

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

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,  
Carl D. Perkins, and  
State-Funded Educational Programs

## Delaware Department of Education

Lillian Lowery, Ed.D., Secretary of Education

Daniel Cruce, Esq., Associate Secretary, Administration and Innovation Branch

Mike Jackson, Associate Secretary, Finance and Services Branch

Michael Owens, Ed.D., Associate Secretary of Education, Career/Adult Education Consolidated Programs Branch

Nancy J. Wilson, Ph.D., Associate Secretary of Education, Curriculum & Instructional Support Branch

Wayne Barton, Ed.D., Director, Professional Accountability

Wayne Hartschuh, Director, DCET/PARTECH

Amelia Hodges, Ed. D., Director, Career & Technical Education & Consolidated Programs

Michael Stetter, Ed.D., Director, Curriculum Development

Martha Toomey, Director, Exceptional Children and Early Childhood

John G. Townsend Building

401 Federal Street, Suite 2

Dover, DE 19901-3639

### For further information, contact:

John Hulse, Education Associate - General Consolidated Application Assistance; [jhulse@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:jhulse@doe.k12.de.us)

Ted Jarrell, Education Associate - Technical Consolidated Application Assistance; [tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us)

Barbara Clendaniel, Administrative Secretary; [bclendaniel@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:bclendaniel@doe.k12.de.us)

Phone 302-857-3320

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

Document # 95-01/09/04/04

## **Table of Contents**

Abstract

- 1.** Success Plan
- 2.** General Information
  - 2.1.** LEA Consolidated Application Planning Team
  - 2.2.** Selection of Federal and State Programs
  - 2.3.** Program Coordinators and Allocations
  - 2.4.** Contact Information
  - 2.5.** Constituency Participation
  - 2.6.** LEA Support for Local School Planning: Systems, Structures, and Services
  - 2.7.** Parental and Community Involvement
- 3.** Identification of Needs
  - 3.1.** Title I Data
  - 3.2.** Health Risk Data
  - 3.3.** Identification of Students with Academic Needs
  - 3.4.** Children with Disabilities under IDEA (EIS Services)
  - 3.5.** Selection of Children – Title I Targeted Assistance Schools
  - 3.6.** Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth
  - 3.7.** Title I Comparability Assurance
  - 3.8.** Title I Services for Private Schools
  - 3.9.** Addressing the Needs of Truant Students
  - 3.10.** Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)
  - 3.11.** Title II, Part A Plan, Professional Development
  - 3.12.** Title II, Part D Technology Plan
  - 3.13.** Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006
- 4.** Budgeted Items

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

## Abstract

---

The Abstract is a brief, precise narrative summary of how this consolidated grant will impact the overall LEA plan for continuous improvement, including goals and objectives, and should include:

- \* Major program outcomes,
- \* The name(s) of school reform models, local innovations, and/or external supports,
- \* A brief description of activities supported by these funds,
- \* Time frames for implementation of these grant activities,
- \* The total amount of allocations, and
- \* The amount of funds requested, which must be equal to the total of funds requested on each summary budget page.

The Christina School District, through an extensive Strategic Planning process that involved the input of thousands of parents, educators, and students, is committed to the vision of Cultivating Students of Distinction through six goals that align with the district's guiding principles:

- Guiding Principle #1 Academic Achievement
  - o Goal 1 Provide effective academic supports for the full range of students
  - o Goal 2 Cultivate leaders to create a culture of high performance
  - o Goal 3 Support the success of students who need special education services
- Guiding Principle #2 Community Collaboration
  - o Goal 1 Develop strong school and family partnerships to support positive school environments
- Guiding Principle #3 Safe and Orderly Environment
  - o Goal 1 Improve school climates and student/staff relationships
  - o Goal 2 Utilize facilities efficiently to improve academics and access

Through these goals, and their associated strategies, project plans, and on-going measurements, we expect significant improvements for the students of Christina. This application reflects the priorities established by the Christina School District Board of Education through this process and by their approval of the plan.

Many of the specific activities outlined continue the reforms already underway in Christina, now with new focus. As an example, the establishment of Professional Learning Communities continued for a second year. In FY10, funds from this application will be used to further deepen the implementation and practice in all CSD schools.

The total funding requested by Christina is \$14,534,395 in both Federal and State funds. The detailed request is outlined in Section 4.0, the Budgeted Items section of this application, and discussed in various other sections as well.

## 1.0 Success Plan

---

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

### Success Plan for: Christina Administrative Office

**Years: 2007-2008 to 2009-2010**

**Mission Statement :** To educate each student to succeed through:

- \* Expectations of Excellence;
- \* Safe Working and Learning Environments;
- \* Respect for Diversity; and
- \* Caring and Knowledgeable Staff Members

**Vision Statement :** CSD Vision:

Christina School District is a system of education where research-based teaching and learning cultivate students of distinction at high levels, and where the entire community works together to put children first.

A community-based Stakeholder Committee was formed and met three times during the 2006 Strategic Planning process. This group included representatives of the business community, elected officials, Region III PTA Council, Special Needs PTA, Vision 2015, community organizations, and employee unions. Many of those on the Stakeholder Committee are also Christina parents, taxpayers, and employees. The Stakeholder Committee provided a variety of perspectives in developing the Strategic Plan. Their input was invaluable to the process. Through this input, the plan became relevant to our parents and community.

The Christina School District undertook a comprehensive strategic planning process beginning in September 2006 that defined the District's future goals, strategies, and measures. The strategic planning process included more than 20 meetings with key groups planned between December 2006 and March 2007, as well as multiple vehicles for staff, students, and the public to share their advice and wisdom. The overall goal of the Strategic Planning Process was to develop a 3-year Strategic Plan for Christina that reflects the priorities of our families and our community, and serves as a true plan of action and not just a static document. The plan holds the district accountable for meeting specific goals through defined measures and annual targets reflected in a "Balance Scorecard" which is reviewed and published periodically.

In April of 2009, meetings were held with parents, community members, teachers, and administrators to review the State of the Strategic Plan. These meetings kicked off the process where progress to the goals were reviewed, and FY10 plans and budgets were developed and refined. The input from these meetings, and from School Improvement Plans, are included in the FY10 LEA Consolidated Grant Application.

(Old Style Needs Assessment)

**Student Needs  
Assessment :**

A huge amount of data was gathered and analyzed as part of this process to determine Christina's real strengths and weaknesses. Once vetted by Christina staff directly supporting this process, the entire staff, stakeholder committee, and community were asked for their opinions as discussed below. Based on this feedback, a number of proposed Strengths were classified as Emerging Strengths, new Emerging Strengths were added, and other Weaknesses were identified. Causes of these were then determined, and the Key strategies were formed to address the real causes, not band-aid the symptom.

Strength:

\* Overall Elementary School Performance

Overall Elementary School Performance

In 2nd through 4th grade, our students grow more than the national average, and, by the end of the year, are at or above the national average in reading AND math

Three elementary schools have both a small poverty achievement gap and high levels of overall performance in both Reading and Mathematics

Almost 90% of elementary and intermediate parents and teachers agree that:

- i. Schools and classrooms support learning
- ii. Students are recognized for academic achievement
- iii. Students feel school staff are committed to helping them learn

Weaknesses:

An unacceptable number of 7th-12th grade students are at or below a 5th grade reading level

An unacceptable number of high school students are not prepared to do high school level math

High School Special Education performance needs critical attention

**Staff & Community  
Assessment:**

A huge amount of data was gathered and analyzed as part of this process to determine Christina's real strengths and weaknesses. Once vetted by Christina staff directly supporting this process, the entire staff, stakeholder committee, and community were asked for their opinions as discussed below. Based on this feedback, a number of proposed Strengths were classified as Emerging Strengths, new Emerging Strengths were added, and other Weaknesses were identified. Causes of these were then determined, and the Key strategies were formed to address the real causes, not band-aid the symptom.

Weaknesses:

Perceptions about high school safety and security are a serious issue

Large differences exist in perceptions about parent's direct involvement in and support of their student's education

**Needs Assessment**

## Staff & Community Needs Assessment

**2 :** Parent Involvement

**Need:** Large differences exist in perceptions about parents' direct involvement in and support of their students' education

**Root Cause:** No clear definition of "parent Involvement" and an inconsistent value that is placed on it various aspects, communication between caregivers and teachers is insufficient to develop relationships and understand the specific supports each provides for their child, and lack of inviting environments in schools

**Data Source:** My Perspective Survey Results

**3 :** Leadership

**Need:** To distribute the leadership responsibilities across the school.

**Root Cause:** Multiple and frequent changes in leadership have reduced the skill set needed.

**Data Source:** Human Resources Data

**1 :** School Climate

**Need:** Perceptions about high school safety and security are a serious issue

**Root Cause:** Inconsistent interpretation and implementation of the Code of Conduct by all involved, communication with caregivers about how to support their child's learning and behavior is not effective, and low interest level in learning

**Data Source:** School Climate Survey

## Student Needs Assessment

**2 :** Secondary Math

**Need:** An unacceptable number of high school students are not prepared to do high school level math

**Root Cause:** Lack of teacher belief in adopted mathematics curriculum, lack of focused mathematics support for student who struggle to acquire skills

**Data Source:** MAP Math Scores

**1 :** Secondary Reading

**Need:** An unacceptable number of 7th-12th grade students are at or below a 5th grade reading level

**Root Cause:** Lack of fidelity to core curriculum across classrooms, lack of focused reading support as students advance grades, minimal relationships between staff and students, and lack of accountability for content acquisition

**Data Source:** MAP Reading Scores

**3 :** Special Education

**Need:** Special Education performance needs critical attention

**Root Cause:** No clearly defined Inclusion model, leadership did not consistently ensure standards are applied to "all" classrooms, expectations for student performance lowered via the IEP goal and objective process, and the lack of student engagement due to frustration with learning

**Data Source:** Special Education DSTP Scores and Needs Indicators

**Goals & Objectives**

**Goal 1: Accelerate achievement for all students and minimize the disparities among all groups of students**

**Objective 1.1: Provide effective academic supports for the full range of students**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Implement new and improve existing support programs for both reading and mathematics across all grades
- 2 Use assessment data consistently to target students for sustained reading or mathematics instruction
- 3 Enhance teacher abilities to provide reading instruction at secondary levels across all content areas
- 4 Establish teacher collaboration framework to ensure efforts are aligned to meet student needs
- 5 Improve lesson designs and instructional practices to make instruction more meaningful and interesting
- 6 Refine School-wide enrichment model to better support academic growth of high achieving students
- 7 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 8 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals
- 9 When filling open positions, give first consideration to Highly Qualified teachers. When there are no Highly Qualified teachers, provide support to assist in teachers becoming Highly Qualified. Assign special education teachers to classes in which they are Highly Qualified.
- 10 Improve lesson design and instructional practice that align with technical skills needed for industry
- 11 Streamline pathways to ensure completion and graduation rate.

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 62.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	83	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 71.8  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 75  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	82	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	84	6/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/30/2010	86	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 91  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** % Proficient in Writing on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 64.0  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 50

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	67	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	74	6/30/2009	Aug 30 2009 12:00AM
6/30/2010	81	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 65

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	75	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	78	6/30/2009	Aug 30 2009 12:00AM
6/30/2010	81	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 66

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

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	74	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 53

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	59	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	66	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	73	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of ELL students moving at least one level as measured by the ACCESS test

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 92

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	93	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2010	95	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2009	94	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of middle and high school students beginning the school year Reading below the 5th grade lev

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 28

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	<16	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2008	<19	6/15/2008	Jun 1 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	<13	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of high school students beginning the school year unprepared to do high school math

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 72

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	<67	6/15/2008	Jun 1 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	<62	6/15/2009	Jun 1 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	<57	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 49

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 49

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 10.8

**DOE** [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	10	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	9	6/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/30/2010	8	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 90.0

**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	91	2/28/2008	Feb 28 2008 12:00AM
2/28/2009	93	2/28/2009	Jan 30 2009 12:00AM
2/28/2010	95	2/28/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 69.4

**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	70	2/28/2008	Feb 28 2008 12:00AM
2/28/2009	75	2/28/2009	Jan 30 2009 12:00AM
2/28/2010	80	2/28/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 37.0  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	40	6/30/2009	Aug 30 2009 12:00AM
6/30/2010	45	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 62.5  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	65	2/28/2008	Feb 28 2008 12:00AM
2/28/2009	67	2/28/2009	Jan 30 2009 12:00AM
2/28/2010	69	2/28/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 53.1  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	55	2/28/2008	Feb 28 2008 12:00AM
2/28/2009	57	2/28/2009	Jan 30 2009 12:00AM
2/28/2010	59	2/28/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 35.5  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	40	6/30/2009	Aug 30 2009 12:00AM
6/30/2010	45	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Meet or Exceed AMAO targets  
**Start Year:** 2009 **Baseline:** >85  
**DOE** (none)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/30/2009	85	9/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
9/30/2010	86	9/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
9/30/2008	84	9/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 68  
**DOE** (none)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 67  
**DOE** (none)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 70.4  
**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP  
**Indicator:** (American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP  
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 77.8  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP  
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 1S1 - % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP  
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 64.3  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 1S1 - % Proficient in Reading on the  
DSTP (CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	62	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	68	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	74	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 1S2 - % Proficient in Math on the DSTP  
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 48.1  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 1S2 - % Proficient in Math on the DSTP  
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	41	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	50	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	59	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing Technical Skills Assessment  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 66.4  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing Technical Skills Assessment  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	69	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	71	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	73	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 3S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathway and Graduating  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 64.2  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 3S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathway and Graduating  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	66	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	74	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE Concentrators)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 82.1  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE Concentrators)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	81	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	82.5	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	84	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 90.3  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	95	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	96	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	97	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 45.2

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	38	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	38.5	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	39	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 41.2

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	20	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	21	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	22	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

## Objective 1.2: Cultivate Leaders to create a culture of high performance

### Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

### Strategy(s):

- 1 Provide training and support for leaders and staff in leadership skills  
- Implement a succession planning process to identify and grow leaders
- 2 Establish a district accountability system that aligns with the Administrator Performance Reviews
- 3 Establish a system of performance measures which includes:  
- Alignment with the strategic plan, and routine operational issues  
- Periodic Board and Superintendent review  
- Communication with constituents
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

### Measure(s):

**Measure:** Percent of teachers at a level 3 or higher as measured on the Lo-Ti survey

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 19

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	20	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	22	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Reading

**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 19.8

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Disparitiy between socioeconomic groups in Mathematics  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 20.3  
**DOE** (none)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 49.5  
**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 83.1  
**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	84	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	88	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 59.9  
**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2008	60	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	64	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (White - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 76.2

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (White - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	75	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	79	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	83	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 53.0

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 60.7

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 82.2

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	86	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2009	84	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 63.3  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (White - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 81.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (White - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	84	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	86	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Objective 1.3: Support the success fo student who need special education services**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Integrate inclusive practices into the overall process for meeting state standards for all students  
- Use student needs to drive student and staff assignments and student supports
- 2 Realign the current special education process to improve services for all students
- 3 Establish system to monitor and adapt implementation based on results
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals
- 6 When filling open positions, give first consideration to Highly Qualified teachers. When there are no Highly Qualified teachers, provide support to assist in teachers becoming Highly Qualified. Assign special education teachers to classes in which they are Highly Qualified.

