Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) Focus School Grant Application

Mark T. Murphy, Secretary of Education
Dr. Susan Haberstroh, Acting Associate Secretary, College & Workforce Readiness
Karen Field Rogers, Associate Secretary, Financial Reform & Resource Management
Theresa Kough, Director, Career, Technical, and Title I Resources

John G. Townsend Building
401 Federal Street, Ste 2
Dover, DE 19901-3639

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Abstract is a brief, precise narrative summary of how this grant will impact the schools' plans for continuous improvement, 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 total amount of allocations, and**

- **The amount of funds requested, which must be equal to the total of funds requested on the summary budget page**

The Red Clay Consolidated School District had four (3) schools, AI 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 94.3%). As Focus schools, they've academic data showing a regressive pattern of student achievement for multiple years. As Title I Schoolwide programs, the changes will be comprehensive and far-reaching. Therefore Red Clay is eligible to apply for the Focus school improvement grant to change outcomes for the students attending these schools.

In summary, this grant will provide for the following school improvement activities:
-Research based extended day programs
-Social and emotional supports for students through agreements 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 meet state targets consistently – and reduce the achievement gap
•Professionally, school staff members will be proficient at a minimum
•Elementary children will be on grade level by 3rd grade
•Middle school students will be college or career ready
•Parents and communities will express satisfaction and be support children in being ready for school

Red Clay Consolidated School District is requesting $1,790,556.20 (including indirect costs) to use from October 1, 2012 – through June 30, 2015. In Year 1, we will request $617,364.96.

Success Plan for: Red Clay District Administration

Years: 2011-2012 to 2013-2014

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

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

Needs Assessment

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

12 :	School Administration
Need:	Increase teacher effectiveness in classrooms and provide leadership in continuous improvement of instruction.
Root Cause:	Classroom instruction needs to be aligned to DCAS assessment to measure priority GLE's and in coming core curriculum.
Data Source:	DCAS II 2010-2011
14 :	Instructional Staff
Need:	Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
Root Cause:	Professional development opportunities related to diversity and tolerance; experiences with healthy choices
Data Source:	Delaware School Survey 2008; classroom walkthroughs
11 :	Professional Staff
Need:	Participate in activities to explore, modify and implement with success with similar populations.
Root Cause:	Strategies can be developed by understanding methods implemented with success at other educational institutions
Data Source:	IRA; Staff Survey data; Distinguished Title I
18 :	Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language
Need:	To use time and operations in a manner that promotes a response to student needs and is inclusive of the school community

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

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

25 : Red Clay Focus School Warner

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

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

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

41 : Warner instructional and administrative staff

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

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

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

17 : All instructional staff

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

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

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

29 : Baltz Families

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

Root Cause: 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.

24 : Red Clay PZ School Marbrook

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

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

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

39 : Warner Pre-School - 2nd grade students

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

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

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

19 : Red Clay PZ School Marbrook

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

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

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

22 : Red Clay PZ School Stanton

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

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

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

21 : Red Clay Focus School Warner

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

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

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

28 : Baltz Staff

Need: Create culture of professional sharing of instructional strategies.

Root Cause: 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

16 : Staff implementing the transformation model

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

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

Data Source: DSTP; DCAS; DIBELS Next

23 : Red Clay PZ School Lewis Dual Language

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

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

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

10 : Instructional Staff

Need: Hire and maintain Highly effective teachers

Root Cause: Teachers need peer to peer productive interactions and knowledge of practices that related to Distinguished practice per DPAS II; while new HQT staff members need to become part of the student success focused culture.

Data Source: DEEDS; DPAS II R

42 : Warner - Administration - teacher effectiveness

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

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

Data Source: DPAS II

20 : Red Clay PZ School Stanton

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

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

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

38 : Warner instructional staff

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

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

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

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

13 : Targeted Families

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

Root Cause:	High Poverty rates, school communication practices and geography can make attending school-related activities to educate parents on instructional strategies they can use to help their child very difficult.
Data Source:	SES; Parent Involvement Survey data 2008 – 2011; Harvard Family Research Parent Involvement Data, attendance at Family events 2008 - 2012

Student Needs Assessment

52 :	AIMS - Students with an IEP
Need:	Children with IEPs in regular standards-based classrooms
Root Cause:	staff knowledge and experience with proven supports; integration and access to the general curriculum; professional development, resources and staffing are needed to provide opportunities and educational environments that support inclusion.
Data Source:	eSchool data, DCAS; I-Tracker
44 :	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 considered for partial or full mainstream services.
Data Source:	DCAS, ACCESS, WIDA MODEL
36 :	Warner Elementary Students - Grade 1
Need:	Students struggle to matriculate to first grade with appropriate comprehension skills and achievement
Root Cause:	Alignment of written, taught and tested curriculum from K -1. Need to assure teachers know how to teach the GLE's.
Data Source:	DIBELS; DIBELS Next
59 :	AIMS - Students with an IEP
Need:	Children with IEPs in regular standards-based classrooms
Root Cause:	staff knowledge and experience with proven supports; integration and access to the general curriculum; professional development, resources and staffing are needed to provide opportunities and educational environments that support inclusion.
Data Source:	eSchool data, DCAS; I-Tracker
15 :	Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students
Need:	Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
Root Cause:	Economically and educationally disadvantaged require additional academic supports to close achievement gaps. Additional professional development training, resources and staffing is needed to help staff understand the culture and challenges of poverty and provide instruction relative to it in order to eliminate academic disparities; lack of structured preschool experiences due to poverty and economic situations

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

50 : AIMS - African American Students

Need: 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

53 : 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

4 : African American Pupils

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

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

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

40 : Warner - 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; RtI

3 : LEP Students

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

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

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

37 : Warner Kindergarten Students

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

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

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

45 : AIMS - Special Education students

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

8 : Low Income Students

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

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

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

5 : Low Income Pupils

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

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

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

1 : Low Income Students

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

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

Data Source: DSTP; DCAS; CQA

6 : Special Education Students

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

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

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

47 : AIMS - Low Income Pupils

Need: Low income 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

54 : AIMS - Special Education Students

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

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

Data Source: Discipline Data

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

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

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

Data Source: Suspension data; Mentoring reports

32 : Baltz - 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

31 : 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 edcuational support; environmental stressors at home must be acknowledged

Data Source: DCAS Testing, Common Assessments, RTI Data; DIBELS Next

7 : Hispanic Students

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

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

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

35 :   Warner - 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

30 :   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

2 :   Special Education students

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

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

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

48 :   AIMS - Hispanic Students

Need: 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

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

Need:	Students from racial, educational, linguistic and economic minority groups are demonstrating a preparation and an achievement gap, demonstrating similar instructional needs in reading and math.
Root Cause:	Students in targeted groups have a variety of external factors that often predispose them to academic challenges. Programs need to address the diversity of each individual learner as a mechanism to make sure each child is being taught the way they learn best. This includes the lack of training for teachers in best strategies for each target group and necessary materials to support those efforts,
Data Source:	Growth as measured from Fall to Spring DCAS assessment
34 :	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
43 :	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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** 34.8% 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 - 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Increase in the number of AP exam takers

Start Year: 2010   **Baseline:** 1,017

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: College retention rate

Start Year: 2010   **Baseline:** 80.0%

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: % of IB participants who attain the IB diploma

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** tbd

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

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

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: % Growth DCAS Reading Targets

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:**   TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:**   TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:**   TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 lrning need

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** tbd

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 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: DCAS growth

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** 34.8% 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 - 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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: % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Number of schools meeting or exceeding AYP targets

Start Year: 2010   **Baseline:** 10 schools

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: % of students reaching the Benchmark level on DIBELS

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** K: 84%; Gr1: 73%

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Number of teachers completing NBCT

Start Year: 2010 **Baseline:** 53

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: % of vacancies filled through the job fair

Start Year: 2010   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Monthly

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

Objective 3.4: Objective 7: Provide effective support to educators

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 23.4

DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

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

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

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

DOE 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: DCAS growth

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** 34.8% 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 - 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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: % of teachers who receive a "satisfactory" or "effective" on DPAS II

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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 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: DCAS growth

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

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** 34.8% 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 - 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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 20.6

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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	Student Need	(Low Income Students) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA standards.
2	Student Need	(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	Student Need	(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	Student Need	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
10	*Staff & Community Need*	(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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 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 teachers utilizing the I-Tracker Pro system

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 lrning need

Start Year: 2011   **Baseline:** tbd

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Measure: LEWIS: % of staff using SF reading street

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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	*Student Need*	(Low Income Students) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA standards.
2	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Student Need*	(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	*Staff & Community Need*	(Instructional Staff) Classrooms need effective management strategies and promotion of understanding, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity in the educational environment
10	*Student Need*	(Incoming Kindergarten - 2nd grade students) Kindergarten children display learning needs and inexperience with structure and standards based learning.
11	*Staff & Community Need*	(Staff implementing the transformation model) Students need to demonstrate proficiency toward meeting the State ELA and math standards across grade levels.
12	*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
13	*Staff & Community Need*	(Red Clay PZ School Stanton) To use time and operations in a manner that promotes college and career readiness and inclusiveness
14	*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 3.1: Increase learning time

Measure(s):

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: % of school enrolled in summer enrichment programming

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

Measure: LEWIS: % of staff using SF reading street

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 cimate 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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

Measure: % Growth DCAS Math Targets

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

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

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** 27.4

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** 30.1

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** 30.7

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

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

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

Start Year: 2012   **Baseline:** 32.4

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 0

DOE Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2013   **Baseline:** TBD

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Semi-Yearly

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 Indicator: (none)

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 Indicator: (none)

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

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
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		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1   Team Members

List the LEA-level staff members and outside experts who will be supporting each school, and each person's expertise that will contibute to successful implementation of the grant.

First Name	Last Name	Title	Email Address	Constituency	Programs	Perkins
Aracelio	Caraballo	ELL Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	aracelio.caraballo@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Stacey	Papa	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	stacey.papa@redclay.k12.de.us	School Employee	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Kami	Kellems	Parent Organization Rep., AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)		Parent	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Laura	Thompson	Educational Diagnostician, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	laura.thompson@redclay.k12.de.us	District Employee	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Earl	Moffett	Teacher, AIMS BLT (Focus Schol Planning Team)	earl.moffett@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Kendall	Mobley	Assistant Principal, Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	kendall.mobley@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Amber	Smalley	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	amber.smalley@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Kim	Cottet	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	kimberly.cottet@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	
Joe	Rappa	AP - AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	joseph.rappa@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds	

Robbie	Johnson	Dean of Students, AIMS BLT (Focus School Planning Team)	robbie.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Marcia	Johnson	Principal, Warner Elementary	marcia.johnson@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Kim	Gardner	Parent / PTA President, Baltz Elementary (Focus School Planning Team)		Parent	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Alice	Conlin	Academic Dean, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	alice.conlin@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Christina	Personti	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	christina.personti@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Sandy	Potter	Teacher, Warner Elementary (PZ Advisory/ Implementation Team)	sandra.potter@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Kelly	Hurtt	Principal - Baltz Elementary	kelly.hurtt@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Equetta	Jones	Parent-PTA Warner Elementary (BLT/ Implementation Team)	equetta.jones@redclay.k12.de.us	Parent	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Katherine	Wallace	Academic Dean- AIMS BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	katherine.wallace@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Malik	Stewart	Manager, Federal & Regulated Programs	Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds

Evonne	Cavallaro	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	evonne.cavallaro@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Mario	Rivera	Baltz BLT Member (Focus School Planning Team)	mario.rivera@redclay.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Theodore	Boyer	Principal - AI DuPont Middle School	Theodore.Boyer@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds
Trevor	Little	Assistant Principal, Baltz Elementary	trevor.little@redclay.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds,Year 1 - State SI Funds,Year 2 - Focus School Funds,Year 2 - State SI Funds,Year 3 - Focus School Funds,Year 3 - State SI Funds

2.2   Program Selection

Federal		State	
✗	Year 1 - Focus School Funds	✗	Year 1 - State SI Funds
✗	Year 2 - Focus School Funds	✗	Year 2 - State SI Funds
✗	Year 3 - Focus School Funds	✗	Year 3 - State SI Funds

Federal Programs

Program	Coordinator	Allocation	Project Subgrant Ending Date
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$372,111.79	6/29/2012
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$417,627.22	6/29/2012
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$315,854.02	6/29/2012

State Programs

Program	Coordinator	Allocation	Give Back	Amount Requested (After Give Back To State)	Project Subgrant Ending Date
Year 1 - State SI Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$245,253.17	$0.00	$245,253.17	6/29/2012
Year 2 - State SI Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$244,380.00	$0.00	$244,380.00	6/29/2012
Year 3 - State SI Funds	Stewart, Malik Malik.Stewart@redclay.k12.de.us	$195,330.00	$0.00	$195,330.00	6/29/2012

3.0   Schools to Be Served

School	Subgroup(s)	School Type	Seek Funds
A I duPont Middle	Low SES Perf, African Amer Perf, Hispanic Perf, SWD Perf, EL Perf	Title I	Yes
Baltz Elem	Low SES Perf, African Amer Perf, Hispanic Perf	Title I	Yes
Warner Elem	Low SES Perf, African Amer Perf, Hispanic Perf, SWD Perf	Title I	Yes

4.1   Information for the First Focus School

Please answer all questions in this section for your first Focus School.

