrant increase funds 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

LEAs must complete Sections 2.2 and 2.3 prior to completing this section. In addition, LEAs must ensure its goals, objectives and strategies have been updated in its Success Plan. LEAs must complete a budget for each program it is applying for in this application. Budgeted item descriptions must include the level of detail required for each type of account (see required details next to salaries, contractual, supplies and materials, etc.) in order for program managers to determine if the item is allowable, reasonable and necessary. LEAs must provide estimated calculations if exact figures are not available at the time of submission. If the LEA intends to take Indirect Costs for one or more federal programs, the LEA may reserve funds from each federal program up to the maximum allowable rate listed in Section 2.4 of this grant for all non-Capital Outlay items. LEAs must ensure that the budgets for each applicable program are zeroed out before submission.

Budgeted Item Detail

Federal Budget Summary

Account	Sub Account	Budgeted Item	IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	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)				\$102,988.46	\$25,747.12			\$128,735.58
		Hire 1 FTE Instructional Sp Ed Supervisor, to provide research-based best practices/PD to district (effective accomodations, modifications to curriculum and instructional strategies) to increase student. (K.B RCCSD-Baltz. .2 Title I, .2 Title II, .6 IDEA 6-21)	\$69,397.20			\$23,132.40	\$23,132.40			\$115,662.00
		Hire 1 FTE Elementary ELA Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .75 Title I, .25 Title II)G.B.				\$89,429.25	\$29,809.75			\$119,239.00
		Hire 1 FTE Math Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .6 Title I, .4 Title II) J.A.				\$74,191.49	\$49,461.00			\$123,652.49
		Hire 1 FTE Secondary ELA Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .40 Title I, .60 Title II)D.R.				\$46,264.80	\$69,397.20			\$115,662.00
		Hire 1 FTE Social Studies Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) R.R.				\$38,038.78	\$88,757.15			\$126,795.93
		Hire 1 FTE Science Supervisor (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .3 Title I, .7 Title II) E.M.				\$51,323.39	\$76,985.09			\$128,308.48

			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Salaries	Professional: Administration	Hire 1 FTE Secretary for Federal and Regulated Programs and School Improvement (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; .8 Title I, .2 Title II)M.S.				\$40,188.80	\$10,047.20			\$50,236.00
		Hire 1 FTE Student Data Auditor (RCCSD-BSS Admin; .5 Title I, .5 Title II) to provide support the school sites in the management of school site data related to the core content areas, Rtl and I tracker Pro by providing technical support, training, and data oversight to ensure compliance with state accountability expectations; serves as a communication bridge between the District and school sites				\$34,808.59	\$34,808.59			\$69,617.18
		Hire 1 FTE Education Associate for Parent Inv./McKinney- Vento/Private School Services(RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .8 Title I, .2 Title II) C.M.				\$87,787.23	\$21,946.81			\$109,734.04
		Hire .392 Restructuring Ed Associate for school reform to provide research -based best practices information and guidance to secodnary schools with regard to college and career readiness aligned with the core subject areas; targeting high need schools and populations; sustained PD with a focus on priority schools AIMS, Stanton MS, JDHS, Central; as well as TMHS, JDHS, CSS, CCSA and all middle schools; and provide support throughout the school year (S.R.).					\$42,633.83			\$42,633.83

Salaries			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
	Professional: Administration	Hire .58 FTE Career Tech Associate RCCSD- Baltz Admin (.33 Title I, .153 IDEA 6-21 - providing Career Pathway support to Central ILC and .125 Perkins-5% allowable for Admin cost (S.R. is responsible for the Perkins resources to support our goals, implementation and compliance of the these funds and the coordination with the state	\$16,640.13		\$9,717.47	\$35,890.72				\$62,248.32
		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)	\$115,662.00							\$115,662.00
		EPER for Lit Coaches/Reading Spec. to provide qtrly parent literacy nights in targeted Title I buildings (2 FTE x 2.5 hours x \$27/hr x 16 sessions: \$2160)				\$2,160.00				\$2,160.00
		Account Total	\$201,699.33		\$9,717.47	\$626,203.91	\$472,726.14			\$1,310,346.85
	Professional: Instruction	Hire 3 FTE Math Instructional Cadre (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; 2 @ .7 Title I, .3 Title II and 1 @ .4 Title I, .6 Title II) - PD Priority 2,3,4 and 5 (L.M.; S.E.; E.S.)				\$145,627.05	\$99,317.55			\$244,944.60
		Hire 1 FTE ELA Instructional Cadre (RCCSD- Baltz Admin; .4 Title I, .6 Title II) PD priority 2,3,4 and 5 (A.K.)				\$31,074.31	\$46,611.46			\$77,685.77
		Hire 1 FTE Science Instructional Cadre (RCCSD-Baltz Admin; .4 Title I, .6 Title II) PD priority 2,3,4, and 5 (K.M.)				\$35,264.08	\$52,896.11			\$88,160.19

Salaries	Professional: Instruction		IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Hire 26 FTE Title I teachers to support standards based instruction in content areas reading and math (3 @ Warner, 4 @ Lewis, 4 @ Baltz, 3 @ Richardson Park, 2 @ Marbrook, 2 @ Mote, 2 @ Shortlidge, 2 @ AIMS, 2 @ Stanton, 1 @ Highlands, 1 @ Richey) and 4 paraprofessional (1 @ each Highlands, Richardson Park, Mote, Shortlidge and Warner)				\$1,892,525.06				\$1,892,525.06
		Hire 1.5 FTE Childfind Coordinators (K.K & M.S .75 IDEA 6-21, .75 IDEA 3-5)	\$128,455.54							\$128,455.54
		Hire 1 FTE Early Childhood Special Educators (A.M. RCCSD)		\$52,156.00						\$52,156.00
		Hire 2 FTE Early Childhood Paraprofessionals(S.T, K.K)	\$67,258.00							\$67,258.00
		Hire 1 FTE Inclusion/PBS Coordinator (S.K. RCCSD- Baltz Admin) with a focus on students with special needs	\$78,793.00							\$78,793.00
		Hire 1 FTE Special Services Vocational Coordinator (C.S. RCCSD - Baltz Admin)	\$93,674.76							\$93,674.76
		Hire .5 FTE District Educational Diagnostician (A.O. RCCSD- Baltz Admin)	\$46,837.38							\$46,837.38
		Hire 1 FTE Extended School Year and Homebound Coordinator (B.G. RCCSD-Baltz Admin)	\$89,474.40							\$89,474.40
		Hire a 2 month data IEPPlus position for summer support (C.B. RCCSD- Baltz Admin (salary costs through July and August - est. \$590.55/day x 20 days)	\$11,811.00							\$11,811.00

Salaries			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
	Professional: Instruction	Hire 1 FTE Special Education Lead Teacher (T.A. Early Years)	\$78,863.34							\$78,863.34
		Hire 1 FTE Autism Liaison (D.G. RCCSD- Baltz Admin)	\$86,673.00							\$86,673.00
		Hire 1 FTE Early Childhood Special Education Teacher (L.L)	\$52,157.64							\$52,157.64
		Hire 6 FTE Behavior Specialist to conduct needs assessments and review current school climate data, develop and impl SW behavior programs, individual student BIPs, and classroom systems in collaboration with admin, plan and provide PD on: behavior interventions, classroom mgt, PBS and related topics, maintain case recs; track student progress; collect and monitor data on sw and indiv student behavior (working closely w/school psychologist).	\$365,574.87							\$365,574.87
		Title I PK: Hire 1 FTE Pre K Coordinator to support Title I PK (1 FTE x \$30,000/yr)				\$30,000.00				\$30,000.00
		Hire 1 IDEA Support Team Facilitator to support students with identified needs	\$77,413.92							\$77,413.92
		Account Total	\$1,176,986.85	\$52,156.00		\$2,134,490.50	\$198,825.12			\$3,562,458.47
	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	Professional Development activities-PD priorities 1,2,3,4 and 5 to improve teacher and leader knowledge regarding effective instructional practices that involve collaborative groups; Address different learning styles, particularly students with special needs and with limited English proficiency	\$45,000.00			\$20,000.00	\$14,403.64			\$79,403.64

Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Saturday Library: EPER for Librarians to facilitate Saturday literacy workshops(4 hrs/day at 2 sites for 5 days (1 day/month)				\$1,120.00				\$1,120.00
		Staff EPER for tutoring program for students who did not meet standard in reading or math. District will determine allocations by building need (est. \$27/ hr x 315 additional hours).				\$6,525.92				\$6,525.92
		EPER for staff to provide parent meetings/focus groups and training sessions to support strategic plan based on GWU recommendations (est. costs \$600/mo x 5 sessions: \$3000)						\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00
		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
		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 6-21 \$27/hr x 259.2 est. hours: \$7000)	\$7,000.00							\$7,000.00

Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		EPER for teachers to participate in problem solving meetings w/bldg admin on regular basis as a method for discussion about delivery system for consultative services to the schools with staff through BLT PD discussions; Maintain case records for the problem-solving process for referred students and track student progress; Grade Level contacts will mg/ facilitate problem - solving meetings-Analyze and interpret assessment data (est. cost \$27/hr x 10,000 hrs (w/OECS: \$300K max)	\$256,196.34							\$256,196.34
		AMAO Imp. plan: EPER costs Counselor project w/ MAEC for collaborative ways to increase understanding about ELL needs and support (40 FTE x 2hours x \$27/hr (no OEC) x 4 meetings (\$8,640 no OEC est. costs)						\$8,640.00		\$8,640.00
		AMAO Imp: SIOP PD sessions for Mote Elementary Staff (55 FTE x \$27/hr x 2 hrs x 4 sessions)						\$11,880.00		\$11,880.00
		AMAO Imp: SIOP PD sessions for Baltz Elementary Staff (50 FTE x \$27/hr x 2 hrs x 2 sessions: \$5,400)						\$5,400.00		\$5,400.00
		Title I PK: EPER for monthly pre K staff (\$27/hr x 2 hrs x 5 FTE x 10 months)				\$2,700.00				\$2,700.00
		Title I PK: EPER for monthly Pre K teacher assistants meetings (\$15/hr x 2 hrs x 14 staff x 10 months)				\$4,200.00				\$4,200.00
		Title I PK: EPER for Literacy Coaches to attend Pre K meetings (\$27/hr x 3 hrs x 2 staff x 4 meetings)				\$648.00				\$648.00

Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Title I PK: EPER for Pre K transition team planning meetings (\$27 x 2hrs x 10 FTE x 9 sessions):				\$4,860.00				\$4,860.00
		Title I PK: EPER for FTE to facilitate PK to KN transition parent meetings (2FTE x \$27/hr x 3 hrs x 12 sessions)				\$1,944.00				\$1,944.00
		EPER for Teachers to teach ESL classes to support families in being engaged in American school syst (2 FTE x \$27/hr x 3.5hrs x 32 sessions: \$6048)				\$6,048.00				\$6,048.00
		EPER for Teachers to provide child care costs for Parent University Forums (2 FTE x \$27/hr x 1.5hrs x 32 sessions): \$2592				\$2,592.00				\$2,592.00
		EPER for professional development to support collaborative and inclusive teaching	\$23,460.13							\$23,460.13
		Title I PreK: Provide EPER support for Title I PreK schools to aid literacy, extended day and transitions to KDG(est. monthly costs: 10 months x \$2,111.55/mo:\$21,115.51)				\$21,115.51				\$21,115.51
		Professional Development activities-PD priorities 1,2,3,4 and 5 to improve teacher and leader knowledge regarding effective early education/achievement gap instructional practices that involve collaborative groups; Address different learning styles, particularly students with special needs and with limited English proficiency (est. 112-217 hrs x EPER rate for TAs)					\$3,045.26			\$3,045.26
		Account Total	\$446,656.47			\$71,753.43	\$17,448.90	\$28,920.00		\$564,778.80

			IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Salaries	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00
	Support Staff		\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	\$892,837.31	\$35,120.29	\$3,934.99	\$1,455,846.27	\$330,075.40	\$8,803.26		\$2,726,617.52
		Account Total	\$892,837.31	\$35,120.29	\$3,934.99	\$1,455,846.27	\$330,075.40	\$8,803.26		\$2,726,617.52
	Classification Total		\$2,718,179.96	\$87,276.29	\$13,652.46	\$4,288,294.11	\$1,019,075.56	\$37,723.26	\$0.00	\$8,164,201.64
Audit Fees	Audit Fees	Audit Fee for federal grant	\$4,181.30		\$404.92	\$5,242.82	\$1,179.75			\$11,008.79
		Account Total	\$4,181.30		\$404.92	\$5,242.82	\$1,179.75			\$11,008.79
	Classification Total		\$4,181.30		\$404.92	\$5,242.82	\$1,179.75			\$11,008.79
Indirect Costs	Indirect Costs	Indirect Costs	\$133,669.18	\$3,336.38	\$4,977.02	\$167,604.16	\$37,714.63	\$4,560.45	\$46.27	\$351,908.09
		Account Total	\$133,669.18	\$3,336.38	\$4,977.02	\$167,604.16	\$37,714.63	\$4,560.45	\$46.27	\$351,908.09
	Classification Total		\$133,669.18	\$3,336.38	\$4,977.02	\$167,604.16	\$37,714.63	\$4,560.45	\$46.27	\$351,908.09
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Set aside funds to support the needs of students experiencing transitions (McKinney-Vento support)				\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00

			IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Purchase CTE resources, supplies/materials specific to the major and minor CTE upgrade and enhancement being worked on during this school year(continued enhancement and upgrade of our Engineering and Digital Imaging & Media pathways at all appropriate high schools, JDHS & TMHS – continue enhancing the engineering pathways – Tech Ed; TMHS – phase 2 of implementing Culinary Pathway – FCS, phase 2 of implementing the Communication Center – Tech Ed (est. \$45,930.33)			\$46,335.25					\$46,335.25
		Provide materials to support Perkins Advisory Council meetings to support 1S, 2S1,6S1, 6S2, 5S1 (\$4500 x 2 district wide mtgs, \$1000 x 1 Program of study mtg per year)			\$10,000.00					\$10,000.00
		Provide materials for district parent engagement activities (5% of 1% set aside)				\$2,464.54				\$2,464.54
		Identify and purchase supplemental interventions for academically at risk students attending Title I schools (est. costs \$1000/non-priority/focus Title I school site: \$5000)				\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
		Instructional materials for after school programming for students who did not meet standard. (\$500/school @ 11 schools: \$5500)				\$5,500.00				\$5,500.00
		AMAO Imp: ELD curriculum pilot - to support ELD curriculum for ELs (\$1500/building x 10 sites: \$15,000)						\$15,000.00		\$15,000.00

			IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	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 services protocols will be determined based on individual needs and based on previous years expenditures we estimate \$10,000 minimum(2400 students x est. \$4-\$4.25/pupil estimate)	\$10,000.00	\$7,507.33						\$17,507.33
		AMAO Imp. - Purchase materials to support ELs parent sessions/workshops/focus group sessions to align with GWU recommendations/strategic plan (\$500-533/session x 5 sessions: est. costs of \$2,664.29 in FY 14)						\$2,664.29		\$2,664.29
		Set aside funds for local school parent engagement activities (95% of 1% set aside after the non public equitable share is reserved)				\$45,499.18				\$45,499.18
		Provide materials for district parent engagement activities related to Red Clay PAC(\$250 per month x 8 months)				\$2,000.00				\$2,000.00
		Title I PK: Purchase supplies and materials for Pre K after school program (est. costs: \$2,000/site x 3: \$6,000)				\$6,000.00				\$6,000.00
		Title I PK: Supplies and Materials for Pre K transition team meetings (\$100/month x 9 months)				\$900.00				\$900.00

			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Title I PK: Supplies and materials for PK to KN transition parent meetings (\$200/session x 12 sessions)				\$2,400.00				\$2,400.00
		Supplies for family ESL classes (Binders (est. \$7x100: \$700); highlighters (est. \$5/pkg x 5: \$10); pens (est. \$10/pkg x10: \$100); pencils (est. \$5/pkg x20: \$100); chart paper (est. \$8 x 5: \$40); markers (est. \$15); Parent's homework dictionary – English est. \$3482.00 total)				\$3,482.00				\$3,482.00
		Supplies and materials for quarterly parent literacy nights help at high needs schools (\$250/session x 16 sessions: est. \$4,000)				\$4,000.00				\$4,000.00
		Title I PK: Purchase administrative supplies and subscriptions (NAEYC, Early Childhood Research Quarterly, Monitoring binders) for the Title I PK Program - Supervision				\$1,275.61				\$1,275.61
		Title I PK: Purchases instructional technology supplies and materials for Pre K program (est. costs \$10,000/site w/ S&H x 3 sites: \$30,372.07)				\$30,372.07				\$30,372.07
		Materials to provide Parent Engagement for private schools per equitable share amounts (1 year not to exceed \$4,528.12)				\$4,528.12				\$4,528.12
		Account Total	\$24,595.81	\$7,507.33	\$56,335.25	\$118,421.52		\$17,664.29		\$224,524.20
	Professional: Administration	Purchase administrative supplies and subscriptions (Title I Newsletter, Ed Week, etc) for the Federal and Regulated Programs Office				\$356.87				\$356.87

Supplies and Materials	Professional: Administration	Identification and acquisition of bilingual curricular materials, bilingual educational software and technologies to be used in Family literacy, parent outreach liaison and activities for immigrant families (est. costs \$360.00)	IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
									\$313.73	\$313.73
		Account Total				\$356.87			\$313.73	\$670.60
		Classification Total	\$24,595.81	\$7,507.33	\$56,335.25	\$118,778.39		\$17,664.29	\$313.73	\$225,194.80
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	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 - est. \$15,000 max)			\$15,000.00					\$15,000.00
		Set aside Perkins funds for substitute (from approved Sub agency) to provide coverage (\$105/day 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 Perkins improvement plan and Program of Study			\$21,000.00					\$21,000.00
		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
		Contract for Assistive Technology support with Therapy Services of DE., Inc.	\$106,706.25							\$106,706.25

Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Title I PK: Contract with Parents As Teachers NCC to support Title I Schoolwide programs and communities with the kindergarten transition for successful school careers, and strengthen schools', families', and students' learning by decreasing environmental barriers.				\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		Saturday Library: Contract with DE Museum of Natural History Science Outreach (\$150/day for 5 days at 2 regional sites)				\$1,500.00				\$1,500.00
		Contract for extended day buses to promote after school programs (165/bus, 2 buses per site @ 4 sites 2 days wk for 20 wks)				\$52,800.00				\$52,800.00
		Provide literacy mentoring support to students placed at-risk to improve academic performance in targeted schools (1 Mentoring Support @ 3 sites x \$7500)				\$22,500.00				\$22,500.00
		Contract with vendor to provide after school supports to ELs (est. costs \$1,000/mo x 10 months: \$10,000)						\$10,000.00		\$10,000.00
		Contract with Vendor to provide supplemental translation services (est. costs \$2500/mo x 10 months: \$25,000)						\$25,000.00		\$25,000.00
		AMAO Imp Support: Contract with vendor to provide ELL Co teaching model (CAL/SIOP - for 3 presentations and materials est. cost \$10,420)						\$10,420.00		\$10,420.00

Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		AMAO Imp: Contract w/ Imagine Learning to provide site licenses and PD to supplement curriculum for ELs 100 licenses for 6 schools x \$3500 = \$21,000; full implementation/PD sites: \$21,000: total \$36,000 \$36,000						\$36,000.00		\$36,000.00
		AMAO Imp: Contract for Teacher Compass walkthrough tool to support EL classes (140 licenses x 80 seats=\$11,200)						\$11,200.00		\$11,200.00
		Contract for translation/interpreter services(based on approved bid for services)	\$200,000.00							\$200,000.00
		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 (\$603,695 - the successful bid)	\$603,695.00							\$603,695.00
		Contract for OT/PT/AT/SLP for Parentally Place Private School Students (base upond 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)	\$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	\$41,061.50							\$41,061.50

Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction		IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Registration for 5 FTE to San Diego, CA to attend the NABE annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the AMAO improvement plan (5 FTE x \$395 Registration fees (\$1975 total)						\$1,975.00		\$1,975.00
		Registration for 5 FTE to Milwaukee, WI to attend the WIDA annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the AMAO improvement plan (5 FTE x \$495 Registration fees (\$2475 total)						\$2,475.00		\$2,475.00
		Registration for 5 FTE to Milwaukee, WI to attend the WIDA pre-conference visits during the annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the AMAO improvement plan (5 FTE x \$125 Registration fees (\$625 total)						\$625.00		\$625.00
		AMAO Imp: Registration for 10 Literacy coaches to attend the CAL training to support literacy for ELs provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the AMAO improvement plan (5 FTE x \$1080 Registration fees (\$10,800 total)						\$10,800.00		\$10,800.00
		AMAO Imp: Contract w/ Dr. Stephen Krashen for research-based methods for effective second language acquisition w/ administrators (2013-2014 contract for services \$4,000 (incl. travel and fees)						\$4,000.00		\$4,000.00

Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		AMAO Imp. ELL PD for administrators: Classroom Instruction that Works with ELLs (est. costs \$2,500/session x 4 sessions: \$10,000)						\$10,000.00		\$10,000.00
		AMAO Imp. - ELL PD for administrators (Legal) 1 session for administrators during 2013-2014 @ \$4500/session						\$4,500.00		\$4,500.00
		AMAO Imp. - Contract for Consultant for AMAO Imp. strategic plan impl based on GWU report and DEDOE approval of plan (2013-2014 sy - est. \$20,000)						\$20,000.00		\$20,000.00
		Contract with a partner to provide research based community school services based on the Children's Aid Society model				\$45,500.00				\$45,500.00
		Title I PK: Contracts for extended day enrichment to provide activities that align with the day and goals (est. costs \$1,000 max x 10 services: \$10,000)				\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		Contact with vendor to provide Title I targeted services to private school students who would've attended RCCSD Title I schools (1 yr @ \$83,407.40)				\$83,407.40				\$83,407.40
		Set aside Title II funds for non-profit private schools allocation for professional development					\$22,183.06			\$22,183.06
		AMAO Imp. - Communications support for topics specific to the parents/families of ELs (\$200/session x 5 sessions: \$1,000)						\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
		Contract to provide professional development for private schools per equitable share amounts (1 year not to exceed \$10,127.38)				\$10,127.38				\$10,127.38

Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract to provide administrative costs for private schools per equitable share amounts (1 year not to exceed \$2,801.42)	IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
						\$2,801.42				\$2,801.42
		Account Total	\$1,036,462.75		\$56,000.00	\$238,636.20	\$22,183.06	\$147,995.00		\$1,501,277.01
	Professional: Administration	Create contract for Tech Support with PCSI; 1 yr @ \$30,000 Title I, \$20,000 Title II(PD priorities 2 and 5); the 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				\$30,000.00	\$20,000.00			\$50,000.00
		AMAO Imp. - Communications support for topics specific to the parents/families of ELs at Title I schools (\$220/session x 5 sessions: (\$550 from Title I)				\$550.00				\$550.00
		Agreement/MOU with Wesley College for Parent Education Certificate w/Title I buildings (\$500/course (4 sessions/course) x 4 courses for the certificate: \$2000/location - 2 locations (city/county): \$4000 total)				\$4,000.00				\$4,000.00
		Contract for Family and Community Engagement Coach to support targeted schools (est. costs 1 FTE x \$24,000)				\$24,000.00				\$24,000.00
		Translation costs for parent involvement activities (est. costs for the year: \$5000/yr)				\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00

Contracted Services	Professional: Administration		IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
		Refreshment costs w/ RCCSD Nutrition Svcs for quarterly parent literacy nights help at high needs schools (\$200/session x 16 sessions: est. \$3,200)				\$3,200.00				\$3,200.00
		Registration for 3 FTE staff to San Diego, CA to go to National 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 (2 FTE x Registration fees (\$549): \$1,647 total)				\$1,647.00				\$1,647.00
		Registration 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
		Contract for family ESL classes to support families in being engaged in American school syst (\$27 x 3.5hrs x 32 sessions: \$3024)				\$3,024.00				\$3,024.00
		Refreshment costs for Parent University Strands sessions (16 monthly sessions x \$300/session): \$4,800				\$4,800.00				\$4,800.00

			IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Title I PreK: Registration 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 (2 FTE x Registration fees (2 x \$330): \$660 total)				\$660.00				\$660.00
		Contract to provide Family literacy, parent outreach liaison and activities, designed to assist parents in adjusting to and understanding the American culture and school system to become active participants in the education of their children (\$100/session x 10 sessions: \$2000).							\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
		Account Total				\$77,276.00	\$20,000.00		\$2,000.00	\$99,276.00
	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00
	Classification Total		\$1,036,462.75	\$0.00	\$56,000.00	\$315,912.20	\$42,183.06	\$147,995.00	\$2,000.00	\$1,600,553.01
Travel	Professional: Instruction	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

			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Travel	Professional: Instruction	Travel for 4 staff to New Orleans, LA 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 flight (\$450); 3 days @ hotel (\$450); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$38.00): \$4,720 total)				\$4,720.00				\$4,720.00
		Mileage for Homebound Instruction(based on est. travel costs to support students with special needs (\$0.40/mile max 6250 miles)	\$2,500.00							\$2,500.00
		AMAO Imp - Travel for 5 FTE to San Diego, CA to attend the NABE annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the RCCSD improvement plan: 5 FTE x flight (\$330); 4 days @ hotel (\$860); parking (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$80): \$6048 total)						\$6,048.00		\$6,048.00
		AMAO Imp: CAL What's Different About Teaching Reading to Students Learning English for Lit. coaches support to ELs (10 FTE @ 3 days x \$150 hotel (\$450); Travel (\$200); Meals (\$192); pkg (\$50); shuttle (\$80) total = \$9,720).						\$9,720.00		\$9,720.00
		Account Total	\$2,500.00		\$15,000.00	\$4,720.00		\$15,768.00		\$37,988.00

			IDEA 611 (6-21)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Travel	Professional: Administration	Travel for 3 staff to San Diego, CA 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 (\$330); 4 days @ hotel (\$860); shuttle (\$100); meals (\$184); shuttle (\$80): \$4,662 total)				\$4,662.00				\$4,662.00
		Travel for instructional cadre and Office of Federal and Regulated Programs to RCCSD schools to provide ongoing support and effective professional development related to the common core areas and student supports related to achievement (.40/mile x 25,000 miles (Title I) and .40/mile x 50,000 (Title II)				\$11,494.32	\$9,000.00			\$20,494.32
		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); pkg (\$48); meals (\$192); cab (\$40) (\$1,148 total)				\$1,148.00				\$1,148.00

			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Travel	Professional: Administration	Title I PK: Travel for 3 staff to Atlanta, GA to attend Beyond School Hours Conference to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement related to extended day programs and 21st CCLC: 3 FTE x flight (\$410); 3 days @ hotel (\$735); pkg (\$50); meals (\$240); shuttle (\$55): \$4,470 total)				\$4,470.00				\$4,470.00
		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 28,750 miles)	\$11,500.00							\$11,500.00
		Registration for 5 FTE to Milwaukee, WI to attend the WIDA annual conference and provide ongoing support locally in targeted schools and support the AMAO improvement plan (5 FTE x flight (\$300); 3 days @ hotel (\$567); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192): \$8872 total)						\$8,872.00		\$8,872.00
		Title I PreK: Travel for 2 FTE staff to Washington, DC to attend NAEYC conference and provide ongoing support related to Title I preschool programs to advance strategic plan goals (2 FTE x train (\$136) @ 3 days x hotel (\$1344); pkg (\$48); meals (\$192); cab (\$40) (\$1760 total)				\$1,760.00				\$1,760.00
		Title I PreK: Travel to RCCSD Title I PK sites and to area PK, DEDOE mtgs, Wilm. & NCC Head Start to provide ongoing support related to Title I preschool programs to advance strategic plan goals (est. costs .40/mile x 12,500: \$5000)				\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00