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 30.6

**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	40	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	45	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	50	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 39.9

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

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 91  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Mean SAT Critical Reading (Verbal) score  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 475  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/15/2008	478	12/15/2008	Dec 12 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	480	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	483	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Mean SAT Mathematics score  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 476  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	478	6/15/2008	Dec 12 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	480	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	482	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Mean SAT Writing score  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 464  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	465	6/15/2008	Dec 12 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	468	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	471	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Number of students taking the SAT Reasoning test  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 587  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/15/2008	600	12/15/2008	Dec 12 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	625	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	650	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of high school seniors who have successfully completed one or more AP courses  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 33  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	42	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	44	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	46	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students with grades of 3, 4, or 5 on an AP exam  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 52  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	55	6/15/2008	Dec 12 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Reading  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 19.8  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Disparitiy between socioeconomic groups in Mathematics  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 20.3  
**DOE** (none)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 48.8  
**DOE** [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	50	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	52	6/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/30/2010	54	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 53  
**DOE** [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	60	3/30/2008	Mar 30 2008 12:00AM
3/30/2009	65	3/30/2009	Mar 30 2009 12:00AM
3/30/2010	70	3/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)  
**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 7.1  
**DOE** [CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)  
**Indicator:**  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	6.2	6/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/30/2010	5.6	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Goal 2: Establish and leverage community partnerships to promote accelerated achievement in welcoming school environments**

**Objective 2.1: Develop strong school and family partnerships to support positive environments**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Establish clear district ownership of school and family partnerships
- 2 Adopt model of involvement and implement associated activities focusing first on positive school environments  
- Parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, collaborating with the community
- 3 Improve communication vehicles to allow timely dialog about student, school, district, and community issues
- 4 Provide Christina staff training in cultural and socioeconomic diversity
- 5 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 6 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** Number of parent/family contacts through the Parent Link telephone messaging system per year

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	500,000	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Start Year:** 2009                      **Baseline:** 483,631

**DOE**                      (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Monthly

**Measure:** Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Parent Survey Communication

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	80	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	85	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 77.5

**DOE**                      (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

**Measure:** Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Survey Support for Learning

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	92.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	94.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 90.3

**DOE**                      (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Monthly

**Goal 3: Create and maintain safe learning environments that promote excellent academic achievement**

**Objective 3.1: Improve school climates and student/staff relationships**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Improve communication and implementation of the student code of conduct
- 2 Develop an intensive support system for students who exhibit severe behavioral issues
- 3 Provide time and training for staff to understand and develop strong connections with students
  - Continued implementation Positive Behavior Support system
  - Continued focus on adult behaviors to de-escalate issues
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 19.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2008	16.8	12/30/2008	Dec 30 2008 12:00AM
12/30/2009	14.8	12/30/2009	Oct 20 2009 12:00AM
12/30/2010	12.8	12/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students who are suspended for more than 15 days in a school year  
**Start Year:** 2007                      **Baseline:** 1.7  
**DOE Indicator:** (none)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	1.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	0.5	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	0.5	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students using drugs (marijuana) reported by the ATOD annual survey

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 3.0

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	2.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	1.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Survey Support for Learning

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 90.3

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	92.0	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	94.0	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 10.8

**DOE** [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	10	6/30/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/30/2009	9	6/30/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/30/2010	8	6/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

### Objective 3.2: Utilize facilities efficiently to improve academics and access

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Educate students close to home in grades K-5
- 2 Establish space in Elementary schools for Full Day Kindergarten
- 3 Create space in middle schools to allow grade configuration and feeder pattern changes  
- K-5, 6-8, 9-12
- 4 Complete school renovations in progress
- 5 Consider options for underutilized buildings

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 62.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	83	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 71.8  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Number of Schools operating at or above 85% capacity

**Start Year:** 2007 **Baseline:** 14

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/30/2008	21	9/30/2008	Sep 30 2008 12:00AM
9/30/2009	24	9/30/2009	Sep 30 2009 12:00AM
9/30/2010	25	9/30/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Number of Elementary Schools with space for Full Day Kindergarten

**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 1

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/28/2008	16	8/28/2008	Aug 28 2008 12:00AM
8/28/2009	17	8/28/2009	Aug 30 2009 12:00AM
8/28/2010	18	8/28/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** % Proficient in Writing on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)

**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 64.0

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Number of schools that received a rating of "good" on a formal facilities assessment

**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 57

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	65	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM
6/15/2010	75	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Goal 4: Support Title I schools under improvement efforts to meet all AYP targets (this applies specifically to Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary Schools for FY10)**

**Objective 4.1: Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development designed to build the capacity of the LEA and school staff to improve schools and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Improve lesson designs and instructional practices to make instruction more meaningful and interesting
- 2 Establish teacher collaboration framework to ensure efforts are aligned to meet student needs

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 62.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	83	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 71.8  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 66

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

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	74	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 49

**DOE Indicator:** (none)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 49

**DOE Indicator:** (none)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 49.5

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

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 53.0  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 63.3  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 68

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 67

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Objective 4.2: Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement**

**Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:**

**Strategy(s):**

- 1 Develop an intensive support system for students who exhibit severe behavioral issues
- 2 Implement new and improve existing support programs for both reading and mathematics across all grades

**Measure(s):**

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 62.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	83	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008                      **Baseline:** 71.8  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students who are suspended for more than 15 days in a school year

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 1.7

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	1.0	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	0.5	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	0.5	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 66

**DOE** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP

**Indicator:** (ELL - All Grades)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	74	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 49

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 49

**DOE** (none)

**Indicator:**

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/15/2008	Jun 10 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	Jun 10 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 49.5  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 53.0  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Start Year:** 2008 **Baseline:** 63.3  
**DOE Indicator:** [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)  
**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance  
**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

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

**Start Year:** 2008

**Baseline:** 60.7

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

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 68

**DOE Indicator:** (none)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM

**Measure:** Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

**Start Year:** 2007

**Baseline:** 67

**DOE Indicator:** (none)

**Perspective:** Student Achievement/Student Performance

**Period:** Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	Jun 30 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	Jun 30 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	Jan 1 1900 12:00AM



# Common Measure Appendix

## [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	62.4
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	64.2
6/15/2010	67		
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	70.4
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	84.0
6/15/2010	67		
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	49.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	51.0
6/15/2010	67		
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	83.1
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	83.9
6/15/2010	67		
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	59.9
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	63.5
6/15/2010	67		
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	76.2
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	78.2
6/15/2010	67		
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	59.1
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	62.5

6/15/2010	67
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	30.6
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	31.1
6/15/2010	67		
6/15/2011	75		
6/15/2012	83		
6/15/2013	92		
6/15/2014	100		

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

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	53.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	55.3
6/15/2010	67		
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	69.9
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	70.1
6/15/2010	79		
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	77.8
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	92.0
6/15/2010	79		
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	60.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	60.5
6/15/2010	79		
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	82.2
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	82.4
6/15/2010	79		
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	63.3
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	67.4
6/15/2010	79		
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	81.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	81.3
6/15/2010	79		
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	56.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	61.9
6/15/2010	79		
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	37.2
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	35.6

6/15/2010	79
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	60.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	61.5
6/15/2010	79		
6/15/2011	84		
6/15/2012	89		
6/15/2013	95		
6/15/2014	100		

**[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)**

**[CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
2/28/2008	95	2/28/2008	86.8
2/28/2009	95		
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	65.5
2/28/2009	95		
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	37.0
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	41.2

6/30/2010 95

**[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	42.4
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	43.2
6/30/2010	95		

**[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	65.0
2/28/2009	95		
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	51.7
2/28/2009	95		
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	35.5
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	37.5
6/30/2010	95		

**[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	28.8
6/30/2009	95	6/30/2009	32.9

6/30/2010 95

**[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	69.1
6/30/2009	82.5		
6/30/2010	84		

**[CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	76	6/30/2008	43.1
6/30/2009	78		
6/30/2010	79		

**[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	10.6
6/30/2009	4.8		
6/30/2010	4.7		

**[CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	4.9
6/30/2009	6.2		
6/30/2010	5.6		

**[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	94.8
6/15/2010	100		
6/15/2011	100		

6/15/2012	100
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	20.6
6/30/2009	12.8	6/30/2009	27.7
6/30/2010	12.8		

**[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	56.2
3/30/2009	59	3/30/2009	56.3
3/30/2010	62		

**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	64.3
6/15/2009	68		

**[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	48.1
6/15/2009	50		

**[CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing Technical Skills Assessment**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	69	6/15/2008	66.4
6/15/2009	71		

**[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	64.2
6/15/2009	70		

**[CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE Concentrators)**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	81	6/15/2008	82.1
6/15/2009	82.5		

**[CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	95	6/15/2008	90.3
6/15/2009	96		

**[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	45.2
6/15/2009	38.5		

**[CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields**

Target Date	Target Value	Actual Date	Actual Value
6/15/2008	20	6/15/2008	41.2
6/15/2009	21		

**Success Plan Team Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Lawson, Lisa	Manager, Special Ed and Pre-School		
Racca, Kelli	Supervisor, Facilities	552-2636	raccak@christina.k12.de.us
Silber, Robert	Chief Financial Officer	552-2614	silberr@christina.k12.de.us
Denney, Sharon	Supervisor, School Climate	552-2711	denneys@christina.k12.de.us
Corey, Susan	Positive Behavior Support Coordinator	552-2689	coreys@christina.k12.de.us
Williams, Whitney	Supervisor, PEEC	552-2694	williamsw1@christina.k12.de.us
Turner, Caren	Parent	454-2174	
Armstrong, Kathy	Parent/PTA	737-6641	
Prodgers, Barbara	CEA- Para Assoc	454-5454	prodgersb@christina.k12.de.us
Ross, Missy	CEA - Sec Assoc	631-4704	rossm@christina.k12.de.us
Green, Randall	CSD Local 218	454-2281	
Brown, Bob	DSEA Uniserve Rep	366-8440	
Hockersmith, Ed	MLS, CSD Media Spec	454-2164	
Brickhouse, Nancy	University of DE	831-1656	
Cox, Mindy	Region II PTA	455-0878	
Mucha, Bonnie	Region III PTA	836-0254	
Saffer, Steve	Special Needs PTA	454-8464	
Buckminster, Catherine	Parent/PTA	737-4184	
Hegedus, Andrew	Supervisor, Grants	302.522.2601	hegedusa@christina.k12k.de.us
Ludwigsen, Eleanor	Supervisor, Elementary/Secondary	302.552.2644	ludwigsene@christina.k12.de.us
Spacht, Helen	Principal, Wilson Elementary	302.454.2180	spachth@christina.k12.de.us
Lyles, Marcia	Superintendent	302.552.2600	lylesm@christina.k12.de.us
Keefer, Philip	Manager, Testing & Assessment	302.552.2683	keeferp@christina.k12.de.us
Farr, Sarah	Director, Special Services	302.552.2685	farrs@christina.k12.de.us

## 2.1 LEA Consolidated Application Planning Team

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

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Programs</b>	<b>Perkins</b>
Andrew	Hegedus	Supervisor, Grants	hegedusa@christina.k12k.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Eleanor	Ludwigsen	Supervisor, Elementary/Secondary	ludwigsene@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	Skilled and Technical Science
Helen	Spacht	Principal, Wilson Elementary	spachth@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Marcia	Lyles	Superintendent	lylesm@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Philip	Keefer	Manager, Testing & Assessment	keeferp@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Sarah	Farr	Director, Special Services	farrs@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Sharon	Denney	Manager, Special Education	Denneys@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Whitney	Williams	Supervisor - Parent Support and Partnerships	williamsw@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Octavia (Penny)	Dryden	Parent Liaison	drydeno@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Lisa	Lawson	Manager, Special Services	lawsonl@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Robert	Silber	CFO/Business Manager	silberr@christina.k12.de.us	Christina School District		
Karen	Keller	Elementary Principals	keller@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title IV	
Sue	Coffing	Parent		Parent	Perkins, Title IV	Business, Finance and Marketing

Susan	Corey	District PBS Coordinator	coreysu@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title IV	
Brenda	Harrell	Educational Diagnostician	harrellb@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21	
Alyssa	Moore	Instructional Coach	moorea@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D)	
Cynthia	Shareef	Parent	cshareef@comcast.net	Parent	Title I, Title II (Part A), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Shannon	Griffin	Foundation	sgriffin@rodelfoundations.org	Administrator	Title I, Title I (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Karen	Hutchinson		khutchinson@doe.k12.de.us	DOE		AgriScience
Thomas	Hannum		Thomas.A.Hannum@usa.dupont.com	Business Person		AgriScience
Manera	Constantine		manera@daccve.k12.de.us	Business Person		Family and Consumer Sciences
Dave	Nolker		davenolker@dtcc.edu	Community Member		Family and Consumer Sciences
Helen	Henry	Teacher	henryh@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		Family and Consumer Sciences
Richard	Ferenz	Teacher	ferenzr@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		AgriScience
Andrew	Beadenkopf	Teacher	beadenkopfa@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		AgriScience
Mary Ann	Cameron	Teacher	cameronm@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		Family and Consumer Sciences
Janell	Zimansky	Teacher	zimanskyj@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		Family and Consumer Sciences
Carlene	Zierfuss	Manager	zierfussc@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator		Business, Finance and Marketing
Jackie	Kook	Teacher	kookj@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		AgriScience
Katie	Esposito	Guidance Counselor	espositok@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator		Family and Consumer Sciences
Kim	Huggins Habbert	Advisor	hugginsk@christina.k12.de.us	Advisor		Family and Consumer Sciences
Candice	McCafferty	Special Education Chair	mccaffertyc@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator		Business, Finance and Marketing
Brandy	Timpson	Teacher	timpsonb@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		Family and Consumer Sciences

Thea	Scott	Visiting Teacher/Homebound Coordinator		Administrator	IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title III, Title IV	
Ann Marie	Logullo	Curriculum and Professional Development	logulloa@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Professional Development	
Lavina	Smith	Homeless Educational Advocate	smithl@christina.k12.de.us	District Employee	Title I	
Robin	Gillis	Family Crisis Therapist	gillisr@christina.k12.de.us	Community Member		
Jacqueline	Stewart	Parent	jacquelis12@yahoo.com	Parent		
Lisa	Reed	PTA Region III President (parent)	lisaannreed@gmail.com	Parent		
Jim	Hill	Parent - PTA Region III	jimhreg3tre@verizon.net	Parent		
Janeen	Harris	Parent	janeenharris24@yahoo.com	Parent		
Caren	Turner	Community - Interfaith Community Housing	cturner@ichde.org	Community Member		
Sherani	Patterson	Community - Nemours	sapatter@nemours.org	Community Member		
Terri	Quinn-Gray	Parent	tquinngrey@verizon.net	Parent		
Romisha	Robinson	Parent - Community (New Directions Early Head Start)	romisha@udel.edu	Parent		
Victoria	Mells-Clymer	Community - Children and Families First	victoria.mells@cffde.org	Community Member		
Cynthia	Romero	Community - Latin American Community Center	cromero@thelatincenter.org	Community Member		
Erika	Husik	Teacher	husike@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher		
Tiffany	Murray	Teacher	murrayt@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Taren	Harmon	Teacher	harmont@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Gail	Morris	Teacher	morrisg@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing

Sam	Postlethwait	Assistant Principal	postlethwait@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Kerry	Waugh	Teacher	waughk@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Lillie	Turner	Teacher	turnerl@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Geoffrey	Extavour	Teacher	extavourg@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Technology Education
Nikia	Whitaker	Assistant Principal	whitakern@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carolyn	Chambliss	Assistant Principal	chamblissc@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Sharon	Hill	Teacher	hills5@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Tony	Jefferson	Teacher	jeffersona@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Technology Education
Brenda	Tomeo	Teacher	tomeob1@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Angie	McAdoo	Teacher	mcadoo@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Rebecca	Fisher			Community Member	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Calvin	Cain	Teacher	cainc@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Carlene	Zierfuss	Principal	zierfussc@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Darlene	Lewis	Teacher	lewisd3@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Darren	Tyson	Teacher	tysond@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Ed	Mayfield	Assistant Principal	mayfelde@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Joyce	Lester	Teacher	lesterj@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Technology Education
Mike	Scott	Assistant Principal	scottm@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Sandra	Fritzler	Teacher	fritzlers@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Tim	Slade	Assistant Principal	sladet@christina.k12.de.us	Administrator	Perkins	Technology Education
Trenly	Yanito	Teacher - Networks	yanitot@christina.k12.de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Technology Education

Fran	Brett	E. Thomas Brett Business Machines		Business Person	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Tom	Kirwin	Culi Quip		Business Person	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Bonnie	Mucha	Region III DE PTA	muchabs@comcast.net	Parent		
Tara	Bosra	Parent	tthatcher04@aol.ocm	Parent		
Dana	Crumlish	Supervisor, Human Resources	crumlishd@christina.k12. de.us	Administrator		
Melanie	Ward	Parent	wardsworld@comcast.net	Parent		
Mindy	Cox	Parent	micmec@comcast.net	Parent		
Elizabeth	Schoenberg	BOE Member	montagnebeau@aol.com	Community Member		
Karen	Tomic	Parent	ktomic@udel.edu	Parent		
Angela	Wright	Parent		Parent		
Michelle	Lockwood	Parent		Parent		
Amanda	Dakin	Parent	amandadakin@verizon.n et	Parent		
Margaret	Crosby	Community Member		Community Member		
Dave	Resler	BOE	dresler@verizon.net	Community Member		
Freeman	Williams	Assistant Superintendent	williamsf@christina.k12.d e.us	Administrator		
Vanessa	Gallaher	Parent		Parent		
Jan	Keen	Parent		Parent		
Roger	McMeekin	Teacher	mcmeekinr@christina.k12 .de.us	Teacher	Perkins	Technology Education
Rick	Clifton	Principal	cliftonr@christina.k12.de. us	Administrator	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences
Baker	Mike	Manager, Technology		Administrator	Perkins, IDEA 3-5, IDEA 6-21, Title I, Title I (Part D), Title II (Part A), Title II (Part D), Title III, Title IV, Professional Development	
Jeff	Turi	Seimens Diagnostics		Business Person	Perkins	Business, Finance and Marketing
Thomas	Hannum	Hotel Dupont Executive Chef		Business Person	Perkins	Family and Consumer Sciences

**2.2 Selection of Federal and State Programs**

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

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

**Consolidated Application Submission Deadlines**

All applications are approved by the Secretary of Education. For 2009 - 2010 Consolidated Applications, the following schedule applies:

<b>Grant Submission Date</b>	<b>DOE Review Dates</b>
July 17, 2009	July 21 - 23, 2009
August 17, 2009	August 25 - 27, 2009

If the applicant does not submit an application by August 17, 2009, the LEA must request an extension. Extensions will only be granted in rare instances with good reason. If an extension request is denied, the LEA will lose these funds.