Question A

A.1 Enter the name of your first Focus School.

Alexis I. du Pont Middle School

A.2 Select the Intervention(s) for your first Focus School.

✕	Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
✕	Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)
○	Strategies to address social, emotional and heath needs
○	Job-embedded Professional Development
○	Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement
○	Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement
○	Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
○	Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan
○	Use of external provider(s) matched to identified school needs
○	Changes to LEA policy, practices, and/or procedures
✕	Staffing selection and assignment
○	Locally developed option(s) that are research based and supported by needs assessment data

Question B

B.1 Please provide a response below to the general questions for your first Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

General Focus School Questions
4.33 Describe the process used to engage a broad spectrum of stakeholders (including families and communities) to determine the appropriate intervention(s) for the Focus school.
•The school will effectively communicate and engage with stakeholders to discuss the needs and interventions needed to support students by conducting informational meetings, conferences, presentations at parent conducted meetings, and informational literature. This process will cover root causes, improvement goals, and achievements.
4.34 Describe how the intervention(s) selected for the Focus School is either new or a significant expansion of existing interventions currently in place at the school. Describe how the Focus School will operate differently as a result of the intervention(s).

The interventions (Extended Time, Communities in Schools, and Special Educational Staff Support) that have been identified in the Alexis I. du Pont Middle School's Focus Plan will provide a broader educational program that the school will provide to underperforming students. The Extended Time intervention will be expanded from the previous (2011-12) year's SES requirement, which just focused on income eligibility; to targeting the lowest performing children in the subpopulations and allow the targeted students to receive additional instruction beyond the regular school hours; focusing on the identified instructional needs in Reading and Math. Communities In Schools is a new intervention and the additional Special Educator is new (not in terms of having a special education certified staff member, but a supplemental one).

Extend learning time

Analysis of current DCAS data suggests that students at AI Middle School need additional instruction in ELA and Math. We will increase instructional time with the addition of the block schedule in 2012-2013. Instructional time in ELA and math will increase by more than 30%.   The extended school day instructional programs and summer Ambassadors program for students will provide opportunities for additional support.   The extended day program will consist of two ten-week sessions with two hour classes running two days per week. The additional time will be used to target the specific student subpopulations and their needs identified through DCAS administration as well as school-based common assessments and other forms of data. The BLT and leadership will examine best practices in extended learning time and use the proposed extended time opportunities to implement strategies that have been proven in the field to produce dramatic gains in student achievement.

The AI Ambassadors program will assist students in transitioning from elementary to middle school. In Year 1, there will be two weeks where students will take diagnostic tests, preview material for the upcoming year, learn organizational skills, and become oriented to the building. In Years 2 and 3, a committee will make decisions based on Year 1 results to create additional summer programs.

Create community-oriented schools

AI Middle School serves a student body that comes from a variety of feeder schools, including receiving the majority of its children from two focus schools (Baltz and Warner Elementary Schools) and one Partnership Zone school (Lewis Dual Language); creating challenges for the building and a sense of community. Additionally, over 83% of students qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch, a 10% increase since 2010. AI will implement several targeted programs to increase attendance, reduce behavior referrals, prevent drop out and support parent and family involvement. Communities In Schools of Delaware CIS will focus on the development of academic, life, and career planning skills as they relate to a student's development. Pritchett Associates will address the parental needs that will enable to better support their children in school and identify valuable resources that provide them more knowledge of the educational system to build lasting relationships between AIMS and the Red Clay community as we engage families in meaningful and culturally respectful ways. All partner interventions will be research based and aligned with our strategic outcomes, including support for students, parents, and school. The LEA will establish an agreement with both partners to achieve first, second and third year benchmark's related to: attendance, school climate measures; achievement gains; and ultimately dramatic growth contributions/increases from baseline.

Special Education Support

The Special Education Staff will work with students with learning disabilities and better address their IEP goals in exclusive educational environment. This intervention is a recommendation that was provided to the school from the Stetson Study that was conducted by the school. Replace the principal and take steps to increase teacher and leader effectiveness. The school proposes an additional Special Education teacher to provide enhanced professional development, support teacher effectiveness, and target specific instructional needs.

4.35 Describe the fiscal resources the LEA will make available to fully implement the intervention(s) if this grant is not fully funded.

•The LEA will allocate over $245,000 for all three Focus Schools to fully implement the interventions. We will also make partnership agreements annual and craft adjustments if needed. AI Middle School will be prepared to use its local budget to provide resources for one - 10 week Extra Time intervention. This will cover the transportation and EPER cost. The Community Partner resources and Special Education Staff would be part of the discussion during the planning for the Consolidated Grant application.

4.36 Describe the LEA's plan to prepare LEA and school staff for the implementation of intervention(s) in the Focus School.

•The LEA has scheduled meetings with the school's Building Leadership Teams and with communities to plan and prepare for the interventions. In addition, the LEA is working with targeted schools to ensure that their outcomes and strategies are aligned to the strategic plan – including the use of data and resources. Additionally, the AIMS will (1) Conduct a Fall instructional data review to identify underperforming students in specific subgroups (2) Determine the staff and schedules needed to implement interventions (3) Communicate to stakeholders (parents, staff, and students) of the intervention plans and activities and (4) Implement interventions and monitor their progress.

B.2 Please provide a response below to the intervention-specific questions associated with the intervention(s) selected for your first Focus School. Please copy and paste the intervention name, questions and your responses to these questions from the word template provided.

Specific/Targeted Questions:

Intervention 1: Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies

4.01 Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Several studies have found that after-school programs do have positive effects on children's academic performance as well as on other factors. This includes an impact on growth in language arts and proficiency on state test scores - significantly showing larger gains in their reading and problem-solving scores compared to nonattendees (Little, P. (2009). Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). School reform efforts that include expanded learning opportunities more fully engage students and can impacts on academic, developmental and health outcomes (Stonehill, R. (2009). Foreword, Introduction and Report Overview. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). Afterschool programs support ELL students by offering extra time for both direct language instruction and practicing oral language skills; providing additional time to meet the learning needs of individual students (Zehr, M. A. (2009). Oral-Language Skills for English-Learners Focus of Researchers. Austin, TX: Education Week, Volume 29, Issue 08.). In addition, afterschool programs that offer inclusive programming provide additional opportunities to use supplemental services and technology to mirror the special education services during the regular school day (National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2007) Afterschool programs and students with special needs. Research Brief). The reading interventions will be supported with direct instruction and the use of Achieve 300 – to further advance comprehension skills. The math supports will also be supported with effective teachers and the use of Think Through Learning (TTM).
4.02 Describe the specific research based activities that will be used during the increased learning time. Provide an explanation as to how the activities will target individual student needs.
•Instructional activities / support that the students will receive during the Extra Time program will be in alignment with state and district standards and curriculum recommendations and will focus on Improving student literacy across the content areas (reading, writing, speaking, listening) Improving student problem-solving, including mathematical problem-solving, Improving classroom management and enhancing student motivation. The following strategies would be in use – and aligned to Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement (Marzano, Pickering and Pollock): small group time; setting objectives with continuous feedback; reinforcement of skills; homework and practice of skills; cooperative learning; nonlinguistic representations; Cues, Questions, and Advance Organizers.   For ELA skills, students will also use Achieve 3000 – which will give them access to personalized literacy support (truly differentiated literacy instruction) and help improve Lexile® gains and sustainable, school-wide improvement. In a National study, students demonstrated increased growth beyond expected targets or norms with regular use of the interventions (National Middle School Lexile Study, Achieve 3000). For math, in addition to teacher support, Think Through Math is a supplemental instructional program that focuses on the critical foundations for algebra. This will deepen students' understanding of critical mathematical concepts, improve higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills, and motivate students to persevere. Support for TTM will require professional development for tutors to properly implement the program for maximum student benefit.
4.03 Describe how the LEA will adjust the school schedule, lengthen the school week or year, and/or use other methods to increase learning time.
•The school will extend the instructional time by adding two hours to the school day for an estimated 20 weeks, during the time that the Extended Time program is offered. In addition, the school is instituting a block schedule greatly increase the time previously devoted to ELA and math and other subjects.
4.04 Describe the LEA's rationale for the duration of extended time to be provided and how the duration of time will be sufficient to meet individual student needs.
•In order to improve academic outcomes for adolescents, especially low-income students of color, school leaders must have additional opportunities to provide curriculum-aligned instruction to students. They must also understand the way that these programs, in alignment with high school reform efforts, can help teens succeed socially and academically. Research data consistently show that demographic differences are associated with children's educational attainment, and local data shows that AIMS is the recipient of children who arrive requiring additional opportunities to practice academic skills and content.

Specific/Targeted Questions:

Intervention 2: Partnerships with community

4.05Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.

Successful middle schools effectively welcome and mobilize the unique strengths and resources that families and community partners can bring schools, while ensuring that such efforts are aligned with schools' mission and messaging to students (Education Week, 2003, national survey; "Family involvement in middle and high school students' education").

AI Middle has a pupil population that is 83% high needs, based on Free and reduced lunch data. These students arrive from no less than three Red Clay Consolidated School District elementary schools that have entire student populations (100%) that qualify for free and reduced price lunches. In addition, they also educate children who reside in the neighborhoods that have been involved in the majority of police activity during the past decade - 45% of all of the police calls in the City for Sept 2005 were to police districts that encompass the neighborhoods of these children. 5 of the top 10 calls for service by grid are in the Westside area; with 50% of the citywide increase in violent crime in complaints in coming from Hilltop and the Browntown/Hedgeville areas.

Communities In Schools gives students the support and encouragement they need to unlock their potential. They provide targeted interventions proven to keep students on the path to graduation by strategically aligning and delivering resources with a dedicated staff member— inside the partner schools. In partnership with school staff, site coordinators help identify students at risk of not finishing school and establish relationships with local agencies, businesses, health care providers, and integrate services into the school to keep the child on track. Communities In Schools is unique in its ability to lower dropout rates and increase on-time graduation compared to other dropout prevention programs (Communities In Schools National Evaluation: A Five Year Executive Summary, ICF International (October, 2010). Services and resources intentionally targeted to students to address specific school leadership priorities result in positive student impacts. Results show that students targeted to receive case managed services by CIS during the critical secondary transition years, were more successful than those who did not receive these services.

Pritchett Associates work focuses on the early adolescent and the relationships with the school and home. Early adolescence and entry into middle school reflect changes on multiple levels including key changes in adolescent development, biological and cognitive growth, social development, and renegotiations of family relationships, especially the parent–adolescent relationship. The middle school context reflects a significant change compared to elementary school, including a larger, more bureaucratic system with many more teachers, peers, and curricular choices. This may entail communicating parental expectations for education and its value or utility, linking schoolwork to current events, fostering educational and occupational aspirations, discussing learning strategies with children, and making preparations and plans for the future—that is, academic socialization (Parental Involvement in Middle School: A Meta-Analytic Assessment of the Strategies That Promote Achievement - Duke University~ (2009). Parental involvement in education is positively associated with academic outcomes during middle school. Middle schools with strong parental involvement have leadership that welcome families and provide them with appropriate opportunities to get involved. A study of low-income African-American students showed that students had significantly higher GPAs after one year of middle school when parents were involved in their work and they were provided with other social supports (Gutman, L.M., and Midgley, C. (2000). "The Role of Protective Factors in Supporting the Academic Achievement of Poor African American Students During the Middle School Transition." Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29(2), Plenum Publishing Corporation, 223–248.).

4.06Provide the name(s) of the community-based organization(s) the LEA and school will partner with and describe the LEA's rationale for how the partnership(s) is aligned to the needs of the school's identified subpopulations.

•Communities In Schools of Delaware: The model of integrated services when implemented with fidelity, yields improved student outcomes. This includes credit completion, attendance and dropout prevention. With the tide of violence in the communities represented in the school and the extreme reliance on transportation (school bus) for over 95% of pupils, the resource provides an assurance of pupil attendance and can catch the pupil before it's too late – keeping them in school to receive a standards-based education.

