

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

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

Table of Contents

Abstract

1. Success Plan
2. General Information
 - 2.1. Team Members
 - 2.2. Program Selection
 - 2.3. Coordinators and Allocations
3. Schools to Be Served
4. Descriptive Information
 - 4.1. Information for the First Focus School
 - 4.2. Information for the Second Focus School
 - 4.3. Information for the Third Focus School
 - 4.4. Information for the Fourth Focus School
5. Budget
7. Certifications of Compliance and Assurances

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 focus school plans for Frederick Douglass Elementary and West Seaford Elementary provide opportunities for each school to extend their school improvement efforts. The focus school grant will allow each school to provide more enrichment and academic opportunities for students as well as continued and focused professional development for staff while strengthening relationships with families and the community.

A summary of the interventions for Frederick Douglass Elementary includes the followings strategies: Implement an extended day program that will include remediation and acceleration activities as well as promote student efficacy and character development; Hire a counselor or psychologist as an interventionist to provide individual social/emotional support for students, implement PBIS, and develop and implement the character education segment of the extended day program; Implement a PBIS program to increase student engagement and efficacy as well as reduce student discipline; Provide job-embedded professional development through training in The Skillfull Teacher and the implementation of a Staff Development Teacher in order to provide ongoing support and increase teacher effectiveness; and deploy a parent engagement plan that will increase parental involvement through 3 avenues - Collaborating, Parenting, and Learning at Home(Epstein).

A summary of the interventions for West Seaford Elementary includes the following strategies: Implement an extended day program that will include remediation and acceleration activities as well as promote student efficacy and character development; Hire a behavior interventionist to provide individual social/emotional support for students, implement PBIS, and develop and implement the character education segment of the extended day program; Implement a PBIS program to increase student engagement and efficacy as well as reduce student discipline; Provide job-embedded professional development through training in The Skillfull Teacher and the implementation of a Staff Development Teacher in order to provide ongoing support and increase teacher effectiveness; Deploy a parent engagement plan that will increase parental involvement through 3 avenues - Collaborating, Parenting, and Learning at Home (Epstein); and establish a community partnership with the Nemours Foundation to provide training on healthy lifestyles, etc. to the school community.

While some school improvement planning began this summer utilizing some of the Baldrige framework, the schools and district support are beginning initial steps of implementation in order to proceed as soon as possible in the best interests of students. The timeframe for this grant will extend from the 2012-2013 school year through the 2014-2015 school year. Major Program outcomes include accelerated student achievement for low income and African American students, with all students benefitting from the implementation of the focus school plans and therefore meeting adequate progress in the all students category as well. Additional major program outcomes include a reduction of school referrals and suspension rates for the identified subgroups and overall totals, as well as an elimination fo the different perceptions of school culture and climate issues from students, teachers, and parents, as measured by the school climate survey each year.

The total requested allocation to accomplish these focus school plans is 1,500,000.00

Success Plan for: Seaford Administrative Office

Years: 2011-2012 to 2013-2014

Mission Statement : The mission of the Seaford School District is to instill in its students a sense of pride through excellence, enabling them to be good citizens, contributing members of society, and to successfully compete in a global economy.

Vision Statement : By 2014, our school district will have evolved into a school district which consists entirely of high performing schools attended by high achieving students who graduate with the knowledge, skills and abilities to successfully compete in a global economy. We will have been aided and supported in this outcome because we will have aligned our curriculum with Common Core Standards, regularly implemented meaningful professional development, made data-based decisions, recruited and retained effective teachers and leaders and used creative approaches to make certain our schools are an integral part of the community with a high degree of meaningful parent and general public access and involvement.

Therefore, by 2014, we will:

- decrease the achievement gaps for African American, ELL, and special education students
- increase student achievement on DCAS assessments to 100% for all students
- increase NCLB graduation rate by 10 percentage points
- increase the percent of students taking the AP exam in AP courses to 100% with 75 % of those students receiving a passing score
- decrease the dropout rate from 7.8% to 4%
- sustain a 10% growth rate in the number of teachers who are rated effective or above on the revised DPAS II initiative
- show a 10% reduction in the number of teachers who are on improvement plans
- provide administrative internships to eighteen teachers and staff members
- increase the percentage of highly effective minority teachers from 10.3% of the total teaching staff to at least 16.3%.

Needs Assessment

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

5 : Staff Access to Technology

Need: 100% of the staff have access to technology throughout the day. This needs to be maintained in order to increase LoTi scores.

Root Cause: Lack of technology skills allows staff to limit their technology access and usage.

Data Source: School data

7 : Data Management Systems

Need: 0% of the teachers are trained in management systems.

Root Cause: Teachers haven't had opportunities to use a management system.

Data Source: District Data

8 : Professional Learning Communities

Need: The district needs to continue to implement PLCs via 90 minute weekly common planning time. 50% of the PLC time should be data analysis time.

Root Cause: Professional Development opportunities are too infrequent to effect change.

Data Source: District Data

12 : SAMs Model

Need: The SAMs Model needs to be implemented in order to maximize administrative time which will lead to student achievement.

Root Cause: School administrators tend to be reactive to events throughout the school day and often limit time spent on instructional duties.

Data Source: District Data

2 : Highly Qualified Teachers

Need: The Seaford School District has less than 100% of its teachers Highly Qualified.

Root Cause: The school district must hire only highly qualified staff.

Data Source: DOE data

6 : Levels of Technology Integration

Need: There was a slight increase in the LoTi scores for teachers (median LoTi level) in 2011.

Root Cause: Lack of technology skills allows staff to limit their technology access and usage.

Data Source: LoTi data

9 : DPAS II Training

Need: 100% of the instructional administrators will need to be trained in DPAS II evaluation system.

Root Cause: Administrators need to enforce the revised DPAS procedures to effectively evaluate teachers.

Data Source: District Data

4 : Professional Development Delivery

Need: 100% of staff who attended workshops and conferences shared knowledge and skills learned with other staff members through professional development sessions.

Root Cause: To implement the train the trainer model effectively, the staff who attend workshops and conferences must conduct professional development sessions and coaching opportunities.

Data Source: School level data

11 : Parent Satisfaction and Involvement

Need: There is a need to survey parents to gauge their levels of involvement and their satisfaction with our schools. There should be a 5% annual increase.

Root Cause: Parents are sometimes too busy to get involved in all aspects of learning and we need to have a means to gauge their satisfaction.

Data Source: District Data

1 : Parental Involvement

Need: Over 75% of our secondary parents and 95% of our elementary parents attended at least one school function this year. These need to be increased to involve 95% of the parents.

Root Cause: As students advance in grade levels parents tend to detach more from the being visibly active in their child's education.

Data Source: School data

35 : Professional Development

Need: Staff requires a more robust professional development plan to increase teacher effectiveness. Many new staff numbers have expanded the professional development needs at Frederick Douglass.

Root Cause:

Data Source: DCAS

37 : Professional Development for Staff

Need: The need exists for a more robust research-based professional development plan to increase teacher effectiveness.

Root Cause:

Data Source: DCAS

3 : Professional Development Observations

Need: 100% of the teachers who participated in professional development had successfully transferred what was learned to the classroom. This has to be maintained.

Root Cause: Administrative observations on walk throughs and class room visitations must confirm transfer of skills learned to instructional habits.

Data Source: Principal data at the school level.

10 : Lead Teachers

Need: Lead teachers who are rated highly effective need to be identified and utilized to improve instruction.

Root Cause: Teachers need access to lead teachers to promote and improve instructional improvement.

Data Source: District Data

13 : Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey

Need: Teachers need to complete a Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey in order to rate work conditions and have equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals.

Root Cause: Teachers need a safe, orderly and highly effective work environment in order to be successful.

Data Source: District Data

Student Needs Assessment

26 : School Accountability Ratings

Need: Four of the six schools received accountability ratings of Under Improvement for the 2010-2011 school year.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DOE data and ratings

32 : Student Discipline

Need: Consistently enforced code of conduct and positive behavior support.

Root Cause: 22% of the population accounted for 319 behavior referrals. The highest documented referral was "inappropriate behavior." Also 79% of the students referred are African American, and 70% are African American males.

Data Source: 2011-2012 Discipline Data

7 : Preschool IEP

Need: As determined by Seaford's ADR, this indicator is not being met at this time.

Root Cause: Students identified from the midyear point on may not be given opportunities to reach those goals due to timelines of progress check.

Data Source: DOE special education data

6 : Child Find Students

Need: As determined by Seaford's ADR, this indicator is not being met at this time.

Root Cause: Rescheduled meetings (at parent request) sometime place them outside of the timelines to meet this indicator.

Data Source: DOE data

33 : Student Achievement Reading - All Students

Need: As measured by the DCAS, last year 57.05 of all students at West Seaford Elementary were proficient, a slight decrease from the previous year.

Root Cause: Need to raise the level of rigor of instruction across all grade levels for all students.

Data Source: DCAS

18 : DCAS Achievement Gaps

Need: Achievement Gaps in 3rd grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=32 pts, ELL=38 pts), 3rd grade math (African American= 27 pts, Spec Ed=21 pts, ELL=29 pts), 5th grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=38 pts, ELL=40 pts), 5th grade math (African American= 35 pts, Spec Ed=55 pts, ELL=41 pts), 8th grade reading (African American= 22 pts, Spec Ed=83 pts, ELL=55 pts), 8th grade math (African American= 10 pts, Spec Ed=41 pts, ELL=60 pts), 10th grade reading (African American= 31 pts, Spec Ed=30 pts, ELL=50 pts), and 10th grade math (African American= 32 pts, Spec Ed=34 pts, ELL=29 pts) need to be closed.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DOE data

39 : Student Discipline

Need: Reduce the number of suspensions by 10% each year.

Root Cause:

Data Source: Student discipline data

31 : Student Achievement - Low Income

Need: Only 54.2% of students scored proficient in Reading and 52.2% in Math on the DCAS state assessment.

Root Cause: The root cause analysis of achievement data indicated lack of teacher knowledge and expertise in delivering a balanced literacy program and teaching for rigor and engagement, as well as student un-preparedness for academic rigor.

Data Source: DCAS Assessment

2 : DCAS Mathematics

Need: 2011 DCAS Mathematics scores are below state average.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DCAS data

27 : Perkins Data

Need: The annual Perkins targets have not been met.

Root Cause: Students delay course selection process and the high school needs to monitor student progress more frequently.

Data Source: DDOE data

12 : Graduation Rate

Need: The latest graduation rate of 76.4 is below state average.

Root Cause: Students don't internalize the value of a high school diploma and supportive services must be in place to assist students' individual needs.

Data Source: DOE data

34 : Student Achievement Math - All students

Need: As measured by the DCAS, 59.84 % of students were proficient in math last year, a slight decrease from the previous year.

Root Cause: Need to raise the level of rigor of instruction across all grade levels in all subjects for all students.

Data Source: DCAS

22 : Effective Teacher Preparation Programs

Need: We need to make sure that all teachers graduate from highly effective teacher preparation programs.

Root Cause: Teacher preparation programs vary greatly in preparation and intensity.

Data Source: District Data

9 : Attendance

Need: The district's 2011 data showed no substantial changes in average daily attendance.

Root Cause: Schools are doing better about using a variety of tools to educate students and parents about the value of school attendance.

Data Source: District attendance data

25 : Formative quarterly/end of instructional period assessments

Need: The Seaford School District needs to create common formative assessments for all students at all grade levels.

Root Cause: Formative assessments can be used to effectively measure progress towards objectives and goals.

Data Source: District data

30 : Student Achievement- African American Subgroup

Need: African American students have a larger percentage of students that score well below or below on the DCAS assessment as compared to their caucasian counterparts. For example in 5th grade math, 71% of African American students perform below standard as compared to only 8% of Caucasian students.

Root Cause: The root cause analysis of achievement data indicated lack of teacher knowledge and expertise in delivering a balanced literacy program and teaching for rigor and engagement, as well as student un-preparedness for academic rigor.

Data Source: DCAS 2011-2012

19 : Percent of College Enrollment

Need: 72% of the 2010 seniors were enrolled in college courses within one year of graduation.

Root Cause: Students are not receiving the college readiness skills they need nor the college application and planning process to be successful in college.

Data Source: School Data

3 : DCAS Science and Social Studies

Need: Most recent DCAS data shows that the Seaford School District scored below the state average in social studies and science.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DCAS data

4 : CTE Targets

Need: The 2009 data shows that the Seaford School District only met 2 out of the 5 CTE state targets.

Root Cause: Lack of monitoring the CTE options and pathways that students are selecting as well as lack of appropriate academic interventions.

Data Source: DOE Common Measures

23 : Supplemental Educational Services and School Choice

Need: Seaford Middle School will need to offer Supplemental Educational Services and Frederick Douglass and West Seaford Elementary Schools must provide in-district School Choice based upon the 2010 school ratings.

Root Cause: School accountability ratings and low student achievement require Supplemental Educational Services.

Data Source: DDOE AYP Results

20 : IEP Meetings

Need: The district did not provide IEP meetings to students within the 45-60 day window 100% of the time.

Root Cause: IEP caseloads sometimes prevent the entire process to be completed within the 45-60 day window.

Data Source: District Data

5 : ELL Targets

Need: Seaford's ELL students met the state AMO targets for 2010. This group scored below state averages on DCAS assessments.

Root Cause: ELL students need intensive language development support.

Data Source: DOE Common Measures

1 : DCAS Reading

Need: 2011 DCAS Reading scores were below the state average.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DCAS data

40 : Nutrition and Physical Fitness

Need: 84% of the students at West Seaford are identified as low income through the free and reduced meals program. Recent research has revealed a correlation between physical fitness and academic success.

Root Cause: Many students lack nutrition education and physical fitness goals.

Data Source: Kids Count, DCAS

24 : Seaford High School Accountability Rating

Need: Seaford High School has an accountability rating of Year I of Under School Improvement. Seaford Middle School has a rating of Year II of being Under Improvement. Frederick Douglass and West Seaford have ratings of Year I of being Under Improvement based upon 2010 test data.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DDOE Accountability Rating

28 : Student-Student Relations

Need: Student to student interactions and students treating each other with respect.

Root Cause: Lack of respect for individual differences as noted in the school climate survey.

Data Source: School Climate Survey conducted at the end of the 11-12 school year revealed that 25% of students, staff, and parents disagreed with the statement that students treat each other with respect.