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

**Consolidated Grant Project Dates: Federal: 07/01/09 - 12/31/10; State: 07/01/09 - 08/31/10; Student Success Block Grant and IRMC: 07/01/09 – 6/30/10**

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

## 2.3 Program Coordinators and Allocations

### Federal Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Ludwigsen, Eleanor ludwigsene@christina.k12.de.us	\$484,453.60	12/31/2010
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	Lawson, Lisa lawsonl@christina.k12.de.us	\$583,625.00	12/31/2010
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	Farr, Sarah farrs@christina.k12.de.us	\$4,275,483.40	12/31/2010
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	Hegedus, Andrew hegedusa@christina.k12k.de.us	\$6,240,043.00	12/31/2010
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	Logullo, Ann Marie logulloa@christina.k12.de.us	\$2,290,351.95	12/31/2010
Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology	Ludwigsen, Eleanor ludwigsene@christina.k12.de.us	\$99,329.35	12/31/2010
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students	Ludwigsen, Eleanor ludwigsene@christina.k12.de.us	\$181,249.00	12/31/2010
Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	Denney, Sharon Denneys@christina.k12.de.us	\$164,818.61	12/31/2010

### State Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Give Back</u>	<u>Amount Requested (After Give Back To State)</u>	<u>Project Subgrant Ending Date</u>
Curriculum and Professional Development	Logullo, Ann Marie logulloa@christina.k12.de.us	\$215,041.00	\$0.00	\$215,041.00	8/31/2010

## 2.4 Contact Information

---

### Consolidated Grant Coordinator:

### Local Education Agency (LEA) Information:

Phone: 3025522600

Fax: 3024294109

Street Address: 600 N. Lombard Street

Town: Wilmington

State: DE

Zip: 198014499

### Consolidated Grant Coordinator:

Name: Hegedus, Andrew

Telephone: 302.522.2601

E-mail: hegedusa@christina.k12k.de.us

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

Name: Hegedus, Andrew

Telephone: 302.522.2601

E-mail: hegedusa@christina.k12k.de.us

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



## 2.5 Constituency Participation

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

#### Question A

A.1 Explain the process through which parents and community members and the LEA Consolidated Application Planning Committee members- building administrators, teachers, and students, including representatives of children with disabilities participated in the planning, design, and review of this Consolidated Application.

The FY10 Consolidated Application is a continuation of the FY08 and FY09 Consolidated Applications. Both were based on the CSD Strategic Plan adopted by the CSD Board of Education in March 2007. This plan runs until 2010 and is expected to continue to set the priorities for leading improvement in CSD. This FY10 Consolidated Application continues to fund activities:

- Required to support students and their families and to maintain compliance with laws and regulations; and,
- Support activities tied to the implementation of the strategic plan.

As a review, the planning for the FY08 Consolidated Application began in October 2006 as the process for developing the Christina School District Strategic Plan, and the Consolidated Grant were aligned. Rollout of the FY08 process began with a briefing for all CSD school and district leaders, and the first public working session began with a process overview and data review at a Strategic Planning Stakeholders Meeting on November 29, 2006. After the kick-off there were over 20 meetings to inform and gather feedback from all of the CSD stakeholders. These meetings included ones with the Strategic Planning Stakeholder Committee that consisted of representatives from a variety of parent organizations, including Title I Parent Advisory Committee and the Special Needs PTA that were in existence then, public at large, legislators, higher education, Union representatives, administrators, and more. There were a number of community forums held in both Wilmington and Newark, during the week and on weekends to ensure everyone had opportunities to participate. There were also web-based questionnaires developed for parent, community, staff, and student participation that resulted in over 1300 responses, and phone-based questionnaires for those that do not have internet access - these phone questionnaires were as developed in Spanish and publicized uniquely within the Hispanic community. During this process, multiple means of communication with the Christina community were utilized to keep everyone informed, including electronic notifications, information posted on the CSD Website, a CSD Communicator mailed to every CSD home, media releases, and presentations at every Board of Education meeting. On March 13, 2007, the Christina Board adopted the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan. This adoption allowed detailed project plans developed to begin to meet each of the six goals in the strategic plan utilizing the strategies that were identified through this comprehensive and inclusive process.

For each goal a project team was established to develop the implementation details and included participation from parents, staff, administrators, and others as appropriate. Once the plans were drafted by these Project Teams, the Strategic Planning Stakeholders and project team members were invited to review the plans on May 23, 2007 to ensure that the details aligned with their knowledge and belief about the actions that were to result from the strategies and measures that they were active participants in developing. These plans were then consolidated and included into the FY08 Consolidated Grant activities and budgets. The grant itself was then reviewed with parents on June 26 and June 28, 2007. Comments received from parents were reviewed and included into the FY08 Consolidated Grant as appropriate.

FY09 followed a similar process, as has FY10. There were stakeholder meetings where the state of the strategic plan was reviewed. Every person who participated in the strategic plan and project plan meetings during FY09 were invited to attend, as well as inviting the CSD community through PTA publicity district website, email, and phone based electronic messages. At these meetings, each Project Manager reported on the progress of their portion of the strategic plan and what activities were completed and which ones were not and why. Interested individuals then met with the Project Managers to work on the details of each project for FY10. Each project team also met separately to develop their plans. Each project manager then brought the proposed activities and budgets to a district meeting where these requests were combined in to the proposed Consolidated Grant budget.

There was a proposal from a group of CSD parents that were submitted to us independently of the process. This input was incorporated into the process as

well. Some of their suggestions were incorporated within District level set-asides (e.g. supporting the "Stop the Violence" campaign), other suggestions were referred to building principals for potential incorporation into their building plans for using their Title I parent involvement funds, and some were not funded for various reasons. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the DDOE Title I Program Director separately per their request and per the CSD Board of Education Parent Involvement policy.

Since there are still significant budget issues being decided by the State of Delaware Legislature that can affect the allocation amounts and the rules and requirements for various funds included in the FY10 Consolidated Grant, a parent and community representative meeting was held on June 25, 2009 to review very preliminary budget information based on projected allocations. A final review meeting with the stakeholders is planned for August 11, 2009 prior to finalizing incorporation of DDOE comment.

## Question B

### B.1 Record the dates of the Consolidated Application LEA Planning Committee Meetings

#### Strategic Planning Stakeholders and District-Wide Parent Meetings

April 2, 2009

May 7, 2009

June 25, 2009

August 11, 2009 - Planned

Meetings with all CSD Principals to obtain needs, priorities, and suggested activities for FY10

March 12, 2009

Individual Project Team Meetings to review FY09 and develop plans for FY10 occurred multiple times during April, May, and June.

District formal review was completed on July 16, 2009.

### Question C

C.1 Explain how the LEA will publicly report the outcomes and results of all programs and activities funded under the Consolidated Application, including mandated reporting to parents regarding student achievement, school performance, educator quality, and IDEA state performance plan indicators.

The strategic plan defines the measures that are used to determine the progress towards achieving the district defined goals. These are reported to the Board of Education in a summary level Balanced Score Card (BSC). The BSC includes indicators showing both academic achievement and operational excellence indicators. Highly Qualified Teacher status is one of the Operational Excellence Indicators. The BSC and all presentations related to the Strategic Plan are posted on the CSD website.

The specific requirements in NCLB about parent notifications for schools at various stages of being "Under Improvement" (e.g. NCLB Choice Transportation and SES notifications for Title I schools, and Planning for Restructuring notifications as examples) will be performed as required upon notification of school AYP status by DDOE. All letters and information provided to Parents is posted on the CSD website along with an electronic copy of all recent approved consolidated grants and their respective evaluations.

All of the information from the DSTP, AYP status, educator quality, and IDEA state performance plan indicators are also reported to the public by DDOE through various means.

### Question D

D.1 Explain how the LEA will provide information about programming options to families and students for whom English is a second language. How will the LEA make written materials accessible and understandable to people with varying levels of literacy?

CSD provides translation services to families for meetings, translation of district documents (including IEP's, code of conduct, district letters, forms, etc.), and general school information. Although the majority of the translation provided is for Spanish speaking families, the Student Services office has offered translations in other languages including Mandarin, Arabic and French. Schools contact the Student Services office when in need of translation services or when parents need clarification about the programs offered by the district such as Choice, extra time, etc. The new phone based parent and school communication system also supports multiple languages. We also acquired a transmitter and receiver with headset system to support simultaneous translation during meetings.

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

### Question A

A.1 How is the LEA supporting individual schools to develop the capacity for school improvement?

Christina School District provides support to individual schools through our School Improvement Planning process (SIP). SIP teams at the school level develop individual school plans using a ten-step process. Site-based teams include the school administration, staff, parents, community members and a district liaison. Teams review multiple data sources, current practice, professional development, community outreach and develop an annual SIP plan. The plans are submitted to district where they are reviewed using a rubric. The district review committee comprised of supervisors, directors, managers and instructional coaches look for common themes, verify data, and provide feedback and support to the individual schools. For schools under improvement, Christina School District and Delaware Department Of Education work together to identify other Technical Assistance resources that can help build capacity in these schools as well. Utilizing multiple surveys, our research and assessment team develops school profiles which are also reflected in the SIP plans.

### Question B

B.1 Explain how the LEA's Consolidated Application is developed through the LEA and schools' strategic planning.

Christina School District developed the new 2007-2010 Strategic Plan this year. A five month timeframe provided us the opportunity to review, process, reflect and share district data with a wide variety of stakeholders. While schools worked diligently on their individual School Improvement Plans (SIPs), we also reviewed academic, discipline, climate, fiscal, and infrastructure needs. The review process of the schools' SIP plans in conjunction with the work of the strategic planning project teams have provided the work of the Consolidated Grant committee. Refer to question 2.5.A.1 for more details on the process.

### Question C

C.1 Identify the schools in the LEA that are currently under improvement, their ESEA sanction(s), and the specific, additional support provided by the LEA.

Kirk MS, Shue-Medill MS, Gauger-Cobbs MS, Christiana HS, Glasgow HS, Newark HS, and Stubbs are all Title I schools classified as In School Improvement Year 1. Bancroft and Pulaski are Title I schools classified as In Restructuring Year 6 and Year 7 respectively. Sterck School is a non-Title I School In School Improvement Year 1.

Consequences for the Year 1 Title I Schools include:

LEA required actions

1. Parent notification – school status and choice option
2. Parent and public notification of school's actions to address problem(s)
3. Designate School Support Team & provide technical assistance
4. Approve school plan
5. Reserve funds and offer school Choice

School required actions

1. Receive technical assistance from LEA-designated School Support Team
2. Amend and implement school success plan including
  - a. Reserve 10% of school's Title I funds for professional development
  - b. Ensure full implementation of teacher mentoring program

c. Ensure parent involvement in children's education and in school decision-making

Consequences for the Year 1 Non-Title I School includes:

1. Amend school success plan
2. Give student subgroups not meeting AYP targets in reading and math priority for extra time services

Consequences for Restructuring Schools:

LEA required actions

1. Parent notification – school status and choice option
2. Parent and public notification of school's actions to address problem(s)
3. Designate School Support Team & provide technical assistance
4. Approve school plan
5. Reserve funds and offer school Choice
6. Parent notification to students eligible for Supplemental Education Services
7. Reserve funds and offer Supplemental Education Services
8. Implement school restructuring plan developed in Year 4

School required actions

1. Amend and implement school success plan to include
  - a. LEA-determined Restructuring
  - b. School is no longer required to Reserve 10% of school's Title I funds for professional development

Schools in Danger of Falling into Improvement Status (did not make AYP in 2008-09)

- Elbert-Palmer Elementary School (Academic Review)
- Keene Elementary School (Academic Review)
- Bayard Middle School had new school status in 2008-09 and thus did not have an AYP status. However, academic performance at the school was very low in 2008-09. There are no mandated consequences for these schools.

LEA Supports

CSD has developed a teired support and oversight structure for Schools in Restructuring, Under Improvement, and Schools of Concern. This teired plan is attached to the DDOE comment about the need for improved LEA support for schools designated as in Restructuring. This teired plan increases the frequency of monitoring and the types of activities based on the status of the school. Also, the number and type of people involved in the oversight activities also increases based on the status of the school. The plan significantly increases the oversight and controls from the LEA for Bancroft and Pulaski, the two schools in restructuring. Based on performance during these oversight activities, schools may be advanced to more intrusive levels of oversight as well. This plan should ensure that school success plans are executed as desired, and that student outcomes are routinely considered in determining school progress.

**Question D**

D.1 Provide the number of students eligible for ESEA Public School Choice for each school Under Improvement.

Bancroft Elementary School - 343  
Pulaski Elementary School - 458  
Stubbs Elementary School - 385

based on May 27, 2009 projections

D.2 Provide the number of students eligible for Supplemental Educational Services for each school under improvement (total number of free/ reduced lunch eligible students in schools in year 2 or higher of school improvement)

Bancroft Elementary School - 326  
Pulaski Elementary School - 395

based on May 27, 2009 projections

**Question E**

E.1 Section 1116 requires that LEAs with schools identified for improvement spend an amount up to 20% of their Title I, Part A allocation divided as follows:

- \* An amount equal to 5% for ESEA Public School Choice Transportation for students
- \* An amount equal to 5% for Supplemental Educational Services (SES)
- \* An amount equal to 10% for either or both, depending on demand

An LEA may use other federal, state, and local funds to support either Public School Choice Transportation or Supplemental Educational Services instead of Title I-A funds.

Provide a brief explanation if the total set-aside for ESEA Public School Choice Transportation and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) is less than 20%.

Based on experience and the number of possible eligible children, CSD will be reserving 17% of its Title I allocation for FY10. Choice will be offered to students at Bancroft, Stubbs, and Pulaski to Elbert-Palmer and Wilson. SES services will be offered to students at Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary. In FY09, SES and Choice were also offered to more students than will be offered in FY10. This 17% reservation also takes into account a higher per-pupil cap due to Title I, Part A ARRA funds. These services, cap and reservation are also the subject of an Ed Flex Waiver request for FY10 that is being submitted to DDOE.

E.2 Describe the process the district will use to implement Supplemental Educational Services (SES) during the school year and summer.

The process for offering SES services is documented in an internal CSD procedure and basically follows the following flow:

- Meet with all DDOE approved SES providers that wish to service CSD to discuss process and contractual requirements.
- Send a letter to all eligible families informing them of the SES services. This packet contains a lot of information on the providers and the services they offer, as well as the Provider selection form. This information is sent in both english and spanish, is posted prominently on the CSD website, and hard copies are available at each school for an eligible parent and any newly enrolled eligible students as well.
- Each school has a Provider fair at their Open Houses in September.
- Parents return their selection to the CSD Title I office.
- CSD Title I office verifies eligibility and selection. Compiles them by Provider and transmits them to the Providers.
- The Providers meet with the parents and student to agree on the services that will be offered. The Providers confirm this agreement to the CSD Title I office.
- Purchase Orders are processed for all confirmed students. As more enrollment occurs, the PO's are modified to account for additional students or changes that are needed.

Parents are notified throughout the year. We plan on sending Parentlink messages, and utilizing community members and parents to ensure the opportunity is communicated to all eligible parents as well this year to stimulate demand.

E.3 Describe the process for reallocating unused ESEA Public School Choice Transportation and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) funds for allowable activities.

Should funds be available for reallocation, we will request an amendment from DDOE to reallocate the funds. Once approved, the funds will be treated like any other Title I allocation. In other words, we may use it for additional district level set-aside or distribute it via the per-pupil allocation process. In either case, equitable amounts will be provided to Private Schools either through the set-aside calculations, or via the normal per-pupil process.

## Question F

F.1 For LEAs in Improvement: How have the Title I 10% set-aside funds been used for the professional development needs of staff in schools under improvement in order to move the LEA out of improvement?