•Pritchett Associates: Pritchett Associates is led by Maurice Pritchett a well-respected member of the Wilmington Community and former School District administrator and the 1994-95 Delaware State National Distinguished Principal Award.. The organization provides assistance to schools districts and public charters struggling with a variety of areas, including transitioning families into schools, leadership, community relations, cultural competence and curricular

alignment. Since 2009, Pritchett Associates has been working with Red Clay on developing new leadership and building family involvement in its city schools. Families trust the organization and the leader, and their impact has been measured in parents becoming partners in the educational process, learning to negotiate the schooling process, and developing connections between the school community and the school – this is key since over 95% of AIMS children arrive to school daily by bus – the other 5% by car (no walkers, not a neighborhood school). These partnerships will provide an extension of the instructional supports for students in their respective communities and are designed to increase parental involvement at the middle schools, while bolstering students' leadership and communication skills. During an 2001-12 school year and summer pilot parents learned about life at AIMS. The Pritchett Associates work is based on research that shows parental involvement dropping off at the middle school level and the positive impact that parental involvement can continue to have throughout a child's school years."The Ambassadors program has made a positive impact on the students that participated in the program," said AIMS Principal Theodore Boyer. "The students received leadership training that will enable them to be role models at Alexis I. du Pont Middle School and in the community. In addition to leadership training, the students developed their writing and technology skills that will help them academically. The staff at Alexis I. du Pont Middle School is very proud of the Student Ambassadors."

4.07Describe the LEA's plan to integrate the community-based partner(s) into the school's improvement efforts.
•Schedule meetings between the LEA, school and the partners to outline the deliverables and expectations per the school plan goals; craft a deliverable-based MOU aligned with the AIMS success plan;
•Provide opportunities for the partners to serve as associate members of the school planning teams;
•Communicate the partnership and the expectations to the school community and more intimately to the targeted families;
•Target dates for reporting on progress toward the outcomes;
•Have a final review of outcomes and contractual expectations (annually in June), and determine the need and goals for the future;
04596B

4.08Describe the specific measurable objectives and responsibilities for the community-based partner(s). Describe the LEA's plan to monitor the progress of the partner(s) toward these objectives.
Objective Measures for Community-Based Partners:
•Measure Name: meetings and/or workshops for parents of AIMS children
•Measure Name: number of reportable offenses (to police department)
•Measure Name: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)
LEA Monitoring of Community-based partners:
•Regular visits to the site(s) where the partners provide services
•Monthly meetings with community based partners to review progress toward outcomes - peripheral level discussion/review to attain important information related to implementation
•Interviews with participating students and their families
•Evaluative reporting on progress relates to MOU
Specific/Targeted Questions:

Intervention 11: Staffing selection and assignment
4.29Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Research has consistently showed that quality instruction in a positive environment has an impact on academic performance, especially when learning tasks selected for struggling students are matched at their instructional levels. Student practice enables students to become familiar with the concepts and skills they are practicing. Acquiring and gaining facility in the use of new information and skill requires opportunities for repetition to enable the new data to become firmly implanted in a student's repertoire and to work their way through working memory (Gravois, T. A., & Gickling, E. E. (2002). Best practices in instructional assessment. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology V (pp. 503–518). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists). Education legislation and regulations (i.e., IDEA, RTI) require districts to align resources and services to ensure quality support for classroom teachers and students. This requires a district to have services that are integrated, especially for those students who are experiencing academic and behavioral difficulty. The strategy must consider and make quality decisions about students' access to resources within the school setting. The

essential components include a collaborative environment, effective communication skills, and to use problem-solving stages to eliminate barriers. The purpose is to enhance teacher capacity to use
data-based decision making and evidence-based interventions to address student academic and behavioral concerns in the classroom. Analyzing data from the instructional triangle helps to determine an instructional match for student learning and the gap between the student's current and expected performance along with the evidence-based interventions if a gap exists (Gravois, T. A., Rosenfield, S., & Gicking, E. E. (2006). IC Teams Manual. Unpublished manuscript.). Research also demonstrates that teachers can create an impact with a caring classroom , showing genuine interest, being consistently assertive and explicitly stating expectations – this can be accomplished with an educator specifically skilled in working with students who've diverse educational needs and backgrounds (Brown, D. F. (2003). Urban teachers' use of culturally responsive management strategies. Theory into Practice, 42(4), 277-282.).

4.30 Describe the level of flexibility and autonomy that will be provided to site-based leadership for hiring, retaining and transferring staff.
Alexis I. du Pont Middle School will be in full compliance with the RCCSD staffing procedures and requirements. The school administrative staff will conduct the screening, interviewing, and submitting the recommendations for the individual that they would like to be employed in this intervention position. The LEAs Special Services and Human Resources Departments will provide support in the final identification and will work as members of the district's monthly staffing committee meetings to enhance and retain the position.
4.31 Describe the systematic schoolwide process that will be used to assign students to classes. Describe how this process will match the most qualified and experienced teachers with students based on student needs in order to help students meet the academic achievement standards.
The school's ED, guidance staff, and administration will review subgroups of students and assign them to the best qualified staff member that can provided instruction to meet their needs. Implementing Response the process requires thought, purposeful planning, and continuous evaluation and refinement. AIMS would do the following:
Needs Assessment: ID a team of stakeholders who (PLC/BLT)are empowered to make decisions; ID Student needs and desired outcomes – putting students into tiers (ID academic needs and skill targets building wide)
Planning: plans for implementation, professional development and review, allocating resources to support (e.g. funds, staff, and time); plan interventions and schedule support
Implement/Do: include targeted students, classrooms, grades, and/or content areas; delivering culturally-responsive and evidence-based supports and assessments; evaluating and refining implementation efforts; ongoing professional development
Review: evaluate progress; adjust practices based on the evaluation and monitor changes to ensure sustainability;

B.3 Please provide a response below to the support, monitoring, and evaluation questions for your first Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

?How will the LEA support the implementation of the focus school plan?

4.37 Describe the LEA-level staff members that have been identified to support the school as it implements the intervention(s). Please describe their individual expertise/responsibility in supporting the school and describe how this expertise is aligned with the needs of the school and is likely to promote successful implementation of the selected intervention(s). Please also note which LEA-level staff member will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan and the monitoring strategy for the duration of the three-year period.
- James Comegys: Director of Curriculum formerly the principal of Middletown HS, where he successfully implemented restructuring requirements – helping the school to make AYP. Mr. Comegys leads the districts curriculum and instructional program to ensure alignment with the common core and with Classroom Instruction That Works
- Samuel Golder: Director of School Operations, formerly the principal of AI DuPont HS. Under Mr. Golder's Leadership, AI DuPont made AYP during the NCLB era with the use of a building-wide implementation of distributive leadership processes. At the district level, Mr. Golder has provided support to both Dickinson and McKean HS in making AYP.
- Amy Grundy: Manager of Turnaround Schools; Dr. Grundy is the former principal of Gauger-Cobbs MS, where she led the school in making AYP and

being removed from state sanctions. In her current role, she oversees the Red Clay Partnership Zone Council and support to Turnaround Schools,.
- Nicholas Russo: Supervisor of Secondary ELA; Mr. Russo was a key member of the McKean HS leadership team and assisted the school in making AYP and being removed from the state's improvement list. In his current capacity, he is focusing on secondary literacy.
- Malik Stewart: Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs; Mr. Stewart is a former Education Associate with the DE Dept. of Education where he led school improvement support efforts statewide. He focuses on federal program requirements, continuous success planning and Title I, II, and III.

4.38   Describe the unique infrastructures that will be in place to monitor and evaluate the academic impact of the intervention(s).
The District has modified its support structure to include a Turnaround Office to focus specifically on the PZ schools. In practice, the District Support Team will create a connection to the new Turnaround Office and will include them in regular meetings. Also, the District has developed a PZ Council which integrates the expertise of the Support Team and The Turnaround Office and utilizes the expertise of Mass Insight and Distinguished Educators to review the plans and progress of the PZ. The Project Manager will also support the tacking of performance objectives related to Race To The Top with a focus on Goal 4 – the PZ. This position supports the work of the Turnaround Office and Support Teams.
In Red Clay, with the adoption of the strategic plan – we are focusing on developing systemic professional development. All Instructional staff will actively participate in, and implement, routinely scheduled and data-driven comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approaches to improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement by SY 2015–16. As a result, all district PD will be:
-driven by student learning needs as determined by ongoing data analysis
-research-based and reflective of best practices
-regularly assessed for effectiveness
4.39 Describe LEA's plan to sustain and support the intervention(s) in the Focus school after the grant expires.
The District has focused its application on the use of adult time and learning to change practice. These are areas that can be sustained through inclusion in the Federal Consolidated Grant Application. As the reforms impact pupil progress, the district will include them in the review of the plan and strategies and make allocation adjustments to support and sustain the changes. In an article entitled "How to Sustain Student Success" (Christman, V. Research in Education Leadership (2005), districts are advised to focus on the following aspects when maintaining improvement momentum (RCCSD initiatives in parenthesis):
-Teacher leadership: Teachers in successful schools made teaching and learning decisions; engaged in informal action research; developed their own internal leadership structures; and participated in weekly collaborative lesson planning (PLCs, and Success Planning/BLT teams along with District level leadership opportunities)
-District office leadership: successful schools received disaggregated assessment data at the beginning of each term, and their principals received training on data interpretation and usage; successful districts scheduled monthly cohort meetings with the principals of all its state improvement program schools (DTO, District Data Days, and Leadership Academy).
-Programs and practices: targeted students had vastly different experiences than comparable students at unsuccessful students (maintain programs with professional development – aligning with Goal 1 of the RCCSD strategic plan).
For example, the Extended Day programs and summer enrichment programs are crucial to district programming, and focus school funds allow us to think differently and redesign the current model by focusing services within a school community (vs. creating regional summer enrichment sites or being mandated to focus tutoring on income needs instead of academic needs per SES). Title I, IIA, III, Perkins and IDEA along with Curriculum and Professional Development resources and other competitive programs will enable us to confidently sustain these changes and build upon the strides that are made to support our customized 5 year strategic plan. Sustaining improvement means not relying on just two or three quick-hit goals that are implemented during the turnaround stage, but looking at the system comprehensively and standing firm behind the established mission. Our constant review of resources in relation to our goals will do exactly this (Duke, Daniel L. "Keys to Sustaining Successful School Turnarounds." Darden-Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education. 2007).

4.2   Information for the Second Focus School

Please answer all questions in this section for your second Focus School.

Question A

A.1 Enter the name of your second Focus School.

Baltz Elementary School

A.2 Select the Intervention(s) for your second Focus School.

✕	Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
○	Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)
✕	Strategies to address social, emotional and heath needs
○	Job-embedded Professional Development
○	Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement
○	Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement
○	Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
○	Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan
○	Use of external provider(s) matched to identified school needs
○	Changes to LEA policy, practices, and/or procedures
✕	Staffing selection and assignment
○	Locally developed option(s) that are research based and supported by needs assessment data

Question B

B.1 Please provide a response below to the general questions for your second Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

General Focus School Questions
4.33 Describe the process used to engage a broad spectrum of stakeholders (including families and communities) to determine the appropriate intervention(s) for the Focus school.
Along with administration and staff Focus School planning team members, including the Baltz PTA president Kim Gardner and parent Mrs. Ruiz, the team used a Plan Do Study Act approach to address the needs. Members provided insight on parent thoughts and concerns regarding Baltz, attended the series of meetings to identify root causes (of challenge and success), review research related to interventions and outcomes, and develop interventions to support the identified targeted goals. The school will continue to effectively communicate and engage with stakeholders to discuss the needs and interventions needed to support students by conducting informational meetings, conferences, presentations at parent conducted meetings, and informational literature.

4.34 Describe how the intervention(s) selected for the Focus School is either new or a significant expansion of existing interventions currently in place at the school. Describe how the Focus School will operate differently as a result of the intervention(s).

The intervention that's been identified in the Baltz Elementary School's Focus Plan will provide a broader educational program that the school will provide to underperforming students. The Extended Time intervention will allow targeted subpopulations of students to receive additional instruction beyond the regular school hours; focusing on the identified instructional needs in Reading and Math. The parent engagement plan seeks to make partners out of our families and remove barriers to information and skills so that they can assist Baltz in addressing the needs of their children.