10 : Climate-Drug Surveys
Need: Seaford met the 5% reduction in usage in some of the grade level targets but not in all of them.
Root Cause: Students from homes in poverty need additional instructional opportunities aimed at making healthy choices
Data Source: 2010 University of Delaware Survey

13 : Student Technology Proficiency
Need: 99% of the current 8th graders performed at the proficient level with technology by the end of the year. This is below the 100% target.
Root Cause: Students need technology skills in order to succeed in career readiness and college readiness learning environments.
Data Source: End of course technology grades

8 : Office Referrals
Need: There was an increase in the student office referrals for the 2011 school year.
Root Cause: Students need to see the benefits of proper classroom behaviors before they will begin making better decisions.
Data Source: District discipline data

36 : Student Achievement Reading and Math Combined - Low Income Students
Need: Need to raise the level of performance for students identified as low income.
Root Cause: Level of rigor, professional development for staff, greater supports for social emotional needs.
Data Source: DCAS, School Climate Survey

16 : % Proficient or Advanced on 8th Grade DCAS Math
Need: 14% of the 8th grade students were proficient on DCAS math which is below state average.
Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.
Data Source: DOE data

21 : College Readiness
Need: Few students meet AP exam success and/or attempt college courses.
Root Cause: Students are not required to take the AP exams and they don't have ready access to college courses.
Data Source: District Data

29 : School Safety / Bullying
Need: Clarity and reinforcement of expectations, character education, and individual behavioral support.
Root Cause: An average of over 60% of students, parents, and teachers agreed with the statement -"students threaten and bully others in this school."
Data Source: School Climate Survey

11 : Dropout Rate

Need: The 2010 drop-out rate for Seaford showed an decrease from the previous year and is above the state average.

Root Cause: Students need to value a complete high school experience and interventions must be in place to assist with credit recovery.

Data Source: DOE dropout rate data

14 : % Advanced 4th Grade Math

Need: 15% of the students are proficient on DCAS math which is below state average.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DOE Data

17 : % Advanced on 8th grade DCAS reading

Need: 14% of the students on the 2011 DCAS assessments achieved at the advanced level which is below state average.

Root Cause: Students do not take advantage of the extended day or previewing opportunities available to them.

Data Source: DOE data

15 : % Advanced on 4th Grade DCAS Reading

Need: 22% of students are either proficient or advanced on 4th grade DCAS which is below state average.

Root Cause: Lack of specific individual interventions within the classroom and lack of appropriate extended day opportunities resulted in low student achievement.

Data Source: DOE data

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

38 : Student, Staff, and Community School Climate perceptions

Need: Reduce the disconnect that exists between staff and student beliefs about support from home, overall behavior, and understanding of what students are expected to learn in class.

Root Cause:

Data Source: School Climate Survey

Goals & Objectives

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

Objective 1.1: Implement college and career ready standards and assessments

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(School Accountability Ratings) Four of the six schools received accountability ratings of Under Improvement for the 2010-2011 school year.
2	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Staff Access to Technology) 100% of the staff have access to technology throughout the day. This needs to be maintained in order to increase LoTi scores.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Preschool IEP) As determined by Seaford's ADR, this indicator is not being met at this time.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(Child Find Students) As determined by Seaford's ADR, this indicator is not being met at this time.
5	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Learning Communities) The district needs to continue to implement PLCs via 90 minute weekly common planning time. 50% of the PLC time should be data analysis time.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Achievement Gaps) Achievement Gaps in 3rd grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=32 pts, ELL=38 pts), 3rd grade math (African American= 27 pts, Spec Ed=21 pts, ELL=29 pts), 5th grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=38 pts, ELL=40 pts), 5th grade math (African American= 35 pts, Spec Ed=55 pts, ELL=41 pts), 8th grade reading (African American= 22 pts, Spec Ed=83 pts, ELL=55 pts), 8th grade math (African American= 10 pts, Spec Ed=41 pts, ELL=60 pts), 10th grade reading (African American= 31 pts, Spec Ed=30 pts, ELL=50 pts), and 10th grade math (African American= 32 pts, Spec Ed=34 pts, ELL=29 pts) need to be closed.
7	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Levels of Technology Integration) There was a slight increase in the LoTi scores for teachers (median LoTi level) in 2011.
8	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Mathematics) 2011 DCAS Mathematics scores are below state average.
9	<i>Student Need</i>	(Perkins Data) The annual Perkins targets have not been met.
10	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Development Delivery) 100% of staff who attended workshops and conferences shared knowledge and skills learned with other staff members through professional development sessions.
11	<i>Student Need</i>	(Attendance) The district's 2011 data showed no substantial changes in average daily attendance.
12	<i>Student Need</i>	(Formative quarterly/end of instructional period assessments) The Seaford School District needs to create common formative assessments for all students at all grade levels.
13	<i>Student Need</i>	(Percent of College Enrollment) 72% of the 2010 seniors were enrolled in college courses within one year of graduation.
14	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Science and Social Studies) Most recent DCAS data shows that the Seaford School District scored below the state average in social studies and science.
15	<i>Student Need</i>	(CTE Targets) The 2009 data shows that the Seaford School District only met 2 out of the 5 CTE state targets.

16	<i>Student Need</i>	(Supplemental Educational Services and School Choice) Seaford Middle School will need to offer Supplemental Educational Services and Frederick Douglass and West Seaford Elementary Schools must provide in-district School Choice based upon the 2010 school ratings.
17	<i>Student Need</i>	(IEP Meetings) The district did not provide IEP meetings to students within the 45-60 day window 100% of the time.
18	<i>Student Need</i>	(ELL Targets) Seaford's ELL students met the state AMO targets for 2010. This group scored below state averages on DCAS assessments.
19	<i>Student Need</i>	(Seaford High School Accountability Rating) Seaford High School has an accountability rating of Year I of Under School Improvement. Seaford Middle School has a rating of Year II of being Under Improvement. Frederick Douglass and West Seaford have ratings of Year I of being Under Improvement based upon 2010 test data.
20	<i>Student Need</i>	(Climate-Drug Surveys) Seaford met the 5% reduction in usage in some of the grade level targets but not in all of them.
21	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Technology Proficiency) 99% of the current 8th graders performed at the proficient level with technology by the end of the year. This is below the 100% target.
22	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Proficient or Advanced on 8th Grade DCAS Math) 14% of the 8th grade students were proficient on DCAS math which is below state average.
23	<i>Student Need</i>	(College Readiness) Few students meet AP exam success and/or attempt college courses.
24	<i>Student Need</i>	(Dropout Rate) The 2010 drop-out rate for Seaford showed an decrease from the previous year and is above the state average.
25	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced 4th Grade Math) 15% of the students are proficient on DCAS math which is below state average.
26	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced on 8th grade DCAS reading) 14% of the students on the 2011 DCAS assessments achieved at the advanced level which is below state average.
27	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced on 4th Grade DCAS Reading) 22% of students are either proficient or advanced on 4th grade DCAS which is below state average.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Support the development of new standards, align curriculum, and conduct assessments (SoW 1)
- 2 Build a culture of college- and career-readiness in schools (SoW 2)
- 3 Support the restructuring of Seaford Senior High School into smaller learning communities through the use of the Transformational Model

Measure(s):

Measure: 80% of the students will achieve at the 80% level on district formative assessments

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
11/30/2010	50	(none)	
1/30/2012	60	(none)	
3/30/2012	70	(none)	
6/15/2012	80	(none)	

Measure: % of 5th graders promoted annually: FY12=99%, FY13=100%, FY 14=100%

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 98%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	99%	6/30/2012	99%
6/30/2013	99%	(none)	

Measure: % of 8th graders promoted annually: FY 12=98%, FY 13=99%, FY 14=100%

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 96.7%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	98%	6/30/2012	98%
6/30/2013	99%	(none)	

Measure: % of 9th graders promoted annually: FY 12=90%, FY 13=95%, FY 14=100%

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 73.2%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	90%	8/30/2012	
8/30/2013	92%	(none)	

Measure: % of all high school students taking college courses (AP, IB, Academic Challenge and Del Tech): FY

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 10%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	13%	6/30/2012	14%
6/30/2013	18%	(none)	

Measure: % of AP and/or IB students taking AP or IB exams: FY 12=60%, FY 13=80%, FY 14=100%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 45%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	60%	6/30/2012	80%
6/30/2013	80%	(none)	

Measure: % of students who took and passed AP or IB exams: FY 12=55%, FY 13=60%, FY 14=75%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 48%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	55%	8/30/2012	
6/30/2013	60%	(none)	

Measure: Average Daily Attendance of students in the Sussex Military Academy and the Delaware New Tech Acade

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 89%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	>90	6/30/2012	93%
6/30/2013	93%	(none)	

Measure: Dropout Rate: FY 12=6%, FY 13=5%, FY 14=4%

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 7%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	6%	6/30/2012	7.8
6/30/2013	5%	(none)	

Measure: Number of student disciplinary referrals: FY 12=5% reduction, FY 13=5% reduction, FY 14=5% reductio

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2859

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	5% reduction	6/30/2012	0%
6/30/2013	5% reduction	(none)	

Measure: % monthly of teachers incorporating LFS skills/strategies into teaching as demonstrated by an LFS ch

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 50%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	75%	6/30/2012	95%
6/30/2013	97%	(none)	

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

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

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

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	40%	6/30/2011	52.4
6/30/2012	60%	6/30/2012	63.5
6/30/2013	80%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Science on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Science on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	40%	6/30/2011	41.4
6/30/2012	60%	6/30/2012	46.4
6/30/2013	80%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DCAS (All Students, All Grades)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Social Studies on the DCAS (All Students, All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	40%	6/30/2011	65.6
6/30/2012	60%	6/30/2012	51.6
6/30/2013	80%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	22%	6/30/2011	22.7
6/30/2012	30%	6/30/2012	30.9
6/30/2013	38%	(none)	
6/30/2014	46%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] NGA Graduation Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] NGA Graduation Rate (All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	81%	6/30/2011	75.6
6/30/2012	83%	(none)	
6/30/2013	86%	(none)	
6/30/2014	88%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] College Enrollment Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] College Enrollment Rate (All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	80%	(none)	
6/30/2012	81%	(none)	
6/30/2013	82%	(none)	
6/30/2014	83%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] College Retention Rate (All Students)

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] College Retention Rate (All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

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

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

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

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	40%	6/30/2011	67.0
6/30/2012	60%	6/30/2012	64.5
6/30/2013	80%	(none)	
6/30/2014	100%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] ESEA Graduation Rate (Current NCLB Rate - All Students)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] ESEA Graduation Rate (Current NCLB Rate - All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	81%	6/30/2011	74.1
6/30/2012	83%	(none)	
6/30/2013	86%	(none)	
6/30/2014	88%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Reading on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	30%	6/30/2011	30.7
6/30/2012	36%	6/30/2012	29.1
6/30/2013	42%	(none)	
6/30/2014	48%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 4)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	15%	6/30/2011	15.4
6/30/2012	25%	6/30/2012	23.6
6/30/2013	40%	(none)	
6/30/2014	50%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Advanced in Math on the DCAS (All Students - Grade 8)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2011	15%	6/30/2011	13.9
6/30/2012	25%	6/30/2012	18.8
6/30/2013	40%	(none)	
6/30/2014	50%	(none)	

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Reading on the DCAS (African American/Black - All Grades)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (African American/Black - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Reading on the DCAS (Hispanic - All Grades)

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on the DCAS (Hispanic - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Reading on the DCAS
(White - All Grades)

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on
the DCAS (White - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Measure: [CM-R2T] % Proficient in Reading on the DCAS
(Low Income - All Grades)

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2011

DOE Indicator: [CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Reading on
the DCAS (Low Income - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

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

Objective 2.1: Improve access to and use of data systems

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Data Management Systems) 0% of the teachers are trained in management systems.
---	------------------------	---

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who rate their comfort level with using the new system as comfortable or somewhat comf

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase	6/30/2013	

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: % of administrators who rate their comfort level with using the new system as comfortable or somewhat

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase	6/30/2013	

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Objective 2.2: Build the capacity to use data

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(School Accountability Ratings) Four of the six schools received accountability ratings of Under Improvement for the 2010-2011 school year.
2	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Data Management Systems) 0% of the teachers are trained in management systems.
3	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Learning Communities) The district needs to continue to implement PLCs via 90 minute weekly common planning time. 50% of the PLC time should be data analysis time.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Science and Social Studies) Most recent DCAS data shows that the Seaford School District scored below the state average in social studies and science.
5	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Reading) 2011 DCAS Reading scores were below the state average.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced 4th Grade Math) 15% of the students are proficient on DCAS math which is below state average.
7	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced on 8th grade DCAS reading) 14% of the students on the 2011 DCAS assessments achieved at the advanced level which is below state average.
8	<i>Student Need</i>	(% Advanced on 4th Grade DCAS Reading) 22% of students are either proficient or advanced on 4th grade DCAS which is below state average.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Ensure implementation of instructional improvement systems (SoW 4)

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who rate their comfort level with using the new system as comfortable or somewhat comf

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase	6/30/2013	

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: % of administrators who rate their comfort level with using the new system as comfortable or somewhat

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	10% increase	6/30/2013	

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Objective 3.1: Improve the effectiveness of educators based on performance

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Highly Qualified Teachers) The Seaford School District has less than 100% of its teachers Highly Qualified.
2	Staff & Community Need	(DPAS II Training) 100% of the instructional administrators will need to be trained in DPAS II evaluation system.
3	Student Need	(Effective Teacher Preparation Programs) We need to make sure that all teachers graduate from highly effective teacher preparation programs.
4	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Development Observations) 100% of the teachers who participated in professional development had successfully transferred what was learned to the classroom. This has to be maintained.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Use evaluations as a primary factor in educator development, promotion, advancement, retention, and removal (SoW 5)

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers who receive at least "satisfactory" on student growth component of DPAS II: FY 12=Base

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

Start Year: 2012 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Objective 3.2: Ensure equitable distribution of effective educators (SoW 7)

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Highly Qualified Teachers) The Seaford School District has less than 100% of its teachers Highly Qualified.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(Effective Teacher Preparation Programs) We need to make sure that all teachers graduate from highly effective teacher preparation programs.

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers rated effective or above: FY 12=Baseline, FY 13=10%, FY 14=10%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Provide opportunities for teachers to move into career ladders: FY 12=4, FY 13=1, FY 14=1

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	4	6/30/2012	4
6/30/2013	1	(none)	

Measure: % of minority teaching staff: FY 12=12.3%, FY 13=14.3%, FY 14=16.3%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 10.3%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	12.3%	6/30/2012	12.4%
6/30/2013	14.3%	(none)	

Objective 3.3: Ensure that educators are effectively prepared (SoW 9)

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Learning Communities) The district needs to continue to implement PLCs via 90 minute weekly common planning time. 50% of the PLC time should be data analysis time.
2	Staff & Community Need	(Highly Qualified Teachers) The Seaford School District has less than 100% of its teachers Highly Qualified.
3	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Development Delivery) 100% of staff who attended workshops and conferences shared knowledge and skills learned with other staff members through professional development sessions.
4	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Development Observations) 100% of the teachers who participated in professional development had successfully transferred what was learned to the classroom. This has to be maintained.
5	Staff & Community Need	(Lead Teachers) Lead teachers who are rated highly effective need to be identified and utilized to improve instruction.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Target recruiting and hiring to the most effective preparation programs (SoW 9 req.)
- 2 Revise the teacher mentoring program to provide strong services including 2nd and 3rd year teachers

Measure(s):

Measure: % of teachers rated effective or above: FY 12=Baseline, FY 13=10%, FY 14=10%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Number of teachers participating in the administrative succession professional development modules:

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Professional Development

Period: Yearly

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

Measure: Number of teachers employed from the New Teacher Pipeline: FY 12=2, FY 13=2, FY 14=2

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Professional Development

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	2	6/30/2014	

Measure: Number of administrative interns employed from the administrative internship program: FY 12=1, FY 1

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Professional Development

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	1	6/30/2012	0
6/30/2013	1	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers in mentoring program who return the following year: FY 12=92%, FY 13=94%, FY 14=96%

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 80%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Professional Development

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	92%	6/30/2012	97%
6/30/2013	93%	(none)	

Objective 3.4: Provide effective support to educators

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Staff Access to Technology) 100% of the staff have access to technology throughout the day. This needs to be maintained in order to increase LoTi scores.
2	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Learning Communities) The district needs to continue to implement PLCs via 90 minute weekly common planning time. 50% of the PLC time should be data analysis time.
3	Staff & Community Need	(Levels of Technology Integration) There was a slight increase in the LoTi scores for teachers (median LoTi level) in 2011.
4	Staff & Community Need	(DPAS II Training) 100% of the instructional administrators will need to be trained in DPAS II evaluation system.
5	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Development Delivery) 100% of staff who attended workshops and conferences shared knowledge and skills learned with other staff members through professional development sessions.
6	Staff & Community Need	(Professional Development Observations) 100% of the teachers who participated in professional development had successfully transferred what was learned to the classroom. This has to be maintained.