CSD has set-aside 10% of our Title I allocation to support professional development in all of our schools in accordance with Title I guidance. An analysis of our district level needs has helped us to determine that we should use our funds to support Instructional Coaches at all levels of the organization, particularly in the areas of Reading and Math, Special Education, and Secondary schools. See the Budgeted Items for the specific salary and OEC line items.

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

## 2.7 Parental and Community Involvement

---

### Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA supports parents and community members, including historically underrepresented groups, to be active participants in the school improvement process. This includes, but is not limited to, analyzing data, determining needs, setting goals, implementing strategies, and evaluating results.

Involving parents and community members in both district-level planning and school improvement planning is vital to developing strategies and tactics that support the full breadth of the population served within Christina and its schools. At a district-level, supports for parents and community members to become active participants include wide-media dissemination of the planning process; forums held both at night and morning and on both weekdays and weekends; questionnaires deployed by internet and phone so that those without computer access could participate as well; and questionnaires being available in both English and Spanish.

Building principals also engage parents and community members in a number of ways, and are required by procedure to broadly communicate their school's achievement and perceptual data (as Step 1 in the Site Improvement Planning Ten Step Process); have at least two parents who are not district employees on their Site Improvement Planning Committee; and have over 30% of parents and students participate in the annual My Perspective-My Voice questionnaire that goes home to all parents in multiple languages. As the team works through the analysis of this data, the setting of goals, and the evaluation of results, parents and community are engaged in the process. This assures a wide variety of voices are included in the process.

Even with these in place, however, we can do better. The district goal in the Strategic Plan to improve school and parent partnerships will work to strengthen this and other aspects of parental support and involvement, including further outreach, better communication tools, improved training for parents and community members on their role in these processes and how they can become more involved if desired, and better training for staff and administration on effectively engaging and supporting parents and students from diverse cultures and communities. These improvements are reflected in the goals and activities in this application.

## Question B

B.1 Describe how the LEA assists schools in the development of parent policies and Title I parent/school compacts and assures that the policies and compacts are followed.

The Christina School District Board of Education adopted a revised and strengthened policy on Parent Partnerships. This new policy clearly requires schools to engage and support parents in their child's education and in the work of the schools. Information was provided to school administrators about the requirements in Title I for Parent Involvement. School Improvement Plans were reviewed to ensure adequate plans were developed to support parent involvement, and to ensure adequate parent participation occurred during the plan development. Where issues were found, administrators are required to revise their plans, with the involvement of their teams, to meet the requirements.

CSD created a one page poster/flyer in both english and spanish that contains all of the Title I required parental notifications. These will be displayed in schools and included in PTA and welcome back to school letters. All of the Parental Notification requirements are also included in an internal procedure for Principal review should they need guidance.

As part of the annual evaluation of the Consolidated Grant, parent involvement data is also obtained (e.g. PTA membership, number of events with parent participation including the number of parents who attended). Focus group work is also done to better understand the barriers that are limiting more active parental engagement as well. The results are then factored into the plans in place to enhance the work of the schools and district.

Again, as a result of the Strategic Plan goal for improved parent partnerships, schools will receive increased support, professional development, and oversight to continue to improve in this area.

## Question C

C.1 Describe how parents, students, teachers, and representatives of business and industry, through the Perkins Advisory Committee, were involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Career and Technical Education programs assisted by this grant.

Each area has an Advisory Committee. Each advisory Committee meets regularly, a minimum of four times a year. The Advisory Committee members include teachers of the specific vocational specialty, other staff, parents and community members. Throughout the year the Committee discusses the progress and needs of the area. With this information, the school develops a request for Perkins funds. In the spring of the year, another committee, the District Perkins Advisory Committee, comprised of District personnel, school leaders, teachers, business/community members, and parents meet to review all the requests and prioritize the requests for the grant.

Meetings of the Advisory committee were held on March 18, 2008 and April 8, 2008 to review all areas of the program and resources needed to meet the program standards and goals. Various CTE specific advisory committee meetings were held throughout the year.

## Question D

D.1 Describe local efforts to use technology to promote parent and family involvement in education and to enhance communication among students, parents, teachers, principals, and administrators.

Technology is used to promote involvement and enhance communication in several ways: the Christina School District website contains significant amounts of information about CSD, and schools have individual websites as well. Many of these were recognized in the recent past as award winning for their content and clarity. The CSD intranet site is used for teachers, administrators, and other staff to obtain procedures and other information (e.g. all the data used to begin the CSD Strategic Planning process). Web-based surveys are also used to collect information. For example, the internal questionnaire for My Perspective-My Voice was all electronic, as was the student questionnaire. The use of phone based questionnaires was also utilized this year, in multiple languages, to ensure mechanisms were in place for people without ready computer access allowing them the ability to have their voice heard as well. Finally, both paper "Communicators" are published several times per year, and CSD updates are published to a list-serve with over six thousand recipients. Through our CSD Strategic Plan related activities, last year we implemented Home Access Center for eschool for all Secondary Schools. We have approximately 50% of all registered user accounts now accessing the system. We also adopted Parentlink, a phone based communication system, to improve communication with parents. We use the system for emergency messaging, attendance calling; school and district-wide reminders and announcements. This year we are also expanding this functionality to include surveys and more. With all of these tools in place, CSD is taking advantage of many tools to improve involvement and enhance communication. The goal for improving school and parent partnerships is causing investigation of even more tools that could be employed.

## Question E

E.1 ESEA requires a LEA to reserve 1% of its Title I allocation for parent involvement, per 20 U.S.C. §1118

AND every LEA who receives a minimum of \$500,000 of Title I, Part A funds must reserve a minimum of 1% of the funds for parental involvement activities that align with sections 1111, 1112, 1116, and 1118 of ESEA, AND 95% of the 1% will be distributed to schools that receive Title I funds (by formula) for school-based parental involvement activities

Describe:

- \* The LEA-wide parental activities as they relate to the student needs,
- \* The schools' parental involvement activities as they relate to the student needs,
- \* The process used to develop, review, and apply LEA parental involvement policies, and
- \* The process used to annually evaluate the effectiveness of the policy (and the involvement of parents in the evaluation process).

CSD reserves 1% of the entire Title I allocation for parental involvement and distributes 100% of the 1% to schools. Any remaining funds from this 1% from prior years is carried over to the subsequent Fiscal Year. CSD also reserves significantly more funds for district level Parent Involvement activities. This amount has increased significantly in each of the last three years. As required by Title I, both district-wide and school-based parental involvement activities are required, and are occurring. As recognized by the adopted CSD Strategic Plan, more work is required to implement a robust partnership with CSD parents and schools. Several steps were taken as a result of this strategic plan. Namely, the Board adopted a significantly improved and strengthened policy on parental involvement, an administrative position was designated to provide oversight and support for parent partnerships across the district, a parent liaison was hired to support Title I schools, communication tools were deployed, and a plan for improving these partnerships was also developed with the participation of parents and community members. This goal and plan was the direct result of the student needs that were identified.

School parental involvement activities also result from the review of student needs through both academic, behavioral, and perceptual data. The CSD has adopted the Six Types of Involvement as a goal from the Strategic Plan and provided accountability through establishing the Office of Parent Support and Community Partnerships. The district has obtained membership from J. Epstein's National Network of Partnership Schools out of Johns Hopkins University. Action Team for Partnership training occurred during the '09 school year which will consist of parents, school administrators and staff, and community based organization representatives. Examples of the effectiveness of this partnership model in other schools and districts include community based meeting locations, interpreters for school meetings for ESL families, volunteer tutors, assistance in disseminating information to parents, and beautification projects to enhance the schools appearance and be more inviting to parents.

As described in the questions above, there are appropriate reviews, processes, and evaluations in place; however, improvement is needed. FY10 will continue to focus in this area and results from FY09 will be built upon to continue to improve.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the parent policy, we will be analyzing data from the My Perspective-Parent Voice survey as well as data from the Delaware School Climate survey. Each survey will be administered in the spring of each year. In addition, we will conduct a parent focus group to gain deeper understanding of some of the components addressed within these two surveys. The focus group will consist of a representative sample of parents with children currently attending our Title I schools, and non-Title I schools as well.

## Question F

F.1 Describe how the results of the "summative progress update" will be disseminated to and made public for the staff, parents, and community.

Every year, the summative evaluation of the results of our consolidated application are posted on the CSD website and made available to the public in hard copy. A simpler version of the results can be found by looking at the CSD BSC also on the district website.



### 3.1 Title I Data

Identify each school's Title I designation in the Title I Status Column.

#### Public Schools

School	Title I Status	Grade Span	Total Enrollment	# of Low Income	% of Low Income	# of Education Deprived	% of Education Deprived	# of Homeless	Total # of students participating in Title I
Douglass School	Not Eligible	K-12	5	5	100.00 %	0	0.00 %	19	0
Bancroft Elem	School-wide	K-5	343	326	95.00 %	0	0.00 %	17	343
Bayard Middle	School-wide	6-8	671	596	89.00 %	0	0.00 %	47	671
Brader Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	K-5	684	243	36.00 %	0	0.00 %	3	0
Brookside Elem	School-wide	K-5	444	313	70.00 %	0	0.00 %	10	444
Christiana High	School-wide	9-12	1258	733	58.00 %	0	0.00 %	39	1258
Brennen School	Not Eligible	K-12	203	107	53.00 %	0	0.00 %	2	0
Sterck School	Not Eligible	K-12	83	50	60.00 %	0	0.00 %	7	0
Downes Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	K-5	429	153	36.00 %	0	0.00 %	4	0
Elbert-Palmer Elem	School-wide	K-5	313	281	90.00 %	0	0.00 %	24	313
Gallaher Elem	School-wide	K-5	487	273	56.00 %	0	0.00 %	3	487
Gauger-Cobbs Middle	School-wide	6-8	1243	669	54.00 %	0	0.00 %	24	1243
Glasgow High	School-wide	9-12	1265	714	56.00 %	0	0.00 %	16	1265
Jones Elem	School-wide	K-5	443	276	62.00 %	0	0.00 %	0	443
Keene Elem	School-wide	K-5	646	284	44.00 %	0	0.00 %	24	646
Kirk Middle	School-wide	6-8	928	490	53.00 %	0	0.00 %	9	928
Leasure Elem	School-wide	K-5	556	328	59.00 %	0	0.00 %	9	556
Maclary Elem	School-wide	K-5	448	186	42.00 %	0	0.00 %	3	448
Marshall Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	K-5	658	250	38.00 %	0	0.00 %	5	0
McVey Elem	School-wide	K-5	476	268	56.00 %	0	0.00 %	11	476
Newark High	School-wide	9-12	1747	864	49.00 %	0	0.00 %	37	1747
Pulaski Elem	School-wide	K-5	458	395	86.00 %	0	0.00 %	17	458
Pyle Academy	Not Eligible	9-12	4	4	100.00 %	0	0.00 %	4	0
Shue-Medill Middle	School-wide	6-8	1056	543	51.00 %	0	0.00 %	33	1056
Smith Elem	School-wide	K-5	559	296	53.00 %	0	0.00 %	2	559
Stubbs Elem	School-wide	K-5	385	350	91.00 %	0	0.00 %	36	385

West Park Place Elem	Eligible But Not Receiving Service	K-5	362	143	40.00 %	0	0.00 %	4	0
Wilson Elem	School-wide	K-5	479	235	49.00 %	0	0.00 %	7	479
Porter Road ES	School-wide	K-5	656	498	76.00 %	0	0.00 %	0	656

Private Schools

<b>School</b>	<b>Title I Status</b>	<b>Grade Span</b>	<b>Total # of students participating in Title I</b>
Christ the Teacher	Participating Private School	K-8	3
Elementary Workshop	Participating Private School	Ungr	2
Holy Angels	Participating Private School	K-8	7
Lab Preschool (UD)	Not Eligible	K	0
St. Elizabeth's Elem	Participating Private School	K-8	10
St. Michael's Day	Participating Private School	K	5
St. Peter's Cathedra	Participating Private School	K-8	26
Nativity Preparatory	Participating Private School	6-8	10
Harvest Academy Wilm	Participating Private School	K-8	14
St. John's	Participating Private School	K-5	2
St. Anthony of Padua	Participating Private School	K-8	8
Corpus Christi	Participating Private School	K-5	2
St. Paul's	Participating Private School	K-8	13
Saint Matthew	Participating Private School	K-5	3
Our Lady of Fatima	Participating Private School	K-5	4
St. Catherine	Participating Private School	K-5	3
Pope John Paul II	Participating Private School	K-5	1
Sharon Temple Adventist S	Participating Private School	K-5	1
St. Ann	Participating Private School	6-8	1

Serviam Girls Academy	Participating Private School	6-8	4
Early Learning Center	Participating Private School	K	9

**School Title I Eligibility: School % Low Income is above the LEA % Low Income**

**For Title I "Schoolwide" status, the School % Low Income must be 40% or greater or have requested and been granted an EdFlex waiver.**

**School Allocation:**

**\* Per pupil cost = LEA Title I allocation divided by the number of students in poverty in the LEA x 1.25**

**\* LEAs with 35% or more students in poverty may rank schools in the order of the number of students in poverty.**

### 3.2 Health Risk Data

---

#### Question A

A.1 Describe the LEA's plan to address health risk behavior through health education and services. Describe how the health risk data will be used to address barriers to learning. How have priorities been established, based upon the student survey data from the University of Delaware reports (Delaware School Survey, Youth Risk Behavior Survey, and Youth Tobacco Survey)? What specific health and safety needs will be targeted?

The health risk data is used to identify student behaviors that affect student wellness and impact academic achievement. Specifically, attention will focus on the preventive educational programs targeting students K-12. The elementary schools will continue to integrate the Great Body Shop curriculum. At the secondary level, Keepin' it REAL as well as the revised health and PE state standards will make up the prevention curriculum. The school district will further incorporate preventive activities following our district's counseling plan focusing on academic development and personal/social development. The health risk data will be used by counselors to determine the target areas for student activities. Students currently exhibiting health risk behaviors are referred to both school-based counseling services and outside agency support. The goal is to enhance overall student wellness and subsequently focus their academic progress. The data will be reviewed further to establish the need for targeted support to schools or grade clusters that show areas of concern. The district will plan support services required from its own resources or contracted specialists in the area of need (i.e. de-escalation and drug, alcohol, and tobacco abuse).

School safety data is used to plan and revise the district's strategic plan goal of "Improving school climates and student/staff relationships" each year. The activities/tasks around this goal included in this grant application came from both school safety data and student/staff/community input.

#### Question B

B.1 What Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)-approved research-based curriculum is being implemented to address tobacco, alcohol, drug, and violence prevention and character development?

The elementary schools will continue to integrate the Great Body Shop curriculum. At the secondary level, Keepin' it REAL as well as the revised health and PE state standards will make up the prevention curriculum.

### 3.3 Identification of Students with Academic Needs

---

#### Question A

A.1 Explain the LEA's procedure for selecting participants for the interventions. The procedure must be uniformly applied for all children at a grade level in the LEA.

A thorough review of all student data available occurs at each school building by the school academic support team. Data sources include - DIBELS, MAP, DSTP, benchmark assessments, informal inventories, end-of-book assessments, teacher prepared tests, observation checklists, parent conferences, progress reports and staff recommendations. After this review, students are provided individualized interventions based on need and in accordance with the Response to Intervention model for elementary students. Initially, classroom teachers provide intervention and monitor progress. Should a student demonstrate a high level of need, reading specialists, or other staff provide additional intervention services. Interventions can include an additional intervention block which provides additional time with a targeted intervention (phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, strategy instruction, skill practice), or a second block of a subject in secondary schools ("Double Up on Mathematics"). The following methods below are used to identify participants based on grade level:

Grades K-1 - Students scoring in the AT RISK range on DIBELS and/or below reading benchmark levels and/or not meeting proficiency on Reading or Math as indicated on their progress reports, teacher recommendations, cumulative record review.

Grade 2 - Students scoring in the bottom quartile on MAP and/or below reading benchmark levels and/or performing one year or more below grade level and/or not meeting proficiency on Reading or Math as indicated on their progress report , teacher recommendation, cumulative record review and/or identified as strategic/intensive on the DIBELS fluency and nonsense word measures.

Grade 3-6 - Students scoring in the bottom quartile on MAP and/or receiving a DSTP score of 1 or 2, and/or below reading benchmark levels and/or performing one year or more below grade level and /or not meeting proficiency on Reading or math as indicated on their progress report, teacher recommendation, cumulative record review.

Grade 7-10 - Students scoring below proficiency on DSTP, predicted to score below by MAP data, or below established course placement guidelines using MAP, along with grades and teacher recommendations, are reviewed for appropriate class placement and intervention support.