			IDEA 611 (6 -21)	IDEA 619 (3 -5)	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant	Total
Travel	Professional: Administration	Account Total	\$11,500.00			\$28,534.32	\$9,000.00	\$8,872.00		\$57,906.32
		Classification Total	\$14,000.00		\$15,000.00	\$33,254.32	\$9,000.00	\$24,640.00		\$95,894.32
Capital Outlay	Capital Outlay	Upgrade, enhancement and innovation of CTE programs/facilities to bring our facilities to education, business and industry standards			\$234,318.35					\$234,318.35
		Account Total			\$234,318.35					\$234,318.35
	Maintenance of Plant		\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$234,318.35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$234,318.35
			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$234,318.35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$234,318.35
Federal			\$3,931,089.00	\$98,120.00	\$380,688.00	\$4,929,086.00	\$1,109,153.00	\$232,583.00	\$2,360.00	\$10,683,079.00
* - Allow Indirect Cost Total										

State Budget Summary

Account	Sub Account	Budgeted Item	Professional Development	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Purchase training materials for Praxis preparation- HQ/HE teachers (PD Priority 1: \$1000 for booklets and ETS resources, etc)	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
		Reimburse PRAXIS registration fees for teachers who qualify as HQT (PD Priority 1 est.costs \$150 x 10 teachers)	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
		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 recieve professional development related to PD priorities 2, 3, 4, and 5	\$30,000.01	\$30,000.01
		Account Total	\$30,000.01	\$30,000.01
	Professional: Administration	Registration for 4 FTE staff to New Orleans, LA to attend National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (NCSM) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement locally (4 FTE x Registration fees (\$210): \$840 total)	\$840.00	\$840.00
		Registration for 4 staff to Los Angeles, CA 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)	\$1,036.00	\$1,036.00
		Account Total	\$1,876.00	\$1,876.00

			Professional Development	Total
Contracted Services	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$31,876.01	\$31,876.01
Salaries	Professional: Instruction	Provide EPER for Professional Development Workshops for staff related to PD priorities 2,3,4,5	\$80,860.93	\$80,860.93
		Pay EPER for instructional technology workshops related to PD priorities 2, 3, 4, 5	\$33,243.64	\$33,243.64
		Account Total	\$114,104.57	\$114,104.57
	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Support Staff		\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	\$34,733.42	\$34,733.42
		Account Total	\$34,733.42	\$34,733.42
	Classification Total		\$148,837.99	\$148,837.99
Travel	Professional: Administration	Travel for 4 staff to New Orleans, LA to attend National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (NCSM) to gain professional learning opportunities necessary to support and sustain improved student achievement locally 4 FTE x flight (\$450); 3 days @ hotel (\$450); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$38.00): \$4,720 total)	\$4,720.00	\$4,720.00

			Professiona l Developme nt	Total
Travel	Professional: Administration	Travel for 4 staff to Los Angeles, CA 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 (\$600); 3 days @ hotel (\$675); pkg (\$50); meals (\$192); shuttle (\$55): \$6,288 total)	\$6,288.00	\$6,288.00
		Account Total	\$11,008.00	\$11,008.00
		Classification Total	\$11,008.00	\$11,008.00
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant		\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
		State Total	\$194,222.00	\$194,222.00

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	\$602.48	\$140.90	\$2,042.61	\$155.48	\$16.52	\$977.00	\$3,934.99
Curriculum and Professional Development	\$7,074.49	\$1,654.51	\$23,984.78	\$1,825.67	\$193.97	\$0.00	\$34,733.42
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 611 (6-21)	\$113,171.25	\$26,467.48	\$383,687.01	\$29,205.48	\$3,103.09	\$337,203.00	\$892,837.31
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 619 (3-5)	\$3,233.67	\$756.26	\$10,963.19	\$834.50	\$88.67	\$19,244.00	\$35,120.29
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	\$175,611.77	\$41,070.49	\$595,380.54	\$45,319.17	\$4,815.16	\$593,649.14	\$1,455,846.27
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	\$42,718.02	\$9,990.48	\$144,827.84	\$11,024.01	\$1,171.31	\$120,343.74	\$330,075.40
Title III - Immigrant Students	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL	\$1,793.04	\$419.34	\$6,078.99	\$462.72	\$49.17	\$0.00	\$8,803.26
Totals	\$344,204.72	\$80,499.46	\$1,166,964.96	\$88,827.03	\$9,437.89	\$1,071,416.88	\$2,761,350.94



**STATE OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

BUDGET SUMMARY

LEA: Red Clay Consolidated
School District

LEA Code: 32

State: Beginning Date: 7/1/2013

End Date: 6/30/2014

Federal: Beginning date: 7/12/2013

Obligation date: 8/1/2015

Liquidation Date: 11/1/2015

			Account Code								Total
			5100	5120	5400	5500		5560	5600	5700	
			Salaries	OECs	Travel	Contracted Services	Audit Fees	Indirect Costs	Supplies and Materials	Capital Outlay	
ApprNo	Activity	Type									
40564	IDEA 611 (6-21)	Federal	\$1,825,342.65	\$892,837.31	\$14,000.00	\$1,036,462.75	\$4,181.30	\$133,669.18	\$24,595.81		\$3,931,089.00
40565	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Federal	\$52,156.00	\$35,120.29				\$3,336.38	\$7,507.33		\$98,120.00
41015	Perkins_ADM	Federal	\$9,717.47	\$3,934.99			\$404.92	\$4,977.02			\$19,034.40
	Perkins_INS	Federal			\$15,000.00	\$56,000.00			\$56,335.25	\$234,318.35	\$361,653.60
05205	Professional Development	State	\$114,104.57	\$34,733.42	\$11,008.00	\$31,876.01			\$2,500.00		\$194,222.00
40554	Title I *	Federal	\$2,832,447.84	\$1,455,846.27	\$33,254.32	\$315,912.20	\$5,242.82	\$167,604.16	\$118,778.39		\$4,929,086.00
40114	Title II (Part A)	Federal	\$689,000.16	\$330,075.40	\$9,000.00	\$42,183.06	\$1,179.75	\$37,714.63			\$1,109,153.00
40560	Title III - ELL	Federal	\$28,920.00	\$8,803.26	\$24,640.00	\$147,995.00		\$4,560.45	\$17,664.29		\$232,583.00
	Title III - Immigrant	Federal				\$2,000.00		\$46.27	\$313.73		\$2,360.00
Total			\$5,551,688.69	\$2,761,350.94	\$106,902.32	\$1,632,429.02	\$11,008.79	\$351,908.09	\$227,694.80	\$234,318.35	\$10,877,301.00

* Please note that Title I has a separate Budget Summary that should be used for tracking funds in FSF.

Distribution of funds chart: LEA Wide, LEA Grant Application - 2014

Federal Funding	IDEA 611 (6-21)	Perkins	Professional Development	Title I	Title II (Part A)	IDEA 619 (3-5)	Title III - ELL	Title III - Immigrant
Administration Cost	312454.92	14057.38	12884.00	1023318.06	712781.46			
CEIS	41061.50							
Homeless				5000.00				
Instruction	2347176.97	331653.60	2500.00	217412.10	18788.12	94783.62	85284.29	
Parent Involvement	200000.00			131187.23			29913.20	2313.73
PPPS	80000.00							
Professional Development	137427.87	30000.00	178838.00	349717.84	317685.73		94511.28	
Indirect Costs	133669.18	4977.02		167604.16	37714.63	3336.38	4560.45	46.27
Total LEA-wide Funding	3251790.44	380688.00	194222.00	1894239.39	1086969.94	98120.00	214269.22	2360.00
Total Allocation	3931089.00	380688.00	194222.00	4929086.00	1109153.00	98120.00	232583.00	2360.00
Percent of Allocation	0.83	1.00	1.00	0.38	0.98	1.00	0.92	1.00

Distribution of School-level funds; LEA Grant Application - 2014

Source of funds - Description	Title I			IDEA 611 (6-21)		Title III - ELL	Title II (Part A)
	Instruction	Parent Involvement	Professional Development	CEIS	Instruction	Professional Development	Instruction
Highlands Elem	167580.00	3686.49					
Lewis Dual Language Elem	321263.99	4117.92					
Shortlidge Elem	221160.00	3955.81					
Baltz Elem	404295.99	4631.18		39703.97		7043.76	
Richardson Park Elem	297984.00	4135.30		39703.97			
Marbrook Elem	263340.00	3935.48					
Richey Elem	104843.13	3182.60					
Mote Elem	294120.00	4986.68				11270.02	
Warner Elem	384896.00	4709.37		80944.44			
A I duPont Middle	176440.00	3892.05			115978.71		
H B duPont Middle				114119.04			
Stanton Middle	252560.00	4266.30		86943.03			
Dickinson High				120960.98			
McKean High				80944.42			
Private Schools	86208.82	4528.12	10127.38				22183.06
Total School Funding	2974691.93	50027.30	10127.38	563319.85	115978.71	18313.78	22183.06
Total Program Allocation	4929086.00	4929086.00	4929086.00	3931089.00	3931089.00	232583.00	1109153.00
Percent of Allocation	0.60	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.03	0.08	0.02

5.1 Maintenance of Effort

LEAs must click “Get Default Values” to automatically populate the fields in the tables below. The information below is pulled from the Annual Financial Statements for the preceding two fiscal years. Refer to Section 14501 of ESEA, 20 U.S.C. §8891 and OMB Circular A-87 for more information on how Maintenance of Effort is calculated. The LEA should address any discrepancies or request adjustments to the data in Section 5.3 of this application.