Strategy(s):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: % monthly of teachers incorporating LFS skills/strategies into teaching as demonstrated by an LFS ch

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 50%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	75%	6/30/2012	95%
6/30/2013	97%	(none)	

Measure: % of teachers annually who are on improvement plans and who successfully complete the improvement pl

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 98%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

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

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

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

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(School Accountability Ratings) Four of the six schools received accountability ratings of Under Improvement for the 2010-2011 school year.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(DCAS Achievement Gaps) Achievement Gaps in 3rd grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=32 pts, ELL=38 pts), 3rd grade math (African American= 27 pts, Spec Ed=21 pts, ELL=29 pts), 5th grade reading (African American= 33 pts, Spec Ed=38 pts, ELL=40 pts), 5th grade math (African American= 35 pts, Spec Ed=55 pts, ELL=41 pts), 8th grade reading (African American= 22 pts, Spec Ed=83 pts, ELL=55 pts), 8th grade math (African American= 10 pts, Spec Ed=41 pts, ELL=60 pts), 10th grade reading (African American= 31 pts, Spec Ed=30 pts, ELL=50 pts), and 10th grade math (African American= 32 pts, Spec Ed=34 pts, ELL=29 pts) need to be closed.
3	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Parent Satisfaction and Involvement) There is a need to survey parents to gauge their levels of involvement and their satisfaction with our schools. There should be a 5% annual increase.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(Supplemental Educational Services and School Choice) Seaford Middle School will need to offer Supplemental Educational Services and Frederick Douglass and West Seaford Elementary Schools must provide in-district School Choice based upon the 2010 school ratings.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Implement the Transformational Model at Seaford High School with fidelity
- 2 Contract with outside educational expert to review and revise the School Improvement Plan/School Success Plan for Seaford Middle School (Corrective Action Plan)
- 3 Contract with outside educational expert to review the content of the Workshop time at Seaford Middle School and begin implementing recommendations for improved math and reading instruction (Corrective Action Plan).

Measure(s):

Measure: % of 9th graders promoted annually: FY 12=90%, FY 13=95%, FY 14=100%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 73.2%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	90%	8/30/2012	
8/30/2013	92%	(none)	

Measure: Average Daily Attendance of students in the Sussex Military Academy and the Delaware New Tech Acade

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 89%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	>90	6/30/2012	93%
6/30/2013	93%	(none)	

Measure: Dropout Rate: FY 12=6%, FY 13=5%, FY 14=4%

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 7%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	6%	6/30/2012	7.8
6/30/2013	5%	(none)	

Measure: Number of student disciplinary referrals: FY 12=5% reduction, FY 13=5% reduction, FY 14=5% reductio

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 2859

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	5% reduction	6/30/2012	0%
6/30/2013	5% reduction	(none)	

Objective 4.2: 4.2 Engage families and communities effectively in supporting students' academic success

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	Staff & Community Need	(Parent Satisfaction and Involvement) There is a need to survey parents to gauge their levels of involvement and their satisfaction with our schools. There should be a 5% annual increase.
---	------------------------	---

Strategy(s):

- 1 Improve school to community relations and services

Measure(s):

Measure: Parent Satisfaction Survey Results: FY 12=5% increase in overall parent satisfaction, FY 13=5% incr

Start Year: 2011 **Baseline:** 70% (A or B)

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/30/2012	70%	8/30/2012	72%
8/30/2013	80%	(none)	

Objective 4.3: 4.3 Implement the focus school plan at West Seaford Elementary in order to dramatically accelerate student achievement in order to close the achievement gap for low income students.

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Achievement Reading - All Students) As measured by the DCAS, last year 57.05 of all students at West Seaford Elementary were proficient, a slight decrease from the previous year.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Achievement Math - All students) As measured by the DCAS, 59.84 % of students were proficient in math last year, a slight decrease from the previous year.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Achievement Reading and Math Combined - Low Income Students) Need to raise the level of performance for students identified as low income.
4	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Development for Staff) The need exists for a more robust research-based professional development plan to increase teacher effectiveness.
5	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Student, Staff, and Community School Climate perceptions) Reduce the disconnect that exists between staff and student beliefs about support from home, overall behavior, and understanding of what students are expected to learn in class.
6	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Discipline) Reduce the number of suspensions by 10% each year.
7	<i>Student Need</i>	(Nutrition and Physical Fitness) 84% of the students at West Seaford are identified as low income through the free and reduced meals program. Recent research has revealed a correlation between physical fitness and academic success.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Implement an extended day program that will include remediation and acceleration activities as well as promote student efficacy and character development.
- 2 Hire a behavior interventionist to provide individual social/emotional support for students, implement PBIS, and develop and implement the character education segment of the extended day program.
- 3 Implement a PBIS program to increase student engagement and efficacy as well as reduce student discipline.
- 4 Provide job-embedded professional development through training in The Skillfull Teacher and the implementation of a Staff Development Teacher in order to provide ongoing support and increase teacher effectiveness.
- 5 Deploy a parent engagement plan that will increase parental involvement through 3 avenues - Collaborating, Parenting, and Learning at Home (Epstein).
- 6 Establish a community partnership with the Nemours Foundation to provide training on healthy lifestyles, etc. to the school community.

Measure(s):

Measure: Student Achievement Reading - All Students
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 57.05
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	70	(none)	
6/1/2014	73	(none)	
6/1/2015	76	(none)	

Measure: Student Achievement Math - All Students
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 59.84
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	70.2	(none)	
6/1/2014	73.2	(none)	
6/1/2015	76.1	(none)	

Measure: Combined Reading and Math Student Achievement - Low Income
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 50.3% in 2010-2011
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	58.6	(none)	
6/1/2014	62.7	(none)	
6/1/2015	66.9	(none)	

Measure: Reduce student suspensions by 10% each year
Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 38
DOE (none)
Indicator:
Perspective: Teaching and Learning
Period: Quarterly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	35	(none)	
6/30/2014	32	(none)	
6/30/2015	29	(none)	

Measure: Increase the percentage of eligible students who pass at least 3 of the 5 tests on the fitnessgram.

Start Year: 2013

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	90%	(none)	
6/30/2014	93%	(none)	
6/30/2015	96%	(none)	

Measure: Increase parent and family engagement by 20% over September 2012 baseline.

Start Year: 2002

Baseline: TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Quarterly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Objective 4.4: 4.4 Implement the focus school plan at Frederick Douglass Elementary in order to dramatically accelerate student achievement in order to close the achievement gaps for african american and low income students.

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student-Student Relations) Student to student interactions and students treating each other with respect.
2	<i>Student Need</i>	(School Safety / Bullying) Clarity and reinforcement of expectations, character education, and individual behavioral support.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Achievement- African American Subgroup) African American students have a larger percentage of students that score well below or below on the DCAS assessment as compared to their caucasian counterparts. For example in 5th grade math, 71% of African American students perform below standard as compared to only 8% of Caucasian students.
4	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Achievement - Low Income) Only 54.2% of students scored proficient in Reading and 52.2% in Math on the DCAS state assessment.
5	<i>Student Need</i>	(Student Discipline) Consistently enforced code of conduct and positive behavior support.
6	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Professional Development) Staff requires a more robust professional development plan to increase teacher effectiveness. Many new staff numbers have expanded the professional development needs at Frederick Douglass.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Implement an extended day program that will include remediation and acceleration activities as well as promote student efficacy and character development.
- 2 Hire a behavior interventionist to provide individual social/emotional support for students, implement PBIS, and develop and implement the character education segment of the extended day program.
- 3 Implement a PBIS program to increase student engagement and efficacy as well as reduce student discipline.
- 4 Provide job-embedded professional development through training in The Skillfull Teacher and the implementation of a Staff Development Teacher in order to provide ongoing support and increase teacher effectiveness.
- 5 Deploy a parent engagement plan that will increase parental involvement through 3 avenues - Collaborating, Parenting, and Learning at Home (Epstein).

Measure(s):

Measure: Reduce the number of referrals by 50% through positive school, student, and community interactions.

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 319

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	160 referrals	(none)	
6/30/2014	145 referrals	(none)	
6/30/2015	135 referrals	(none)	

Measure: Student Achievement Reading - All students

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 62.96

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	70	(none)	
6/1/2014	73	(none)	
6/1/2015	76	(none)	

Measure: Combined Reading and Math Student Achievement - African American

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 32.6

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	38.7	(none)	
6/1/2014	44.8	(none)	
6/1/2015	51	(none)	

Measure: Combined Reading and Math Student Achievement - Low Income Students

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 43.7

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/1/2013	48.8	(none)	
6/1/2014	53.9	(none)	
6/1/2015	59	(none)	

Measure: Reduce by 20% student discipline referrals among low income and African American students

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** 223

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Teaching and Learning

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2013	178	(none)	
6/30/2014	142	(none)	
6/30/2015	113	(none)	

Measure: Increase the rate of parent and family engagement by 20% over September 2012 baseline.

Start Year: 2013 **Baseline:** TBD

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Connections to Learning

Period: Quarterly

No measure details are defined for this measure.

Goal 5: Ensure compliance with all federal grants and grant requirements

Objective 5.1: Ensure compliance with all federal requirements associated with federal grants by implementing programs, expending funds, monitoring programs and evaluating effectiveness

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	<i>Student Need</i>	(School Accountability Ratings) Four of the six schools received accountability ratings of Under Improvement for the 2010-2011 school year.
2	<i>Staff & Community Need</i>	(Highly Qualified Teachers) The Seaford School District has less than 100% of its teachers Highly Qualified.
3	<i>Student Need</i>	(Supplemental Educational Services and School Choice) Seaford Middle School will need to offer Supplemental Educational Services and Frederick Douglass and West Seaford Elementary Schools must provide in-district School Choice based upon the 2010 school ratings.

Strategy(s):

- 1 Implement, monitor and evaluate all federal requirements associated with federal grants

Measure(s):

Measure: 100% of all federal grants will be implemented according to federal guidelines

Start Year: 2011

Baseline: 100%

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2012	100%	(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	13.9
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	15.4
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	41.4
6/30/2011	45.8	6/30/2011	41.4
[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	51.6
[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	22.7
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	30.7

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	52.4
6/30/2012	66.5	6/30/2012	63.5
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	54.9
6/30/2012	66.3	6/30/2012	64.5
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	66.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	65.3
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	64.6
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	80.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	85.7
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	70.0

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

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

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	52.6
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	50.3
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	88.9
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	87.5
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	86.1
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	73.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	69.9
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	68.0
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		

6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		
[CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (White - All Grades)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	75.1
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	75.7
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	76.4
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	66.3
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	59.4
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	38.6
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	31.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	30.4
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	25.6
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	61.9
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	58.9
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	57.3
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	72.8
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	72.2
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	68.0
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	80.0
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	100.0
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	70.0
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	62.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	60.3
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	55.3
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	85.2
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	90.0
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	88.2
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	73.9
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	73.3
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	62.8
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	79.9

6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	80.7
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	78.9
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	60.8
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	56.9
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	22.2
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	44.5
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	38.2
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	28.6
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	68.2
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	66.0
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	60.5

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	91.9
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	92.1
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	80.4
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	79.8
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	47.1
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	47.5
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	57.1
[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	59.8
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	56.9
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	42.6

[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	64.3
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	60.7
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	61.2
2/28/2009	95	2/28/2009	57.8
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	44.1
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	43.5
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	46.3
[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	46.7
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	44.7
6/30/2010	95	6/30/2010	36.2
[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	71.8
6/30/2009	82.5	6/30/2009	76.4
6/30/2010	84	6/30/2010	78.1

[CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	76	6/30/2008	60.0
6/30/2009	78	6/30/2009	88.9
6/30/2010	79	6/30/2010	60.9
[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	8.5
6/30/2009	4.8	6/30/2009	8.0
6/30/2010	4.7	6/30/2010	7.4
[CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	3.0
6/30/2009	6.2	6/30/2009	4.4
6/30/2010	5.6	6/30/2010	7.4
[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	94.0
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	94.3
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	93.8
6/15/2011	100	6/15/2011	94.8
6/15/2012	100	6/15/2012	92.6
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	16.5

6/30/2009	12.8	6/30/2009	21.7
6/30/2010	12.8	6/30/2010	20.9
[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	83.6
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	83.4
3/30/2010	62	3/30/2010	83.1
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	36.8
6/15/2009	68	6/15/2009	80.0
6/15/2010	68	6/15/2010	75.0
[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	42.1
6/15/2009	50	6/15/2009	60.0
6/15/2010	50	6/15/2010	55.6
[CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing Technical Skills Assessment			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	69	6/15/2008	0.0
6/15/2009	71	6/15/2009	100.0
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	100.0
[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	0.0
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	92.9
6/10/2010	70	6/10/2010	97.9

[CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE Concentrators)			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	81	6/15/2008	58.8
6/15/2009	82.5	6/15/2009	92.9
6/15/2010	84	6/15/2010	97.9
[CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	95	6/15/2008	90.5
6/15/2009	96	6/15/2009	36.8
6/15/2010	52	6/15/2010	47.3
[CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	38	6/15/2008	40.6
6/15/2009	38.5	6/15/2009	50.4
6/15/2010	36.5	6/15/2010	47.2
[CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields			
Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	20		
6/15/2009	21	6/15/2009	39.5
6/15/2010	16	6/15/2010	58.8

