



State of Delaware
Department of Education
Sub-Grant Application

Advanced Placement Incentive Grant Program

LEA/Agency/Organization Information

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Address 1: _____
Street Address P.O. Box

Address 2: _____
City DE State Zip Code

Amount of Funding Requested: _____ Total Cost of Project: _____

Coordinator's Name: _____ Email: _____ Telephone: _____

Proposed Sub-Grant Project Title: _____

Description of Project:

Objective and Goals of the Project (How will this sub-grant strengthen organization, make improvement, or achieve success?):

Specific Activities (Include information about service delivery and timeline):

Signature of Chief
School
Officer/Agency Head: _____

Printed Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Business
Manager: _____

Printed Name: _____ Date: _____

Background

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) is seeking applications from Delaware school districts and charter schools that are willing to plan and implement new and innovative programs to offer rigorous academic education programs to students who demonstrate the potential for advanced academic work focused on Advanced Placement.

One of our core challenges as a state is increasing student readiness and access for advanced courses by 12th grade. Students successfully completing at least one advanced math and English course by 12th grade are least likely to require remediation upon entering college.

This grant is intended to support the Delaware Department of Education's mission to prepare all students for successful entry and completion of an advanced math and English course by the 12th grade. The focus includes student preparation, recruitment, supports, as well as professional learning and vertical articulation between middle and high school programs.

The Delaware schools selected will be those that can demonstrate through the application process their readiness to plan and implement successful innovation to drive change for student learning and educator engagement in their schools. These schools will develop programs as exemplary models of academically rigorous education and will be expected to share their challenges and successes with other schools in the state.

Selected schools will be funded for one year. This grant will be based on the following timeline:

1. This funding will support programs for the 2016-2017 school year. All funds should be encumbered prior to the end of the 2017 fiscal year.
2. Applications will be made available to all Delaware public schools on April 5, 2016.
3. LEAs must complete a diagnostic analysis through College Board. Please see the timeline below.
4. Completed applications from school districts and charter schools are due to DDOE by close of business Wednesday, June 1, 2016.
5. Selected schools will be notified by June 16, 2016.

Rigorous Academic Incentive Grant		
Release of grant		April 4, 2016
LEAs email intent to apply	to Deb Hansen, DDOE and to Diana Frank, College Board	by April 11, 2016
All diagnostics complete	by Diana Frank, College Board	by May 23, 2016
Grant due to DDOE		on or before June 1, 2016
Grant reviewed	by DDOE grant review panel	week of June 13
Grant awards	by DDOE grant review panel	June 17, 2016

Selection Criteria

The selection of the schools will be made by DDOE based on an application that addresses the following questions and are evaluated with the rubric included at the end of this application. All applications for grants shall receive a specific numerical score from the panel of persons assigned by the Department to rate the applications. Those programs receiving the top possible scores shall receive grants to the extent that funds are available. Scoring shall be done on formal score sheets.

College Board Diagnostic (zero points)

Districts must submit a copy of their College Board Diagnostic results with their grant application. Applications without College Board Diagnostic will not be considered completed and will not be reviewed. Diagnostics must have been completed no earlier than the 2013-2014 school year.

Quality of the Academic Education Plan (zero to 15 points)

To what extent is the LEA utilizing the data from the College Board diagnostic tool in the planning and implementing of the LEA goals to increase student access, support high quality professional development and increase student success in the coursework? To what extent do Advanced Placement courses reflect the rigor of Delaware's Standards i.e. Common Core State Standards? Proven models might include AP Insight (Biology, Chemistry, World History, U.S. History and Calculus), AP summer institutes, AP public workshops, and Springboard. The LEA should justify use of models not on this list.

Student Success Plan (zero to 25 points)

What is the LEA's plan for implementing innovative practices to increase the number of overall students entering 12th grade ready for advanced math and English courses? What strategies will the LEA implement to evaluate current practices in terms of course scheduling, student recruitment and classroom rigor to prepare students for success in advanced courses? What challenges does the LEA anticipate facing in implementing the chosen innovations and what steps are in place to mitigate these risks?