Instruction	FY2012		FY2011	
Total Expenditures (line 1999)	\$221,942,790.00		\$205,839,374.00	
Less:				
Instate Tuition (line 0152)	\$11,783,341.00		\$11,794,922.00	
Capital Outlay (line 0170, 0270, 0370, 0470, 0570, 0670, 0770, 0870, 0970)	\$635,045.00		\$105,831.00	
Community Services (line 1299)	\$0.00		\$0.00	
Adult Education (line 1399)	\$689,162.00		\$886,439.00	
Facilities Acquisition (line 1499)	\$101,769.00		\$7,558,592.00	
Debt Service (line 1599)	\$7,447,100.00	\$20,656,417.00	\$7,649,470.00	\$27,995,254.00
Subtotal	\$201,286,373.00		\$177,844,120.00	
Less:				
Federal Expenditures (line 3999 less Adult Basic Ed)	\$22,492,192.00		\$22,963,055.00	
Subtotal	\$178,794,181.00		\$154,881,065.00	
Divided By:				
September 30 Enrollment	16103		15954	
Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2006	\$11,103.16		\$9,707.98	
Less: Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2011 (in block)	\$9,707.98			
Total increase/(decrease)	\$1,395.18			

5.2 Excess Cost for IDEA

LEAs must click “Get Default Values” to automatically populate the fields in the tables below. The information below is pulled from the Annual Financial Statements for the preceding two fiscal years. The LEA should address any discrepancies or request adjustments to the data in Section 5.3 of this application.

IDEA Excess Cost	FY2012	FY2011	Difference
Regular Units	\$758.54	\$749.44	
Special Units	\$288.17	\$311.54	
% of Spec to Reg	\$37.99	\$41.57	
98% of the above	\$37.23	\$40.74	
0115 prorated for spec ed	\$20,053,416.79	\$20,406,488.37	(\$353,071.58)
0116 Cafeteria Expenses	\$610,366.86	\$635,675.59	(\$25,308.73)
0139 prorated for spec ed	\$11,403,969.70	\$11,474,731.44	(\$70,761.74)
0165 prorated for spec ed	\$1,122,132.12	\$1,206,454.60	(\$84,322.48)
0186 prorated for spec ed	\$2,468,825.54	\$2,754,497.40	(\$285,671.86)
0181 Private Placement	\$72,009.07	\$99,953.84	(\$27,944.77)
0183 Academic Excellence Allotment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
0150/0152/0153 Transportation	\$2,108,684.68	\$2,267,397.13	(\$158,712.45)
0159 Energy	\$1,116,315.77	\$882,877.56	\$233,438.21
Subtotal State Funds Expended	\$38,955,720.53	\$39,728,075.93	(\$772,355.40)
8000 Local funds prorated for spec ed	\$23,919,353.19	\$21,723,390.95	\$2,195,962.24
8200 Tuition	\$669,760.91	\$1,018,587.39	(\$348,826.48)
Subtotal Local Funds Expended	\$24,589,114.10	\$22,741,978.34	\$1,847,135.76
Total Funds Expended	\$63,544,834.63	\$62,470,054.27	\$1,074,780.36

5.3 Financial Item Questions

After the LEA reviews Sections 5.1 and 5.2, LEAs must respond to the questions below as appropriate.

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?

None applicable

A.2 If a decrease in Maintenance of Effort (MOE) occurred in Section 5.1, check all the applicable reasons the decrease occurred:

- ☐ The voluntary departure, by retirement or otherwise, or departure for just cause, of special education or related services personnel
- ☐ A decrease in the enrollment of children with disabilities
- ☐ The termination of the obligation of the agency to provide a program of special education to a particular child with a disability that is an exceptionally costly program because the child has either: left the jurisdiction of the agency, reached the age where there is no longer an obligation to provide FAPE, and/or no longer needs the program of special education
- ☐ The termination of costly expenditures for long term purchases
- ☐ The assumption of cost by the high cost fund operated by the SEA
- ☐ Exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as a natural disaster
- ☐ A precipitous decline in the financial resources for your LEA
- ☐ None of the above. Note: if this option is selected, then the LEA acknowledges they do not meet the allowable exceptions to the MOE requirements and will be contacted by DE DOE regarding potential repayment and/or allocation reduction

A.3 If a decrease in MOE occurred in Section 5.1, indicate if your LEA received an increase in the IDEA allocation.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

5.4 Consolidation of Administrative Funds

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) allows LEAs to consolidate administration funds from the following programs (as applicable): Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A and Title III. LEAs may only consolidate funds from a particular program that are reasonable and necessary for the proper and efficient administration of that program. An LEA that chooses to consolidate administrative funds in a given fiscal year may not use any other funds for administration in that year from the programs included in the consolidation. LEAs that consolidate funds must maintain records that show:

- 1) the amount of administrative funds from each program for each grant year that the agency consolidated for administrative activities;
- 2) that the amount consolidated from each program does not exceed any statutory or regulatory cap on administrative funds;
- 3) that funds were obligated within the period of availability; and
- 4) that the activities for which the funds were used were allowable under section 9201(b) of Title IX.

Check one of the following statements:

The LEA is consolidating the following administrative funds:

Title I

Title II (Part A)

Title III - ELL

Title III - Immigrant

OR

+ The LEA is not consolidating any administrative funds

LEA Grant Application 2013 - 2014 : Compliance Signatures

District: Red Clay Consolidated School District

The chief school officer and all other personnel who will be responsible for activities or funds covered by these Certifications must read and understand each certification and all assurances below. The chief school officer and the chief financial officer should sign the assurances electronically below. Make sure a printed copy of this completed, electronically signed page (and the whole LEA Consolidated Grant Application when it is completely approved) is filed in the LEA central office for review upon request by state and federal officials and members of the public. You do NOT have to send any signature pages to the Delaware Department of Education.

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: Thursday, July 11, 2013

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 611 (6-21)	
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 619 (3-5)	
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	

4. I have reviewed and approved the submission of the budgets for each of these programs.

Chief Financial Officer: Floore, Jill **Approval Date:** Thursday, July 11, 2013

Signature: _____

Assurances

01. General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)

- A. Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- B. To the extent applicable, an LEA will include in its local application a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, any program.

02. Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)

- A. The LEA will comply with the all of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR-Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Parts 74-86 and 97-99).

03. Additional Federal

- A. All regulations as stated in OMB Circular A-133 and OMB Circular A-87 will be adhered to and records will be readily made available when audited for a period of time of at a minimum of three years after successful audit.
- B. In accordance with Executive Order 13513, grant personnel will not text message while driving a government owned vehicle, or while driving their own privately owned vehicle during official grant business, or use government supplied electronic equipment to text message or email when driving.

04. State of Delaware

- A. The LEA will comply with all requirements put forth by the State of Delaware Office of the Governor, Delaware Office of Management and Budget, and Delaware Department of Education.

05. General Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

- A. Each ESEA program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications.
- B. The control of funds provided under each ESEA program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency or in a nonprofit private agency, institution, organization, or Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and that the public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization will administer the funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing statutes.
- C. The applicant will adopt and use proper methods of administering each ESEA program, including (A) the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program; and (B) the correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation.
- D. The applicant will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each ESEA program conducted by or for the State educational agency, the Secretary, or other Federal officials.
- E. The applicant will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the applicant under each ESEA program.
- F. The applicant will (A) submit reports to the State educational agency (which shall make the reports available to the Governor) and the Secretary as the State educational agency and Secretary may require to enable the State educational agency and the Secretary to perform their duties under each ESEA program; and (B) maintain such records, provide such information, and afford such access to the records as the State educational agency (after consultation with the Governor) or the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out the State educational agency's or the Secretary's duties.
- G. Before the application was submitted, the applicant afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment.
- H. The LEA will comply with the all of the legislative and regulatory requirements of ESEA programs for which it receives funds, including all applicable sections of Title IX.
- I. The LEA will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1991, and all regulations, guidelines, and standards lawfully adopted under the above statutes by the United States Department of Education.

- J. The LEA certifies that it does not have any policy that prevents or otherwise denies participation in constitutionally protected prayer in the elementary and secondary schools under its authority as set forth in the U.S. Department of Education guidance to the extent that the guidance does not conflict with controlling precedent.
- K. In any publication or public announcements, the LEA will clearly identify any program assisted under the No Child Left Behind Act (ESEA) as a federal program funded under the specific title.
- L. The agency will comply with Section 9521 of the ESEA regarding Maintenance of Effort (MOE) which includes maintaining at least 90 percent of the aggregate state and/or local expenditures in the second preceding fiscal year.

06. Specific Curriculum/Professional Development

- A. Funds will be used for developing and implementing curriculum based on the content standards established by the Curriculum Frameworks Commission as approved by the State Board of Education or for other professional development activities, including but not limited to: discipline, special education/inclusion, collaboration/consensus building, conflict resolution, shared decision making, local school board member training, and educational technology.
- B. The curriculum and/or professional development supported by these funds is directly related to an analysis of student performance data by each school.