### 3.4 Children with Disabilities under IDEA (EIS Services)

---

#### Question A

A.1 For LEAs providing early intervening services (EIS) under IDEA, explain how the LEA will develop and implement its EIS system to provide coordinated, early intervening services for students in grades K-12 who are not identified as needing special education, but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment. EIS activities may include professional development and direct student evaluations, services and supports, but are not limited to these activities. (20 U.S.C. §1413(f) and 34 C.F.R. §226).

Multiple formative and summative assessments will be administered to all students consistently across the district to identify students who may require additional academic support. Some examples of the assessments include DIBELS, MAP and common curriculum-based assessments. Common expectations regarding critical points when student data must be reviewed will be set at the district level. Guidance and support regarding data analysis will accompany expectations. These expectations will be in addition to guidance provided to school leaders in the area of looking at data and identifying supports. All reading interventions must be chosen from the approved District Reading Literacy Plan. The Reading Literacy Plan includes only evidence-based interventions and strategies. The District Math Literacy Plan is under development and will include only evidence-based interventions and strategies as well. Curriculum access at the secondary level will be addressed through differentiation and accommodations. Professional development in the area of differentiation will continue, but the level of monitoring and evaluation of implementation on the part of school and district leaders will increase. Strategies to increase curriculum access such as those learned at the DOE Curriculum Access Training will be incorporated in district-wide training and instructional conversations to expand effective strategy use. A District approved lesson planning template has been developed and piloted with a small group of teachers. The template guides ensures that specific differentiation strategies and curriculum accommodations are noted. Use of the template will be expanded next year through district-wide content meetings and PLCs. Training on curriculum accommodations will continue during the 2009-2010 school year with both general and special educators as well as educational diagnosticians and school psychologists.

Beginning in the summer of 2007 the last phase of PBS schools began training with implementation to begin in the fall. This brought the district closer to the long range plan of becoming a PBS district. Monitoring and evaluation of implementation for fidelity to the program will help ensure early identification and intervention as well as more intensive intervention for students requiring additional behavior support. This monitoring and evaluation will take place at both the building and district level. As with student performance data, behavioral data will be routinely analyzed to determine the need for intervention and assist with overall monitoring and evaluation of implementation.

#### Question B

B.1 For LEAs using IDEA Part B funds to support a Title I schoolwide program, explain how the LEA will assure that it will continue to comply with all other requirements of IDEA Part B to the same extent as if the LEA did not use special education funds in the schoolwide program. (20 U.S.C. §1413(a)(2)(D) and 6314(a)(3)(A) and 34 C.F.R. §200.29 and 300.206).

FY10 IDEA funds will be utilized to support Response to Intervention (RtI) and CEIS in the Christina School District. Comprehensive training for all staff was implemented. In addition processes and procedures was developed and established as part of district requirements and expectations. This training and processes and procedures will support the early intervention work already underway as mentioned in response 3.4A.1. By using IDEA funds to support RtI, early intervening services should be enhanced and reflected in the number of students referred to receive special education services. In addition to the regular support of the needs of students with disabilities, FY10 funds will be used to support training on inclusive practices school-wide for all Christina School District schools, and to support implementing the electronic IEP development and monitoring tool (IEP Plus) provided by the Department of Education.



### 3.5 Selection of Children – Title I Targeted Assistance Schools

---

#### Question A

A.1 Explain the LEA's procedures for identifying participants for the program. The procedures must be uniformly applied for all students at a grade level in the LEA.

There are no Targeted Assistance Schools in CSD.

**Possible Methods: previous Title I students, diagnostic test results, standardized test results, cumulative records (grades, levels), teacher recommendations (based on basal program), and others (please specify)**

### 3.6 Services and Programs for Homeless Students and Youth

---

#### Question A

A.1 A child or youth who is homeless is automatically eligible to receive Title I services. ESEA requires that LEAs reserve a portion of their Title I, Part A funds as necessary to provide services to homeless students and youth attending non-Title I participating schools. Services provided must be comparable to those provided to students in Title I participating schools.

Specify:

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

An allocation of \$98,661 was made from Title I funds to pay for a homeless liaison (0.9 FTE). The material and supplies needed to service over 415 students will be from the McKinney-Vento Grant submitted in June 2009. This cost was determined based on the salary of the liaison and previous experience in serving this population of students.

### 3.7 Title I Comparability Assurance

Title I law requires that LEAs provide educational services in Title I schools that are comparable to the services provided in non-Title I schools.

- \* An LEA may exclude schools with 100 or fewer students from its comparability determinations.
- \* An LEA does not need to demonstrate comparability to have met the comparability requirement if it has only one building for each grade span.
- \* An LEA is considered to have met the comparability requirement with the SEA by completing this written assurance form.
- \* An LEA must maintain records that are updated at least biennially to document compliance.

#### Question A

A.1 Make the appropriate selection:

- LEA has only one building per grade span. Do not complete Question B of the section.
- LEA has more than one building per grade span. Please complete Question B of this section.

#### Question B

B.1 If the LEA has more than one building per grade span: Make the appropriate selections

- The LEA has established and implemented an LEA-wide salary schedule.
- The LEA has established and implemented a policy to ensure equivalence among its schools, teachers, administrators, and other staff. The policy can be either a School Board-adopted policy or a procedural policy.

B.2 What evidence does the LEA use to ensure this equivalence (ex: using student/teacher ratios, LEA-wide class sizes, policy numbers)?

The Christina Board of Education has implemented a district-wide salary schedule which is in place for all employee groups. The district also complies with the requirements outlined in Sections 1704(4) and 1705A, Title 14 of the Delaware Code related to class size requirements for grades K-3. In addition, the practice is to maintain a low a student/teacher ratio across all grade levels with every effort made to ensure that classes are reasonable in size and conducive for learning. Building budgets are also established based on the number of state earned teaching units in each school generated by each school's September 30th student enrollment. With these measures in place, appropriate equivalence is assured between Title I and Non-Title I schools.

B.3 What evidence does the LEA use to support this policy (ex: through the single audit, documenting per pupil expenditures)?

Several times throughout the school year, a comparability calculation is performed that provides the evidence supporting this requirement. This calculation is typically performed for the last time in early October as the September 30th count results are being reviewed and staffing is being finalized accordingly.

### 3.8 Title I Services for Private Schools

---

#### Question A

A.1 LEAs have the flexibility in the methods they use to collect poverty data on private school students. Indicate how the LEA collect Title I poverty data on private school students in the LEA:

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Using the same measure of low income used to count public school students.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Using the result of a survey that, to the extent possible, protects the identities of families of private school students and allowing such survey results to be extrapolated if complete actual data are unavailable. |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Applying low income percentage of each participating school attendance area to the number of private school students who reside in that school area.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Using an equated measure of low income correlated with the measure of low income used to count public school students.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other  |

A.2 If "Other" is checked above, please explain:

--

A.3 What evidence does the LEA use to support this policy (ex: through the single audit, documenting per pupil expenditures)?

Each Title I participating private school is required to submit documentation supporting each student's low income status and the student's address to ensure that the student resides within the attendance area of a CSD Title I school.
--

#### Question B

B.1 How will the LEA serve private school students for Title I?

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Provide equitable services to eligible private school students.  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Combine the funds generated by poor private school students in all participating areas to create a pool of funds and provide equitable services to eligible private school students. Under this option, the services provided to eligible students in a particular private school are not dependent upon the amount of funds generated by poor students in a school. |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other  |

B.2 If "Other" is checked above, please explain:

--

### 3.9 Addressing the Needs of Truant Students

---

#### Question A

A.1 How many students have had more than three (3) unexcused absences?

12,713

A.2

- \* How many students have had 4 - 10 unexcused absences?
- \* How many students have had 11 - 15 unexcused absences?
- \* How many students have had 16 - 30 unexcused absences?
- \* How many students have had more than 30 unexcused absences?

(The combined total of these four categories should equal the number of students listed in Part 1 above.)

How many students have had 4 - 10 unexcused absences? 6,243  
How many students have had 11 - 15 unexcused absences? 2,102  
How many students have had 16 - 30 unexcused absences? 2,387  
How many students have had more than 30 unexcused absences? 1,981

#### Question B

B.1 A student is identified as truant when he or she has more than three (3) unexcused absences. How do you address the needs of the students addressed in the four categories in Question A, Part 2 of this section?

Computer generated letters are sent at 3, 5 and 10 days of absence, notifying parents of the number of excused and unexcused absences. The letters also provide information on Compulsory School Attendance Laws for the State of DE as well as the possibility of court proceedings for failing to comply. Unexcused absences for students with less than 10 days are handled at the school. Schools typically work with students and families through phone calls, home visits, conferences, and developing attendance contracts. As a result of the attendance conference, administrators, staff, parents, and the student develop an action plan with intervention strategies. The purpose of the plan is to improve student attendance and to provide information on resources that may be needed to support daily school attendance.

Students who have ten or more unexcused absences, cumulative or consecutive, are referred by the respective school to a District Visiting Teacher. The Christina School district currently has four Visiting Teachers on staff. Each school has a point person responsible for making sure that all school level tasks associated with making a referral to the Visiting Teacher have been completed. Ideally, an attendance conference is held at the school to develop an attendance action plan for the student. In some cases, the schools will invite the District Visiting Teacher to the attendance conferences held prior to formal referral to the Visiting Teacher. Within 48 hours of a referral from the school the Visiting Teacher makes contact with the parent/guardian by phone and sends a follow-up certified letter. Home visits are generally made within three days of the referral. Based on the investigation, the Visiting Teachers use their discretion to file charges however Compulsory School Attendance Laws state that charges must be filed against a student and/or parent of a student who has 30 unexcused absences. Upon investigating a referral, it may be necessary for the Visiting Teacher to refer a family to the district's homeless advocate, to a State agency and/or community agency for additional assistance. Students and their families may need assistance with housing, food, clothing, etc.

B.2 List the specific strategies from your School Success Plan(s) and activities and resources from Section 4.0 in your LEA Consolidated Grant that address the needs of truant students. (Title IV funds can be used to help support these activities.)

Strategies utilized to address the needs of truant students include:

District Letters

Teacher/parent communication

Parent Link, including automated attendance calling

Positive Behavior Support Attendance incentives

Attendance conferences with subsequent Attendance Action Plans

Visiting Teachers

Although all the goals will have some level of impact and support of truant students, the two objectives that most support these efforts are: Improving school climates and student/staff relationships, and developing strong school and family partnerships to support positive school environments. These items are funded from a variety of sources. For example the Parent Link system is included in Section 4.0 as "Parent Phone and Web-Based Communication System". It is funded from Titles I, II-D, III, and IV.

### 3.10 Title II, Part A, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

---

#### Question A

A.1 This question and questions A-2 and A-3 are about the ESEA content areas of need within individual schools or the charter school. Focus on the content areas with the lowest percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

What are the content areas of need within the schools or charter school? Cite specific schools and ESEA content areas. Use the most recent HQT data in answering the questions. Be specific in the response.

The content area of greatest need is science, particularly Physical Science (77.8%), General Science (85.3%), and Earth Science (88.9%). The weakest schools in Physical Science were Christiana and Newark High Schools. Bayard Middle School, Sterck (Delaware School for the Deaf), and Douglass Alternative School had the lowest number of HQ classes in General Science. Sterck (Delaware School for the Deaf) had 0% HQ classes for Earth Science (as well as Biology and Chemistry).

One school, Kirk Middle School, showed a weakness in Language Arts (78.9%) and Social Studies (78.9%), while Shue-Medill had the lowest number of HQ classes in mathematics of the secondary schools (84.6%)

While our overall HQ% (94.8%) exceeded that of the state of Delaware average, the two schools that kept Christina School District from approaching 100% HQ are Douglass Alternative School (35.7%) and Sterck Delaware School for the Deaf (67.3%).

A.2 Refer to the response to Question A.1.

What actions/strategies is the district or charter school taking (and/or planning to take) to increase the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the identified content areas of need within the schools or charter school?

Those teachers who are not HQ in the areas described above will

a. be terminated if he/she is on a temporary contract.

b. if on a permanent contract, he/she will be notified of their "conditions of employment", which include a timeline to become HQ, a prescribed plan for achieving HQ status, and a description of district supports that are available. If an individual does not meet the HQ status, the teacher will be recommended for non-renewal of their teaching contract.

A.3 Following up on the response to Question A-2...

Why does the district/charter school believe that the actions/strategies in A-2 will result in increasing the number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the identified content areas of need within the school(s)? Cite specific evidence, reasons, and/or past experiences.

Prior to this time, teachers in Sterck (Delaware School for the Deaf), have mainly focused on their ability to work with hearing impaired students. All are certified in this area and many have Masters Degrees in teaching the hearing impaired. These teachers will be required to become HQ in their content areas (especially the sciences and other secondary subjects) as a condition of employment (as outlined in A-2 b).

The plan outlined in A-2 provides a target date for non-renewal of non-HQ teachers. This target date in addition to the availability of an ample support system should be strong incentives for compliance.

## Question B

B.1 The ESEA requirement is that all classes of core academic content areas were to be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005 - 2006 school year.

If the district or charter school has not yet met this requirement, respond to this question:

What specific actions/strategies is the district/charter school taking (and/or planning to take) to meet the 100% HQT goal? Include all actions/strategies and be certain to address the following:

- \* Praxis II support
- \* Teacher assignment/reassignment
- \* Hiring practices
- \* Collaboration with school leaders about the HQT requirement.

For the last two years, the district has supported the efforts of individuals who were working towards becoming HQ by providing reimbursement for up to \$40 of Praxis II study materials and for successful completion of Praxis II. The district has also partnered with the University of Delaware in the Teacher Quality Enhancement Project. This project provides support for special education teachers to become HQ in a specific core subject. The district has also offered and provided individual assistance to any teacher who needs individual counseling on available options to become HQ or needs assistance with completing the HQ survey. As long as funding remains available, the district plans to continue to provide these or similar supports. Wherever possible, all teachers will be assigned to classes for which they have HQ status.

B.2 The ESEA/Title I requirement is that all teachers hired after the first day of the 2002 - 2003 school year were to be highly qualified at the time of hire if they were to be placed in a Title I school-wide school or a program supported with Title I funds.

How does the district/ charter school assure that it meets this federal requirement? Be specific in the response.

Of the 627 Title I classes in our district, 26 are being taught by non-HQ teachers (4%). 195 of these Title I classes are in a newly formed middle school where all non-HQ teachers (19 of them) are working toward HQ status or will be moved to other positions.

B.3 This question is about plans to assist all teachers who are not yet highly qualified to become HQ as soon as possible.

Describe the process for developing the plan with the teacher; the available options for meeting the HQT requirement; the responsibility of the district/charter, including support and monitoring; and the responsibility of the teacher, including consequences for not following the plan.

When filling any open positions, Highly Qualified candidates were given first consideration. Only when an HQT was unavailable was a non-HQT interviewed. If hired, a non-HQT is required to attain HQ status within a reasonable time frame. The supports in place include, but are not limited to multiple meeting times/locations to assist with survey process, meeting at every school with the sixth grade population, reimbursement offered for passing appropriate Praxis II tests (registration, test fees, practice and support materials), and teachers needing to become HQ were offered tutoring support via district personnel as well as the University of Delaware (partnership program). In addition, any teacher who is hired and is not highly qualified will be placed on a temporary contract.

We believe the actions stated will be successful because we are targeting specific teachers and making direct contact and notifying them of the consequences for not following through with the appropriate steps to become highly qualified.

## Question C

C.1

This question is about student access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Refer to the most recent HQT data. Consider race/ ethnicity, English language learners, students with disabilities, and low income status. Which student sub-groups, if any, show a disparity in access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers? Do some schools have greater disparities than others? If disparities exist, cite the schools and state the disparities. Be specific in the response.

For the sub-groups "race/ethnicity", "English language learners", and "low income status" disparities were not significant. However, for "students with disabilities", there were disparities in six schools: Bancroft Elementary (5%), Kirk Middle (6%), Bayard Middle (7%), Shue-Medill Middle (10%), Christiana High (10%), Glasgow High (20%).  
On the other hand, schools with a majority of "students with disabilities", (Douglass Alternative School, Brennen/Delaware Autism Program, and Sterck/Delaware School for the Deaf), more students with disabilities were being taught by HQ teachers than their counterparts.

C.2 Refer to the response to Question C-1.

What specific actions/strategies is the district/charter school taking (or planning to take) to address the student sub-group disparities identified in Question C-1? Be certain to address teacher and student assignment. Be specific in the response.