Extend learning time

Analysis of current DCAS data suggests that students need additional instruction in ELA and Math, and that they need additional time with the highly effective staff at Baltz. The extended school day instructional programs for students will provide opportunities for additional support. This will expand from the previous two (2010-2011 and 2011-12) years' SES requirements, which just focused on income eligibility; to targeting the lowest performing children in the subpopulations and allow the targeted students to receive additional instruction beyond the regular school hours; focusing on the identified instructional needs in Reading and Math. This program will consist of two eight-week sessions (16 weeks) with two hour classes running two days per week. The additional time will be used to target the specific student subpopulations and their needs identified through DCAS administration as well as school-based common assessments and other forms of data. The BLT and leadership will examine best practices in extended learning time and use the proposed extended time opportunities to implement strategies that have been proven in the field to produce dramatic gains in student achievement. This targeted support provided more than 90% of pupils with support in 2010-2011 and the result was that Baltz made AYP per DEDOE ratings. In summer 2013 and 2014, Baltz will also add a summer enrichment program to address the needs of children at the school. This will be a 5 week program, operating 3 hours per day (24 days total) – providing additional ELA and math support. This will change Baltz into a building that extends its day and year to meet the needs of the children.

Social and emotional supports:

Baltz Elementary School serves a student body that comes from a variety of communities and neighborhoods – and all, 100%, of the children qualifies for free and reduced price meals. Over 32% of our pupils are identified as English Language Learners. Based on the George Washington University's Center for Equity and Excellence in Education review of Red Clay's ELL programming, parent engagement should be culturally relevant and responsive. Baltz will transform into a school that provides opportunities for detailed, school based partnerships with families to create mutual benefit – ultimately impacting the child. This will require going beyond the base Title I requirements of "compacts, policy, translation, and annual meeting" – to becoming enhanced and personal to increase attendance, reduce behavior referrals, prevent drop out and support classroom improvement. We plan to see dramatic impact on student data from the current baseline to the future outcomes as the Family Crisis Supports become integral to our plan in an effort to reduce the achievement gap. The FCT position would do more than support case management – especially with the degree of the current needs at Baltz. The position would be restructured to focus on the identified subgroups and deliver correlated assistance to fully meet children's needs.

The position will work as a member of the BLT and prioritize support within the targeted subpopulations to address the issues confronting their families.

4.35 Describe the fiscal resources the LEA will make available to fully implement the intervention(s) if this grant is not fully funded.

•The LEA will allocate over $245,000 for all three Focus Schools to fully implement the interventions. We will also make adjustments if needed. The district is supporting additional ELL parent opportunities through local resources and in-kind support. Baltz Elementary School will be prepared to use its local budget to provide resources for one - 8 week Extra Time intervention. This will cover the transportation and EPER cost. The summer enrichment resources would be part of the discussion during the planning for the Consolidated Grant application as would the Family Crisis supports.

4.36 Describe the LEA's plan to prepare LEA and school staff for the implementation of intervention(s) in the Focus School.

The LEA has scheduled meetings with the school's Building Leadership Teams and with communities to plan and prepare for the interventions. In addition, the LEA is working with targeted schools to ensure that their outcomes and strategies are aligned to the strategic plan – including the use of data and resources. Additionally, the Baltz Elementary will (1) Conduct a Fall instructional data review to identify underperforming students in specific subgroups (2) Determine the staff and schedules needed to implement interventions (3) Communicate to stakeholders (parents, staff, and students) of the intervention plans and activities and (4) Implement interventions and monitor their progress.

B.2 Please provide a response below to the intervention-specific questions associated with the intervention(s) selected for your second Focus School. Please copy and paste the intervention name, questions and your responses to these questions from the word template provided.

Specific/Targeted Questions:
Intervention 1: Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies

4.01Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Extended Time

The Baltz Cares Extended Time program will be implemented to provide instructional support after the regular school hours. This intervention will extend and provide specific instructional support to underperforming students in the subgroup areas that have not met the standard on state assessments are reduce the achievement gap and use the Professional Learning Communities and the building Leadership Team to identify targeted students based on Fall DCAS scores, classroom assessments and advisement. The program includes math and reading tutoring with research –based supports identified with the support of the District ELA and Math Cadre, including using Teacher Created Materials and Math Supports. The program will also include attendance supports for families, contact/reminders for chronic absentees and even family conference discussions and goal-setting to encourage consistent behavior. These programs will be funded through the Focus Schools funding from the Delaware Department of Education. Beginning in the 2012-13 school year, formative assessment data will be available to assess student growth. This information will equip the Extended Day service providers to teach directly to students who need such services while, at the same time, focusing on specific weaknesses for each of these students. This formative assessment data will be augmented by the services of the school's ELA and Math and instructional support staff members to coordinate programs and material with the grade level curriculum.   This intervention will require the instructional staff to periodically review student data. This process will be monitored by the school's administration, building leadership team, content area teachers, and district administration.
The school staff will review student performance levels for students arriving in September. Extended Day funds will be used to support efforts to increase student achievement. The support will be sustained throughout the school year with two 8 week after school programs and a 5 week summer enrichment program. The school year program sessions will be conducted two times a week after school two hours per session.   The students will receive tutoring/instructional support in specific areas as identified through DCAS data.   The tutoring services will be provided by staff members that are highly qualified in their content area. Baltz Elementary will monitor the participating students progress throughout the school year. This monitoring will consist of DCAS growth (Fall – Winter – Spring), marking period grades, and attendance in school and with extended day. Building Leadership Team will review data with the monitoring program to assess the delivery services being provided, their effectiveness, and potentially make alterations in service delivery. Identified students in African American and ELL/Hispanic Cell along with low income students will be provided additional individualized instruction in a small group setting in ELA and Math. This additional support will take place for an additional hour twice a week. One hour per week will be provided for students to participate in extra-curricular activities. Several studies have found that after-school programs do have positive effects on children's academic performance as well as on other factors. This includes an impact on growth in language arts and proficiency on state test scores - significantly showing larger gains in their reading and problem-solving scores compared to nonattendees (Little, P. (2009). Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). School reform efforts that include expanded learning opportunities more fully engage students and can impact academic, developmental and health outcomes (Stonehill, R. (2009). Foreword, Introduction and Report Overview. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). Afterschool programs support ELL students by offering extra time for both direct language instruction and practicing oral language skills; providing additional time to meet the learning needs of individual students (Zehr, M. A. (2009). Oral-Language Skills for English-Learners Focus of Researchers. Austin, TX: Education Week, Volume 29, Issue 08.). In addition, afterschool programs that offer inclusive programming provide additional opportunities to use supplemental services and technology to mirror the special education services during the regular school day (National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2007) Afterschool programs and students with special needs. Research Brief). Students who attended a formal program housed in the students' school and staffed by the classroom teachers outperformed students who were tutored in a community based environment by childcare providers in both reading and mathematics. It was also stated that through staffing after-school programs with regular-school-day teachers, the alignment of the after-school program to the school's curriculum was an effective method. (Rothman, T., & Henderson, M. (2011). So school-based tutoring programs significantly improve student performance on standardized tests? RMLE Online - Research in

Middle Level Education, 34(6), 2.). Extracurricular activities help students develop of a sense of belonging, opportunities to expand social networks, provide positive reinforcement and an achievement orientation, while giving participants leadership roles and age-appropriate expectations and goals (Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (1st ed., p. 158). New York: Routledge).

4.02Describe the specific research based activities that will be used during the increased learning time. Provide an explanation as to how the activities will target individual student needs.
Identified students in African American and ELL/Hispanic Cell along with low income students will be provided additional individualized instruction in a small group setting in ELA and Math. This additional support provides the opportunity to teach children in small steps and segment complex skills into smaller instructional units to allow for mastery and synthesis. It also provides an additional opportunity to review skills and provide demonstrations (Archer, A.L.; Hughes, C.A. (2011) Explicit Instruction: Effective and Efficient Teaching. (New York: The Guilford Press).. Instructional activities / support that the students will receive during the Extra Time program will be in alignment with state and district standards and curriculum recommendations and will focus on Improving student literacy across the content areas (reading, writing, speaking, listening) Improving student problem-solving, including mathematical problem-solving, Improving classroom management and enhancing student motivation. The research based activities will include specific objectives and feedback, Homework and Practice, collaborative learning and reinforcing effort/recognizing practice (Classroom Instruction That Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001).

4.03Describe how the LEA will adjust the school schedule, lengthen the school week or year, and/or use other methods to increase learning time.
•The school will extend the instructional time by adding two hours to the school day for 16 weeks, during the time that the Extended Time program is offered. In addition, the school is adding 3 hours a day four times per week (12 hours) for an additional 5 weeks in the summer.

4.04Describe the LEA's rationale for the duration of extended time to be provided and how the duration of time will be sufficient to meet individual student needs.
Since 2010-11, Baltz has implemented state test-focused supports with success. The 2010-2011 Baltz SES afterschool program achievements were directly related to students' attendance in the program – hence the rationale for student mentoring and parent engagement partnering. In 2010-2011, attendance for students was consistent and resulted in the school achieving AYP status. In 2011-2012, attendance in the lower non-DCAS grades (K-2) was high and those students subsequently scored higher on formative and summative assessments (DIBELS Next and NWEA). Also, Baltz has implemented a "Girl's on the Run" program as well as a "Fluency Futbol" program, which combined mentoring, academics and enrichment. Attendance in these activities was high and served as great motivation for the students involved both academically and socially. The activities planned for the upcoming school year want to tie the academic programs to the extra-curricular activities to increase attendance in the academic piece and therein increase student (ELL and African American) achievement. Based on past experience, the goal for the leadership is to structure a program that targets attendance incentives, partnerships with families, and ultimately academic success.
Specific/Targeted Questions
Intervention 3: Strategies to address social, emotional, and heath needs

4.09Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Hiring a Family Crisis Intervention for Family preservation and enhancement: A family crisis occurs when a family is forced change. It is a turning point where the life at home will either get better, or get worse. The impact is transferred to school once the students arrive. Exposure to and perceptions of danger are likely to threaten the ability of youth to fulfill their potential in the school setting – keeping in mind Maslow lists safety and security as secondary only to physiological needs in his hierarchy of needs that must be met before individuals can get to the higher-levels associated with school achievement (Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.). Unexpected events (death, fire, job loss), developmental situations (marriage, childbirth, puberty, parental aging), and structural issues can aggravate and can lead to many actions that create harmful situations for a learner. Crisis intervention has several purposes. It aims to reduce the intensity of the child's emotional, mental, physical and behavioral reactions to a crisis through family support. Another purpose is to help them regain their former level of functioning before the crisis. Functioning may be improved above and beyond

this by developing new coping skills and eliminating ineffective ways of coping, such as withdrawal, isolation, and detrimental decision-making. When a child or a family is in crisis, both the kind of help and how it is given makes a crucial difference between the family getting the support to contribute to educational success or being set back. The Family Crisis Therapy will provide immediate emotional and environmental support to reduce the stress and risk and teach better, more constructive, effective ways to deal with stress or painful feelings by creating a positive, trauma sensitive, and strength based culture and climate (Colton, D. (2008). Leadership's and program's role in organizational and cultural change to reduce seclusions and restraints. In M. A. Nunno, D. M. Day, & L. B. Bullard (Eds.), For our own safety: Examining the safety of high-risk interventions for children and young people (pp. 143-166). Arlington, VA: Child Welfare League of America.). The Family Crisis Therapist will prioritize a caseload of subgroup families and will be an integral part of the school community through:

•Individual, Group, and Family Counseling
•Child/Parent Support Groups and Social Skills workgroups
•Crisis intervention, conflict resolution, and discipline alternatives.
•Expertise on the school's Success/Leadership Teams
•Collaborate with the school and any outside agencies.
•Locate resources (as needed)

Baltz is 54% Hispanic and 33% of its population are classified as English Language Learners. Cultural sensitivity is significantly related to the treatment of children affected by trauma and their families, particularly Hispanic/Latino families. Research suggests that the Family Crisis Therapy worker be familiar with the subtle nuances of the school's diverse cultures and values to effectively implement the needed change (Miranda, J. Siddique, J., Der-Martirosian, C., studies have shown a robust connection between family structure and schoolwork engagement (Susan L. Brown, "Family Structure and Child Well-Being: The Significance of Parental Cohabitation," Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 66, No. 2 (May 2004), pp. 351-367), and more importantly reading performance (Marcia J. Carlson and Mary E. Corcoran, "Family Structure and Children's Behavioral and Cognitive Outcomes," Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 63, No. 3 (August 2001), pp. 779-792). The Family Crisis Therapist provides support to rebuild, develop, or enhance the stability needed; being a conduit to services for our populations than often have the greatest needs for care combined with the most challenges in accessing the care. When Baltz was assigned an FCT by DEDOE, the staff person addressed the issues related to family as a support to everyone. With DOE's decision to remove to FCT, Baltz is requesting a position that will be fully aligned to the identified subpopulations - working as a member of the building leadership team to prioritize services to the families of students demonstrating academic needs within the subgroups (as measured by classroom, state, and local assessments) to help demonstrate the correlation between the intervention and its support to academics. The Baltz poverty population increased from 560 to 612 within 2 months; with many unemployed families who cannot afford the basics; the needs for attending and participating in (FOOD, SHELTER, CLOTHING). Baltz families are coming to the school with needs related to shelter, counseling, mental supports, guidance – the basic needs – and there is an increase in the number of low income families. The school is currently performing triage services, using administrators, the guidance counselor and nurse – but need a staff member who can dedicate their time to coordinating support to impact the subpopulations.   The previous FCT did support case management – but not to the degree of the current needs at Baltz. The position would focus on cases of students identified within the targeted subgroups who are low performing – to provide correlated assistance to fully meet children's needs. The Baltz FCT will work with school administration as a member of the BLT and be assigned families based not only on social need alone, but prioritized within the targeted subpopulations to address the issues confronting their families. They will help the families receive help with a range of issues (ex: legal, financial, health, emotional, housing, immigration and English language classes) so that the parent can better focus on the needs of their children. The result will be supports that target academic subpopulations and empower families to support their students in meeting the academic goals.