07. Specific IDEA

- A. The LEA has received a copy of, reviewed, and is familiar with all requirements of the IDEA, as amended by the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004.
- B. Agency personnel administering the IDEA program for the LEA are familiar with requirements of the Education Department General Administrative Requirements (EDGAR), General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and the cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal governments as outlined in OMB circular A-87, Rev.
- C. The agency will comply with all of the requirements of the IDEA ('the Act') found in PL 108-446 as amended including: (1) all of the policies and procedures as contained in the Delaware Department of Education Special Education Regulations, (2) all of the eligibility requirements of Section 612 of the Act, and (3) all of the requirements of Section 613 of the Act throughout the period of this subgrant award.

- D. Coordination with NIMAC and Provision of Accessible Instructional Materials. In order to assist the DOE in meeting its responsibility in 14 DE Admin Code § 923.72.1.2, each public agency shall take reasonable steps to provide instructional materials in accessible formats to children with disabilities who need those instructional materials at the same time as other children receive instructional materials. Preparation and delivery of files: As part of any print instructional materials adoption process, procurement contract, or other practice or instrument used for purchase of print instructional materials, the LEA shall enter into a written contract with the publisher of the print instructional materials to: Require the publisher to prepare and, on or before delivery of the print instructional materials, provide to NIMAC electronic files containing the contents of the print instructional materials using the NIMAS; or Purchase instructional materials from the publisher that are produced in, or may be rendered in, specialized formats. The local education agency will participate with the National Instructional Materials Center (NIMAC) to ensure that instructional materials will be provided to students who are blind or other persons with certified print disabilities in a timely manner. The local education agency will not participate with the National Instructional Materials Center (NIMAC) and hereby assures that instructional materials will be provided in a timely manner to students who are blind or other persons with certified print disabilities, in accordance with the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS). If an LEA chooses not to coordinate with NIMAC, the LEA must submit a plan of action to comply with NIMAS, assuring that it will provide the instructional materials to blind persons and other persons with certified print disabilities in a timely manner. LEAs are to submit their plan to the State NIMAS Coordinator.
- E. The agency will comply with 34 CFR Section 300.203 regarding Maintenance of Effort (MOE) which requires an LEA to both budget in each subsequent year at least the same amount that is expended in the most recent prior year for which information is available and expend from year to year at least the same amount that it expended in the previous year.
- F. The agency will comply with IDEA requirements regarding Excess Costs which includes spending at least the average annual per student expenditure on the education of an elementary school or secondary school child with a disability before funds under Part B of the Act are used to pay the excess costs of providing special education and related services.

08. Specific Perkins

- A. The LEA's local plan for its career and technical education program will meet the plan requirements outlined in Section 135(b)(1) through (11) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

09. Specific Title I

- A. The agency will participate, if selected, in the State National Assessment of Educational Progress in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics carried out under section 411(b)(2) of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994.
- B. The local educational agency will inform eligible schools and parents of schoolwide program authority and the ability of such schools to consolidate funds from Federal, State, and local sources.
- C. The local educational agency will provide technical assistance and support to schoolwide programs.
- D. The local educational agency will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop the schools' plans pursuant to section 1114 and assist schools as the schools implement such plans or undertake activities pursuant to section 1115 so that each school can make adequate yearly progress toward meeting the State student academic achievement standards.

- E. The local educational agency will provide services to eligible children attending private elementary schools and secondary schools in accordance with section 1120, and conduct timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials regarding such services.
- F. The local educational agency will take into account the experience of model programs for the educationally disadvantaged, and the findings of relevant scientifically based research indicating that services may be most effective if focused on students in the earliest grades at schools that receive funds under this part.
- G. The local educational agency will, in the case of a local educational agency that chooses to use funds under this part to provide early childhood development services to low-income children below the age of compulsory school attendance, ensure that such services comply with the performance standards established under section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act.
- H. The local educational agency will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop and implement their plans or activities under sections 1118 and 1119.
- I. The local educational agency will comply with the requirements of section 1119 regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development.
- J. The local educational agency will inform eligible schools of the local educational agency's authority to obtain waivers on the school's behalf under title IX and, if the State is an Ed-Flex Partnership State, to obtain waivers under the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999.
- K. The local educational agency will ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.
- L. The local educational agency will ensure that the results from the academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) will be provided to parents and teachers as soon as is practicably possible after the test is taken, in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.
- M. The local educational agency will assist each school served by the agency and assisted under this part in developing or identifying examples of high-quality, effective curricula consistent with section 1111(b)(8)(D).
- N. The local educational agency will provide (i) a local educational agency-wide salary schedule; (ii) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff; and (iii) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum materials and instructional supplies.

10. Specific Title II, Part A

- A. The LEA shall conduct an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring.
- B. The LEA shall target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of highly-qualified teachers and/or the largest class size particularly at the primary level.
- C. The LEA shall comply with Section 9501 regarding consultation with private schools in order to provide professional development services for private school teachers.
- D. All teachers paid by the LEA with Title II, Part A funds for class size reduction are highly qualified.

- E. The planning, implementation, and evaluation of the professional development plan are conducted by a professional development team that includes a majority of teachers and one or more administrators, curriculum specialists, parents, and others identified in the plan.
- F. The professional development plan focuses on improving student performance and teacher practice as identified through data analysis.
- G. The professional development plan describes professional development that a) is aligned with state content standards and the common core anchors and grade level standards, b) is aligned with Delaware Professional Development Standards, c) is articulated within and across grade levels, d) is continuous and sustained, e) indicates how classroom instruction and teacher practice will be improved and assessed, f) indicates how each teacher in the LEA will participate, and g) reflects congruence between student and teacher needs evidenced in DPAS II evaluations and the Success Plan needs analysis.
- H. The plan describes how the effectiveness of the professional development will be evaluated, and indicates how activities will be adjusted in response to that evaluation.
- I. The LEA will implement the state's mentoring program for new teachers and new administrators.
- J. The LEA will implement the state's DPAS II evaluation system and ensure all evaluators are certified by the DDOE.
- K. All teachers holding a continuing license will have ample opportunity to complete 90 clock hours of professional development every 5 years.
- L. All professional staff, paraprofessionals, and long-term substitute teachers will have the opportunity to participate in professional development activities.
- M. The plan or the annual update to the plan was adopted at a public meeting by the local Board of Education.

11. Specific Title III

- A. The LEA will not use more than 2 percent of the funds for the cost of administration.
- B. (1) The LEA shall, not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year, inform the parent or guardian of an English language learner ;(ELL) student in language that is understandable, and to the extent practicable, in the native language: a. the reasons for the identification of their child(ren) of English proficiency, b. the assessment used and the level of English proficiency, c. the type of program or instruction and how that program will assist in the development of English proficiency and meet the state content standards, d. the exit criteria for the program, e. how the program meets the objectives of the IEP for the ELL/Special Education student, f. the right that parents have upon request to remove or to refuse to enroll their ELL child(ren) in a program. (2) The LEA shall inform the parent or guardian of an ELL student of the failure of the program to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives set by the state, no later than 30 days after the failure occurs. (3) If a student registers after the beginning of a school year, the parent or guardian shall be informed of 1) (a) through (f) within two weeks of placement in a program.
- C. The LEA will inform the parents of English Language Learners in any given year when it has failed to meet the progress and/or attainment annual measurable achievement objective target.
- D. The LEA shall comply with Title IX, Part E, Section 9501, to provide consultation to private school officials in a timely and meaningful way to address services that can be provided under the Title III, Part A program.
- E. The LEA will annually assess the English proficiency of all identified English language learners (ELLs).

Federal Programs

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 611 (6-21)

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Linda Smith	9/12/2013

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 619 (3-5)

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Verna Thompson	7/22/2013

Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Dennis Rozumalski	9/10/2013
Theodore Jarrell	9/11/2013
Kimberly Wells	9/10/2013
John Hulse	7/22/2013

Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Wendy Modzelewski	9/30/2013
Erin Pieshala	9/12/2013

Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Rita Hovermale	9/25/2013

Title III - Language Instruction for ELL

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	Approval Date
Terry Richard	9/12/2013

Title III - Immigrant Students

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager

Terry Richard

Approval Date

7/24/2013

State Programs

Curriculum and Professional Development

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager

Wendy Modzelewski

Approval Date

9/30/2013

Finance

Federal Programs

Approval Date

Eulinda DiPietro

7/22/2013

State Programs

Approval Date

Leah Jenkins

9/30/2013

Director(s)

Director

Title

Approval Date

Susan Haberstroh

9/30/2013

Mary Ann Mieczkowski

9/30/2013

Theresa Kough

10/1/2013

Verna Thompson

10/1/2013

Angeline Willen

10/6/2013

Secretaries

Secretary

Title

Approval Date

Susan Haberstroh

Associate Secretary

9/30/2013

Michael Watson

Associate Secretary

10/7/2013

Secretary

(none)

Application Comments; LEA Grant Application - 2014

LEA Grant Application: Red Clay - 2014

2.1 LEA Consolidated Application Planning Team

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:32PM

Please identify teachers by name who participated in the Perkins Advisory Committee.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 9 2013 3:08PM*

* Identified

2.4 Indirect Cost Rates

From Kimberly Wells at Jul 17 2013 4:11PM

Red Clay did not budget indirect costs for Title III Immigrant. Please set the rate in the "Indirect Rate" column for Title III Immigrant to 0.0 if this is the LEA's intention. If the LEA unintentionally did not take Indirect Costs for this program, please set the rates as appropriate and adjust the budget for this program accordingly.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:07AM*