Success Plan Team Members

Name	Title	Phone	Email
Carey, Kelly	Principal	302-629-4587	
Evans, Brent	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Blackburn, Donna	Business Manager	302-629-4587	
Desaultels, Kathy	Teacher	302-628-4416	
McKain, Michael	Teacher	302-628-4416	
Oliver, Otelia	Parent	302-629-4587	
Washington, Bridgette	Parent	302-629-2545	
DuPont, Albert	Assistant Superintendent	302-629-4587	adupont@seaford.k12.de.us
Moore, Desi	JDG Teacher	302-629-4587	
Scollo-Crouse, Tina	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Wagner, Danielle	Student		
Pentoney, Ben	Manager	302-629-4587	
Barr, John	Business Liaison	302-629-4587	
Mackler, Bradley	Community Member	302-629-4587	
Gunson, Paula	Community member	302-629-4587	
Johnson, Klye	Student	302-629-4587	
Keeton, Patti	Supervisor	302-629-4587	
Painter, David	Community Member	302-629-4587	
LaPrad, Phil	Community Member	302-629-4587	
Harris, Jessica	Student	302-629-4587	
Harris, Sherry	Parent	302-629-4587	
Cannon, Sharon	Parent	302-629-4587	
Wooten, Tracy	Agriculture Specialists	302-629-4587	
Adams, Becky	Parent	302-629-4587	
Quillen, Alan	Business	302-629-4587	
Breeding, Ron	Director	302-629-4587	

Nancarrow, Susan	West Seaford Elementary	302-629-9352	snancarrow@seaford.k12.de.us
Jocano, Denise	Principal	302-628-4413	djacono@seaford.k12.de.us
Zachry, Robert	Assoc. Principal	302-628-4413	rzachry@seaford.k12.de.us
Shockley, Debbie	Staff Development Teacher	302-628-4413	dlshockley@seaford.k12.de.us
Shockley, Debbie	Staff Development Teacher	302-628-4413	dlshockley@seaford.k12.de.us
Baker, Sandra	Director of School Performance	302-629-4587	sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us
Waters, Thonia	Teacher	302-628-4413	twaters@seaford.k12.de.us
Waters, Thonia	Teacher	302-628-4413	twaters@seaford.k12.de.us
Ross, Isaac	Pastor		
Ross, Isaac	Pastor		
Cannon, Carlton	Mr.		
Walsh, Christina		302-628-4413	cwalsh@seaford.k12.de.us
Adams-Cannon, Vanessa			
Taylor, Hollie	Teacher	302.629.9352	htaylor@seaford.k12.de.us
Handy, Wallace	Teacher	302.629.9352	whandy@seaford.k12.de.us
Stark-Garand, Debbie	Staff Development Teacher	302.629.9352	dstark@seaford.k12.de.us
Edwards, Kathleen	Teacher	302.629.9352	kedwards@seaford.k12.de.us
King, Michael	Teacher	302.629.9352	mking@seaford.k12.de.us
Wilson, Janice	Teacher	302.629.9352	jwilson@seaford.k12.de.us
Longo, Gail	Reading Specialist	302.629.9352	glongo@seaford.k12.de.us
Cohee, Matt	Teacher	302.629.9352	mcohee@seaford.k12.de.us
Smolecki, Alison	Teacher	302.629.9352	asmolecki@seaford.k12.de.us
Zlock, Diana	Teacher	302.629.9352	dzlock@seaford.k12.de.us
Spangler, Britney	Teacher	302.629.9352	bspangler@seaford.k12.de.us
Thompson, Al	Leadership Coach		
Thompson, Al			
Holston, Shannon	Coordinator of Assessment & Accountability	302-629-4587 ext. 279	sholston@seaford.k12.de.us
Van Sciver, Cathy	Nemours		

Edwards, Kathy	Ms.	302-628-4414	kedwards@seaford.k12.de.us
Quillen, Tara	Parent	302-629-6761	
Lavelle, Lance	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Deiter, Amber	Administrator	302-629-4587	
Croce, Joe	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Taylor, Hollie	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Covelli, Angela	Teacher	302-628-4414	
Ewing, Kim	Parent	302-629-4587	
Baker, Sandy	Administrator	302-629-4587	
Reed, Brice	Associate Principal	302-629-4587	
Andrus, Robin	Director	302-629-4587	
Laws, Dara	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Johnson, Laura	Parent	302-629-4587	
DiCarlo, Gwen	Support Staff	302-629-4587	
Vaughn, Charlotte	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Moore, Dezi	Parent	302-629-4587	
Kidder, Jennifer	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Harris, Ruth	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Baker, Liz	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Simmons, Kim	Associate Principal	302-629-4587	
Wright, Ellen	Teacher	302-629-9300	
Herd, Kathy	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Covington, Jennifer	Teacher	302-629-8102	
Shockley, Debbie	Teacher	410-546-0214	
Walsh, Christina	Teacher	302-629-2129	
Ayers, Connie	Teacher	302-629-4587	
Rolph, Shannon	Teacher	302-628-9029	
Bailey, Lisa	Support Staff	302-628-1963	
Matthews, Maxine	Teacher	410-754-7729	

Speicher, Debbie	Teacher	302-629-9292
Lamberton, Kathryn	Teacher	302-841-9622
Painter, Janice	Teacher	302-628-3108
Bleile, Elizabeth	Teacher	302-628-8788
Filipiak, Cheryl	Counselor	302-629-4587
Porter, Amber	Teacher	302-629-4587
Mann-Jarmon, Gwen	Parent	302-629-4587
Maddox, Evelyn	Para	302-629-4587
Fishburn, Todd	Principal	302-628-4416
Eskridge, Patti	Teacher	302-628-4416
Tingle, Alison	Teacher	302-629-4587
Reale, Wendy	Secretary	302-628-4416
Phillips, Chandra	Associate Principal	302-629-4587
Rohlich, John	Counselor	302-629-4587
Salisbury, Rita	Teacher	302-629-4587
Towers, Charlie	Parent	302-629-4587
Zoll, Gary	Teacher	302-629-4587
Covey, Ann	Nurse	302-629-4587
Powell, Nikita	Support Staff	302-629-4587
Bower, Jennifer	Teacher	302-629-4587
Widen, Michele	Support Staff	302-629-4587
Wright, Krystal	Teacher	302-628-4414
Longo, Gail	Teacher	302-628-4414
Evans, Chanelle	Teacher	302-629-4587
Yelveton, Diana	Parent	302-629-4587
Garner, Steve	Director	302-629-4587 x279
Johnson, Paula	Director	302-629-4587 x280
Zachry, Rob	Principal	302-629-4587

Nancarrow, Susan	Principal	302-628-4416
Forjan, Jeff	Associate Principal	302-628-4414
Smith, Stephanie	Principal	302-628-4587

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 contribute to successful implementation of the grant.

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Email Address</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Programs</u>	<u>Perkins</u>
Cathy	Van Sciver	Nemours		Community Member	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Susan	Nancarrow	Principal		Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Hollie	Taylor	Teacher		Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Alison	Smolecki	Teacher	asmolecki@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Gail	Longo	Teacher		Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Britney	Spangler	Teacher	bspangler@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Matt	Cohee	Teacher	mcohee@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Thonia	Waters	Teacher	twaters@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Isaac	Ross	Pastor		Community Member	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Denise	Jocano	Principal	djacono@seaford.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Debbie	Stark-Garand	Staff Development Teacher	dstark@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Shannon	Holston	Coordinator of Assessment & Accountability	sholston@seaford.k12.de.us	District Employee	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Debbie	Shockley	Teacher		Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Diana	Zlock	Teacher	dzlock@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Debbie	Shockley	Teacher		Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Robert	Zachry	Assoc. Principal	rzachry@seaford.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	
Isaac	Ross	Pastor		Community Member	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds	

Al	Thompson	Leadership Coach		Contractor	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Vanessa	Adams-Cannon			Parent	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Sandra	Baker	Director of School Performance	sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	Administrator	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Christina	Walsh	Teacher		Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Janice	Wilson	Teacher	jwilson@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Carlton	Cannon	Mr.		Community Member	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Michael	King	Teacher	mking@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Kathleen	Edwards	Teacher	kedwards@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Kathy	Edwards	Ms.	kedwards@seaford.k12.de.us	School Employee	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds
Wallace	Handy	Teacher	whandy@seaford.k12.de.us	Teacher	Year 1 - Focus School Funds, Year 1 - State SI Funds

2.2 Program Selection

Federal		State	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 1 - Focus School Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 1 - State SI Funds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 2 - Focus School Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 2 - State SI Funds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 3 - Focus School Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Year 3 - State SI Funds

2.3 Coordinators and Allocations

Federal Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	7/10/2012
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	8/31/2012
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	8/31/2012

State Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Give Back</u>	<u>Amount Requested (After Give Back To State)</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Year 1 - State SI Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00	7/10/2012
Year 2 - State SI Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00	8/31/2012
Year 3 - State SI Funds	Baker, Sandra sbaker@seaford.k12.de.us	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00	8/31/2012

3.0 Schools to Be Served

School	Subgroup(s)	School Type	Seek Funds
Fred Douglass Elem	SES Gap, African Amer Perf	Title I	Yes
West Seaford Elem	SES Gap	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.

Frederick Douglass Elementary School Narrative:

Provide information regarding each of the following:

School background: Frederick Douglass Elementary includes students in pre-kindergarten through grade 5. Among our population, Fredrick Douglass Elementary houses the district's autistic and elementary intensive learning center programs. The faculty consists of more than 40 professionals including regular education teachers, special education teachers, a staff development teacher, reading specialist, educational diagnostician, shared physical education, music art, and ESL teachers, a guidance counselor, full-time family crisis therapist and a full-time nurse. District itinerant staff includes a technology specialist, a school psychologist, a speech therapist, an inclusion specialist and occupational and physical therapists. In addition, the school has 15 paraprofessionals who assist with instructional programs in a variety of ways (autistic, intensive learning center, computer, pre-school, ESL, Media Center, and hearing impaired). There is one principal and one associate principal. The principal reports directly to the district's Superintendent.

School demographics: Frederick Douglass' enrollment was 430 on June 30, 2012. Specific data regarding school demographics are listed below:

Enrollment – 430

•African American – 41%

•White – 47%

•Native American – 10%

•Other/Multi-race – 2%

•Poverty – 76%

•Special Education – 9%

•School Choice –5%

Mission and vision: The mission of Frederick Douglass Elementary School is to provide a child-centered learning environment where expectations for academic success are high, and self-directed learning is encouraged. To that end, each child's uniqueness is celebrated and cultivated by the school working in partnership with families and the community.

Needs assessment and identified root causes: During the 2011-12 school year, a school climate survey was taken of school staff, parents, and students.

This survey was sent to a representative sample population of parents and/or guardians of Frederick Douglass students at each grade level, a similar sampling of students, and staff. The survey included several components: Teacher-Student Relations, Student-Student Relations, Staff Relations, Respect for Diversity, Student Engagement, Clarity of Expectations, Fairness of Rules, School Safety, Bullying, Positive/Punitive Techniques and Teacher-Home Communications. Surveys were distributed to parents of high achieving, average achieving, low achieving and LEP students. Participants rated statements using a scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. In addition, parents were given the opportunity to provide comments, which were shared with the leadership team. Below is a brief summary of survey results.

Teacher-Student Relations

There was a general consensus among all three groups that students like and are liked by their teachers with parents and teachers agreeing with these statements over 90% of the time. Students concurred with these statements 88% of the time

Student-Student Relations

Given the statements: students are friendly with others, students care about each other, students treat each other with respect, and students get along with

each other, responses varied among participants. Students uniformly disagreed with these statements on average 28% of the time while parents and teachers disagreed less often. One area of commonality came with respect to the question regarding students treating each other with respect. The average of those disagreeing with the statement was 25%.

Respect for Diversity

Responses between teachers and parents showed that while most feel both adults and students support respect for diversity, an average of 15% disagreed with roughly 28% believing that students do not respect those of other races.

Student Engagement

Among students, 30% felt that most students did not pay attention in class, 20% believed students did not give their best, and 24% felt that students did not turn in their homework. The strongest correlation with teacher responses involved students not trying their best in class.

Clarity of Expectations/Fairness of Rules

An average of 17% of teachers and students believed that the school rules are not made clear to students. Additionally, an average 25% of teachers and students do not believe the consequences of breaking school rules are fair.

School Safety/Bullying

Although there is some disconnect on Frederick Douglass Elementary school as a safe place, an average of 22% of students and teachers disagreed with the statement that students feel and know that they are safe in the school. In regard to bullying, an average of just over 60% of students, teachers, and parents agreed with the statement students threaten and bully others in this school, an average of 52% of the same groups agreed with the statement in this school, bullying is a problem, and 49% agree with the statement students worry about others hurting them in this school. A significant percentage of teachers agreed with the statements students are mean to one another in this school (68%), students threaten to hurt each other in this school (41%), there are many fights in this school (83%), and students are cruel to each other in this school (57%). In addition, one-third of teachers feel that teachers do not understand their students or that teachers and students respect each other. At least 34% of teachers felt that students are not taught to feel responsible for how they act, they are not taught to understand how others think, and are not taught how to solve conflicts with others. In addition, nearly one in four believed that students are not taught they should care about how others feel and nearly 20% thought that students are not taught that they can control their own behavior.

Staff Relations

Teachers disagreed with the following statements: Teachers, staff, and administrators function as a good team in this school (61%), Teachers work well together in this school (27%), Teachers, staff, and administrators work well together in this school (60%), Administrators and teachers support one another (52%), and There is good communication among teachers, staff, and administrators (73%).

Achievement

According to DCAS results for the 2011-2012 school year, nearly 60% of 2nd grade students scored either below or well below standard in reading and 54% scored at the same level for mathematics. 3rd grade students did not fare much better with 53% either below or well below standard in reading and 35% below or well below for mathematics. 4th and 5th grade saw 42% and 36% score below or well below for reading and 33% and 29% for mathematics respectively. Among the ethnic groups making up the majority of the population, African American students are having much less success than their Caucasian counterparts. The chart below shows the discrepancy between those in each group failing to make standard:

African American

% below standardCaucasian

% below standard

5th GradeMathematics

718

Reading7611
4th GradeMathematics
5418
Reading7124
3rd GradeMathematics
5316
Reading7630
2nd GradeMathematics
7116
Reading6850

Discipline

During the 2011-12 school year, a total of 319 behavior referrals were written for students. This included 189 school referrals and 130 bus referrals. 93 students accounted for the referrals or 22% of the student population. These referrals resulted in 90 out of school suspensions and 21 in school suspensions.

An analysis of the referrals showed that behaviors classed as "inappropriate behavior" accounted for 113 referrals or 62 % of all referrals. Clearly, behaviors that bring the safety of staff and students in to question as well as those which show disrespect to others are a concern. Additionally, 79% of those referred were male and 70% are African American with the majority being African American males.

Chosen interventions:

Extended time (day, year) for students with designated intervention strategies, ,
Strategies to address social, emotional and health needs,
Job embedded professional development,
Comprehensive parent engagement plan

•Rationale for chosen interventions

Based on the root causes determined from climate surveys, demographics, discipline, and achievement data, the interventions listed above were selected to support the need of a high poverty, diverse population of students with limited access to academic and social resources that are readily available to non-low income students who demonstrate higher levels of achievement in reading and math.

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strategies to address social, emotional and health needs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Job-embedded Professional Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.