4.10Describe the specific strategies that will be used to address social, emotional, school climate, health, nutrition, and physical activity needs of the school's identified subpopulations. Describe how the strategies will be integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.

?The FCT will work with the school team to identify a caseload of targeted children and employ research based strategies to meet the needs of the children and their families; in essence removing barriers to enable children to partipcate fully in the educational process - Assess Each targeted Student's Resources. Research shows that one way to define poverty and wealth is in terms of the degree to which we have access specific resources linked to our well being (Nine Powerful Practices: Nine Strategies Help Raise the Achievement of Students Living in Poverty." Educational Leadership, 65(7), 48–52. (2008). The FCT will access these resources for families and children to help them navigate life and the American educational process.

?School success, as it's currently defined, requires a huge amount of resources that schools don't necessarily provide. The FCT will help Baltz to provide interventions that require students to draw on resources they do not possess so that they can be successful. For example, many students in households

characterized by generational poverty have a very limited support system. If such a student isn't completing homework, telling that student's parent, who is working two jobs, to make sure the student does his or her homework isn't going to be effective. But if the addresses the supports needed - that student will be more successful.

?The FCT will support the school planning team and PLCs and review and provide data, with discretion, to help define the needs/resources that a student may require in order to be successful ("Health and Poverty Through the Lens of Economic Class: An Invitation to Healthcare Providers to Create New Models for Better Serving People in Poverty," with Philip DeVol. (2008). The FCT will help the school to Empower students and families to become partners in learning to promote student responsibility.

?The FCT will incorporate school programs such as Capturing Kids Hearts (a researched based process designed to strengthen students' connectedness to school through enhancing strong bonds with teachers, and clear rules of conduct that are consistently enforced) and the staff/student mentoring program to support our students identified in our African American and Hispanic cell by providing them a support system with another teacher in the building.

Intervention 11: Staffing selection and assignment

4.29 Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Goal 1 Strategy 1: Extra support Personnel 1. African American Support Personnel 2. ELL/Hispanic Support Personnel
Rationale: 1. Extra support personnel to provide small group instruction and support to identified target African American cell. Individualized instruction will be provided based on students' individual needs using assessment data. 2. Extra support personnel to provide small group instruction and support to identify target ELL/Hispanic cells. Individualized Bilingual instruction will be provided based on students' individual needs using assessment data.

Supporting research:
•"The effects of small group learning were significantly enhanced when students had group work experience or instruction, where specific cooperative learning strategies were employed, and when group size was small." (Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (1st ed., p. 95). New York: Routledge)
•"A consistent message from studies of the effectiveness of grouping and mixing students within classes by ability or for small groups is that instructional materials and the nature of instruction must be adapted for these specific groups. Simply placing students in small or more homogenous groups is not enough. For grouping to be maximally effective materials and teaching must be varied and made appropriately challenging to accommodate the needs of students at their level of ability." (Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (1st ed., p. 95). New York: Routledge)
•" …reducing class size leads to more individualized instruction, higher quality instruction, greater scope for innovation and student-centered teaching, increased teacher morale, fewer disruptions, less student misbehavior, and greater ease of engaging students in academic activities." (Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (1st ed., p. 85). New York: Routledge)

4.30 Describe the level of flexibility and autonomy that will be provided to site-based leadership for hiring, retaining and transferring staff.
The 1st grade enrollment at Baltz for the upcoming 2012-2013 school year showed a high need for an additional teaching unit for 1st grade. In the July staffing meeting the RCCSD staffing committee recognized this need and assigned a Teach for America corps member at Baltz. Placing this person a first grade classroom lowers student teacher ratio creating a more conducive learning environment for all first grade students, including ELL and African American. At the same staffing meeting the RCCSD staffing committee recognized the need for additional ELL support and assigned a bilingual teacher to Baltz to provide additional support in for ELL students.
A technology teaching position allows for all students K-5, including ELL and African American, to have exposure to the computer skills necessary to succeed on state assessments as well as other computerized testing (MAP and Curriculum). In addition, this lowers the class sizes in Unified Arts at each grade level benefiting all students, including ELL and African American.
4.31 Describe the systematic schoolwide process that will be used to assign students to classes. Describe how this process will match the most qualified and experienced teachers with students based on student needs in order to help students meet the academic achievement standards.

Students (ELL and African American) recognized as having the greatest need through formative and summative assessments are placed in smaller RTI groups and assigned to Baltz's reading specialists. The additional ELL and African American support personnel then are able to meet with RTI groups of students that would otherwise occupy the reading specialists.

B.3 Please provide a response below to the support, monitoring, and evaluation questions for your second Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

?How will the LEA support the implementation of the focus school plan?

4.37 Describe the LEA-level staff members that have been identified to support the school as it implements the intervention(s). Please describe their individual expertise/responsibility in supporting the school and describe how this expertise is aligned with the needs of the school and is likely to promote successful implementation of the selected intervention(s). Please also note which LEA-level staff member will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan and the monitoring strategy for the duration of the three-year period.
- Gaysha Beard: ELA Supervisor ad formerly a District Literacy Coach and a highly effective reading teacher. Dr. Beard has provided literacy support for high-poverty buildings and provided her expertise to the development of extended day program materials.
- James Comegys: Director of Curriculum formerly the principal of Middletown HS, where he successfully implemented restructuring requirements – helping the school to make AYP. Mr. Comegys leads the districts curriculum and instructional program to ensure alignment with the common core and with Classroom Instruction That Works
- Andrea Lanciault: Director of School Operations, formerly the principal of North Star Elementary School. Under Ms. Lanciault's Leadership, North Star continually exceeded state targets while meeting the needs for all students. In her initial year in the District Office, she coordinated the North Star-Warner partnership, a professional learning community between a suburban and urban school.
- Amy Grundy: Manager of Turnaround Schools; Dr. Grundy is the former principal of Gauger-Cobbs MS, where she led the school in making AYP and being removed from state sanctions. In her current role, she oversees the Red Clay Partnership Zone Council and support to Turnaround Schools,.
- Nicholas Russo: Supervisor of Secondary ELA; Mr. Russo was a key member of the McKean HS leadership team and assisted the school in making AYP and being removed from the state's improvement list. In his current capacity, he is focusing on secondary literacy.
- Malik Stewart: Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs; Mr. Stewart is a former Education Associate with the DE Dept. of Education where he led school improvement support efforts statewide. He focuses on federal program requirements, continuous success planning and Title I, II, and III.

4.38   Describe the unique infrastructures that will be in place to monitor and evaluate the academic impact of the intervention(s).
The District has modified its support structure to include a Turnaround Office to focus specifically on the PZ schools. In practice, the District Support Team will create a connection to the new Turnaround Office and will include them in regular meetings. Also, the District has developed a PZ Council which integrates the expertise of the Support Team and The Turnaround Office and utilizes the expertise of Mass Insight and Distinguished Educators to review the plans and progress of the PZ. The Project Manager will also support the tacking of performance objectives related to Race To The Top with a focus on Goal 4 – the PZ. This position supports the work of the Turnaround Office and Support Teams.
In Red Clay, with the adoption of the strategic plan – we are focusing on developing systemic professional development. All Instructional staff will actively participate in, and implement, routinely scheduled and data-driven comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approaches to improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement by SY 2015–16. As a result, all district PD will be:
-driven by student learning needs as determined by ongoing data analysis
-research-based and reflective of best practices
-regularly assessed for effectiveness
4.39Describe LEA's plan to sustain and support the intervention(s) in the Focus school after the grant expires.
The District has focused its application on the use of adult time and learning to change practice. These are areas that can be sustained through inclusion in the Federal Consolidated Grant Application. As the reforms impact pupil progress, the district will include them in the review of the plan and strategies and make allocation adjustments to support and sustain the changes. In an article entitled "How to Sustain Student Success" (Christman, V. Research in Education Leadership (2005), districts are advised to focus on the following aspects when maintaining improvement momentum (RCCSD initiatives in

parenthesis):

-Teacher leadership: Teachers in successful schools made teaching and learning decisions; engaged in informal action research; developed their own internal leadership structures; and participated in weekly collaborative lesson planning (PLCs, and Success Planning/BLT teams along with District level leadership opportunities)

-District office leadership: successful schools received disaggregated assessment data at the beginning of each term, and their principals received training on data interpretation and usage; successful districts scheduled monthly cohort meetings with the principals of all its state improvement program schools (DTO, District Data Days, and Leadership Academy).

-Programs and practices: targeted students had vastly different experiences than comparable students at unsuccessful students (maintain programs with professional development – aligning with Goal 1 of the RCCSD strategic plan).

For example, the Extended Day programs and summer enrichment programs are crucial to district programming, and focus school funds allow us to think differently and redesign the current model by focusing services within a school community (vs. creating regional summer enrichment sites or being mandated to focus tutoring on income needs instead of academic needs per SES). Title I, IIA, III, Perkins and IDEA along with Curriculum and Professional Development resources and other competitive programs will enable us to confidently sustain these changes and build upon the strides that are made to support our customized 5 year strategic plan. Sustaining improvement means not relying on just two or three quick-hit goals that are implemented during the turnaround stage, but looking at the system comprehensively and standing firm behind the established mission. Our constant review of resources in relation to our goals will do exactly this (Duke, Daniel L. "Keys to Sustaining Successful School Turnarounds." Darden-Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education. 2007).

4.3   Information for the Third Focus School

Please answer all questions in this section for your third Focus School.

Question A

A.1 Enter the name of your third Focus School.

Warner Elementary School

A.2 Select the Intervention(s) for your third Focus School.

✕	Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
○	Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)
✕	Strategies to address social, emotional and heath needs
○	Job-embedded Professional Development
○	Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement
○	Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement
○	Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
○	Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan
○	Use of external provider(s) matched to identified school needs
○	Changes to LEA policy, practices, and/or procedures
○	Staffing selection and assignment
○	Locally developed option(s) that are research based and supported by needs assessment data

Question B

B.1 Please provide a response below to the general questions for your third Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

4.33 Describe the process used to engage a broad spectrum of stakeholders (including families and communities) to determine the appropriate intervention(s) for the Focus school.
•The school effectively communicates and engages with stakeholders to discuss the needs and interventions needed to support students through Building Leadership Team, PLC and faculty meetings. This process started a year ago and intensified during the 1003g planning process. This effort involved identifying root causes, possible potential outcomes, research based interventions and developing a plan to implement and monitor. The community was also asked to participate and information was shared at parent/community outreach meetings. Once the plan is approved, we will again share out with all parties.
4.34 Describe how the intervention(s) selected for the Focus School is either new or a significant expansion of existing interventions currently in place at the school. Describe how the Focus School will operate differently as a result of the intervention(s).
The Extended Time intervention will allow targeted subpopulations of students to receive additional instruction beyond the regular school hours; focusing on the identified instructional needs in Reading and Math.
Extend learning time
Analysis of current DCAS data suggests that Warner Elementary School has showed continuous growth, however students need additional time to understand and apply concepts related to ELA and Math. The extended school day instructional program for students will provide opportunities for additional support.   The program will consist of two eight-week sessions with two hour classes running two days per week. The additional time will be used to target the specific student subpopulations and their needs identified through DCAS administration as well as school-based common assessments and other forms of data. The BLT and leadership will examine best practices in extended learning time and use the proposed extended time opportunities to implement strategies that have been proven in the field to produce dramatic gains in student achievement. This intervention will allow the school to focus instruction on their students as well as hire qualified staff to instruct the students. Information as to current levels of performance can be shared to best serve the students. It will allow for students to be familiar – with staff as well as classmates – to allow for easier transition into the program.
4.35Describe the fiscal resources the LEA will make available to fully implement the intervention(s) if this grant is not fully funded.
•The LEA will allocate over $245,000 for all three Focus Schools to fully implement the interventions. Warner Elementary School will be prepared to amend its 1003g grant and use its local budget to provide resources for the Extra Time intervention. This will cover the transportation, materials and EPER cost.
4.36 Describe the LEA's plan to prepare LEA and school staff for the implementation of intervention(s) in the Focus School.
The LEA has scheduled meetings with the school's Building Leadership Teams and with communities to plan and prepare for the interventions. In addition, the LEA is working with targeted schools to ensure that their outcomes and strategies are aligned to the strategic plan – including the use of data and resources. Additionally, Warner will (1) conduct a Fall instructional data review to identify underperforming students in specific subgroups (2) Determine the staff and schedules needed to implement interventions (3) Communicate to stakeholders (parents, staff, and students) of the intervention plans and activities and (4) Implement interventions and monitor their progress.