Professional Learning Plan (zero to 15 points)

What is the LEA's plan to ensure vertical team alignment between middle school and high school and across grades 9-12? How will the vertical alignment strategy support increased student success and readiness for advanced courses? What is the LEA's overall plan for providing high quality and on-going professional learning opportunities for administrators & teachers specific to Advanced Placement? What is the LEA's plan to support new Advanced Placement teachers and what learning opportunities are provided for seasoned teachers relative to new standards and new models of instruction? Are the professional

learning strategies articulated aligned with the state's professional learning standards? Proven models might include Professional Learning Communities, vertical alignment, and feedback from the College Board diagnostic tool. The LEA should justify use of models not on this list.

Sustainability (zero to 15 points)

To what extent has the applicant described how it will sustain the proposed program after the requested grant expires either by showing how the program can be sustained with existing state and local funds or by identifying the funding sources that will be used to sustain the program?

Efficiency of spending (zero to 15 points)

Does the proposed program target student access and professional learning?

Student Diversity (zero to 25 points)

To what extent does the proposed program improve results for students from diverse backgrounds? In what ways will the plan reduce achievement and access gaps for students? In what ways does the proposed program support middle school students and provide opportunities for students previously not targeted for advanced courses? Are there various entry points for students seeking Advanced Placement coursework?

Program evaluation (zero to 15 points)

How reliable and accurate is the program evaluation component of the applicant's proposal?

Grant evaluation rubric - 125 possible points

	Exceeds the standard	Meets the Standard	Approaches the Standard	Below the Standard	
<p>Quality of the Academic Education Plan (0 -15 points)</p>	<p>15 points The application provides an exemplary use of the College Board diagnostic tool and clearly identifies the model(s) being used to meet the needs of the students.</p>	<p>10 points The application provides clear use of the College Board diagnostic tool and identifies the model (s) being used to meet the needs of the students.</p>	<p>5 points The application provides some use of the College Board diagnostic tool and identifies the model being used to meet the needs of the students.</p>	<p>0 points The application provides no evidence of use of the College Board diagnostic tool.</p>	
<p>Student Success Plan (0-25 points)</p>	<p>25 points The application provides an exemplary and innovating research based strategy to increase the number of students ready to enter an advanced math or English course by 12th grade. The plan clearly identifies research based strategies and S.M.A.R.T goals to ensure successful implementation. The plan identifies a strategy for continued implementation and targets beyond the grant funding. AND</p>	<p>15 points The application provides research based strategies to increase the number of students ready to enter an advanced math or English course by 12th grade. AND The plan clearly identifies research based strategies and S.M.A.R.T goals to ensure successful implementation. AND The plan identifies a strategy for continued implementation and targets</p>	<p>5 points The application provides research based strategies to increase the number of students ready to enter an advanced math or English course by 12th grade. AND The plan identifies S.M.A.R.T goals to ensure successful implementation.</p>	<p>0 points The application does not provide a plan to increase the number of students ready to enter an advanced math or English course by 12th grade. OR The plan provided does not identify research based strategies and/or S.M.A.R.T goals to ensure successful implementation.</p>	

	The plan clearly identifies strategies to identify students who demonstrate need for additional supports to enter and succeed in an advanced course.	beyond the grant funding.			
Professional Learning Plan (0 -15 points)	<p>15 points</p> <p>The LEA plan provides an exemplary model for utilizing the College Board diagnostic tool to develop a high quality and sustainable plan for staff development.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The plan clearly identifies a strong vertical alignment strategy that includes middle school and grade 9-12 teachers.</p>	<p>10 points</p> <p>The LEA plan effectively utilizes feedback from the College Board diagnostic tool to develop a high quality and sustainable plan for staff development.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The plan addresses vertical alignment opportunities for teachers in advanced courses.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The LEA plan utilizes feedback from the College Board diagnostic tool to develop a high quality and sustainable plan for staff development.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The LEA plan does not utilize feedback from the College Board diagnostic tool to develop a high quality and sustainable plan for staff development.</p>	
Sustainability (0 -15 points)	<p>15 points</p> <p>The application provides an exemplary plan for sustaining the initiative at the end of grant funding.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The plan demonstrates the district's financial and</p>	<p>10 points</p> <p>The application provides a clear plan for sustaining the initiative at the end of grant funding.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The application provides little or unclear plans for sustaining the initiative at the end of grant funding.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The application provides no plan for sustaining the initiative at the end of grant funding.</p>	