* We've taken the 2% out of Title III Immigrant and adjusted the budget

2.9 Equitable Services

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:57PM

Title IIA, A2. It is unclear if the process discussed in this section, beginning with "The total Professional Development set-aside ..." is referencing Title IIA. If so, it does not appear that the set-aside was calculated using the USDOE formula (Visit <http://dcet.k12.de.us/instructional/NCLBTitleIID/titleIIA/index.shtml> and see Examples of Calculating Equitable Services for Title II, Part A). Please clarify.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:44AM*

* This was addressed and the calculation clarified during/per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:57PM

Title IIA, B1. Who will provide PD Services: It appears that the content of this section refers to Title I. Please add content to this section specific to Title IIA.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:45AM*

* This was addressed per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:57PM

Title IIA, B2.Types of PD Services: It appears that the content of this section refers to Title I. Please add content to this section specific to Title IIA. As a note, the PD set-aside calculation as described, does not appear to conform to the USDOE formula. See comment in A2 above.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:45AM*

* This was addressed per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:58PM

Title IIA, B3.Ensuring Equitability: It appears that the content of this section refers to Title I. Please add content to this section specific to Title IIA.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:46AM*

* This was addressed per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:58PM

Title IIA, C1.Monitoring: Does the Title I coordinator also monitor the services provided using Title IIA funds? It appears that the content of this section refers to Title I. Please add content to this section specific to Title IIA.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:54AM*

* This was addressed during/per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support. The Federal and Regulated Programs office leads the monitoring with an annual schedule and maintains records for auditors.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:58PM

Title IIA, C2. Ensuring Allowable Materials: It is unclear if this process applies to Title IIA. Please add content to this section specific to Title IIA.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 11:54AM*

* This was addressed during/per our 7.24.2013 technical assistance and support. The Federal and Regulated Programs office maintains records for auditors which define the process for purchasing.

3.6 Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth

From Dennis Rozumalski at Jul 16 2013 12:34PM

Please clarify use of homeless set-aside funds for transportation. Also, refer to guidance sent out about this topic.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:07PM*

* This has been addressed

3.7 Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals (HQP)

From Erin Pieshala at Jul 22 2013 2:17PM

General Comment: Your district recently participated in an end of the year performance evaluation with the DOE. During the meeting various data points were reviewed and potential uses of federal funds like Title II A were discussed. Please continue to explore ways to utilize your Title II A funds to address the identified areas of need.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 6 2013 9:22AM*

* General comment: Thank you for the suggestion

From Erin Pieshala at Jul 22 2013 2:18PM

3.7 A1 and A2 hiring needs – Please describe the teacher and principal hiring needs assessment process for your LEA (i.e. forecasting, review of vacancy, retention and attrition percentages, etc.) and list the findings. Also, as per ESEA 2122, was your needs assessment conducted with the involvement of teachers, including teachers participating in programs under Title I, Part A? Please revise your response to this question accordingly.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 6 2013 9:21AM*

* Addressed with data that can be made public

3.8 Professional Development Plan

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:49PM

3.8 – NOTE ONLY: It is noted that all of the educator outcomes are identical. The LEA may maintain these outcomes but may want to consider selecting outcomes that will yield more valuable data on the efficacy of each PD initiative.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:26PM*

* This has been addressed per our technical support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:51PM

G2.It is unclear how some of the checked items will be addressed with the information provided. Please verify this list. Of particular concern are the following items:

- >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 give principals instructional leadership skills

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:26PM*

* This has been addressed per our technical support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:51PM

I2.It is unclear how some of the checked items will be addressed with the information provided. Please verify this list. Of particular concern are the following items:

- >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 give principals instructional leadership skills

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:26PM*

* This has been addressed per our technical support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:51PM

K2.It is unclear how some of the checked items will be addressed with the information provided. Please verify this list. Of particular concern are the following items:

- >Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:26PM*

* This has been addressed per our technical support.

From Wendy Modzelewski at Sep 12 2013 4:51PM

NOTE ONLY: E2, G2, I2, and K2. As the content of the PD is at the LEA discretion, these items will remain as indicated.

3.9 Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:45PM

F.3 Please provide specific details of how Perkins/other funding will be used to address missed Perkins targets.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 9 2013 3:13PM*

** Addressed*

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 24 2013 12:46PM

C.1 Please be more specific about how Perkins funds will be used to strengthen the academic and CTE programs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 9 2013 3:13PM*

** Addressed*

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 24 2013 12:47PM

C.3 Please clarify that Perkins will not be used for student travel.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 9 2013 3:13PM*

** As per DE DOE direction after their Federal Audit we do not use Perkins funds for student travel – we do use Perkins funds for CTE staff traveling with CTE students.*

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 24 2013 12:48PM

F.2 Please elaborate how Perkins will be used to provide career guidance and counseling.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 9 2013 3:14PM*

** Addressed*

4.0 Budget and Distribution of Funds

From Theodore Jarrell at Jul 17 2013 3:20PM

I did not see a private school set aside for Parent Involvement and PD. Please check the first or last tab of the spreadsheet for the amounts that are generated. Otherwise the budget looks very good.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 4:04PM*

** The adjustments have been made to PD, Parent Inv. and Admin for private schools*

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:52PM

Title IIA – Hiring of Staff – NOTE ONLY - The LEA needs to align all hired positions to tasks within the allowable uses of funds that are listed in Title IIA Guidance Document: www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc. One of the allowable uses of funds listed is to provide training to improve classroom practice and student learning. If these individuals are providing PD to improve classroom practice and student learning, then the LEA may use Title IIA funds up to the pro-rated FTE funded. If they are performing administrative functions, that would not be allowable.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:28PM*

** We understand, per the Title II law.*

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:52PM

Title IIA – Hiring of Secretaries - – NOTE ONLY.

- Secretaries may be hired with Title IIA funds if the prorated amount of their salaries reflects a proportional dedication to Title IIA teacher professional development activities.

- FTE or proportional part of FTE must be provided.

It is the LEA's responsibility to maintain documentation that reflects these activities.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:29PM*

** We understand, per the Title II law, and maintain documentation for annual audits.*

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:53PM

Title IIA – Hiring of Data Auditor – NOTE ONLY.

The LEA needs to align all hired positions to tasks within the allowable uses of funds that are listed in Title IIA Guidance Document: www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc. One of the allowable uses of funds listed is to provide training on how to use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning. If this individual is analyzing teacher and/or student data to improve classroom practice and student learning, then the LEA may use Title IIA funds. If they are populating student and teacher data for administrative purposes, that would not be allowable.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:30PM*

** We understand, per the Title II law, and maintain documentation for annual audits.*

From Wendy Modzelewski at Jul 17 2013 3:53PM

State Curriculum & PD Funds – According to the Epilogue language in Section 313, it does not appear that recruitment is an acceptable use of these funds. Please modify or explain your rationale for this expenditure.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 22 2013 12:31PM*

** We understand, per the Title II law, and have eliminated this allocation.*

*** From Wendy Modzelewski at Sep 12 2013 4:55PM*

* * The \$1000 allocation for recruitment is still appearing in the State Curriculum and PD budget. Please find an alternate use for these funds.

From Linda Smith at Jul 19 2013 8:41AM

IDEA 6-21:

CEIS allocation exceeds allowable amount by 24%. Please reduce activities under CEIS.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 11:53AM*

* This has been addressed

From Linda Smith at Jul 19 2013 8:49AM

IDEA 6-21 Contracted services and salaries- Many uses of funds provide good detail. For the following, please provide description of how costs were determined (e.g. estimated hourly rates, fee per days/ estimated number of days): OT, PT, AT, SLP in general and for PPPSS; ESY Bus Transportation; AT-Therapy Services of DE; EPER for homebound and homebound in hospitals; PD activities EPER

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 6 2013 11:23AM*

* Addressed - per discussion; we've the bids and contracts on file for auditors as services will be based on identification of services and the development of plans

From Linda Smith at Jul 19 2013 8:58AM

IDEA 6-21 Materials and Supplies - Test protocols - please provide detail to include estimated list of items, quantity, estimated unit price to show how costs were determined.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:04PM*

* Services/protocols will be determined based on individual needs and based on previous years averages and expenditures we estimated \$10,000 min.

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:23PM

Please indicate that registration fees for CTSO conferences will be used for teachers only while supervising students.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:53PM*

* As per DE DOE direction after the Federal Audit we do NOT use Perkins funds for student CTSO registration – we do use Perkins funds for CTE staff registration.

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:24PM

Please explain the difference between the two \$15,000 allocations for travel.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:54PM*

* We believe that was a screen or system error - we only see one allocation for travel

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:25PM

How will the \$10,000 be used to support the Perkins Advisory Council meetings?

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:54PM*

* Red Clay holds two district CTE Advisory Council Meets – one in the Fall and one in the Spring. Approximately 100+/- CTE Staff, Business & Industry Partners, members of Higher Education, and District Administrators meet as a group and in content specific breakout sessions for a full day. Funds are used for facility, meals, material & supplies. Independent of these two meetings as needed or requested specific to content or a major project additional meetings may be held.