Department or grade level chairs were invited, the reading specialist for the building, and the Staff Development Teachers, and other members of the staff were given the opportunity to join the Leadership Team. Included in the invitations to join the team are parents from the parent-teacher organization and community members. During the development of the Focus Plan, the Leadership Team analyzed data from DCAS, DIBELS, and school climate to determine specific goals in the areas of literacy, math, and school climate. The Director of School Performance and the Assessment Coordinator from the District Office also serve as participants on the team who will also provide district level monitoring of the plan's implementation

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).

Historically, extended day programs offered at Frederick Douglass Elementary School were ones of remediation and sporadic in nature due to funding. This grant proposal differs in that the focus is on promoting achievement through the engagement of students in high interest activities that emphasize the arts, hands-on activities, and athletics while stimulating an interest in learning. Programs that appeal to students and offer alternatives to what is offered during the regular school day are more likely to be attended than those that mirror the school day. The extended day activities expand the scope of PBS in that participation will be linked to school behavior. Underlying all offerings will be a clear focus on developing social and behavioral skills. The acquisition of these skills increases task-persistence and self control, which are linked to higher achievement. Volunteers will be recruited from the community to serve as coaches, and academic team advisors. In addition, we will hire an interventionist with a background in counseling or psychology. This will be a new position and this professional will work with students and parents to set goals for success and celebrate growth in academic, developmental, and social arenas. The counselor or psychologist hired would be dedicated to resolving behavioral issues which interrupt instruction and inhibit academic growth for all students. Job functions would include counseling students, developing and monitoring behavioral plans, and conducting classroom observations to identify triggers and provide teachers with guidance so they can become more proactive rather than reactive to reduce the amount of time off task and improve student performance. Presently, the school guidance counselor's ability to work with students one on one is limited by the number of students needing services along with other job related functions, which include classroom instruction, managing the mentoring and homeless programs, and other special projects. The job embedded professional development, Studying Skillful Teaching course, will include more than just the 30 hours of coursework. The facilitator will conduct on-site visits to observe and provide feedback to participating teachers. Modeling of instructional strategies for participating teachers would occur in classrooms. These demonstration lessons will provide teachers the opportunity to observe the high impact techniques used by the facilitator, student responses, and afford the opportunity for teachers to ask questions of the facilitator to improve their own professional practice. The addition of on-site visits by the facilitator will connect the material presented in the classroom setting with the classroom practice. Although teachers were trained in Learning Focus Strategies, the training was not cohesive and on-going. As a result, the strategies were not implemented with fidelity, and student achievement was minimally impacted. To scale up this model of cohesive professional development, we will implement a second cohort of Studying Skillful Teaching during the 2012-13 school year, which will complete training for 100% of our staff and provide an instructional framework for the school. Community engagement strategies in the past have focused on informational sessions, changes in policies or school rules, and

other proforma tasks. Using Joyce Epstein's "six keys" as a guide, Frederick Douglass elementary school staff will provide a coherent and comprehensive family engagement plan that includes required informational pieces, but goes much further to address the needs of the family and the whole child. These needs include family literacy, effective parenting, and English as a Second Language classes for parents of ELL students. Although many opportunities will be provided at the school, home visits are also an integral part of the Frederick Douglass outreach to engage parents and enlist their support for school programming.

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 district has leveraged staff units, Title I, Title II, RTTT, and local funds to provide a reading specialist, a psychologist, and a Staff Development Teacher in every school in the district. Because increasing the efficacy of Tier I interventions, the regular classroom that serves all students, this investment in personnel is considered to be critical to the success of the following district wide initiatives: implementation of balanced literacy in the elementary schools, Studying Skillful Teaching and Critical Thinking Skills professional development for all instructional and administrative staff, faithful implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports pre-K to 12, implementation of literacy skills in all secondary classrooms and the implementation of rigorous curriculum tools such as William and Mary and Junior Great Books. Rather than purchase an abundance of new programs, district leaders are investing funds in increasing the expertise of staff in the delivery of high quality and highly effective tools for intervention and acceleration that are already available in the district. That stated, Frederick Douglass Elementary School is applying for additional funding to provide what the district cannot: teacher stipends, transportation, materials, and supplies for a highly engaging extended day programming; funds to supplement what is available in Title I to promote parent involvement; and funds to provide a behavioral interventionist who will directly support children who struggle with social and emotional needs.

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

The superintendent has made a commitment to improving student performance in reading and math by reducing the achievement gap between low-income and non low-income and African-American and white students at Frederick Douglass Elementary School. As part of the monitoring protocol, the Frederick Douglass Leadership team is required to provide progress-monitoring data to track reading and math achievement during bi-monthly supervisory meetings. In addition to appointing a district level administrator to monitor school performance directly, the superintendent has initiated a rigorous professional development program, "Studying Skillful Teaching" to improve the instructional skills of all staff. The district is also providing training in the use of Compass Odyssey, one of the reading and math intervention programs that will be utilized in the extended day program. Additional training is being provided in the use of the McGraw-Hill Triumphs reading intervention program and Soar to Success that will also be used for appropriate students. Frederick Douglass staff will utilize MAP reading and math screening data, as well as demographic data to determine which students will be invited to attend the extended day program and begin to advertise the opportunity. Strategies will include flyers sent home to parents and made available at the Family Resource Center in Spanish, English, and Haitian-Creole; information on the district web site, Alert Now messages to parents, and an after school meeting for interested families. Appropriate trainings, purchase of needed supplies and materials, and agreements established with community volunteers will be established.

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.

Intervention 1: Extended time for students with designated intervention strategies.

Specific/Targeted Questions:

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.

Although it is not always the case, many of the students in the identified subpopulations tend to belong to more than one subgroup. In the case of Frederick Douglass Elementary, many of our African-American students are also counted as a part of the low socioeconomic subgroup. Extended day activities for students in these subgroups address the needs in terms of access. Many of these students do not have access to clubs or organizations outside school that will provide enrichment activities. This would include activities such as instrument rental, club membership fees, transportation, and other associated materials. Additionally consistent and systematically provided remediation, intervention, and acceleration opportunities found in private tutoring requiring

tuition are also beyond their means.

Jane L. David, director of the Bay Area Research Group summarized the results of 3 research studies as follows:

“In a study of 35 recommended programs serving either elementary or middle school students, Reisner and his colleagues (2007) found positive academic outcomes as well as social and behavioral benefits. Students who attended regularly for 2 years showed improvement in work habits, task persistence, and social skills (such as the ability to refrain from aggressive behavior). Students also demonstrated significant gains in mathematics achievement, even when math was not the focus of the program. Features that stood out across these successful programs included tightly knit partnerships between the after-school programs and students’ schools and communities and a focus on high quality arts, enrichment, and recreation rather than academic subjects.”

“Durlak and Weissberg (2007) reviewed studies of 73 programs that targeted personal and social skills, all using control groups. The researchers identified 39 programs that used what they defined as “sound” training approaches-sequenced activities to achieve skill objectives, active learning, and an explicit focus on personal or social skills. These programs showed significant positive benefits in terms of student self-confidence, positive social behaviors, and achievement test scores. In contrast, programs that did not use these approaches failed to produce success on any of the outcomes.”

“In their synthesis of several dozen studies of after school programs, Little, Wimer, and Weis (2008) identified three key features necessary for successful programs: sustained attendance, quality programming and staffing, and strong partnerships between the program and other places where students learn, including schools, families, and community institutions”.

One conclusion reached by Vandell and his associates in their 2006 study, Study of Promising After-School Programs, was that in comparison to a less-supervised group, school age children who frequently attended high quality after school programs, alone and in combination with other supervised activities displayed better work habits, task persistence, social skills, pro-social behaviors, and academic performance, and less aggressive behavior at the end of the school year.

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.

Reading and math interventions, tutoring, and homework help will be available Monday through Thursday to promote the development of academic skills and provide students with assistance with long-term projects. Remediation and acceleration activities will be included. Guidance will also be available to parents so that they can assist their children at home and build capacity for more self directed behavior. The anticipated outcomes are:

- Better attitudes toward school
- Higher attendance rates
- Less disciplinary action
- Better performance in school, as measured by achievement test scores and grades.
- Improved homework completion.
- Engagement in learning.

A focus on reading and mathematics intervention periods will be supplemented by enrichment opportunities. A schedule will be developed that includes the following: reading interventions that include but are not limited to Soar to Success, Reading Mastery, SRA Reading, and Compass for Reading and math interventions that include but are not limited to Math Out of the Box, SRA Math, and Compass for Math. This schedule will be supplemented by enrichment activities that will include but are not limited to music, hands on science, physical movement, and drama. A draft schedule is as follows:

3:30-5:30 p.m.	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
40 min.	Math Intervention	Math Intervention	Enrichment	Enrichment
10 min.	Snack	Snack	Snack	
Snack				
40 min.	Reading Intervention	Reading Intervention	Enrichment	Enrichment
30 min.	Recreation	Recreation	Recreation	Recreation

The fine arts component, which will include music, art, and drama programs will expose children to new experiences and is intended to stimulate

interest in learning. High interest activities will attract students and encourage regular attendance. The goal of this component is to promote student efficacy by providing them with opportunities to build new skills and experiences in addition to the core academics. The desired outcomes are:

- Decreased behavioral problems
- Improved social and communication skills and/or relationships with others.
- Increased self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-efficacy
- Development of Initiative
- Improved feelings and attitudes toward self and school.

Structured recreational activities, which emphasize character development, teamwork, and healthy life style choices, will be offered to balance the program. Expected outcomes include:

- Increased physical activity.
- Decreased behavioral problems
- Improved social and communication skills and/or relationships with others.
- Increased self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-efficacy
- Development of Initiative
- Improved feelings and attitudes toward self and school.
- Better food choices
- Increased knowledge of nutrition and health.

Involvement in the Junior Lego League promotes interest in math science and technology. Using a real world scientific concept, students explore it through research, teamwork, construction, and imagination, which in turn promotes the development of social skills, critical thinking, and confidence.

- Better attitudes toward school
- Higher attendance rates
- Less disciplinary action
- Better performance in school, as measured by achievement test scores and grades.
- Improved homework completion.
- Engagement in learning.
- Improved critical thinking and problem solving skills.

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.

Increased learning time for low performing African American, and low income students will be the result of the extended day program. Too many of these same students in grades 2 through 5 currently receive sub-standard after school care. They are either unsupervised or attend program that simply “keep them busy.” The most frequently used after school program merely provides recreational space, electronic game equipment, and vending machine snacks to scores of elementary children living and attending elementary schools in the district. The Frederick Douglass Elementary School Extended Day Program seeks to “re-purpose” two hours of that time to provide disadvantaged students with academic and enrichment activities that parallel the opportunities enjoyed by non low-income students.

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.

- The two-hour program will enable students to rotate among the 4 blocks of scheduled events: math and reading interventions, healthy snack, and recreation. Students will receive small group or one-on-one instruction during reading and math intervention; they will have an environment that is safe, structured, and free of aimless use of technology; they will be provided an opportunity to build executive skills with caring adults. Rotating the activities will help maintain student interest and engagement while providing low performing, low income students with academic and social advantages experienced by their non-low income peers. Recruiting community volunteers to assist with the recreation rotation will establish a positive relationship with community leaders who can provide positive role models and mentoring for African American and low income students.

Intervention 3: Strategies to address social, emotional, and health needs

Success Plan:

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.09 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.

As described in the needs assessment, over 20% of the student population is making poor choices resulting in behavioral referrals that are impeding their learning and that of others. Of those, more than 60% demonstrate inappropriate behaviors that present safety concerns and demonstrate poor social skills, impulse control, and coping skills.

According to the Policy Studies Associates, Inc, 2007 study, Promising After Schools Programs, students reported improved social and behavioral outcomes; elementary students reported reductions in aggressive behavior towards other students and skipping school.

In its February 2008 brief, the Harvard Family Research project stated, "Does participation in after school programs make a difference? The short answer is yes. A decade of research and evaluation studies, as well as large-scale, rigorously conducted syntheses looking across many research and evaluation studies, confirms that children and youth who participate in after school programs can reap a host of positive benefits in a number of interrelated-outcome areas academic, social/emotional, prevention, and health and wellness. The brief cited results of evaluations of LA's Best, a multi-component school based after school program serving over 19,000 students, that consistently demonstrate that participation in LA's BEST programs improves school-day attendance. Participants report higher aspirations regarding graduation and postsecondary experiences than non-participants. A longitudinal study that examined the dropout rates of former LA's BEST participants revealed that participation in LA's BEST for at least 1 year in grades 2 through 5 had a positive impact on high school dropout rates, and even greater participation resulted in a further reduction of dropout rates. These findings were particularly salient or low-income children."

In a 2001 study Sheridan, Eagle, Cowan, & Mickelson found that Conjoint Behavioral Consultations were effective in addressing academic, behavioral, and socioeconomic concerns. Their findings further suggested that the benefits to early elementary students were greater than for older students. Capella, Hamre, Kim, Henry and Frazier 2012 study indicated that teacher consultation and coaching can be integrated within existing mental health activities and impact classroom effectiveness and child adaptation across multiple domains.

4.10 Describe 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.

Specific strategies include the following:

The Leadership Team will coordinate with the cafeteria manager to provide a menu of healthy snacks for students each day.

The principal will meet with the community representatives on the Leadership Team to coordinate the schedule of volunteers and mentors for the daily recreational program.

In addition to the extended day activities, a certified counselor or psychologist will be employed as an interventionist to provide support to both students and teachers. Because of the nature of the support provided, a psychologist is preferred. Students with intensive needs will receive individual and small group support to meet their needs and provide them with additional skills for managing their classroom behaviors. This interventionist will develop the social skills program that will be delivered during snack time and provide staff responsible for interventions with protocols to follow to implement PBIS in the extended day program.

Teachers will receive job embedded professional development in the area of classroom management and strategies for working with students who present behavior challenges.

Intervention 4: Job-embedded Professional Development

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.10 Describe 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. A certified elementary teacher with a transcript that includes child development coursework or previous experience or certification in counseling will be hired as an interventionist to provide academic and behavioral interventions during the school day. The goal is to reduce the amount of time that students with behavior difficulties spend out of class, to continue academic learning when out of class time is unavoidable, to provide behavioral interventions, to ensure ongoing

communication with parents and teachers, and to successfully re-integrate students into the regular classroom. This interventionist will undergo PBIS training with the district psychology intern and provide leadership in the revitalization of PBIS at West Seaford Elementary School. This staff member will also maintain, monitor, and present student data that triangulates behavior, attendance, and academic progress of targeted students during building leadership meetings.

4.11 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.

The subpopulations that caused Frederick Douglass Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School are low-income and African American students. The higher the poverty level, the more specific and intentional the strategies need to be. Max Thompson, Doug Reeves, and the Vision 2015 network agree that there are specific characteristics of successful 90/90/90 schools, which are supported by the Studying Skillful Teaching pedagogical framework presented by Research For Better Teaching. The Studying Skillful Teaching pedagogical framework increases teacher effectiveness – including some strategies like higher order questions, summarizing and collaborative strategies that have greater effect on students in poverty and African American students.

4.12 Describe the specific professional development that will be offered. Describe how this professional development will be high-quality, job-embedded, focused, coherent, and continuous to address the needs of the school's identified subpopulations. Describe how the professional development will be maintained throughout the duration of the three-year plan.