	resource commitment over and above the grant funding.				
Efficiency of spending (0 -15 points)	15 points 75% of funding or higher is targeted towards professional learning and student access efforts.	10 points 60-74% of funding or higher is targeted towards professional learning and student access efforts.	5 points 40-60% of funding or higher is targeted towards professional learning and student access efforts.	0 points The application’s financial plan is not clearly identified. OR Less than 40% of funding is targeted towards professional learning and student access.	
Student Diversity (0 -25 points)	25 points The plan has clear targets and strategies for increasing student diversity in advanced courses while maintaining overall student achievement. AND The plan demonstrates strong alignment to the district’s root cause analysis regarding challenges in student recruitment and diversity in advanced courses.	15 points The plan has clear targets and strategies for increasing student diversity in advanced courses while maintaining overall student achievement. AND The plan identifies probable causes for challenges in student recruitment and in increasing diversity in advanced courses.	5 points The plan has clear targets and strategies for increasing student diversity in advanced courses while maintaining overall student achievement.	0 points The plan has little or no potential to close gaps in achievement and access for all students from diverse backgrounds.	

<p>Program evaluation (0 -15 points)</p>	<p>15 points</p> <p>The plan proposes exceptional research-based and reliable methods for collecting and analyzing data for evaluating the success of the program.</p>	<p>10 points</p> <p>The plan proposes research-based and reliable methods for collecting and analyzing data for evaluating the success of the program.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The plan proposes limited research-based and reliable methods for collecting and analyzing data for evaluating the success of the program.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The plan proposes no research-based and reliable methods for collecting and analyzing data for evaluating the success of the program.</p>	
<p>Total</p>					

All applications are due no later than 4:30 p.m. EST on June 1, 2016 to DDOE Higher Education Office – Attention Rose Stayton (rose.stayton@doe.k12.de.us). All submitted applications shall also include a completed Proposed Budget Information sheet. A blank Excel Proposed Budget Information sheet with instructions is included below, and can be opened by double-clicking the sheet area. The DDOE contact person for this grant is Deb Hansen, Education Associate for Visual & Performing Arts and Gifted and Talented Programs. deb.hansen@doe.k12.de.us or (302)735-4180.

Accelerated Academic Fund Grant	DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Teaching and Learning Branch 401 Federal Street, Suite 2 Dover, DE 19901 Phone: 302-735-4180 Fax: 302-739-3744														
ACCELERATED ACADEMIC FUND GRANT – PROPOSED BUDGET INFORMATION															
Submitting District Information															
DISTRICT AND SCHOOL NAME:	PROJECT TITLE:														
CONTACT NAME AND TITLE:	WORK PHONE NUMBER:														
WORK E-MAIL:															
BUSINESS MANAGER'S NAME AND INITIALS (REQUIRED WHEN SUBMITTED AS AN APPLICATION BUDGET):	FAX NUMBER:														
STATE GRANT AWARD AMOUNT (approved by DOE):															
Activity Budget															
	Salary (Account Code 5100)														
Activity	Administrative (ex. Assistant Principal and higher)	Instructional (ex. Teachers, Paras)	Support (ex. Secretary, Custodial, Food Service)	Non-Pension Positions (ex. Substitutes)	Salary Subtotal	Other Employee Costs (Account Code 5120)	Total Salary and OEC	Health Insurance/Other Non-Taxed Benefits	Contracted Services (Account Code 5500)	Travel (Account Code 5400)	Supplies and Materials (Account Code 5600)	Capital Outlay (Account Code 5700)	Audit Fees (Account Code 5500)	Indirect Cost (Account Code 5560)	Total
Administration					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Instruction					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Curriculum					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Other Educational Materials and Services					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Transportation					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Professional Development					\$0	\$0	\$0						-	-	\$0
Grant Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-	\$0
Grant Check ("OK" if grant total equals grant award amount; +/- value if grant total out of balance with grant award amount)															OK
Grant Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-	\$0