B.2 Please provide a response below to the intervention-specific questions associated with the intervention(s) selected for your third Focus School. Please copy and paste the intervention name, questions and your responses to these questions from the word template provided.

Specific/Targeted Questions:
Intervention 1: Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies

4.01Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
Extended Time

The Warner Winners Summer Academy Extended Time program will be implemented to provide instructional support after the regular school hours. This intervention will extend and provide specific instructional support to underperforming students in the subgroup areas that have not met the standard on state assessments are reduce the achievement gap and use the Professional Learning Communities and the building Leadership Team to identify targeted students based on Fall DCAS, DIBELS NExt scores, classroom assessments and advisement. The program includes math and reading tutoring with research –based supports identified with the support of the District ELA and Math Cadre, including using Teacher Created Materials and Dreambox Math Supports. These programs will be funded through the Focus Schools funding from the Delaware Department of Education. Beginning in the 2012-13 school year, formative assessment data will be available to assess student growth. This information will equip the Summer Academy staff to teach directly to students who need such services while, at the same time, focusing on specific weaknesses for each of these students. This formative assessment data will be augmented by the services of the school's ELA and Math and instructional support staff members to coordinate programs and material with the grade level curriculum.   This intervention will require the instructional staff to periodically review student data. This process will be monitored by the school's administration, building leadership team, content area teachers, and district administration. The school staff will review student performance levels for students throughout the year, including focusing on students attending the extended day program. The support will follow (and then be a pre-cursor to) the two 8 week after school programs – creating a year round calendar. The summer program sessions will be conducted four days a week for five hours a day, with breakfast and lunch and transportation provided. The session will cover 20 days during the summer months. The students will receive tutoring/instructional support in specific areas as identified through DCAS data.   The program will be provided by staff members that are highly qualified in their content area and Warner will monitor the participating students' progress throughout the summer and coming school year. This monitoring will consist of DCAS/DIBELS Next growth (Fall – Winter – Spring), marking period grades, and attendance in school and with extended day. Building Leadership Team will review data with the monitoring program to assess the delivery services being provided, their effectiveness, and potentially make alterations in service delivery. Identified students in targeted (grades 2-5, Special Education and Hispanic) cell groups will be provided additional individualized instruction in a small group setting in ELA and Math. This additional support will connect to the extended day program, funded with 1003g supports, which provides an additional 90 minutes twice a week. Several studies have found that after-school and summer (extended day) programs have positive effects on children's academic performance as well as on other factors. This includes an impact on growth in language arts and proficiency on state test scores - significantly showing larger gains in their reading and problem-solving scores compared to non-attenders (Little, P. (2009). Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). School reform efforts that include expanded learning opportunities more fully engage students and can impact academic, developmental and health outcomes (Stonehill, R. (2009). Foreword, Introduction and Report Overview. Enhancing School Reform through Expanded Learning. Naperville, IL). In addition, extended day programs that offer inclusive programming provide additional opportunities to use supplemental services and technology to mirror the special education services during the regular school day (National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2007) Afterschool programs and students with special needs. Research Brief). Students who attended a formal program housed in the students' school and staffed by the classroom teachers outperformed students who were tutored in a community based environment by childcare providers in both reading and mathematics. It was also stated that by staffing the programs with regular-school-day teachers, the opportunity to align to the school's curriculum was found to be most effective (Rothman, T., & Henderson, M. (2011). So school-based tutoring programs significantly improve student performance on standardized tests? RMLE Online - Research in Middle Level Education, 34(6), 2.). Extracurricular activities help students develop of a sense of belonging, opportunities to expand social networks, provide positive reinforcement and an achievement orientation, while giving participants leadership roles and age-appropriate expectations and goals (Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (1st ed., p. 158). New York: Routledge).

4.02Describe the specific research based activities that will be used during the increased learning time. Provide an explanation as to how the activities will target individual student needs.

Identified students in targeted student groups (Special Education, 3-5 grades, Hispanic) will be provided additional individualized instruction in a small group setting in ELA and Math. This additional support provides the opportunity to teach children in small steps and segment complex skills into smaller instructional units to allow for mastery and synthesis. It also provides an additional opportunity to review skills and provide demonstrations (Archer, A.L.; Hughes, C.A. (2011) Explicit Instruction: Effective and Efficient Teaching. (New York: The Guilford Press).. Instructional activities / support that the students will receive during the Extra Time program will be in alignment with state and district standards and curriculum recommendations and will focus on improving student literacy across the content areas (reading, writing, speaking, listening) Improving student problem-solving, including mathematical problem-solving, Improving classroom management and enhancing student motivation. The research based activities will include specific objectives and

feedback, Homework and Practice, collaborative learning and reinforcing effort/recognizing practice (Classroom Instruction That Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001).

4.03Describe how the LEA will adjust the school schedule, lengthen the school week or year, and/or use other methods to increase learning time.
•The school will extend the instructional year by adding 5 weeks to the school year (the school year will go from 180 traditional days to a minimum of 200 days). In addition, through the 1003g grant, Warner is adding 90 minutes a day, two times per week for an additional 16 weeks during the school year.

4.04Describe the LEA's rationale for the duration of extended time to be provided and how the duration of time will be sufficient to meet individual student needs.
Since 2010-11, Warner has implemented state test-focused supports with degrees of success. For example, the Warner SES afterschool program achievements were directly related to having highly effective Warner staff provide tutoring and check in on the students. This was repeated during the 2011-2012 school year. Warner has demonstrated growth in both reading and math over that time period, especially for students who've received additional assistance. Warner met safe harbor in 5 cell groups in 2010-2011 and met all but two cells in 2011-2012. Students subsequently scored higher on formative and summative assessments (DIBELS Next and NWEA). Attendance in these activities was high and served as great motivation for the students involved both academically and socially. The school also provides a safe haven for children who reside in Wilmington neighborhoods that have been subjected to gun-related incidents and homicides. In addition, the Warner Jump Start to kindergarten summer pilot in 2010 provided an academic boost for students who've traditionally arrived at school underprepared for standards based education. The activities planned for the upcoming school year want to tie the academic programs to the extra-curricular activities to increase attendance in the academic piece and therein increase student achievement.
Target Groups - sped students; students showing now growth 1a - 1a per DCAS; Hispanic students

Measures ~
of the students who attend a minimum of 20 of the 24 days of intervention, 75% of the targeted students will demonstrate improvement toward benchmark as per the pre and posttest (DIBELS Next)

Structure of the Program ~
the program will be held at Warner Elementary Monday through Thursday 8:15-12:15 Class size of 10 students or less - grades K-5 Breakfast and Lunch will be provided Teacher hours - 8:00-1:00
1 day for set up/1 day for teachers to take down Minimum of 2 teachers per grade level; 1 site coordinator

Estimated costs ~ $76,830

Teacher EPER $43,500 -
12 teachers/day x ($30 x 5 hours/day x 24 days) + take down/set up (12 teachers x $30 x 5 hours x 2 days) Transportation $25920 -
3 buses x ($180/trip x 2 trips/day) = $1080
$1080 x 24 days = $25920
Supplies $1200
$10/120 students
Training for teachers $2160
12 teachers x 6 hours x $30 = $2160
Materials use district created summer program materials Site Coordinator EPER $4050
$30/hr x 27 days x 5 hrs/day = $4050

Questions - cost for breakfast/lunch

time line ~

Beginning June 2013 for 24 days
Beginning June 2014 for 24 days

Who is responsible
Administrative team to hire a coordinator and staff coordinator to monitor program Staff to monitor student growth

Specific/Targeted Questions:
Intervention 3: Strategies to address social, emotional and heath needs
4.09Describe how this intervention will address the needs (as described in the needs assessment) of the subpopulations that caused the school to be identified as a Focus School. Describe, including the use of citations, the research that supports that this type of intervention has a proven record of success with the subpopulation(s) identified in the Focus School.
*School Based Mentoring Supports:
School-based or student mentoring programs grow out of the rationale that supportive adults can help students avoid high-risk activities and make successful transitions. Youth mentoring programs are a means to connect at-risk youth with volunteers from outside the family who serve as role models, provide support and guidance, and provide academic assistance. School based mentoring (SBM) programs provide at-risk youth with these supportive relationships during the school day. Research has shown that a strength of SBM is that staff can supervise matches at the school, and thus involve groups of mentors not typically utilized in community-based settings (ex: high school and college age mentors who may prefer or require the additional structure of the school context and on-site supervision (Karcher, M. J. (2005b). Cross-age peer mentoring. In D. L. DuBois in addition to the requests, the need for mentoring was based on academic and climate/referral data. The unintended consequences of poverty are even more reflective in the student feeder pattern, which encompasses Wilmington neighborhoods that represent some of its highest poverty and incidents of crime – the West Side and Market Street corridors (Wilmington Shootings 2009: A Comparative Working Paper (May 2010). Students who reside in challenging situations are often identified as "placed at risk" because they have one or more of the factors related with school dropout data (retention in grade level, poor attendance, behavioral problems, low socioeconomic status or poverty, low achievement, substance abuse, or teenage pregnancy (Slavin, R, 43% of the student population changed from September 2009 to May 2010; 60% of 4th graders indicate they have attended 3 or more schools; over 51% of the children in the building have an incarcerated relative). These factors inhibit academic performance and require strategic interventions that make a difference. Research by Public/Private Ventures has examined whether a one-to-one mentoring experience makes a tangible difference in the lives of targeted young people. Their findings revealed that mentees were 1/3 less likely to be violent toward another, demonstrated improved school attendance and were less likely to abuse narcotics or alcohol (Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., the number of assignments turned in (homework and in-class assignments); reduction in serious school infractions (including principal's office visits, fighting and suspensions, and scholastic efficacy (feeling more competent academically). This evidence mirrors a two year review of data at Warner where mentees demonstrated improved behavior (a reduction in RAP data, disciplinary action, etc.) and academic growth as measured by state testing. During the spring of 2011-12 school year, staff reported an increase in requests from students and families for mentors for the first time.   Warner must build on these initial experiences to design a mentoring program that focuses on the characteristics of effective SBM in order to maximize its potential and meet the needs of children. SBM programs require mentor training, staff support, match maintenance efforts, such as summer contacts and transition activities.
*School Based Mental Health Supports:
Children with a reading disorder often demonstrate significant deficits in the most fundamental reading skills. Young children learn to identify letters and connect both name and sound to them. Through these skills, children become able to connect letters and sounds and use this to sound out new words. Children with a reading disorder are unable to do so efficiently, making it difficult for them to learn and understand new words. The National Center for Learning Disabilities notes that a lack of phoneme awareness can lead to significant difficulties with reading as a child gets older. Many children with these challenges demonstrate overlapping difficulties in learning –further inhibiting their ability to ready fluently (Weiss, R. "Introduction to Abnormal Child and Adolescent Psychology (2008)." Learning impairments unfortunately occur more frequently in schools settings and populations that have high poverty, often in settings that mirror Warner's feeder pattern (10 to 15% based on research findings as well as clinical observations). Reading comprehension depends on the ability to quickly sound out and recognize words, which can be hard for students with environmental, cognitive or learning challenges. Unfortunately, no party (not the school, the pediatrician or specialists) has clear responsibility for diagnosing and treating the challenges and the school is left to address learning and the symptoms as well. Treatment is fragmented and schools are left to cope with behaviors that interfere with the student's

progress as well as the classroom atmosphere.   Warner proposes partnering with a contractor, licensed to provide Multimodal support and providing 2 FTE behavior interventionists to support treatment and positive behavior. This approach includes multiple interventions, or "modes" of treatment that reinforce each other and produce the best outcomes for children. The elements include:
•specific behavior management techniques
• parent and child education about diagnosis and treatment
•stimulant support and
•appropriate education and supports.
Rationale: Warner has higher rates of behaviors that impair learning than the general population. Without treatment based on a clear understanding (the diagnosis) of the behavior, these children will not reach their academic potential; they will also disrupt other children's academic progress. The clinical psychologist in this proposal would provide diagnosis and act as a liaison with providers and teachers to track the effectiveness of treatment to address student behaviors that impair academic progress (Zionts, P., Zionts, L., and 2) To provide clinical psychology support to school staff. The onsite support allows parents to have their needs met without incurring out of pocket costs and possible challenges with insurers (ex: Warner learned that some pediatricians would only work with the family if they had a diagnosis from a specialist, which costs $850 for an initial analysis (no follow up monitoring); that is combined with often long waits to schedule an appointment to see a specialists – thus impacting attendance for a building of 100% poverty.