We will continue with the successful practices of hiring and placement for the three sub-groups noted in C-1.  
The district is working with all teachers who are not highly qualified. The special education population is the most challenging (especially at the secondary level where both subject area and specialized pedagogy are needed). The district is working with the University of Delaware to assist special education teachers in becoming highly qualified. We are a partner in the Teacher Quality Enhancement Project. The University of Delaware is able to provide tutors and additional study materials to assist special education teachers in their endeavor to become HQ.

C.3 Following up on the response to Question C-2...

Why does the district/charter school believe that the actions/strategies stated in C-2 will result in reducing the identified disparities in student access to classes taught by highly qualified teachers? Cite specific evidence, reasons, and/or past experiences

The disparities seem to be a reflection of our special education teachers missing the needed core-content courses and/or Praxis II in those subject areas. The Teacher Quality Enhancement Project was developed to address this very need.

## Question D

D.1 This question is about student access to experienced highly qualified teachers. Experienced teachers have three or more years of teaching experience. Refer to the most recent HQT data.

Do the data show a difference in the percentage of classes taught by experienced highly qualified teachers? (Is the percentage of classes taught by experienced highly qualified teachers greater than that of less experienced teachers?) If differences exist, what are they?

The difference in the percentage of classes taught by HQ teachers with fewer than three years' experience (89.2%) as compared to those with more than three years' experience (95.8%) is a 7.6% gap

D.2 Refer to the response to Question D-1.

What actions/strategies is the district/charter school taking (or planning to take) to make certain that all students have equal access to experienced highly qualified teachers? Be certain to address teacher and student assignment. Be specific in the response.

This discrepancy is a reflection of those teachers who have emergency certification, have been unsuccessful in their Praxis II exams, or were unable to access HOUSSE due to their lack of experience. Any of these teachers who were hired on a temporary contract have not had their contracts renewed. Those few who were hired with permanent contracts will receive notification of consequences. (See A-2) Every attempt is made to place students with highly qualified teachers. This information is made public, and parents have the right/opportunity to request that their child be transferred from a class being taught by a non-HQ teacher.

D.3

Following up on the response to Question D-2...

Why does the district/charter school believe that the actions/strategies will result in all students having equal access to experienced highly qualified teachers? Cite specific evidence, reasons, and/or past experiences.

Since every attempt is made to

- (a) hire only HQ teachers
- (b) support teachers' attainment of HQ status if they are not HQ at time of hire
- (c) provide opportunities for parents to request change in their students' classes

all students have equal access to experienced HQ teachers.

### 3.11 Title II, Part A Plan, Professional Development

---

#### Question A

A.1 Describe how district and school professional development needs are determined, which data are analyzed, and who is involved in the needs-assessment process.

Instructional coaches met in the spring with district office to begin work on the professional development calendar for the district. The main areas of focus at this stage were on content area PD and district-wide initiatives including PLC's, the 90 minute reading block and inclusion. Through the summer of 2009, principals and their school teams will complete a Professional Development Plan detailing the areas of focus for schools based on their school improvement plans and recent student performance data. Instructional coaches work with their assigned school teams and bring this information to district meetings. Trends were established across the district, looking at needs that extended across multiple schools. The district PD plan was revised adding on this information and creating a plan to support building needs as well as roll out district-wide initiatives. Close attention was paid to necessary training/preparation of district staff beyond IC's to deliver PD. These included department chairs or other teacher leaders that were known to excel in instructional areas of need from schools. School PD plans were given back to principals with comments and feedback for the IC's to tighten the district's PD plan.

Student Needs - to determine the District Professional Development needs, a variety of tools and analysis are incorporated. Staff and faculty review disaggregated student achievement data from both the state DSTP and the district assessment (MAP - Measures of Academic Progress and DIBELS) at multiple levels classroom, school, and district. Each school utilizes the 10-step process to develop their School Improvement Plan. The school based team, known as the SIP Team, consists of the School Administrators, at least four teachers, and two parents. At the district level, all school SIP plans and district student achievement data across each grade level in DSTP and MAP are reviewed at the time of submittal. The data is summarized and aligned with the District Strategic Plan, and District/School initiatives in order to determine district-wide Professional Development.

Teacher Needs - Curriculum and Instruction along with Human Resources evaluate district progress toward 100% Highly Qualified each year by school to identify teacher certification and hiring needs and also to establish and validate school needs for professional development based on percentage of highly qualified teachers. Funds are reserved to assist teachers to become highly qualified (e.g. Title I). Enrollment and completion of district-sponsored Professional Development activities are tracked using the web-based software tool, MyLearningPlan.com. The data is reviewed and summarized by the number and type of activities offered, the number of staff participating in professional development offerings by school, grade level and/or content, and the total number of hours offered and the number of participants. This information is used in conjunction with student achievement data and other performance measures to determine next steps and/or gaps in the Professional Development plan for the district.

Administrator Needs - Staff Development that improves the learning of students requires investment in school and district leaders who can guide and promote continuous instructional improvement. To determine the Leadership Development needs of Administrators and aspiring Administrators, the District Staff Members monitor and review the Administrator Evaluations to determine the instructional and operational management training needs of the administrative staff. Principal meetings have been changed in response to principal input. These meetings now focus on principals working in their own PLC's with data monitoring protocols to assess the effectiveness of the activities section of their SIP's in relation to the improvement of student achievement.

**Question B**

B.1 List your priority one professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

Our number one priority for professional development is to ensure that teachers are teaching the core curriculum following DRC and 502 aligned units of study with effective instructional strategies and interventions embedded in their instruction. According to Marzano (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock 2001 and Marzano 2007) effective pedagogy stems from three components all involving how teachers use the following in their classrooms: instructional strategies, management techniques, and curriculum. Since research finds teacher practices as a major indicator to student achievement, the PD of teachers in what they teach and how they teach it becomes our main PD focus.

B.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
- Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

B.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Title I, Title II, SSBG, Local Funds

**Question C**

C.1 List your priority two professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

Establishing collaborative teacher teams focused on student learning and results through the Professional Learning Communities model. According to Defour et. al (2006) this model supports effective teacher teams that address student needs and support continuous improvement in teaching that equates to student success. District protocols for professional learning communities are established to provide continuity across the district.

C.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

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

Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

C.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Title II, Student Success Block Grant

#### Question D

D.1 List your priority three professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

Provide PD and technical support to teachers, support staff, and administrators on an effective model of Response to Intervention (RTI) in the Christina School District. "RTI is the process of providing high quality, scientifically validated, instructional practices based on learner needs, monitoring student progress, and adjusting instruction based on student's response" (Bender & Shores, 2007).

D.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps

Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles

Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom

Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education

Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning

Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

D.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

IDEA-B, Title I, and Title II

#### Question E

E.1 List your priority four professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

Job embedded professional development for school leaders to create systems and practices that translated into improved student performance. Among the areas of focus are effective school structure models, knowledge and involvement in curriculum and instruction, etc. This PD initiative stems from the research behind School Leadership that Works (Marzano et.al., 2005) and is supported by Christina School District's participation in Vision 2015.

E.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps

Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles

- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

E.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Title II, Student Success Block Grant

**Question F**

F.1 List your priority five professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

Professional development for administrators, instructional coaches and teacher leaders focused on LFS, Learning Focused Strategies will address the needs of having common exemplary practice and research based instructional strategies that will raise student achievement. These professional development opportunities will also focus upon student learning maps and how to organize learning into student learning units. This professional development will also focus upon identifying key components for monitoring and walk through protocols throughout the district and identifying "look fors" and "ask fors." This professional development work is based on the work of Dr. Max Thompson and Marzano (2001)

F.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
- Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

F.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

Title II and Student Success Block Grant

**Question G**

G.1 List your priority six professional development activity. In addition, indicate the research basis for the activity (provide citation, key authors, or field of research).

G.2 Check all that apply to this activity.

- Activity designed to improve student academic achievement and eliminate achievement gaps
- Activity designed to help teachers address the needs of students with different learning styles
- Activity designed to help teachers improve student behavior in the classroom
- Activity designed to help teachers involve parents in their child's education
- Activity designed to help teachers understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning
- Activity designed to give principals instructional leadership skills

G.3 List the sources of funds to support this activity.

--

### 3.12 Title II, Part D Technology Plan

---

#### Question A

A.1 Describe the type and costs of technologies to be acquired under Title II, Part D, including services, software, digital curricula, and any specific provisions for interoperability among components of such technologies.

All items purchased with Title IID will (a) improve teacher integration with technology, (b) improve student achievement, or (c) improve school-home or student communication. A description of budgeted items is included below:

Summer work hours for IT curriculum development (a): the work conducted here includes revisions to our technology literacy portfolio assessment program, collaboration with content area instructional coaches, iSAFE internet safety curriculum, Career Technical Educator technology integration projects, LoTi data analysis which informs professional development for the upcoming year

Licensing cost for Inspiration/Kidspiration (a) (b): Inspiration/Kidspiration is concept mapping software. This software is integrated into core curricular areas with an emphasis on writing.

iSAFE curricular materials (c): Curricular materials are used to implement our iSAFE internet safety curriculum. K-12th grade students participate in the iSAFE curriculum and it is one of the components of our Technology Literacy Assessment Portfolio Program. Parent nights are conducted district wide two times a year (fall and spring).

Parent phone web-based communication system (c): a portion of the licensing costs for this system is paid for in Title II D. This system is used to increase district-to-home as well as school-to-home communication.

Instructional Technology software and equipment pilot programs (a) (b):

A) Art: Anamationish software and equipment (projector, tablet, cart). This software is used to create animations and with the use of the tablet and projector can be implemented whole-class or by individual students. The pilot will consist of two art teachers and their classes at two of our elementary schools. These art teachers will develop and implement integrated lessons.

B) Music: Groovy Jungle software (elementary), Sibelius Student software (middle school), Sibelius 6 software (HS), Auralia Ear Training (K-12), Midi USB keyboards (K-12). These titles are composition and notation software pieces. These applications in conjunction with the Midi USB keyboards will make it easier for students to learn how to compose music. The chosen programs provide lessons and give compositional ideas that will help a beginning composer. The ear training software will help students develop better musical skills that are crucial for developing melodic and rhythmic ideas.

A.2 Describe how these technologies will improve the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction OR how they will improve student academic achievement.

Evaluations will be conducted as described in an email between Alyssa Moore and Wendy Modzelewski on 8/25/09. This email is included as an electronic document submitted with the comment response regarding the A.2 item.

**Question B**

B.1 Describe how programs will be developed, where applicable, in collaboration with adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technology. If these programs are not applicable, write N/A.

Not applicable

**Question C**

C.1 Eighth grade technology literacy – As stated in Title II, Part D, LEAs must assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate, with the ability to responsibly use appropriate technology to communicate, solve problems, and access, manage, integrate, evaluate and create information to improve learning in all subject areas and to acquire lifelong knowledge and skills in the 21st century (SETDA, 2003), by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student’s race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability. Describe how the LEA is addressing this for grades K-8 and how this requirement is evaluated.

Christina School District has developed and is in the process of implementing our Technology Literacy Assessment Program. We are using a performance based, electronic portfolio assessment model. Students will successfully complete assessment elements that integrate technology in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, as well as participate in the iSAFE curriculum in order to be considered Technology Literate. Detailed rubrics for each component/element can be provided upon request. Currently 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students participate in the Technology Literacy Assessment Program. However, students are only assessed for Technology Literacy achievement in 8th grade. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year students will be able to test-out earlier if they achieve the standards of the 8th grade rubric for each element. Our long term plan is to create grade level integrated lessons K-5 and 9-12 as well.

During SY 2008-2009 this program was implemented. 8th grade students were required to successfully complete the English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies and iSAFE components to be considered Technology Literate. We had some technological and implementation issues that primarily affected the collection and scoring of the technology literacy assessment data. For SY 2009-2010 we will continue to make enhancements to the system and will move forward with our implementation.

**Question D**

D.1 What is the percentage of students the LEA deems to be technology literate?

Due to the technological and implementation issues described in C.1 we had 11% of our 8th students assessed as technology literate. However, we believe that this may be an under-estimate due to the issues described above in C.1.

## Question E

E.1 Technology Integration – Twenty-five percent (25%) of the Title IID funds must be utilized for high quality professional development. How will the LEA promote initiatives that provide school teachers, principals, and administrators with the capacity to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction that are aligned with challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, through such means as high-quality professional development?

All professional development purchased with Title IID will be high quality professional development. A description of budgeted items is included below:

Summer work hours for Instructional Technology PD: summer professional development includes various topics such as Smart Notebook software, MS Office curriculum integration, Thinkfinity.org, and the integration of Web 2.0 tools. Professional development sessions are offered in a tiered approach so that teachers can move on to more complex technologies and more involved integration as they feel comfortable. PD sessions include how-to information, integration activities and planning, as well as hands-on practice.

Stipend for Instructional Coach for professional development for IT, support, and coaching: The Instructional Coach works with Technology Coordinators (one per building) by providing professional development and coaching so that they can maintain building equipment as well as increase the integration of technology in the classrooms in their building. This work is done in a Professional Learning Community format.

Instructional Technology software and equipment pilot programs:

A) Art: Professional development for the Art pilot will include one full day session, where participants will learn how to use the software and equipment, and two half-day sessions where participants will develop integrated lessons. These lessons will then be implemented in their classrooms and they participate in collaborative reflection after implementation.

B) Music: Professional development for the music pilot will include full day sessions where participants will learn how to use the software and equipment. Teachers will use this information in conjunction with the lessons provided to incorporate the use of the software into their daily curriculum.

E.2 Describe how the LEA will ensure ongoing integration of technology into school curricula and instructional strategies in all schools until technology becomes fully integrated.

Evaluations will be conducted as described in an email between Alyssa Moore and Wendy Modzelewski on 8/25/09. This email is included as an electronic document submitted with the comment response regarding the E.2 item.

## Question F

F.1 The State recommended score for a teacher that is fully integrating technology is a “Levels of Teaching Innovation” (LoTi) level 3. Report the LoTi data for the LEA (Personal Computer Use (PCU), Current Instructional Practices (CIP), and LoTi scores

CSD uses the LoTi Survey to assess teachers' level of technology integration. Our 2008-2009 data shows that 9% of our teachers reported being at a LoTi level 0, 32% at level 1, 42% at level 2, 8% at level 3, 9% at level 4, 0% at level 5, and less than 1% at level 6. PCU: 22% at level 0, 26% at level 1, 24% at level 2, 12% at level 3, 9% at level 4, 4% at level 5, 2% at level 6, and 1% at level 7. CIP: 3% at level 0, 7% at level 1, 16% at level 2, 21% at level 3, 23% at level 4, 16% at level 5, 9% at level 6, and 3% at level 7.

F.2 Describe how the plan detailed in Question E will promote the improvement of these scores.

Our professional development plan detailed in Question E will improve PCU, CIP, and LoTi scores. We provide on-going, high-quality professional development by offering sessions in a tiered format so that we are differentiating by participant readiness levels. All professional development includes an integration component and participants are expected to implement what they've learned and worked on in their classrooms. Professional development strategies and topics are aligned to the ISTE NETS-T, focusing on standards 1: Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity, 2: Design and Develop digital-Age Learning Experiences and Assessments, 3: Model Digital-Age Work and Learning, 4: Promote and Model Digital Citizenship and Responsibility, and 5: Engage in Professional Growth and Leadership.

**Question G**

G.1 Child Internet Protection Act (CIPA) Certification An LEA seeking Title II, Part D Technology funds must certify that one of the following conditions exists. Check one of the following statements:

- Every 'applicable school' has complied with the CIPA requirements in subpart 4 of Part D of Title II of the ESEA. An 'applicable school' is an elementary or secondary school that receives e-rate discounts and for which Enhancing Education Through Technology funds are used to purchase computers used to access the internet or to pay the direct cost associated with accessing the internet.
- Not all 'applicable schools' have yet complied with the requirements in subpart 4 of Part D of Title II of the ESEA. However, the LEA has received a one-year waiver from the U. S. Secretary of Education under section 2442(b) (2) (C) of the ESEA for those applicable schools not yet in compliance.
- The CIPA requirements in the ESEA do not apply to the school because no funds made available under the program are being used to purchase computers to access the internet or to pay for direct costs associated with accessing the internet for elementary and secondary schools that do not receive e-rate services under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

### 3.13 Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006

Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this statute must respond to the requirements listed below, referencing core indicators where applicable. The eligible recipients do not have to use federal funds as a way to meet these requirements, but the following requirements must be met.

#### Question A

A.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to strengthen the academic and career and technical skills of students in CTE programs.