A cohort of teachers was trained in Studying Skillfull Teaching through the Research for Better Teaching this summer; however due to financial limitations, only part of the staff was able to be trained. Frederick Douglass will use the focus school grant funds to train a second cohort of teachers to ensure that all staff members are trained in the pedagogical framework. Training will be offered throughout the school year and in the evenings The Skillful Teacher framework embodies four courses that focus on the art and science of teaching. Skillful Teaching will teach staff to communicate to all students that they can achieve at high levels, help students develop a positive academic identity, use multiple sources of data to make decisions about teaching, and provide expert instruction in every classroom. Support for implementation will be also be supplied through our Professional Learning Communities as well as individualized support from the Staff Development Teacher that resides in each building in the district.

Intervention 8: Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.19 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.

The poverty rate for Frederick Douglass Elementary School is 76%. Families in this group may feel disfranchised, believing because of their own economic and educational experiences that the system doesn't work. Teachers may not recognize how the school experience of parents, shape their responses to them. Language and cultural differences are two more potential barriers to school involvement. Parents are reluctant to attend meetings where they don't know what is being said, or where they are not understood. Messages sent by automated phone messaging and answered by non-English speaking parents or relatives are often ignored so important information is missed.

Walberg found in his 1984 study found that family participation in education was twice as predictive of students' academic success as family socioeconomic status. Cotton and Wieland found that the most effective forms of parent involvement are those, which engage parents in working directly with their children on learning activities.

According to the Michigan Department of Education's, fact sheet, What Research Says About Parental Involvement in Children's Education research consistently demonstrates that parental involvement produces the following results:

- Higher grades, test scores, and graduation rates
- Better school attendance
- Increased motivation, better self-esteem

- Lower rates of suspensions
- Fewer incidents of aggressive behavior

4.20 Describe the multiple methods (a minimum of three methods from Epstein's 6 Types of Parent Involvement) that will be used to engage parents in the school. Describe how these methods will inform a coherent plan to integrate families into the school's improvement efforts.

Frederick Douglass Elementary School will employ the following methods of parent involvement as defined by Epstein:

1: Parenting

To help families establish home environments that support and promote learning, Frederick Douglass Elementary plans to offer parent education through evening and weekend seminars. Through these sessions, parents will be provided with information and skill building activities to develop their abilities and encourage them to assume a more active role in their children's education. Included will be activities designed to give parents of our entering kindergartens an intensive orientation so that from early on they can fully support their children's learning throughout their school careers.

English language classes will be offered to our non- English speaking parents so that they can better communicate with teachers and others with whom they come in contact.

Home visits to establish a strong relationship between the home and school will occur.

2: Communicating

The web page will be updated daily to provide parents with the most current information and a bi-weekly newsletter highlighting important information, school events, and most importantly students' achievements will be published.

Written communications will be translated into Spanish and Haitian Creole to improve communication. Translators will be present at school meetings to assist parents and the school will utilize a Language Line service to facilitate understanding when phone calls are made to non-English speaking parents.

3. Volunteering:

Parents will be recruited to assist with daily school activities as well as after school activities. Community volunteers will be recruited to serve as coaches for scheduled recreational and academic activities.

4. Learning at Home:

Brochures outlining the standards and expectations for every grade level will be developed and provided to parents. Included in these brochures will be ideas for encouraging high achievement in each of the core content areas.

Parent seminars will include sessions on how parents can help with homework and school projects.

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.

Narrative:

•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.

District level staff members identified to support Frederick Douglass Elementary School include the Director of School Performance, the Director of Special Services, and the Assessment Coordinator who will assist with the writing of the Focus School grant, coordination of professional development, and in assisting the school's leadership team in analyzing the data for the superintendent's bi-monthly monitoring protocol. Other expectations include attending leadership team meetings to provide ongoing support for the implementation of the plan. The job descriptions for these two staff members include providing assistance in monitoring and analyzing achievement data that include DCAS, MAP reading and math and local reading and math assessments; assisting with the development of their Baldrige Guided Improvement Plans; and participating in the superintendent's bi-monthly supervisory meetings during which pertinent achievement, climate, and staff data are presented according to the established Monitoring Protocols. Both of these district level staff members provide support for revisions to the school improvement plan.

4.38 Describe the unique infrastructures that will be in place to monitor and evaluate the academic impact of the intervention(s).

Frederick Douglass Elementary School has been assigned an 11-month Staff Development Teacher utilizing Title I funds to provide ongoing, job embedded professional development and professional leadership throughout the school year. This staff member is responsible for leading weekly professional learning communities, conducting learning walks with feedback, peer teaching and coaching to increase teacher instructional effectiveness, and for assisting in the analysis of relevant data that impacts student success.

4.39 Describe LEA's plan to sustain and support the intervention(s) in the Focus school after the grant expires.

Following the grant's expiration, interventions that can be sustained include the 11-month Staff Development Teacher, Reading Specialist, PBIS implementation, Compass Reading and Math, Triumphs, and Soar to Success interventions, technology to help deliver interventions. Utilizing community volunteers to provide a recreational program each day is also feasible. The district plan is to increase the effectiveness of Tier I, general classroom instruction, repair parent and community relationships, develop student efficacy, and put Baldrige school improvement practices in place that will sustain long term school improvement.

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.

West Seaford Elementary School Narrative:

Provide information regarding each of the following:

•School background

West Seaford Elementary School serves 370 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. There are sixteen classes taught by highly qualified teachers, two and one-half special education teachers, one ELL teacher, a staff development teacher, reading specialist, two instructional paraeducators, one non-instructional paraeducator, and a shared music, art, and physical education teacher. There is one secretary and one principal.

•School demographics

The school demographics as of August 14, 2012 are as follows:

Total enrollment	350
African American	46%
Asian	3%
Native American	2%
Caucasian	49%
Special Education	11%
Free and Reduced Meals	84%

•Mission and vision

The mission of West Seaford Elementary School is as follows:

We Educate Students Together

The vision of West Seaford Elementary School is to empower children to change the world.

•Needs assessment and identified root causes.

oReading

Overall, 57% of the students at West Seaford Elementary met the standard in Reading on the DCAS assessment this past year, falling 10 percentage points below the AMO target of 67%. Comparatively, the average state growth in the elementary tested grades from the 2010-2011 school year to the 2011-2012 in the all student cell was 13 percentage points, while West Seaford Reading results declined 1.76%.

oDespite decline in the overall student proficiency in reading, West Seaford displayed growth from year to year in reading proficiency in the low-income accountability cell of 6.72%, but still fell short of the state average growth of 16% for low-income students. While a challenge exists for the school as a whole, the low-income and non-low-income proficiency gap in Reading was 17.5% last year (2011-2012) and 37.29% the previous year (2010-2011).

•Math

oWest Seaford did not achieve the AMO targets in math for the ALL students cell (59.84%), nor did they achieve the AMO target for the low-income cell (52.26%). Furthermore, West Seaford declined in student proficiency growth in math in both the ALL students cell (- 3.05) and the low income cell (- .72%) as measured by the DCAS from the previous year, while state averages posted growth of 9% and 12% respectively.

•School Climate

•School level referrals increased slightly compared to the previous year, 154 school level referrals in FY12 compared to 138 in FY11; however these numbers have seen significant decreases over the previous 3 years. Additionally 74 students (21%) received some type of school level referral last year, which is an increase from the previous 2 years.

oThere appears to be a slight disconnect in the percentage of African American males who received a referral last year (52%) compared to the demographic data of the school (i.e African American males account for 41% of the population). However, overall West Seaford's percent of students suspended (10.7%) is below the district average (17.43%) as well as the state average (15.14%).

oBased on a school climate survey, there appears to be some disparity between the perception of the students and the perceptions of the staff related to support from home, overall behavior, and understanding of what students are expected to learn in class.

•Root Causes:

oNeed for a more robust ongoing professional development plan to increase teacher effectiveness.

oNeed to raise the level of rigor of instruction across all grade levels in all subjects for all students.

oLack of resources to be able to provide greater supports to meet the needs of the whole child – academically, developmentally, socially and emotionally.

oGreater connections needed between families and the school in order to be more proactive.

•Chosen interventions

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

Intervention 2: Develop Partnerships with community

Intervention 3: Implement Strategies to address social, emotional and health needs

Intervention 4: Provide Job-embedded Professional Development

Intervention 8: Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan

•Rationale for chosen interventions

Based on the root causes determined from climate surveys, demographics, discipline, and achievement data, the interventions listed above were selected to support the need of a high poverty, diverse population of students with limited access to academic and social resources that are readily available to non-low income students who demonstrate higher levels of achievement in reading and math.

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Extended time (day, week, year) for students with designated intervention strategies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partnerships with community (academic + enrichment)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strategies to address social, emotional and health needs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Job-embedded Professional Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assignment of Leadership Coach to support administrator evaluation/improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assignment of Development Coach to support educator evaluation/improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Targeted and refocused use of Data Coaches in LEA and school leadership Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Use of external provider(s) matched to identified school needs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes to LEA policy, practices, and/or procedures
<input type="checkbox"/>	Staffing selection and assignment
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

Staff members who were department or grade level chairs were invited, and all members of the staff were given the opportunity to join our Focus Team. Parents from the parent-teacher organization and community members analyzed data from DCAS, DIBELS, and school climate to determine specific goals in the areas of literacy, math, and school climate. The principal's Leadership Performance Coach from the Leadership and Learning Center serves as both a participant and Coach to the Focus Team.

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 day program previously consisted of remedial reading or math instruction only. The new extended day program will focus on the whole child. In addition to providing a safe, secure time for reading and math intervention with a very small group or one-on-one with a caring adult, students will receive snacks, transportation, and projects or activities to help build self-efficacy. Further, we will hire an interventionist with a background in child development. This will be a new position and will work with students to set goals for success and celebrate growth in academic, developmental, and social arenas. A cohesive, on-going professional development program has not existed at West Seaford, and teacher effectiveness and beliefs are not aligned with the needs of the students as evidenced by the annual climate survey. Therefore, we will implement a second cohort of Studying Skillful Teaching, which will complete training for 100% of our staff and serves as an instructional framework for our school. Additionally, a smaller group of teachers will attend the 90/90/90 School Summit to receive specific training in raising the achievement of all students, regardless of poverty level. Further, to address the high level of referrals, the staff will participate in Cooperative Discipline training. We will begin a partnership with the Sussex County Health Promotion Coalition and Family Resource Center to offer activities to children and their families to increase physical activity, provide healthy meals, and educate families about creating and keeping a healthy lifestyle.

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 district has committed significant grant funding to support West Seaford Elementary School. In addition to requiring the elementary school to allocate a teaching unit to a reading specialist position, the district has allocated Title II funding to provide a Staff Development Teacher who will provide job embedded professional development during the weekly scheduled Professional Learning Communities. Other district funded resources include an initial cohort participating in Studying Skillful Teaching professional development, Compass Learning, SOAR to Success, and Triumphs reading interventions. The district supervisor of foods and nutrition will partner with the Food Bank of DE to help provide nutritious snacks. These resources are not dependent upon the Focus School Grant. Although the district has leveraged many existing funding sources, the resources that it cannot support without additional grant funding include teacher stipends for the extended day program, salary for a behavioral interventionist, technology to help deliver the Compass Odyssey reading and math interventions, and an additional cohort of teachers to participate in Studying Skillful Teaching.

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

The superintendent has made a commitment to improving student performance in reading and math by reducing the achievement gap between low-income and non low-income students at West Seaford Elementary School. As part of the monitoring protocol, the West Seaford Leadership team is required to provide progress-monitoring data to track reading and math achievement during bi-monthly supervisory meetings. In addition, to appointing a district level administrator to monitor school performance directly, the superintendent has initiated a rigorous professional development program, "Studying Skillful Teaching," to improve the instructional skills of all staff. The district is also providing training in the use of Compass Odyssey, one of the reading and math intervention programs that will be utilized in the extended day program. Additional training is being provided in the use of the McGraw-Hill Triumphs reading intervention program and Soar to Success that will also be used for appropriate students.

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.

Intervention 1: Extended time for students with designated intervention strategies

Specific/Targeted Questions:

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.

The subpopulation that caused West Seaford Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School is low-income students. Since 84% of all students are considered to be in poverty (receive free or reduced meals), all subgroups are affected. Parents work outside of the home and many work after the school day (Marshall et al., 1997; Ross et al., 1992; Stroman & Duff, 1982). The Afterschool Alliance states that after school programs are beneficial to students in poverty especially when they address one or more of the following components: 1. Academic achievement, 2. Increased safety and security, 3. Cultural and community identification and appreciation, or 4. Increased social skills and competency. Our program will address components 1, 2, and 4 primarily.

Further, the Afterschool Alliance states that, "Merely adding more of the same to the school day will not improve student outcomes. In fact, 'more of the same' is likely to further disengage kids who are most at-risk of dropping out of school."

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning conducted a meta-analysis of 73 afterschool studies and concluded that afterschool programs employing evidence-based approaches to improving students' personal and social skills consistently showed multiple benefits, including improvements in children's personal, social and academic skills, as well as their self-esteem.

Afterschool programs give students opportunities to explore interests, learn real world skills, solve problems, develop leadership and teamwork skills, connect with adult role models, and become involved in improving their communities. It is these skills that business leaders cite as most needed in today's workforce. In a recent survey, employers reported that four of the five of the most important skills needed by high school graduates are applied thinking and personal skills rather than basic skills – professionalism, teamwork, oral communication, and ethics and social responsibility

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.

Students will receive one hour of small group academic math and/or reading intervention from a caring school or district staff member utilizing Compass Learning reading and math on line intervention program. The program will begin with a healthy snack with instruction in appropriate manners and social conversation, engage students in an evidence-based social skills curriculum, and then focus on research based math and reading interventions.

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 West Seaford extended day program will depend upon lengthening the school day by 90 minutes for targeted students. During the 90 minutes, 15 minutes will be allocated to provide students with a healthy snack, explicit teaching of manners and social conversation instruction, and 15 minutes of social skills instruction with a research-based social skills curriculum that teaches:

- Appropriate greetings depending on relationships: i.e. peer to peer or child to adult.
- Appropriate and polite ways to make requests (please) and express gratitude (thank you.)
- Addressing adults.
- Shaking hands.
- Taking turns.
- Sharing
- Giving positive feedback (praise) to peers, no put downs.
- Cooperation

The extended day program will also provide reading and math intervention for 60 minutes. Students will be provided with transportation home eliminating a barrier to after school participation among many low-income students. This academic intervention will take place three days a week. Students will be expected to have a morning "check in" with an identified buddy teacher regarding homework completion throughout the program.

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.

•The 90 minute program will enable students to receive small group or one-on-one instruction to support increased reading and math achievement, provide

a safe structured space, provide an opportunity to build executive skills with a caring adult. Rotating activities such as snack time, reading and math intervention, and social and executive skills development will maintain student interest and engagement while providing low performing, low income students with academic and social advantages experienced by their non-low income peers.

Intervention 2: Partnerships with community

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.05 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.