4.10Describe the specific strategies that will be used to address social, emotional, school climate, health, nutrition, and physical activity needs of the school's identified subpopulations. Describe how the strategies will be integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.
School Based Mentoring Supports:
1) Contract with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Delaware to develop a school based mentoring program at Warner, targeting students from identified subpopulations.
•Review data with Warner administration to impact 2012-2013 goal outcomes
•Identify "littles and bigs for the year and develop the system to capture data;
•Monitor behavior, academic performance, and related items (family).
•Provide feedback to the school staff.
•Perform data analysis, specifically compare child data before and after support (consent form is required).
All school-based mentoring programs share a common goal: student success. According to the National Mentoring Partnership, nearly 16 million young people in the United States are referred for/request mentors while it's estimated that fewer than one million youth get connected. Professionally structured School-Based Mentoring helps to fill the requests by being onsite – giving it the opportunity to reach many more children than in a community-based setting. Warner staff will refer students to help ensure targeted children are reached. When implemented strategically, this effort has produced academic success in places such as Austin Independent School District (TX) and the Oklahoma City Public Schools, where the academic growth averages about one year across the district (Belt, L. One Child at a Time: The Case of School-Based Mentoring SEDL Letter Volume XIV, Number 1, February 2002, Family and Community Connections with Schools).
School Based Mental Health Supports:
1) Provide health evaluation and management services to children to assist targeted students and families
Components of Evaluation and Treatment (Details of Service #1 listed above).
•(Based on the input of the Warner Team) Evaluate children in pre-K through Grade 5 at Warner in the 2012-2013 school year.
•Develop an evaluation for the primary care physician (PCP) to start treatment when appropriate.
•Monitor behavior, academic performance, side effects, and cardiovascular changes.
•Provide feedback to parents for support at home, to PCPs to adjust treatment (as needed), medication, if needed.
•Work with experts as consultants to PCPs as needed on complicated cases
•Perform data analysis, specifically compare children who received support with those who decline support (consent form is required).
2) Provide consultation to school leadership and the School Climate Team to better coordinate behavior support procedures with classroom management and administration.
3) Present to the faculty and parent groups (PTA) as requested; supporting the school success plan goals,
4) Partner with the Community school project by meeting with smaller groups of teachers, such as in Professional Learning Communities in coordination

with school leadership
5) Prepare and submit proposal for a federal Education SBIR grant; to expand the strategy the proposal will be submitted in January 2013.
The intervention will help the school to look at all learning differences and to give the support needed to address the chemical and neurological challenges that the child may face while pursuing their education. The intervention will also support evidence related to school-based mental health models and the strong relationship between therapeutic supports, academic interventions and pupil success (Lane, K. L., Wehby, J. H., Menzies, H. M., Gregg, R. M., Doukas, G. L., & Munton, S. M. (2002). Early literacy instruction for first-grade students at-risk for antisocial behavior. Education and Treatment of Children, 25, 438-458.).

B.3 Please provide a response below to the support, monitoring, and evaluation questions for your third Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

?How will the LEA support the implementation of the focus school plan?

4.37 Describe the LEA-level staff members that have been identified to support the school as it implements the intervention(s). Please describe their individual expertise/responsibility in supporting the school and describe how this expertise is aligned with the needs of the school and is likely to promote successful implementation of the selected intervention(s). Please also note which LEA-level staff member will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan and the monitoring strategy for the duration of the three-year period.
- Gaysha Beard: ELA Supervisor ad formerly a District Literacy Coach and a highly effective reading teacher. Dr. Beard has provided literacy support for high-poverty buildings and provided her expertise to the development of extended day program materials.
- James Comegys: Director of Curriculum formerly the principal of Middletown HS, where he successfully implemented restructuring requirements – helping the school to make AYP. Mr. Comegys leads the districts curriculum and instructional program to ensure alignment with the common core and with Classroom Instruction That Works
- Andrea Lanciault: Director of School Operations, formerly the principal of North Star Elementary School. Under Ms. Lanciault's Leadership, North Star continually exceeded state targets while meeting the needs for all students. In her initial year in the District Office, she coordinated the North Star-Warner partnership, a professional learning community between a suburban and urban school.
- Amy Grundy: Manager of Turnaround Schools; Dr. Grundy is the former principal of Gauger-Cobbs MS, where she led the school in making AYP and being removed from state sanctions. In her current role, she oversees the Red Clay Partnership Zone Council and support to Turnaround Schools,.
- Nicholas Russo: Supervisor of Secondary ELA; Mr. Russo was a key member of the McKean HS leadership team and assisted the school in making AYP and being removed from the state's improvement list. In his current capacity, he is focusing on secondary literacy.
- Malik Stewart: Manager of Federal and Regulated Programs; Mr. Stewart is a former Education Associate with the DE Dept. of Education where he led school improvement support efforts statewide. He focuses on federal program requirements, continuous success planning and Title I, II, and III.

4.38   Describe the unique infrastructures that will be in place to monitor and evaluate the academic impact of the intervention(s).
The District has modified its support structure to include a Turnaround Office to focus specifically on the PZ schools. In practice, the District Support Team will create a connection to the new Turnaround Office and will include them in regular meetings. Also, the District has developed a PZ Council which integrates the expertise of the Support Team and The Turnaround Office and utilizes the expertise of Mass Insight and Distinguished Educators to review the plans and progress of the PZ. The Project Manager will also support the tacking of performance objectives related to Race To The Top with a focus on Goal 4 – the PZ. This position supports the work of the Turnaround Office and Support Teams.
In Red Clay, with the adoption of the strategic plan – we are focusing on developing systemic professional development. All Instructional staff will actively participate in, and implement, routinely scheduled and data-driven comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approaches to improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement by SY 2015–16. As a result, all district PD will be:
-driven by student learning needs as determined by ongoing data analysis
-research-based and reflective of best practices
-regularly assessed for effectiveness
4.39Describe LEA's plan to sustain and support the intervention(s) in the Focus school after the grant expires.

The District has focused its application on the use of adult time and learning to change practice. These are areas that can be sustained through inclusion in the Federal Consolidated Grant Application. As the reforms impact pupil progress, the district will include them in the review of the plan and strategies and make allocation adjustments to support and sustain the changes. In an article entitled "How to Sustain Student Success" (Christman, V. Research in Education Leadership (2005), districts are advised to focus on the following aspects when maintaining improvement momentum (RCCSD initiatives in parenthesis):

-Teacher leadership: Teachers in successful schools made teaching and learning decisions; engaged in informal action research; developed their own internal leadership structures; and participated in weekly collaborative lesson planning (PLCs, and Success Planning/BLT teams along with District level leadership opportunities)

-District office leadership: successful schools received disaggregated assessment data at the beginning of each term, and their principals received training on data interpretation and usage; successful districts scheduled monthly cohort meetings with the principals of all its state improvement program schools (DTO, District Data Days, and Leadership Academy).

-Programs and practices: targeted students had vastly different experiences than comparable students at unsuccessful students (maintain programs with professional development – aligning with Goal 1 of the RCCSD strategic plan).

For example, the Extended Day programs and summer enrichment programs are crucial to district programming, and focus school funds allow us to think differently and redesign the current model by focusing services within a school community (vs. creating regional summer enrichment sites or being mandated to focus tutoring on income needs instead of academic needs per SES). Title I, IIA, III, Perkins and IDEA along with Curriculum and Professional Development resources and other competitive programs will enable us to confidently sustain these changes and build upon the strides that are made to support our customized 5 year strategic plan. Sustaining improvement means not relying on just two or three quick-hit goals that are implemented during the turnaround stage, but looking at the system comprehensively and standing firm behind the established mission. Our constant review of resources in relation to our goals will do exactly this (Duke, Daniel L. "Keys to Sustaining Successful School Turnarounds." Darden-Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education. 2007).

4.4   Information for the Fourth Focus School

Please answer all questions in this section for your fourth Focus School.

Question A

A.1 Enter the name of your fourth Focus School.

N/A

A.2 Select the Intervention(s) for your fourth Focus School.

○ Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies

○ Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)

○ Strategies to address social, emotional and heath needs

○ Job-embedded Professional Development

○ Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement

○ Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement

○ Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)

○ Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan

○ Use of external provider(s) matched to identified school needs

○ Changes to LEA policy, practices, and/or procedures

○ Staffing selection and assignment

○ Locally developed option(s) that are research based and supported by needs assessment data

Question B

B.1 Please provide a response below to the general questions for your fourth Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

N/A

B.2 Please provide a response below to the intervention-specific questions associated with the intervention(s) selected for your fourth Focus School. Please copy and paste the intervention name, questions and your responses to these questions from the word template provided.

N/a

B.3 Please provide a response below to the support, monitoring, and evaluation questions for your fourth Focus School. Please copy and paste the questions and your responses from the word template provided.

N/a

5.0   Budget

Budgeted Item Detail

Federal Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)	Baltz Care Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - EPER paid to teachers; (44 days x 2hr/wk x 15 staff x $27) $35640 yr 1 (@ 32 days in yrs 2 and 3): $25,920.00 /yr x 3 yrs *	$35,640.00	$25,920.00	$25,920.00	$87,480.00
		Baltz Cares Summer Enrichment Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - EPER paid to teachers; (24 days 3.5 hours/day x 15 staff x $27): $34,020 /yr x 2 yrs *	$34,020.00	$34,020.00		$68,040.00
		Warner summer enrichment program for 24 days - EPER paid to teachers; (24 days x 5 hours/day x 15 staff x $27): $48,860/ yr x 2 yrs *	$48,860.00	$48,860.00		$97,720.00
		AIMS Tiger Pride Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - EPER paid to teachers; (40 days x 2hr/wk x 10 staff x $27): $21,600.00 *	$21,600.00	$21,600.00	$21,600.00	$64,800.00
		Warner summer enrichment program for 24 days - Preparation (3 days x 5 hours/day x 15 teachers x $27): $6,075/ yr x 2 yrs *	$6,075.00	$6,075.00		$12,150.00
		Account Total	$146,195.00	$136,475.00	$47,520.00	$330,190.00

			Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Salaries	Professional: Instruction	AIMS Special Education specialist added to team to support inclusion, Classroom Instruction that Works (CITW), and Stetson Instructional Strategies - $65,000 (yr. 1), $70.000 (yr. 2), $75,000 (yr. 3) *	$65,000.00	$70,000.00	$75,000.00	$210,000.00
		Account Total	$65,000.00	$70,000.00	$75,000.00	$210,000.00
	Support Staff	Warner - Hire 2 FTE Behavior interventionists to support BioAssessments work related to the treatment of behaviors that disrupt and impair the learning process – (Salaries: 2 FTE @ $25,000 ea $42,000/year x 3 yrs) *	$42,000.00	$42,000.00	$42,000.00	$126,000.00
		Account Total	$42,000.00	$42,000.00	$42,000.00	$126,000.00
	Professional: Administration		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	$75,578.71	$74,169.79	$49,109.22	$198,857.72
		Account Total	$75,578.71	$74,169.79	$49,109.22	$198,857.72
	Classification Total		$328,773.71	$322,644.79	$213,629.22	$865,047.72
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Baltz - Develop a contract to obtain 1 FTE Family Crisis Therapist - $45,000/yr 1 (split b/w state ($24,873.17)and federal($22,817.83); Projected staffing an FTE in yrs. 2 and 3($55,000/ yr 2, $65,000 / yr 3) *	$21,530.32	$55,000.00	$65,000.00	$141,530.32
		Account Total	$21,530.32	$55,000.00	$65,000.00	$141,530.32

			Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$21,530.32	$55,000.00	$65,000.00	$141,530.32
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Materials for extended day Academy *	$811.08			$811.08
		Account Total	$811.08			$811.08
	Classification Total		$811.08			$811.08
Travel	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Capital Outlay		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Federal *** - Allow Indirect Cost Total**			$351,115.11	$377,644.79	$278,629.22	$1,007,389.12

State Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Baltz Care Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Materials: $2000/session x two 8-week sessions: $4000 /yr x 3 yrs *	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	$12,000.00
		Baltz Cares Summer Enrichment Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Materials: $5250 ($35/student x 150 students) /yr x 2 yrs *	$5,250.00	$5,250.00		$10,500.00
		Warner summer enrichment program for 24 days - Materials: $4200 ($35/student x 120 students) / yr x 2 yrs *	$4,200.00	$4,200.00		$8,400.00
		AIMS Tiger Pride Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Materials: $3000/session x two 10-week sessions: $6000/yr x 3 yrs *	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$18,000.00
		Baltz - Monthly Curriculum Nights - Materials(books and supplies): $400/night x 9 nights: $3,600/yr x 3 yrs *	$3,600.00	$3,600.00	$3,600.00	$10,800.00
		Baltz - ELL Books and Breakfast - Materials (books and supplies): $200/day x 5 days: $1,000/yr x 3 yrs *	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$3,000.00
		Account Total	$24,050.00	$24,050.00	$14,600.00	$62,700.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Administration	Baltz - Materials for Family/Group workshops, consultative sessions directed by the 1 FTE Family Crisis Therapist: $5000/ yr 1, $5000/ yr 2, $5000/ yr 3 *	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$15,000.00
		Account Total	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$15,000.00
	Classification Total					
			$29,050.00	$29,050.00	$19,600.00	$77,700.00
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Baltz Cares Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Transportation costs for two trips/ week x 16 weeks (1 bus x 32 trips x $165/bus ($5,280/bus x 3 buses: $15,840) /yr x 3 yrs *	$15,840.00	$15,840.00	$15,840.00	$47,520.00
		Baltz Cares Summer Enrichment Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Transportation costs for eight (pick up and drop off) trips/ week x 5 weeks sessions (3 bus x 40 trips x $165/bus ($19,800)/ yr x 2 yrs *	$19,800.00	$19,800.00		$39,600.00
		Warner summer enrichment program for 24 days - Transportation costs for eight (pick up and drop off) trips/ week x 5 weeks sessions (3 buses x 40 trips x $165/bus ($19,800)/yr x 2 yr *	$19,800.00	$19,800.00		$39,600.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	AIMS Tiger Pride Extended Day Academy providing increased learning time opportunities for students via targeted tutoring and enrichment in ELA and math - Transportation costs for two trips/ week 20 weeks sessions (1 bus x 40 trips x $165/bus ($6,600 for all sessions)/ yr x 3 yrs *	$6,600.00	$6,600.00	$6,600.00	$19,800.00
		AIMS Provide Think Through Math's tutorial model as a supplement for targeted students - Estimated cost of this program is: $16 per student x 525 students plus $1895 for three half days of on-site professional development. (total cost $10,295.00/yr x 3 yrs *	$10,295.00	$10,295.00	$10,295.00	$30,885.00
		Baltz - Develop a contract to obtain 1 FTE Family Crisis Therapist - $45,000/yr 1 (split b/w state ($24,873.17)and federal($22,817.83) contracted service support); *	$24,873.17			$24,873.17
		Account Total	$97,208.17	$72,335.00	$32,735.00	$202,278.17
	Professional: Administration	AIMS Partner with Communities In Schools, DE to provide research based community school services to AIMS students, including mental, social and economic wellness - $30,000 (yr. 1), $30,000 (yr. 2), $30,000 (yr. 3) *	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$90,000.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	AIMS Implement AI Ambassadors to assist with 6th grade transitions, academic development and build a cohort of leaders who can continue influence to climate and help parents assist their children with at-home skills: •2012-13: up to 20 Ambassadors and increase in family participation •2013-14: up to 20 Ambassadors (the 2012-13 cohort parents help lead the training) and increase in family participation •2014-15: up to 20 Ambassadors (the 2 cohorts help train families by grade level); and increase in family participation - (Yr. 1 covered by local funds) $24,000/ yr (Yr:2) $24,000/ yr (Yr:3) *		$24,000.00	$24,000.00	$48,000.00
		Baltz - Contracts with community agencies for services (TBD by the 1 FTE Family Crisis Therapist): $10,000/yr 1, $10,000/ yr 2, $10,000/ yr 3 *	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$30,000.00
		Baltz - Monthly Open Forum to allow parents/guardians open communication with administration - Food costs: $150/evening event x 9 events: $1,350/yr x 3 yrs *	$1,350.00	$1,350.00	$1,350.00	$4,050.00
		Baltz - Monthly Curriculum Nights - Food costs: $250/evening event x 9 events: $2,250/yr x 3 yrs *	$2,250.00	$2,250.00	$2,250.00	$6,750.00
		Baltz - ELL Books and Breakfast - Food costs: $150/ event x 5 events: $750/yr x 3 yrs *	$750.00	$750.00	$750.00	$2,250.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Warner - Contract with BioAssessments, LLC to provide an in-school clinical psychologist for diagnosis and treatment of behaviors that disrupt and impair the learning process: Contracted Services: (165 days * 4 hrs/day * $65/hr = $42,900. Development of the Database (Kylla) $5000; Testing Materials: $745 (Total $48,645/ yr. x 3 yrs) *	$48,645.00	$48,645.00	$48,645.00	$145,935.00
		Warner - Contract with Big Brothers Big Sisters DE to create and coordinate school based mentoring program for targeted children - Contracted Services: Est. 180 days @ $24,000 ea year Total $24,000/year x 3 yrs *	$24,000.00	$24,000.00	$24,000.00	$72,000.00
		Account Total	$116,995.00	$140,995.00	$140,995.00	$398,985.00
	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$214,203.17	$213,330.00	$173,730.00	$601,263.17
Travel	Professional: Administration	Baltz - Mileage for the FTE Family Crisis Therapist to make home and agency visits): $2000/ yr 1, $2000/yr 2, $2000/yr 3 *	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$6,000.00
		Account Total	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$6,000.00
	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$6,000.00
Salaries	Professional: Administration		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Salaries	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Capital Outlay		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		State Total	$245,253.17	$244,380.00	$195,330.00	$684,963.17

OEC Summary

Program	FICA	Medicare	Pension	Workman's Comp	Unemployment	Health Ins. \ Non Taxed Benefits	Total OEC Cost
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	$15,698.09	$3,671.33	$51,347.95	$4,430.91	$430.43	$0.00	$75,578.71
Year 1 - State SI Funds	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	$18,815.45	$4,400.39	$61,544.74	$5,310.81	$515.90	$0.00	$90,587.29
Year 2 - State SI Funds	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	$14,230.24	$3,328.04	$46,546.66	$4,016.60	$390.18	$0.00	$68,511.72
Year 3 - State SI Funds	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Totals	$48,743.78	$11,399.76	$159,439.35	$13,758.32	$1,336.51	$0.00	$234,677.72

Indirect Cost Summary

Program	Total Direct Program Charges	Indirect Cost Rate	Indirect Cost Billable
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	$351,115.11	5.98 %	$20,996.68
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	$394,062.29	5.98 %	$23,564.93
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	$298,031.72	5.98 %	$17,822.30
Totals	$1,728,172.29		$62,383.91

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Business Mgr. initials when submitted as an Application Budget:

_____

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: **X**

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

| Annual But Not Final | _____ | Final Report | _____ |

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y1 - Focus School Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 9/17/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind Cost 2nd Yr: Number Exceeds:

0.00
0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)

TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS | EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	$253,195.00	$21,530.32		$811.08	$75,578.71			$351,115.11
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	$19,660.67	$1,287.51		$48.50				$20,996.68
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		$272,855.67	$22,817.83		$859.58	$75,578.71			$372,111.79

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin   DATE: 9/17/2012   PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Business Mgr. initials when submitted as an Application Budget:

_____

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: | **X**

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

| Annual But Not Final | _____ | Final Report | _____ |

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y2 - Focus School Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 9/17/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind Cost 2nd Yr: Number Exceeds: | 0.00 | 0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)

TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	$248,475.00	$55,000.00			$90,587.29			$394,062.29
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	$19,294.16	$4,270.77						$23,564.93
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		$267,769.16	$59,270.77			$90,587.29			$417,627.22

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin _____ DATE: _____ 9/17/2012 PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Business Mgr. initials when submitted as an Application Budget:

_____

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: **X**

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

| Annual But Not Final | _____ | Final Report | _____ |

For subgrants extending across two fiscal years, an Annual Expenditure Report is to be submitted within 45 days after June 30 of the first year. A Final Report is due within 90 days after the end of the subgrant award period.

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y3 - Focus School Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 9/17/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

Ind Cost 1st Yr: Ind Cost 2nd Yr: Number Exceeds: 0.00   0.00

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT:
(Complete for Expenditure Report Only)
TO

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	**Acct. No**								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	$164,520.00	$65,000.00			$68,511.72			$298,031.72
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	$12,775.03	$5,047.27						$17,822.30
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		$177,295.03	$70,047.27			$68,511.72			$315,854.02

CHIEF OFFICER: Daugherty, Mervin   DATE: 9/17/2012   PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

(Signature required only when submitted as an Annual or Final Report)

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH
BUDGET REPORT OF STATE FUNDS

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: | X |

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y1-State SI Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

For subgrants of State funds, no annual or final expenditure report is required. Prior notification of intent to amend is required when exceeding approved budget amounts by $1,000 or 5% whichever is greater. This budget form is required for planning purposes only and is to accompany a subgrant application for State funds when application for such funds is required

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100		$116,995.00	$2,000.00	$5,000.00				$123,995.00
Instruction	200		$97,208.17		$24,050.00				$121,258.17
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800								
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget			$214,203.17	$2,000.00	$29,050.00				$245,253.17

DATE: 9/17/2012   PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH
BUDGET REPORT OF STATE FUNDS

Business Mgr. initials when submitted as an Application Budget:

_____

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: **X**

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y2-State SI Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

For subgrants of State funds, no annual or final expenditure report is required. Prior notification of intent to amend is required when exceeding approved budget amounts by $1,000 or 5% whichever is greater. This budget form is required for planning purposes only and is to accompany a subgrant application for State funds when application for such funds is required

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS | EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100		$140,995.00	$2,000.00	$5,000.00				$147,995.00
Instruction	200		$72,335.00		$24,050.00				$96,385.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800								
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget			$213,330.00	$2,000.00	$29,050.00				$244,380.00

DATE: _____9/17/2012_____   PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH
BUDGET REPORT OF STATE FUNDS

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: | X |

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Red Clay

PROJECT TITLE: Y3-State SI Funds

GRANT NUMBER:

FUND & LINE:

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

ENDING: 6/29/2012

For subgrants of State funds, no annual or final expenditure report is required. Prior notification of intent to amend is required when exceeding approved budget amounts by $1,000 or 5% whichever is greater. This budget form is required for planning purposes only and is to accompany a subgrant application for State funds when application for such funds is required

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION

Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100		$140,995.00	$2,000.00	$5,000.00				$147,995.00
Instruction	200		$32,735.00		$14,600.00				$47,335.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800								
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget			$173,730.00	$2,000.00	$19,600.00				$195,330.00

DATE: _____ 9/17/2012   PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

District: Red Clay Consolidated School District

Chief School Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief school officer of the LEA. I am authorized to apply for the funds identified in this Application. I am also authorized to obligate the LEA to conduct any program or activity approved under this 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 Application.
2. I have read this 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 Application.
3. I have also read the attached Assurances. I understand that those Assurances are incorporated into and made a part of this Application as though they were fully set out in this 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 Application as represented in this 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, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Application.
5. I understand that compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this 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:** Monday, September 17, 2012

Signature:

Chief Financial Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief financial officer of the LEA and I am authorized to submit the budget and financial information contained in this Application on its behalf.

2. I have read this Application and specifically read and reviewed the budget and financial information contained in or made part of the Application. The information contained in the 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**

Year 1 - Focus School Funds	Year 1 - State SI Funds
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	Year 2 - State SI Funds
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	Year 3 - State SI Funds

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

Chief Financial Officer: Floore, Jill   **Approval Date:**   Monday, September 17, 2012

Signature:

Delaware Department of Education Signatures

Federal Programs

Year 1 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

Year 2 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

Year 3 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

State Programs

Year 1 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

Year 2 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

Year 3 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Prorgam Manager	**Approval Date**
Brian Curtis	12/19/2012

<u>Finance</u>

Federal Programs	**Approval Date**
Eulinda DiPietro	12/19/2012

State Programs	Approval Date
Leah Jenkins	12/20/2012

Director(s)

Director	Title	Approval Date
Theresa Kough		12/20/2012

Secretaries

Secretary	Title	Approval Date
Susan Haberstroh	Associate Secretary	12/20/2012
Mark Murphy	Secretary	12/21/2012