Over the last couple of years all CTE courses went through a rigorous curriculum development and review process to ensure alignment with standards and also integration of core content courses. All CTE courses went through an approval process by DDOE to ensure completeness, rigor, adherence to industry standards and compliance. Perkins, as well as other funds, will be used to update and upgrade the equipment as necessary for the expectations of the courses, as well as provide textbooks and technology to align with industry standard.

A.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide students with strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of an industry.

In developing the curriculum for the CTE courses industry standards and expectations were used. No longer are there isolated courses that stand alone. The CTE pathways start with a basic course that is an overview of the industry and there are sequential courses students must take in order to complete the CTE requirements. Some industries may offer more than one pathway but the core course is still the same. Perkins will be used to support this work with equipment, professional development, textbooks and student competitions.

A.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to develop, improve, or expand the use of technology in CTE.

The use of technology is now expanding beyond the use of computers. CTE courses are using various forms of technology to enhance the curriculum. For instance, SmartBoards are becoming more familiar tool in the classroom for both teachers and students. The Agriculture Department regularly uses available technologies to demonstrate and involve students in the process; the Culinary Department is following the lead. New technologies are continually researched to determine how to best integrate the core content into the CTE classes.

#### Question B

B.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used for inservice and professional development for those involved in integrated CTE programs.

Funds will be used to continually improve the skills of the CTE professionals. For the upcoming year, all CTE staff will be trained on Microsoft 2007, along with other technologies as desired and required. For instance, there will be professional development on the use of Smart Boards as well as integrating it into the specific curriculum. There will be levels offered to meet the needs of the novice, beginner and advanced user. Additionally, for the staff needing training in the technologies used by their industry, opportunities will exist for professional development.

B.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to develop and implement evaluations of the CTE programs.

A percentage of Perkins is used for evaluation of Perkins and the CTE programs. Evaluations will be developed in accordance with the new course expectations. All teachers will be involved in professional development on Learning Focused strategies. Strengthening the teacher's instructional strategies to use in the classroom will assist all students in obtaining the best quality education. Coaching and monitoring are part of the implementation plan. The curriculum work over the past year has aligned the curriculum with the core curriculum. Professional development is needed to ensure teacher content knowledge in the core area.

B.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to initiate, improve, expand, and modernize quality CTE programs.

In developing the curriculum for the CTE courses industry standards and expectations were used. The CTE courses start with a basic overview of the industry and there are sequential courses students must take in order to complete the CTE requirements. Some industries may offer more than one pathway but the core course is still the same. Perkins will be used to support this work with equipment, professional development, textbooks and student competitions. Perkins funds are used to update and modernize the equipment and rooms where classes are held. Students are introduced to the various offerings in the middle school through exploratory courses. All middle schools offer business and technology classes. Family consumer science and agriculture are offered at some of the middle schools. Clubs, such as BPA, offer opportunities for students at the middle level to become familiar with opportunities in the high schools. High schools introduce the pathways offered in the high schools during the 8th grade year as those students prepare for the transition. Course offerings, explained by teachers and counselors, are part of the course catalog that all students receive.

Counselors work with students in the 8th grade year discussing career opportunities and students complete the career inventory as part of this.

### Question C

C.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide services and activities that are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective.

Perkins funds will assist in developing pathways, one at a time that will provide the services and activities that are appropriate for the school. Research is done to ensure that there is a need for the pathway at the school. Through updating courses and ensuring adherence to industry standard and by updating materials and technologies, the resulting opportunities for students will be more appropriate and therefore more motivating. The district has had a decrease in offerings over the past few years. Continued decrease in enrollment and reduction of units has been a challenge. By revamping our offerings through the curriculum alignment and strengthening the curriculum by increasing the connections with the core curriculum, our belief is that there will be an increase in student achievement resulting in overall increase in the desire to attend the programs. As more students enroll in the high schools, the need will be increased to expand the existing programs and pathways.

C.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to provide activities to prepare special populations for high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations that will lead to self-sufficiency.

Perkins funds are used to support the NetWorks program to help prepare special populations for self sufficiency. This program trains students in a variety of areas, including GreenWorks, BeadWorks, FloralWorks, TeamWorks, AutoWorks, etc. to ensure students have the skills and find an area that best meets their needs.

C.3 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to foster enrollment of students (male or female) in pathways that are non-traditional for their gender.

The updated curriculum and courses will assist in fostering enrollment of students in pathways. The student associations related to the CTE pathways are a way of building connections between the students, staff and the pathways. The advisory groups in each area also assist as students ready to leave the high school experience. Having other opportunities such as the Tech Prep and the SEED program will also assist in this effort.

### Question D

D.1 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to assist non-traditional students to complete the pathways in which they are enrolled.

Once a student is enrolled in a pathway, there is a requirement to complete three courses. There may be an opportunity for a student to change a pathway once, however, the graduation requirement is for students to complete a pathway. Perkins will assist in ensuring classes have up to date equipment and materials.

D.2 Explain how Perkins and/or other funds will be used to ensure that disproportionate enrollment by gender, race and ethnicity is not caused by any type of discrimination or “tracking”.

All CTE classes are open to all students and every student has an opportunity to participate regardless of gender, race or ethnicity. There is no tracking of any class. Students are expected to follow the pathway and take courses sequentially.

D.3 How are federal and state funds being directed to ensure that all required Perkins targets are met? What specifically is being done to meet the targets that were not met this past year?

Administrators and staff regularly meet to discuss CTE classes, what the needs are and what targets are met and not met. Adjustments are made to the schedule as needed. The Advisory groups meet regularly in each CTE area and make recommendations that assist in ensuring the programs are successful.

**4.0 Budgeted Items**

Input the LEA-level and school- level budgeted items and their funding sources:

**For Salaries and Personnel:** Give name, position % FTE, hourly/daily rate, number of hours/days

**For Contracted Services and Travel:** List vendor, type of service, and show fee/daily rate or number of days. For travel, list the position of persons traveling, destination and specific costs of items and rates

**For Materials and Supplies:** List item(s), description, quantity, unit price, school, and program, as applicable

**For Capital outlay:** List item(s), description, quantity and unit price, school, and program, as applicable

**Please note:** OEC rates are based upon the Governor's approved budget as of July 1, 2008. These rates are subject to change several times before June 30th and will be updated when the final budget has been approved on or about July 1, 2009.

**Budgeted Item Detail**

***Federal Budget Summary***

Classification	Account	Activity	IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Salaries / Employee Costs	Professional: Instruction	Reading Intervention Coach (1 FTE - Cindy LaRiccia) - EIS *		\$73,500.00							\$73,500.00
		PD on Supporting Second Language Learners - Stipends *							\$10,000.00		\$10,000.00
		Secondary Math PD (P-Cubed, SBTL, School Based Teacher Leaders and Converging Curriculum) *					\$5,553.00				\$5,553.00
		Lead Special Services Stipend (3 FTE) *		\$15,000.00							\$15,000.00
		Transition Coordinator *		\$70,000.00							\$70,000.00
		Parent Liaisons (1.1 FTE) *				\$65,000.00					\$65,000.00
		Title I and ELL parenting workshops and materials (AA, Hispanic, General), includes transportation and food for parents and children *				\$2,000.00					\$2,000.00
		Homeless Liaison (0.9 FTE) *				\$65,930.00					\$65,930.00

		IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Salaries / Employee Costs	Professional: Instruction				\$345,004.00					\$345,004.00
					\$90,061.00	\$14,569.00			\$1,325.00	\$105,955.00
					\$1,375,000.00					\$1,375,000.00
						\$19,833.00				\$19,833.00
						\$558,000.00				\$558,000.00
						\$62,000.00				\$62,000.00
						\$116,620.00				\$116,620.00
						\$7,933.00				\$7,933.00
							\$5,000.00			\$5,000.00
		\$62,000.00								\$62,000.00
		\$217,000.00								\$217,000.00
			\$70,000.00							\$70,000.00
			\$68,960.00							\$68,960.00
			\$15,000.00							\$15,000.00
			\$31,949.00							\$31,949.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Salaries / Employee Costs	Professional: Instruction	Stipend for instructional coach for PD for IT, support, coaching *						\$7,174.00			\$7,174.00
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$279,000.00	\$344,409.00		\$1,942,995.00	\$784,508.00	\$12,174.00	\$10,000.00	\$1,325.00	\$3,374,411.00
	Professional: Administration	Aspiring Leaders (2 FTE) *					\$124,000.00				\$124,000.00
		<b>Account Total</b>					\$124,000.00				\$124,000.00
	Support Staff	Grant Administrative Support *				\$41,382.00	\$6,694.00			\$608.00	\$48,684.00
		Pre-School Para-Professional (1 FTE) *	\$26,112.00								\$26,112.00
		Para- Professionals (60) *		\$1,514,499.00							\$1,514,499.00
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$26,112.00	\$1,514,499.00		\$41,382.00	\$6,694.00			\$608.00	\$1,589,295.00
	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes, EPER, and others )	Intervening Services Support - EIS *		\$214,722.00							\$214,722.00
		Psychologist Interns (3 FTE) *		\$35,000.00							\$35,000.00
		<b>Account Total</b>		\$249,722.00							\$249,722.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	\$144,422.59	\$1,220,903.02		\$1,513,197.75	\$380,201.20	\$3,180.46	\$2,965.00	\$829.99	\$3,265,700.01
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$144,422.59	\$1,220,903.02		\$1,513,197.75	\$380,201.20	\$3,180.46	\$2,965.00	\$829.99	\$3,265,700.01
	<b>Classification Total</b>		\$449,534.59	\$3,329,533.02	\$0.00	\$3,497,574.75	\$1,295,403.20	\$15,354.46	\$12,965.00	\$2,762.99	\$8,603,128.01
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	PD for Early Interventions in Reading - Subs *					\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
		PD for integration of Technology - Substitutes *					\$12,000.00				\$12,000.00
		Subs for 8th grade Tech Literacy Requirement *					\$6,800.00				\$6,800.00
		PD on Supporting Second Language Learners - Substitutes *							\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
		PD on RtI - Substitutes *					\$16,000.00				\$16,000.00
		Teacher Instructional Best Practice *					\$60,000.00				\$60,000.00
		PD on DPAS-II - Substitutes *					\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00

		IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction					\$45,000.00				\$45,000.00
	SIP PD subs *									
	Establish District and School Level Action Team for Partnerships from Epstein's Six Types of Involvement - NNPS partnerships including PD, and Technical Assistance *				\$10,000.00					\$10,000.00
	Title I and ELL parenting workshops and materials (AA, Hispanic, General), includes transportation and food for parents and children *				\$8,000.00			\$8,000.00		\$16,000.00
	CSD Parent Conference, including location, food, transportation, advertising *				\$15,000.00					\$15,000.00
	Parent phone and web based communication system *				\$37,000.00		\$3,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$50,000.00
	PD on eSchool Grade Book to support better data in Home Access Center *					\$3,000.00				\$3,000.00
	School Climate and Classroom Management PD - Substitutes *					\$35,000.00				\$35,000.00
	AP Institute Registration Fees *					\$7,800.00				\$7,800.00
	Private School - Related Services *		\$40,300.00							\$40,300.00
	Choice Transportation *				\$312,002.00					\$312,002.00
	Other Choice or SES Reservation *				\$436,803.00					\$436,803.00
	Private School - Instruction *				\$93,118.00					\$93,118.00
	Private School - Parent Involvement set-aside *				\$6,901.00					\$6,901.00
	Private School school contract administration *				\$16,000.00					\$16,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	School allocation - Parent Involvement (1% distributed to schools). Expenditures include transportation for parents to and from school, guest speakers, food for parents and students, books for parents to take home to read with their children *				\$31,200.00					\$31,200.00
		SES Minimum Set-Aside *				\$312,002.00					\$312,002.00
		Private School Allocation for Title II, II-D, and IV *					\$18,314.00				\$18,314.00
		Federal Audit Fee *		\$2,064.00	\$2,064.00	\$2,064.00	\$2,064.00				\$8,256.00
		Intervening Services Support - EIS *		\$280,000.00							\$280,000.00
		Parent Support Deaf Blind Program *		\$10,000.00							\$10,000.00
		Professional Development for speech and psychologist licensure *		\$5,000.00							\$5,000.00
		Special Education Related Services *		\$250,000.00							\$250,000.00
		School-Wide Allocations - Supplemental expenditures based on Needs Assessment and Comprehensive plans. Expenditures include teachers both full and part-time interventionists, stipends for after school professional development, mentor coordinators (approximately 22 FTE), mileage to PD sessions held in Dover or travel to other schools to observe classrooms, contracted counselors or behavior interventionists, intervention supplies, SMART boards and other technology. *				\$535,824.00					\$535,824.00
		HR Support for Teacher induction and qualification *					\$16,000.00				\$16,000.00
		My Learning Plan License Fees *					\$17,250.00				\$17,250.00
		Praxis II Test Fees *					\$3,400.00				\$3,400.00

		IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction					\$120,000.00				\$120,000.00
	School PD Allocation *									
	Subs - PD for non-core subjects *					\$17,010.00				\$17,010.00
	Substitutes for PD for Core Subjects *					\$378,427.00				\$378,427.00
	License Fees for Kidspiration/Inspiration *						\$13,182.00			\$13,182.00
	Subs for 509 tech, librarians, MLP *					\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
	ATOD Prevention Services-Middle Schools *								\$12,193.00	\$12,193.00
	Douglass Alternative School - Elementary Counseling and Behavior Intervention Services *								\$97,608.00	\$97,608.00
	School Climate Services - De-escalation, counseling, PD *								\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
	Childfind - PD and substitutes for PD *	\$10,000.00								\$10,000.00
	Portables-Brader *	\$36,676.00								\$36,676.00
	District Success Plan Data Gathering and Analysis Support *		\$4,000.00		\$5,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$16,000.00
	Extra Time - ESY Summer School - Transportation *		\$95,537.00							\$95,537.00
	ELL Summer School Transportation *							\$100,000.00		\$100,000.00
	Childfind - Related Services *	\$21,171.90								\$21,171.90
	Gauger -BPA/FCCLA Advisory travel expenses and fees *			\$3,500.00						\$3,500.00
	Bayard - Exploring Business - Net Support *			\$10,158.00						\$10,158.00
	CHS - Business - Software License Fees *			\$2,333.00						\$2,333.00
	Computer/Technical Support *			\$86,458.00						\$86,458.00
	Networks- Floralworks - FFA attendance fees, lessons *			\$10,000.00						\$10,000.00
Regional and National Student Conferences and competitions - Student and Staff fees *			\$5,000.00						\$5,000.00	

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total	
Contracted Services	Professional: Instruction	SPA - Business - Student/Teacher Conferencing *			\$600.00						\$600.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$67,847.90	\$686,901.00	\$120,113.00	\$1,820,914.00	\$776,065.00	\$17,182.00	\$120,000.00	\$120,801.00	\$3,729,823.90	
	Fixed Charges		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	<b>Classification Total</b>			\$67,847.90	\$686,901.00	\$120,113.00	\$1,820,914.00	\$776,065.00	\$17,182.00	\$120,000.00	\$120,801.00	\$3,729,823.90
	Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	PD materials for New Teacher Induction *					\$2,000.00				\$2,000.00
			Instructional technology software and equipment: Pilot for using technology to significantly enhance Art and Music instruction *						\$18,317.85			\$18,317.85
			SIP PD materials *					\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
Title I and ELL parenting workshops and materials (AA, Hispanic, General), includes transportation and food for parents and children *						\$5,000.00			\$5,000.00		\$10,000.00	
CSD Parent Conference, including location, food, transportation, advertising *						\$5,000.00					\$5,000.00	
Support for Stop the Violence Campaign *						\$20,000.00					\$20,000.00	
Investigate district parent resource centers *						\$5,000.00					\$5,000.00	
Parent Guide including Translations *						\$10,000.00			\$4,000.00		\$14,000.00	
School Climate and Classroom Management PD - Materials *							\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00	
Private School Allocation for Title II, II-D, and IV *							\$9,268.00	\$12,132.00		\$26,284.00	\$47,684.00	