The subpopulation that caused West Seaford Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School is low-income students in low income. Students in poverty have significant issues with obesity, food insecurity, and lack of nutritious meals. (Food Research and Action Center, Washington, DC)

4.06 Provide 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.

The Sussex County Health Promotion Coalition and Seaford School District Family Resource Center will partner with West Seaford Elementary School to offer meal preparation classes to create healthy meals using low cost food and increase the type and regularity of exercise. This partnership will address the statistics below:

- 84% of our student population receives subsidized meals,
- Delaware is in the top 10% of states with the highest obesity rate,
- Sussex County has the highest rate of obese and overweight children,
- West Seaford is 51% minority,
- Minorities have the highest rate of obesity within the above subgroups, and
- New research has determined that there is a high correlation between physical fitness and academic success

Given the above statistics West Seaford Elementary School staff will work with the community partners to provide classes in lifetime fitness activities and create a walking-fitness trail on the campus of West Seaford Elementary School. The life course will be created in sections throughout the duration of the grant with the project be completed by the end of the grant period. The intention is to grow the school's capacity to deliver intervention and enrichment opportunities each year.

4.07 Describe the LEA's plan to integrate the community-based partner(s) into the school's improvement effort.

The Sussex County Health Promotion Coalition and Seaford School District Family Resource Center will partner with West Seaford Elementary to offer meal preparation classes as part of a monthly parent outreach program.

4.08 Describe 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.

The community partners will combine to offer instruction on shopping for and creating low cost nutritious meals. This will take place in local churches, family homes, or businesses. Monitoring will be accomplished by brief parent surveys and follow up support and contacts. Partners will also work in conjunction with our school to instruct identified students in lifelong fitness activities and monitor their continued exercise habits. Pre- and post- data will be collected by the nurse and in physical education classes.

Intervention 3: Strategies to address social, emotional and health needs

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.09 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.

The subpopulation that caused West Seaford Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School is low-income students .

4.10 Describe 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 community partners will combine to offer instruction on shopping for and creating low cost nutritious meals. This will take place in local churches, family homes, or businesses. Monitoring will be accomplished by brief parent surveys and follow up support and contacts. Partners will also work in conjunction with our school to instruct identified students in lifelong fitness activities and monitor their continued exercise habits. Pre- and post- data will be collected by the nurse and in physical education classes.

Intervention 4: Job-embedded Professional Development

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.11 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.

The subpopulation that caused West Seaford Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School is low-income students. The higher the poverty level, the more specific and intentional the strategies need to be. Max Thompson and Doug Reeves agree that there are specific characteristics of successful 90/90/90 schools, which are supported by the Studying Skillful Teaching pedagogical framework presented by Research For Better Teaching

The Studying Skillful Teaching pedagogical framework increases teacher effectiveness – including some strategies like higher order questions and summarizing strategies that have greater effect on students in poverty. Also, the school plans to purchase the Ruby Payne book, “Understanding the Framework of Poverty” to learn specific strategies to use with students in poverty. The books will be used as part of ongoing professional development that will occur in professional learning communities on a weekly basis. Further, West Seaford will be trained in Cooperative Discipline, which dovetails with the nascent school- and district-wide PBS initiative

Provide job embedded professional development during PLC utilizing the Staff Development Teacher assigned to the school. Funding is provided through Title II and includes data-driven school improvement, peer coaching, and mentoring.

4.12 Describe the specific professional development that will be offered. Describe how this professional development will be high quality, job-embedded, focused, coherent, and continuous to address the needs of the school's identified subpopulations. Describe how the professional development will be maintained throughout the duration of the three-year plan.

A cohort of approximately 10 teachers were trained in Studying Skillfull Teaching through the Research for Better Teaching this summer; however, due to financial limitations, only part of the staff was able to be trained. West Seaford will use focus school grant funds to train a second cohort of teachers to ensure that all staff members are trained in the pedagogical framework. Training will be offered throughout the school year and in the evenings. The Skillful Teacher framework embodies four courses that focus on the art and science of teaching. Skillful Teaching will teach staff to communicate to all students that they can achieve at high levels, help students develop a positive academic identity, use multiple sources of data to make decisions about teaching, and provide expert instruction in every classroom. In addition to the core training, support for implementation will be provided through the Professional Learning Communities as well as individualized support from the Staff Development Teacher that is assigned to West Seaford Elementary School.

Intervention 8: Develop and initiate a comprehensive parent engagement plan

Specific/Targeted Questions:

4.19 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.

The subpopulation that caused West Seaford Elementary School to be identified as a Focus School is low-income students. Research from the Michigan Department of Education shows that when parents are involved, students have higher grades, test scores, and graduation rates, better school attendance, increased motivation, better self-esteem, lower rates of suspension, decreased use of drugs and alcohol, and fewer incidences of violent behavior.

4.20 Describe the multiple methods (a minimum of three methods from Epstein's 6 Types of Parent Involvement) that will be used to engage parents in the school. Describe how these methods will inform a coherent plan to integrate families into the school's improvement efforts.

Joyce Epstein identifies six types of parent involvement and this plan will integrate several types. First is Collaborating with the Community (Type 6) as described in Intervention 2. Next is Parenting (Type 1) which will be monthly parent events with presenters on topics such as family literacy, effective parenting, supporting children with reading and math, navigating the internet safely. We will also go to community centers and local churches with these topics and as much as possible, vary the times of day that they are offered. The third type we will offer is Learning at Home (Type 4) where we will alter our school practices in redefining and providing information, homework, and activities, both at home and at school.

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.

Narrative:

•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.

District level staff members identified to support West Seaford Elementary School include the Director of School Performance, the Director of Special Services, and the Assessment Coordinator who will assist with the writing of the Focus School grant, coordination of professional development, and in assisting the school's leadership team in analyzing the data for the superintendent's bi-monthly monitoring protocol. Other expectations include attending leadership team meetings to provide ongoing support for the implementation of the plan. The job descriptions for these two staff members include providing assistance in monitoring and analyzing achievement data that include DCAS, MAP reading and math and local reading and math assessments; assisting with the development of their Baldrige Guided Improvement Plans; and participating in the superintendent's bi-monthly supervisory meetings during which pertinent achievement, climate, and staff data are presented according to the established Monitoring Protocols. Both of these district level staff members provide support for revisions to the school improvement plan.

4.38 Describe the unique infrastructures that will be in place to monitor and evaluate the academic impact of the intervention(s).

West Seaford Elementary School has been assigned an 11-month Staff Development Teacher utilizing Title II funds to provide ongoing, job embedded professional development and professional leadership throughout the school year. This staff member is responsible for leading weekly professional learning communities, conducting learning walks with feedback, peer teaching and coaching to increase teacher instructional effectiveness, and for assisting in the analysis of relevant data that impacts student success.

4.39 Describe LEA's plan to sustain and support the intervention(s) in the Focus school after the grant expires.

Following the grant's expiration, interventions that can be sustained include the 11-month Staff Development Teacher, Reading Specialist, PBIS implementation, Compass Reading and Math, Triumphs, and Soar to Success interventions, technology to help deliver interventions. Utilizing community volunteers to provide a recreational program each day is also feasible. The district plan is to increase the effectiveness of Tier I, general classroom instruction, repair parent and community relationships, develop student efficacy, and put Baldrige school improvement practices in place that will sustain long term school improvement.

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.

#Error

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 health 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.

#Error

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.

#Error

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.

#Error

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.

#Error

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 health 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.

#Error

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.

#Error

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.

#Error

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)	Stipends for Extended Day program @ 2 hrs./day x 4 days/wk. x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 6 teachers *	\$40,320.00			\$40,320.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 90min./day x 4days/wk. x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 7 teachers *		\$35,280.00		\$35,280.00
		Professional development stipends for cohort of teachers participating in Studying Skillful Teaching training @ 15 teachers x \$25/hr. x 15 hrs. *	\$5,625.00			\$5,625.00
		Professional development stipends for cohort of teachers participating in Studying Skillful Teaching training @ 15 teachers x \$25/hr. x 30 hrs. *			\$11,250.00	\$11,250.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 2.5 hrs./day x 4days/wk. x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 1 coordinator *			\$8,400.00	\$8,400.00
		Account Total		\$45,945.00	\$35,280.00	\$19,650.00
Professional: Instruction		Interventionist TBD @ M.Ed plus 10 yrs. experience *	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$120,000.00
		Stipends for Extended Day program @ 2 hrs./day x 4 days/wk. x 26 weeks x \$30/hr. x 5 teachers *		\$31,200.00		\$31,200.00
		Stipends for Extended Day program @ 2hrs./day x 4days/wk x 25weeks x \$30/hr. x 5 teachers *			\$30,476.00	\$30,476.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 90 min./day x 4 days/wk x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 6 teachers *	\$30,240.00			\$30,240.00

		Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Salaries	Professional: Instruction			\$30,240.00	\$30,240.00
	Stipends for extended day program @ 90min./day x 4days/wk. x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 6 teachers *				
	Stipends for extended day program @ 2hrs./day x 4days/wk. x 28 weeks x \$30/hr. x 1 coordinator *		\$6,720.00		\$6,720.00
	Account Total	\$70,240.00	\$77,920.00	\$100,716.00	\$248,876.00
Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)	Release days for teacher professional development with psychology intern who will provide PBIS training @ 30teachers x 3 days x \$100/day *	\$9,000.00			\$9,000.00
	Release days for teacher professional development with psychology intern who will provide PBIS training @ 30teachers x 3 days x 100/day *		\$9,000.00		\$9,000.00
	Release days for teacher professional development with psychology intern who will provide PBIS training @ 30 teachers x 3 days x 100/day *			\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00
	Release time for teachers in Studying Skillful Teaching training to conduct peer observation and coaching @ \$100/day x 2 days x 15 teachers *		\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00
	Account Total	\$9,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$9,000.00	\$30,000.00
Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Support Staff		\$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	\$46,542.52	\$45,938.60	\$47,790.54	\$140,271.66
	Account Total	\$46,542.52	\$45,938.60	\$47,790.54	\$140,271.66

		Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Salaries	Classification Total	\$171,727.52	\$171,138.60	\$177,156.54	\$520,022.66
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction				
	Transportation home for students following the Extended Day program @ \$100/day x 99 days *	\$9,912.00			\$9,912.00
	Transportation home for students participating in the extended day program @ \$100/day x 4days/wk. x 28 wks. *	\$11,200.00			\$11,200.00
	Transportation home for students following the Extended Day program @ \$100/day x 112 days *		\$22,200.00	\$22,200.00	\$44,400.00
	Contract with a publisher to bind student-created books that contain student photographs to share with parents at end of year @ \$30/book x 400 books + shipping. *	\$12,944.57			\$12,944.57
	Contract with a publisher to bind student-created books that contain student photographs to share with parents at end of year @ \$30/book x 300 books + shipping. *		\$9,000.00		\$9,000.00
	Attend and potentially present at a 90/90/90 regional conference in SY 2014 @ 8 staff member x \$1000 each *		\$8,000.00		\$8,000.00
	Attend and potentially present at a 90/90/90 regional conference in SY 2015 @ 8 staff member x \$1000 each *			\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
	Registration fee for two teams to participate in First State Lego League Competition *	\$450.00			\$450.00
	Account Total	\$34,506.57	\$39,200.00	\$30,200.00	\$103,906.57
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Professional: Administration	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	

			Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$34,506.57	\$39,200.00	\$30,200.00	\$103,906.57
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Secure cart @ \$910 with 30 laptops @ \$750 each to deliver Compass Odyssey reading and math interventions *	\$24,001.84			\$24,001.84
		Secure cart @ \$910 with 30 laptops @ \$700 each to deliver Compass Odyssey reading and math interventions *		\$22,006.32	\$21,988.39	\$43,994.71
		Digital camer lab with flash drives and b/w laser printer @ \$60 x 30 cameras, \$900/printer, \$300 flash drives (30) *	\$2,109.00			\$2,109.00
		Purchase lending library for use by Parents as Teachers group that meets on Thursdays @ \$25/family x 40 families *	\$1,000.00			\$1,000.00
		Purchase lending library for use by Parents as Teachers group that meets on Thursdays @ \$25/family x 40 families. *		\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
		Print and non-print materials for "Taking it to the Streets" community outreach program for parent information regarding school programming, pre-school readiness, college preparation, literacy, and available community resources. Based on data, attendance is 150 for this event that will occur four times a year. Educational materials are given to the students and their families such as but not limited to books, information on healthy living, and information on classes at the family resource center. *	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00

			Y1 - Focus School Funds	Y2 - Focus School Funds	Y3 - Focus School Funds	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Math intervention materials such as Dream Box math remediation @ \$20/student x 150 students *			\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
		Account Total	\$32,110.84	\$28,006.32	\$30,988.39	\$91,105.55
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$32,110.84	\$28,006.32	\$30,988.39	\$91,105.55
Travel	Professional: Instruction		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Professional: Administration		\$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			\$238,344.93	\$238,344.92	\$238,344.93	\$715,034.78
* - Allow Indirect Cost Total						

State Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Musical instruments for extended day program @ \$250/students x 150 students *	\$37,500.00			\$37,500.00
		Snacks to supplement Food Bank provisions @ \$15/day x 112 days *	\$1,680.00	\$1,680.00	\$1,680.00	\$5,040.00
		Snacks for Parent Night events @ \$300/event x 4 events *	\$1,200.00		\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00
		Materials for Lego League competitions such as FLL Robot Set @\$420, Green City Challenge @ \$299, Robot Set w/Intel Convertible PC Pack @ \$995 *	\$1,714.00			\$1,714.00
		Math intervention materials such as site license for Dream Box math remediation @\$20/student x 240 students *	\$4,760.78			\$4,760.78
		Healthy snacks to supplement Food Bank provisions @ \$15/dayx 112 days *	\$1,680.00			\$1,680.00
		Snacks for Parent Night events @ \$200/event x 4 events *		\$800.00		\$800.00
		Materials for Lego League competitions such as FLL Robot Set @\$420, Green City Challenge @ \$299, Robot Set w/Intel Convertible PC Pack @ \$995 x 2 teams *		\$6,502.64	\$3,074.64	\$9,577.28
		Healthy snacks to supplement Food Bank provisions @\$15/day x 112 days *		\$1,680.00		\$1,680.00
		Healthy snacks to supplement Food Bank provisions @ \$15/day x 112 days *			\$1,580.00	\$1,580.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Curriculum materials for Character Counts, Wise Skills character education program to implement during Extended Day program *	\$3,500.00			\$3,500.00
		Math intervention materials such as Dream Box math remediation @ \$20/license x 150 students *	\$6,000.00			\$6,000.00
		Soft cover leveled reading books from Scholastic to supplement reading interventions and give to students who regularly attend the Extended Day program @ \$20/student x 216 students *	\$4,338.94			\$4,338.94
		Soft cover leveled reading books from Scholastic to supplement reading interventions and give to students who regularly attend the Extended Day program @ \$20/student x 166 students *		\$3,339.13		\$3,339.13
		Digital camcorder lab with flash drives and b/w laser printer @ \$60 x 30 cameras, \$900/printer, \$300 flash drives (30) *		\$2,109.00	\$2,109.00	\$4,218.00
		Materials such as games and prizes to support the PBIS Carnival for students and their families at end of year @ \$2.00/student x 356 students *		\$712.00		\$712.00
		Materials such as games and prizes to support the PBIS Carnival for students and their families at end of year @ \$2/student x 356 students *	\$746.00		\$712.00	\$1,458.00
		Account Total	\$63,119.72	\$16,822.77	\$10,355.64	\$90,298.13
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$63,119.72	\$16,822.77	\$10,355.64	\$90,298.13
Salaries	Extra Pay for Extra	Stipends for teacher/presenters at	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$2,880.00