From Rita Hovermale at Jul 21 2013 1:27PM

Please provide details including, school, items, programs, etc that will part of the \$234,318.35 upgrade and enhancement.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:55PM*

* Due to the text limit in the budget - the detail is provided here:

High Schools

- JDHS & TMHS – continue enhancing the engineering pathways – Tech Ed
- TMHS – phase 2 of implementing Culinary Pathway – FCS, phase 2 of implementing the Communication Center – Tech Ed
- AIDHS – BFM Banking facility and curriculum

Middle Schools

- CSS – phase 2 of upgrading the Tech ED facility
- HBDMS – set up new facility for FCS program
- Stanton – set up new facility for Tech Ed program
- AIDMS – upgrade current FCS & BFM facilities

From Erin Pieshala at Jul 22 2013 2:20PM

Title II A - \$62,283.16 “Hire .42 Restructuring Ed Associate for school reform S.R” – Please include more detail explaining this item.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:49PM*

* Detail provided in the budget (*To provide sustained professional development related to CCCS and to college and career readiness with a focus on priority schools AIMS, Stanton MS, JDHS, Central; as well as TMHS, JDHS, CSS, CCSA and all middle schools; and provide support throughout the school year).

From Erin Pieshala at Jul 22 2013 2:59PM

Title II A General Comment: As a follow up to the general comment in Section 3.7, please consider utilizing your Title II funds to invest in professional learning, recruitment, compensation, and educator evaluation systems.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:49PM*

* This is under consideration

From Kimberly Wells at Jul 23 2013 3:29PM

The maximum allowable for Indirect Costs PLUS Administrative Costs for Perkins is 5% or \$19,034.40. Your current budget exceeds the 5% maximum allowable. You can take the maximum allowable for Indirect Costs (\$5,293.50 based on your current budget which includes Capital Outlay items that is subtracted out) but you must keep the total amount for Indirect costs plus Administration costs under 5% of the total budget for Perkins. If you take the maximum allowable Indirect Costs, you can only take up to \$14,057.38 in Administrative costs for this program. Please adjust your budget accordingly. Reminder – If you adjust any Capital Outlay items, it will impact the maximum amount you can take for Indirect Costs.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:03PM*

* We've made the adjustments

*** From Kimberly Wells at Sep 10 2013 10:23AM*

*** The amount taken for Administration and Indirect Costs for Perkins still exceeds the allowable amount (only by \$404.92). Please adjust your indirect costs/Admin amounts to stay within the 5% cap. Rita Hovermale can't approve your grant until this issue is resolved.*

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:37PM

Title III Budgeted Item: Contract with Vendor to provide supplemental translation services (est. costs \$2500/mo x 10 months: \$25,000)

Please provide details of translation services as it pertains to Title III parent notifications.

If the SEA or LEA has a contract with a translation company that provides translated notices for Federal programs, then only the portion of the contract that pertains to Title III notices may be paid for with Title III funds.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 15 2013 1:28PM*

* Bid is still pending - we've not ID the vendor

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:16PM*

* This refers to the portion of the services that pertains to Title III parental notices.

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:46PM

Title III Budgeted Item: AMAO Imp. - Contract for proctors to support the state assessment.

This is considered supplanting and is not an allowable expense. The LEA is required to conduct the state assessment, but unfortunately, the cost of administering the assessments may not be paid with Title III funds.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:18PM*

* This has been corrected/removed

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:48PM

Title III Budgeted Item: AMAO Imp. - Communications support for topics specific to the parents/families of ELs (\$220/session x 5 sessions: (\$550 from Title III and \$550 from Title I)

Could you define "communications support" and the context in which this will be used with ELL parents/families?

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:33PM*

* The GWU report indicated that we've to address topics specific to the families of ELs (literacy development, US education participation) to level the educational playing field; this would help them to participate in supplemental educational sessions (reading nights)

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:51PM

Title III Budgeted Item: AMAO Imp. - ELL PD for administrators (Legal) 1 session for administrators during 2013-2014 @ \$4500/session.

Is this the session conducted by Roger Rosenthal of Migrant Legal Action (July 23 and 30)?

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:23PM*

* Yes, this was the session with Roger Rosenthal.

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:54PM

Title III Budgeted Item: AMAO Imp: ELD curriculum pilot - to support ELD curriculum for ELs (\$1500/building x 10 sites: \$15,000)

Please provide a bit more explanation about the ELD curriculum pilot.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:39PM*

* This PD involves What is different about teaching Reading to ELLs tentatively provided by the Center for Applied Linguistics.

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 7:56PM

Title III Budgeted Item: AMAO Imp: SIOP PD sessions for Baltz Elementary Staff (50 FTE x \$27/hr x 2 hrs x 2 sessions: \$5,400)

Is this SIOP being provided to all of the school staff at each of the campuses indicated?

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 29 2013 12:41PM*

* SIOP is being phased in with the whole staff, yes

From Terry Richard at Jul 24 2013 8:00PM

Title III: In general, remember that the combination of administrative and indirect costs is limited to 2% of your subgrant. Please review your administrative costs (both labor and non labor costs) and your indirect cost to ensure your total falls within this percentage.

** From Malik Stewart at Aug 26 2013 4:24PM*

* Understood

From Erin Pieshala at Jul 25 2013 1:15PM

Title II A - \$55,026.32 item "Hire 1 FTE Student Data Auditor" -- Please include more detail explaining this item. Also, you indicate this item is funded with .5 Title II and .5 Title II (the same funds).

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 6 2013 9:27AM*

* We've corrected the error (this is 50% Title I and 50% Title II) and we've addressed the description

From Terry Richard at Sep 10 2013 8:18PM

Title III Immigrant: Please revise the strategy listed under this budgeted item. Since Title III funds may not be used to develop new standards or conduct assessments, just change the strategy. Approved with that change made.

Otherwise - very nice parent involvement activities planned for the immigrant families.

Item: Indirect Costs

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

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 13 2013 9:44AM*

* Thanks - we've addressed this.

From Rita Hovermale at Sep 12 2013 1:59PM

Please explain how the \$10,000 for Advisory Board meetings will be used.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 13 2013 12:03PM*

* Red Clay holds two district CTE Advisory Council Meets – one on Oct 4, 2013 and the other scheduled for Feb 14, 2014. Approximately 100+/- CTE Staff, Business & Industry Partners, members of Higher Education, and District Administrators meet as a group and in content specific breakout sessions for a full day. Funds are used for facility, meals, material & supplies. Independent of these two meetings as needed or requested specific to content or a major project additional meetings may be held.

We have 53 CTE staff, each invite 1-2 Business/Industry partners (53-106); a building administrator from each secondary school (11); RCCSD Administrators and Board Members(7-15); DOE Associates (6)

From Rita Hovermale at Sep 12 2013 2:01PM

You must provide details for \$234,318.35 expenditure. Exactly what upgrades will take place and at what schools/programs.

** From Malik Stewart at Sep 13 2013 1:02PM*

* Due to the text limit in the budget - the detail is provided here: High Schools • JDHS & TMHS – continue enhancing the engineering pathways – Tech Ed • TMHS – phase 2 of implementing Culinary Pathway – FCS, phase 2 of implementing the Communication Center – Tech Ed • AIDHS – BFM Banking facility and curriculum Middle Schools • CSS – phase 2 of upgrading the Tech ED facility • HBDMS – set up new facility for FCS program • Stanton – set up new facility for Tech Ed program • AIDMS – upgrade current FCS & BFM facilities.

NOTE: All Bids for outside contractors and designers followed the state bid/RFP regulations, were handled by the Data Service Center and are maintained 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 record

** * From Malik Stewart at Sep 24 2013 11:26AM*

* * Due to the text limit in the budget - the additional detail you've requested is provided here:

- HBDMS – set up new facility for FCS program

o\$40,000 - in the planning process with potential companies will begin the BID process once the grant has been approved – to include new large appliances, small appliances, utensils, cookware, student work stations, instructional supplies, current curriculum & resource materials, upgrading the cabinets in the kitchen area, student computers with required software

- Stanton – set up new facility for Tech Ed program

o\$55,000 - in the planning process with potential companies will begin the BID process once the grant has been approved – to include student work stations, equipment work benches, storage & tool cabinets, replacement tools & equipment, instructional/project supplies, curriculum modules (software & equipment), and training

- AIDMS – upgrade current FCS & BFM facilities

o\$25,000 – FCS - to include upgrading identified large a

* * * *From Malik Stewart at Sep 25 2013 11:36AM*

* * * Per email from DEDOE on 9/25/13:

Listed below are the additional details you requested

- HBDMS – set up new facility for FCS program

o\$40,000 - in the planning process with potential companies will begin the BID process once the grant has been approved – to include new large appliances, small appliances, utensils, cookware, student work stations, instructional supplies, current curriculum & resource materials, upgrading the cabinets in the kitchen area, student computers with required software

* * * * *From Malik Stewart at Sep 25 2013 11:37AM*

* * * * Per 9/25/13 email from DEDOE:

Listed below are the additional details you requested.

- Stanton – set up new facility for Tech Ed program

o\$55,000 - in the planning process with potential companies will begin the BID process once the grant has been approved – to include student work stations, equipment work benches, storage & tool cabinets, replacement tools & equipment, instructional/project supplies, curriculum modules (software & equipment), and training

* * * * * *From Malik Stewart at Sep 25 2013 11:39AM*

* * * * * Per 9/25/13 email from DEDOE:

- AIDMS – upgrade current FCS & BFM facilities

o\$25,000 – FCS - to include upgrading identified large and small appliances, utensils, cookware, student work stations, instructional supplies, current curriculum & resource materials, upgrading the cabinets in the kitchen area, student computers with required software

o\$15,000 – BFM – student work stations, upgrade identified computers, software and technology specific to BFM

From Rita Hovermale at Sep 12 2013 2:01PM

As per the recent comment from Kim Wells, please adjust your admin/indirect budgets to fall within the 5% cap.

* *From Malik Stewart at Sep 13 2013 11:31AM*

* We've just addressed this.