Salaries	Responsibility (EPER)	Parent Night activities. Topics will include Family Literacy including ELL lessons, How to Help Your Succeed in School, How to Access School and Community Resources @ \$30/hr. x 2 hr. x 4 events x 4 teachers *	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$2,880.00
		Parent programming: Learning at Home Kindergarten Academy with home visits from teachers to provide support for school readiness @ 10 visits x 2 teachers x 1.5 hrs. x \$30/hr. *	\$900.00			\$900.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 2 hrs/day x 4 days/wk. x 28 wks. x \$30/hr. x 2 teachers *	\$13,440.00			\$13,440.00
		Professional development stipends for cohort of teachers participating in Studying Skillful Teaching training @ 15 teachers x \$25/hr. x 30 hrs. *	\$11,250.00	\$22,500.00		\$33,750.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 2 hrs/day x 4 days/wk. x 28 wks. x \$30/hr. x 4 teachers *		\$26,880.00		\$26,880.00
		Stipends for extended day program @ 2hrs./day x 4 days/wk. x 28 wks. x \$30/hr. x 5 teachers *			\$33,600.00	\$33,600.00
		Professional development stipends for cohort of teachers participating in Studying Skillful Teaching training @ 15 teachers x \$25/hr. x 30hrs. *			\$11,250.00	\$11,250.00
		Stipends for 3 teachers x 3 hrs./month x 10 months x \$25/hr. to assist the Family Resource Center and Sussex Co. Health Promotion Coalition in the coordination of the monthly parent outreach program *	\$2,250.00	\$2,250.00		\$4,500.00
		Stipends for 4 teachers x 3 hrs./month x 10 months x \$25/hr. to assist the Family Resource Center and Sussex Co. Health Promotion Coalition in the			\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00

Salaries	Responsibility (EPER)	coordination of the monthly parent outreach program *			\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
		Stipends for staff on the Leadership Team to conduct monthly data analyses and monitoring of Focus School Grant strategies and activities @ 3 hrs./teacher x \$25/hr. x 8 teachers x 8 mtg *			\$5,662.70	\$5,662.70
		Stipends for staff on the Leadership Team to conduct bi-monthly ongoing data analyses of student achievement and monitoring of the Focus School Grant strategies and activities @ 3 hrs./week x 14 weeks x \$25/hr. x 10 teachers *			\$10,500.00	\$10,500.00
		Stipends for Leadership Team to conduct bi-monthly data analyses and monitoring of Focus Grant activities @ \$25/hr x 3 hrs./wk x 12 weeks x 10 teachers and teacher-specialists *	\$9,000.00			\$9,000.00
		Professional development stipends for teachers to attend a summer institute on Cooperative Discipline @ 10 teachers x \$25/hr. x 4 hrs./day x 5 days *	\$5,000.00			\$5,000.00
		Professional development stipends for a core team of teachers to participate in a summer institute on the topic of effective lesson plan development @ 10teachers x 4 hrs./day x \$25/day x 5 days *		\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
		Professional development stipends for teachers to attend a summer institute for literacy development @ \$25/hr. x 4 hrs. x 5 days x 10 teachers *			\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
		Stipends for staff on the Leadership Team to conduct ongoing data analyses and monitoring of Focus School Grant strategies and activities @ 3 hrs./teacher x \$25/hr. x 10 teachers x 8 monthly		\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00

Salaries

Responsibility (EPER)	reviews *		\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00
Account Total		\$42,800.00	\$63,590.00	\$69,972.70	\$176,362.70
Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)	Release time for teachers to conduct home visits during the school day for parent outreach to increase the effectiveness of school and home communications @ 4 days/mo. x 8 months x 4 teachers x \$114/teacher *	\$14,592.00			\$14,592.00
	Release time for teachers to conduct home visits during the school day for parent outreach to increase the effectiveness of school and home communications @ 4 days/mo. x 8 months x 4 teachers x \$114/day *		\$14,592.00		\$14,592.00
	Release time for teachers to conduct home visits during the school day for parent outreach to increase the effectiveness of school and home communications @ 4 days/mo. x 8 months x 4 teachers x \$114/day *			\$14,592.00	\$14,592.00
	3 substitute days for teachers in Studying Skillful Teaching training to conduct peer observation and coaching @ \$100/day x 30 teachers *			\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00
	Release time for teachers in Studying Skillful Teaching cohort to participate in walk throughs, peer coaching, and modeling to observe for implementation of effective strategies and provide feedback @ \$100/day x 3 days x 15 teachers *	\$4,500.00			\$4,500.00
	Release days for teachers participating in Studying Skillful Teaching cohort to conduct peer observations, model lesson, peer coaching @ \$100/day x 3 days x 15 teachers *	\$4,500.00			\$4,500.00
	Release days for teachers		\$9,000.00		\$9,000.00

Salaries	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)	participating in Studying Skillful Teaching cohort to conduct peer observations with feedback, peer coaching, and lesson modeling @\$100/day x 3 days x 30 teachers *		\$9,000.00		\$9,000.00
		Stipends for teacher leadership team to monitor achievement in extra time programs, conduct data analyses, and prepare reports for superintendent @ \$25/hr x 3hrs./wk.x14 weeks x 8 teachers for bi-monthly mtgs. *		\$8,400.00		\$8,400.00
		Account Total	\$23,592.00	\$31,992.00	\$23,592.00	\$79,176.00
	Professional: Instruction	Interventionist TBD @ M.Ed plus 10 yrs. experience *	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$120,000.00
		Account Total	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$120,000.00
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Support Staff		\$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	\$37,973.54	\$44,983.23	\$46,084.61	\$129,041.38
		Account Total	\$37,973.54	\$44,983.23	\$46,084.61	\$129,041.38
		Classification Total	\$144,365.54	\$180,565.23	\$179,649.31	\$504,580.08
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Registration fees for one 10- student team in First State Lego League Competition *	\$225.00			\$225.00
		Contract with Research for Better Teaching for professional development for a cohort of 15 teachers in Studying Skillful Teaching. This cost includes course fee which is \$1000 per participant. This provides 30 hours of coursework in the Skillful Teaching Framework. *	\$30,000.00			\$30,000.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract w/ B&B Music to repair, replace, sanitize musical instruments for extended day program @ \$100/student x 150 instruments *		\$15,000.00		\$15,000.00
		Contract with B&B Music to repair/replace and sanitize musical instruments for extended day program @ \$100/instrument x 150 instruments *			\$15,526.38	\$15,526.38
		Registration fees for two teams to participate in First State Lego League Competition *		\$450.00		\$450.00
		Contract with Research for Better Teaching for professional development for a cohort of 15 teachers in Course II of Studying Skillful Teaching. This cost includes course fee which is \$1000 per participant. This provides 30 hours of coursework in the Skillful Teaching Framework. *		\$15,000.00		\$15,000.00
		Contract with Research for Better Teaching for professional development for a cohort of 15 teachers in Course II of Studying Skillful Teaching. This cost includes course fee which is \$1000 per participant. This provides 30 hours of coursework in the Skillful Teaching Framework. *			\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
		Contract with Research for Better Teaching for professional development for a cohort of 15 teachers in Studying Skillful Teaching Course II. This cost includes course fee which is \$1000 per participant. This provides 30 hours of coursework in the Skillful Teaching Framework. *		\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$30,000.00

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract with a publisher to bind student-created books that contain student photographs to share with parents at end of year @ \$30/book x 400 books + shipping. *			\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00
		Transportation home for students following the Extended Day program @ \$100/day x 20 days *	\$2,000.00			\$2,000.00
		Contract with educational consultant, Sharon Hemphill, to conduct training in observing peers for elements of Skillful Teaching and delivering constructive feedback for teachers who will conduct peer observations @ \$750/day x 4.5 days *	\$3,404.00			\$3,404.00
		Bus transportation to Lego League Competition @ 1 bus x \$200 *	\$200.00			\$200.00
		Bus transportation to Lego League Competition @ \$200 x 1 bus *		\$200.00		\$200.00
		Transportation to Lego League competition @ \$200 x 1 bus *			\$200.00	\$200.00
		Consultant to provide training in Cooperative Discipline for a core team of teachers @ \$418/day x 7 days *	\$2,924.00			\$2,924.00
		Consultant to provide professional development in highly effective lesson planning for a core team of teachers @ \$410/day x 8 days for planning and instruction *		\$3,212.00		\$3,212.00
		Contract with a consultant to provide professional development in literacy development @ \$410/day. x 5 days for planning and instruction during summer institute *			\$2,268.67	\$2,268.67

			Y1-State SI Funds	Y2-State SI Funds	Y3-State SI Funds	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	Contract with Sue McGregor from Research for Better Teaching to conduct learning walks with feedback for individual teachers @ \$750/day x 5 days *	\$3,761.74			\$3,761.74
		Contract with Sue McGregor of Research for Better Teaching to conduct Learning Walks and provide feedback @ \$750/day x 5 days *		\$3,750.00		\$3,750.00
		Account Total	\$42,514.74	\$52,612.00	\$59,995.05	\$155,121.79
	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Classification Total	\$42,514.74	\$52,612.00	\$59,995.05	\$155,121.79
Travel	Professional: Instruction		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		Account Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Professional: Administration		\$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			\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$750,000.00

OEC Summary

Program	FICA	Medicare	Pension	Workman's Comp	Unemployment	Health Ins. \ Non Taxed Benefits	Total OEC Cost
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	\$7,761.47	\$1,815.18	\$23,562.32	\$2,190.74	\$212.81	\$11,000.00	\$46,542.52
Year 1 - State SI Funds	\$6,596.30	\$1,542.67	\$16,791.84	\$1,861.87	\$180.86	\$11,000.00	\$37,973.54
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	\$7,762.40	\$1,815.40	\$22,956.96	\$2,191.00	\$212.84	\$11,000.00	\$45,938.60
Year 2 - State SI Funds	\$8,406.08	\$1,965.92	\$21,008.05	\$2,372.70	\$230.48	\$11,000.00	\$44,983.23
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	\$8,020.69	\$1,875.80	\$24,410.22	\$2,263.91	\$219.92	\$11,000.00	\$47,790.54
Year 3 - State SI Funds	\$8,281.01	\$1,936.68	\$22,302.47	\$2,337.39	\$227.06	\$11,000.00	\$46,084.61
Totals	\$46,827.95	\$10,951.65	\$131,031.86	\$13,217.61	\$1,283.97	\$66,000.00	\$269,313.04

Indirect Cost Summary

Program	Total Direct Program Charges	Indirect Cost Rate	Indirect Cost Billable
Year 1 - Focus School Funds	\$238,344.93	4.89 %	\$11,655.07
Year 2 - Focus School Funds	\$238,344.92	4.89 %	\$11,655.08
Year 3 - Focus School Funds	\$238,344.93	4.89 %	\$11,655.07
Totals	\$1,465,034.78		\$34,965.22

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD _____

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

PROJECT TITLE: Y1 - Focus School Funds

BEGINNING: 9/5/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 7/10/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$125,185.00	\$34,506.57		\$32,110.84	\$46,542.52			\$238,344.93
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$8,397.48	\$1,687.37		\$1,570.22				\$11,655.07
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$133,582.48	\$36,193.94		\$33,681.06	\$46,542.52			\$250,000.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Joseph, Shawn

DATE: 9/5/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

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

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

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

PROJECT TITLE: Y2 - Focus School Funds

BEGINNING: 9/5/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 8/31/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$125,200.00	\$39,200.00		\$28,006.32	\$45,938.60			\$238,344.92
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$8,368.69	\$1,916.88		\$1,369.51				\$11,655.08
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$133,568.69	\$41,116.88		\$29,375.83	\$45,938.60			\$250,000.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Joseph, Shawn

DATE: 9/5/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

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

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ASMINISTRATIVE SERVICE BRANCH

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget: _____

BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

CHECK ONE:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY: X

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

or EXPENDITURE REPORTS: _____

Program Manager who signed the Notification of Subgrant Award

Annual But Not Final _____ Final Report _____

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD _____

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

PROJECT TITLE: Y3 - Focus School Funds

BEGINNING: 9/5/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 8/31/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$129,366.00	\$30,200.00		\$30,988.39	\$47,790.54			\$238,344.93
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs	800	\$8,662.96	\$1,476.78		\$1,515.33				\$11,655.07
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
Total Budget		\$138,028.96	\$31,676.78		\$32,503.72	\$47,790.54			\$250,000.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Joseph, Shawn

DATE: 9/5/2012

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

Business Mgr. initials when submitted
as an Application Budget:

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY:

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

PROJECT TITLE: Y1-State SI Funds

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 7/10/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$106,392.00	\$42,514.74		\$63,119.72	\$37,973.54			\$250,000.00
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		\$106,392.00	\$42,514.74		\$63,119.72	\$37,973.54			\$250,000.00

DATE: 9/5/2012

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:

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

PROJECT TITLE: Y2-State SI Funds

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 8/31/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$135,582.00	\$52,612.00		\$16,822.77	\$44,983.23			\$250,000.00
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		\$135,582.00	\$52,612.00		\$16,822.77	\$44,983.23			\$250,000.00

DATE: 9/5/2012

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:

SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Seaford

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

PROJECT TITLE: Y3-State SI Funds

BEGINNING: 7/1/2012

GRANT NUMBER: _____

ENDING: 8/31/2012

FUND & LINE: _____

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

EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS		EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION							
Classification		Salaries	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	OECs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$133,564.70	\$59,995.05		\$10,355.64	\$46,084.61			\$250,000.00
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		\$133,564.70	\$59,995.05		\$10,355.64	\$46,084.61			\$250,000.00

DATE: 9/5/2012

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: _____

Focus Schools 2012 - 2013 : Compliance Signatures

District: Seaford 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: Joseph, Shawn

Approval Date: Wednesday, September 05, 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 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: Blackburn, Donna

Approval Date: Wednesday, September 05, 2012

Signature: _____

Federal Programs

Year 1 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

Year 2 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

Year 3 - Focus School Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

State Programs

Year 1 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

Year 2 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

Year 3 - State SI Funds

Initial Approvals

Program Manager	Approval Date
Brian Curtis	12/14/2012

Finance

Federal Programs	Approval Date
Eulinda DiPietro	12/19/2012

State Programs

Leah Jenkins

Approval Date

12/14/2012

Director(s)

Director

Theresa Kough

Title

Approval Date

12/20/2012

Secretaries

Secretary

Susan Haberstroh

Mark Murphy

Title

Associate Secretary

Secretary

Approval Date

12/20/2012

12/21/2012