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	School-Wide Allocations - Supplemental expenditures based on Needs Assessment and Comprehensive plans. Expenditures include teachers both full and part-time interventionists, stipends for after school professional development, mentor coordinators (approximately 22 FTE), milage to PD sessions held in Dover or travel to other schools to observe classrooms, contracted counselors or behavior interventionists, intervention supplies, SMART boards and other technology. *				\$348,286.00					\$348,286.00
		Title I Admin (Choice Mailings/Copying/M&S) *				\$18,104.00					\$18,104.00
		Materials and Supplies to support PD *					\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		Revised curriculum distribution *					\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
		ISAFE curriculum *						\$20,000.00			\$20,000.00
		ELL Instructional Materials and Supplies *							\$28,316.40		\$28,316.40
		Great Body Shop Instructional materials *								\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
		Childfind-Assistive Technology *	\$16,227.00								\$16,227.00
		Childfind - Materials and Supplies *	\$9,700.00								\$9,700.00
		CHS - Business - Printers and Supplies *			\$2,325.00						\$2,325.00
		Gauger - Tech Ed - Software and materials *			\$5,681.00						\$5,681.00
		GHS - Business - BPA NLC for students *			\$3,000.00						\$3,000.00
		Kirk - Business - Student workbooks, CD's, textbooks, software, career fair *			\$8,005.00						\$8,005.00
		Networks - Munchworks - Kitchen equipment and supplies *			\$1,719.00						\$1,719.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Networks- Autoworks - Other Auto cleaning equipment and supplies *			\$2,533.00						\$2,533.00
		Shue- Business - Software Licenses *			\$358.00						\$358.00
		Shue- Tech Ed - Lego/K'Nex kits; texts; software *			\$8,700.00						\$8,700.00
		SPA - Business - Lego/K'Nex kits; texts; software *			\$3,490.00						\$3,490.00
		SPA - Business - Software Licenses *			\$334.00						\$334.00
	<b>Account Total</b>		\$25,927.00		\$36,145.00	\$411,390.00	\$41,268.00	\$50,449.85	\$37,316.40	\$31,284.00	\$633,780.25
	Professional: Administration	School allocation - Parent Involvement (1% distributed to schools). Expenditures include transportation for parents to and from school, guest speakers, food for parents and students, books for parents to take home to read with their children *				\$31,200.00					\$31,200.00
	<b>Account Total</b>				\$31,200.00						\$31,200.00
	<b>Classification Total</b>		\$25,927.00		\$36,145.00	\$442,590.00	\$41,268.00	\$50,449.85	\$37,316.40	\$31,284.00	\$664,980.25
Capital Outlay	Capital Outlay	Instructional technology software and equipment: Pilot for using technology to significantly enhance Art and Music instruction						\$11,000.00			\$11,000.00

			IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Capital Outlay	Capital Outlay	School-Wide Allocations - Supplemental expenditures based on Needs Assessment and Comprehensive plans. Expenditures include teachers both full and part-time interventionists, stipends for after school professional development, mentor coordinators (approximately 22 FTE), milage to PD sessions held in Dover or travel to other schools to observe classrooms, contracted counselors or behavior interventionists, intervention supplies, SMART boards and other technology.				\$80,000.00					\$80,000.00
		Shue - FCS - Computer Furniture *			\$12,000.00						\$12,000.00
		Bayard - Exploring Business - Variquest Equipment			\$14,980.00						\$14,980.00
		CHS - Business - Upgrade computers and workstations and obtain Smartboards			\$56,691.00						\$56,691.00
		Gauger - Computer Tech - Computer upgrade			\$38,652.00						\$38,652.00
		GHS - Business - Lab Upgrade including computers, SmartBoards, projectors, furniture, printers			\$63,000.00						\$63,000.00
		Kirk - Business - Smartboards, laptop			\$4,927.00						\$4,927.00
		NHS - BPA - Laptops			\$3,106.00						\$3,106.00
		NHS - DECA - Computers, printers, projectors *			\$55,894.00						\$55,894.00
		Shue - Technology/F&CS - Computer lab upgrade			\$37,376.00						\$37,376.00
		<b>Account Total</b>			\$286,626.00	\$80,000.00		\$11,000.00			\$377,626.00
	Maintenance of Plant		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<b>Classification Total</b>		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$286,626.00	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	\$11,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$377,626.00

Travel	Professional: Instruction	Private School Allocation for Title II, II-D, and IV *				\$10,000.00				\$10,000.00
		School-Wide Allocations - Supplemental expenditures based on Needs Assessment and Comprehensive plans. Expenditures include teachers both full and part- time interventionists, stipends for after school professional development, mentor coordinators (approximately 22 FTE), milage to PD sessions held in Dover or travel to other schools to observe classrooms, contracted counselors or behavior interventionists, intervention supplies, SMART boards and other technology. *			\$8,930.00					\$8,930.00
		Conference Travel to support Title I program (Title I program manager, and parent liaison attendance at National Title I conference, BOE member attendance at Title I ESEA Parent Conferences, minor support of parents attending local and regional conferences) *			\$17,000.00					\$17,000.00
		Core Professional Development *				\$4,000.00				\$4,000.00
		District Level Professional Development *				\$5,000.00				\$5,000.00
		Instructional coach training and PD *				\$16,000.00				\$16,000.00
		Non-Core Professional Development *				\$4,000.00				\$4,000.00
		Childfind - Conference and PD expenses *	\$5,000.00							\$5,000.00
		CHS - Business - BPA and DECA travel and fees *		\$4,000.00						\$4,000.00
		Gauger - BPA/FCCLA Advisory travel expenses and fees *		\$3,500.00						\$3,500.00
		Kirk - Business - Advisory travel expenses and fees *		\$7,000.00						\$7,000.00
		NHS Bus Ed - BPA/DECA travel and fees *		\$11,000.00						\$11,000.00

		IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Perkins	Title I	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III	Title IV	Total
Travel	Professional: Instruction	<b>Account Total</b>	\$5,000.00		\$25,500.00	\$25,930.00	\$39,000.00			\$95,430.00
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		<b>Classification Total</b>	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$25,500.00	\$25,930.00	\$39,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$95,430.00
	<b>Federal</b>	\$548,309.49	\$4,016,434.02	\$468,384.00	\$5,867,008.75	\$2,151,736.20	\$93,986.31	\$170,281.40	\$154,847.99	\$13,470,988.16
	<b>* - Allow Indirect Cost Total</b>									

**State Budget Summary**

Classification	Account	Activity	Professional Development	Total	
Salaries / Employee Costs	Professional: Instruction	Parent Partnership Administrator (.3FTE)	\$32,574.24	\$32,574.24	
		Director - Elementary C&I and PD	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	
		Director - Secondary C&I and PD	\$54,304.00	\$54,304.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$136,878.24	\$136,878.24	
	Students (with WC and UI)		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	OEC	Total OECs	\$48,162.76	\$48,162.76	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$48,162.76	\$48,162.76	
	<b>Classification Total</b>			\$185,041.00	\$185,041.00
	Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction	Teacher Handbook	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
<b>Account Total</b>			\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	
<b>Classification Total</b>			\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	
Contracted Services	Fixed Charges		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Classification Total</b>			\$0.00
Travel	Professional: Administration		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	<b>Classification Total</b>			\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		<b>Account Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	<b>Classification Total</b>			\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>State Total</b>			\$215,041.00	\$215,041.00	

**OEC Summary**

<b>Program</b>	<b>FICA</b>	<b>Medicare</b>	<b>Pension</b>	<b>Workman's Comp</b>	<b>Unemployment</b>	<b>Health Ins. \ Non Taxed Benefits</b>	<b>Total OEC Cost</b>
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Curriculum and Professional Development	\$8,486.45	\$1,984.74	\$20,901.31	\$2,737.56	\$232.70	\$13,820.00	\$48,162.76
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	\$18,916.94	\$4,424.12	\$46,590.60	\$6,102.24	\$518.69	\$67,870.00	\$144,422.59
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	\$130,735.06	\$30,575.14	\$283,855.25	\$42,172.60	\$3,584.67	\$729,980.30	\$1,220,903.02
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	\$123,031.37	\$28,773.46	\$303,014.36	\$39,687.54	\$3,373.44	\$1,015,317.58	\$1,513,197.75
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	\$56,742.54	\$13,270.43	\$139,751.34	\$18,304.04	\$1,555.85	\$150,577.00	\$380,201.20
Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology	\$754.79	\$176.52	\$1,858.97	\$243.48	\$20.70	\$126.00	\$3,180.46
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students	\$620.00	\$145.00	\$1,527.00	\$200.00	\$17.00	\$456.00	\$2,965.00
Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	\$119.85	\$28.03	\$295.17	\$38.66	\$3.28	\$345.00	\$829.99
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$339,407.00</b>	<b>\$79,377.44</b>	<b>\$797,794.00</b>	<b>\$109,486.12</b>	<b>\$9,306.33</b>	<b>\$1,978,491.88</b>	<b>\$3,313,862.77</b>

## Indirect Cost Summary

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Direct Program Charges</b>	<b>Indirect Cost Rate</b>	<b>Indirect Cost Billable</b>
Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	\$249,652.00	6.44 %	\$16,069.60
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	\$548,309.49	6.44 %	\$35,315.51
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	\$4,016,434.02	6.44 %	\$259,049.38
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	\$5,787,008.75	6.44 %	\$373,034.25
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	\$2,151,736.20	6.44 %	\$138,615.75
Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology	\$82,986.31	6.44 %	\$5,343.04
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students	\$170,281.40	2.00 %	\$10,967.60
Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	\$154,847.99	6.44 %	\$9,970.62
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$13,161,256.16</b>		<b>\$848,365.75</b>

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: Christina

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

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

PROJECT TITLE: IDEA 3-5

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$305,112.00	\$67,847.90	\$5,000.00	\$25,927.00				\$403,886.90
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$144,422.59				\$35,315.51			\$179,738.10
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$449,534.59	\$67,847.90	\$5,000.00	\$25,927.00	\$35,315.51			\$583,625.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew

(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: Christina

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

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

PROJECT TITLE: IDEA 6-21

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$2,108,630.00	\$686,901.00						\$2,795,531.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$1,220,903.02				\$259,049.38			\$1,479,952.40
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$3,329,533.02	\$686,901.00			\$259,049.38			\$4,275,483.40

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegeudus, Andrew

(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: Christina

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

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

PROJECT TITLE: Perkins

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200		\$120,113.00	\$25,500.00	\$36,145.00				\$181,758.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800					\$16,069.60			\$16,069.60
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200						\$286,626.00		\$286,626.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>19000</b>								
<b>Total Budget</b>			\$120,113.00	\$25,500.00	\$36,145.00	\$16,069.60	\$286,626.00		\$484,453.60

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew

(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: Christina

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

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

PROJECT TITLE: Title I

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100				\$31,200.00				\$31,200.00
Instruction	200	\$1,984,377.00	\$1,820,914.00	\$25,930.00	\$411,390.00				\$4,242,611.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$1,513,197.75				\$373,034.25			\$1,886,232.00
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200						\$80,000.00		\$80,000.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>19000</b>								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$3,497,574.75	\$1,820,914.00	\$25,930.00	\$442,590.00	\$373,034.25	\$80,000.00		\$6,240,043.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew

(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: Christina \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

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

PROJECT TITLE: Title II (Part A) \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009 \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010 \_\_\_\_\_

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100	\$124,000.00							\$124,000.00
Instruction	200	\$791,202.00	\$776,065.00	\$39,000.00	\$41,268.00				\$1,647,535.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$380,201.20				\$138,615.75			\$518,816.95
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$1,295,403.20	\$776,065.00	\$39,000.00	\$41,268.00	\$138,615.75			\$2,290,351.95

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew \_\_\_\_\_

(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: Christina \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

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

PROJECT TITLE: Title II (Part D) \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009 \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010 \_\_\_\_\_

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$12,174.00	\$17,182.00		\$50,449.85				\$79,805.85
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$3,180.46				\$5,343.04			\$8,523.50
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200						\$11,000.00		\$11,000.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>19000</b>								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$15,354.46	\$17,182.00		\$50,449.85	\$5,343.04	\$11,000.00		\$99,329.35

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew \_\_\_\_\_

(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: Christina \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

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

PROJECT TITLE: Title III \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009 \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010 \_\_\_\_\_

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$10,000.00	\$120,000.00		\$37,316.40				\$167,316.40
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$2,965.00				\$10,967.60			\$13,932.60
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>19000</b>								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$12,965.00	\$120,000.00		\$37,316.40	\$10,967.60			\$181,249.00

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew \_\_\_\_\_

(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: Christina \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

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

PROJECT TITLE: Title IV \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINNING: 9/4/2009 \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 12/31/2010 \_\_\_\_\_

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$1,933.00	\$120,801.00		\$31,284.00				\$154,018.00
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$829.99				\$9,970.62			\$10,800.61
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
Total Expenditures	19000								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$2,762.99	\$120,801.00		\$31,284.00	\$9,970.62			\$164,818.61

CHIEF OFFICER: Lyles, Marcia \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew \_\_\_\_\_

(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:  X

**SUBMIT EXPENDITURE REPORT TO:**

(Not Required)

AGENCY: Christina

PROJECT BUDGET PERIOD

PROJECT TITLE: Professional Development

BEGINNING: 7/1/2009

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING: 8/31/2010

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 / Employee Costs	Contracted Services	Travel	Supplies and Materials	Indirect Costs	Capital Outlay	Total Expenditures	Total Budget
Account	Acct. No								
Administration	100								
Instruction	200	\$136,878.24			\$30,000.00				\$166,878.24
Attendance Service	300								
Health Services	400								
Pupil Transportation Services	500								
Operation of Plant	600								
Maintenance of Plant	700								
Fixed Charges	800	\$48,162.76							\$48,162.76
Food Services	900								
Student Body Activities	1000								
Community Service	1100								
Capital Outlay	1200								
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>19000</b>								
<b>Total Budget</b>		\$185,041.00			\$30,000.00				\$215,041.00

DATE: 8/27/2009

PERSON COMPLETING REPORT: Hegedus, Andrew

5.1 Maintenance of Effort

Refer to Section 14501 of ESEA, 20 U.S.C. §8891 and OMB Circular A-87

Retrieve Data from the Annual Financial Statement for Fiscal Year 2008 and compare to Fiscal Year 2007

Instruction	FY2008		FY2007	
Total Expenditures (line 1999)	\$244,809,568.00		\$242,991,284.00	
<b>Less:</b>				
Instate Tuition (line 0152)	\$15,144,505.00		\$21,176,507.00	
Capital Outlay (line 0170, 0270, 0370, 0470, 0570, 0670, 0770, 0870, 0970)	\$287,394.00		\$146,993.00	
Community Services (line 1299)	\$0.00		\$0.00	
Adult Education (line 1399)	\$1,698,656.00		\$1,470,931.00	
Facilities Acquisition (line 1499)	\$22,807,431.00		\$18,579,082.00	
Debt Service (line 1599)	\$16,835,544.00	\$56,773,530.00	\$15,408,176.00	\$56,781,689.00
Subtotal	<b>\$188,036,038.00</b>		<b>\$186,209,595.00</b>	
<b>Less:</b>				
Federal Expenditures (line 3999 less Adult Basic Ed)	\$13,733,974.00		\$9,493,036.00	
Subtotal	<b>\$174,302,064.00</b>		<b>\$176,716,559.00</b>	
<b>Divided By:</b>				
September 30 Enrollment	14629		15752	
Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2006	\$11,914.83		\$11,218.67	
Less: Total per student non-federal expenditure for FY 2007 (in block)	\$11,218.67			
<b>Total increase/(decrease)</b>	\$696.16			

&#160;

## 5.2 Excess Cost for IDEA

---

### Worksheet

#### **FUNDING TOTALS WORKSHEET USE 2005-2006 FUNDS FOR THIS PAGE**

611(g) For use in calculating Excess Cost and Non Supplanting/Maintenance of Effort for FY 2008 2007-2008 IDEA Part B applications. Use data from second preceding school year 2005-2006.

**A. State Funds Expended In:**

1. Special Education Units, Division I	\$22,396,273.00
2. Special Education Units, Division III	\$2,946,453.00
3. Speech Pathology Units	\$1,212,938.00
4. Psychology Units, Prorated for Spec. Ed.	\$925,894.00
5. Related Services Units	\$644,017.00
6. Purchase of Service	\$792,111.00
7. Special Education Transportation	\$5,539,777.00
8. Division II, Other Costs Prorated for Spec. Ed.	\$2,846,023.00
9. Private Placement	\$1,165,237.00
10. Academic Excellence	\$565,362.00
11. Other:	\$12,916,519.00
<b>Subtotal A, State</b>	<b>\$51,950,604.00</b>

**B. Local Funds Expended In:**

1. Special Education Teacher Salary	\$6,959,029.00
2. Special Education Teacher Supplement	\$0.00
3. Special Education Transportation	\$1,212,938.00
4. Local Funds, Prorated for Special Education	\$14,666,546.00
5. Private Placement	\$823,982.00
6. Academic Excellence	\$159.00
7. Tuition	\$842,440.00
8. Other:	\$0.00

<b>Subtotal B, Local</b>	\$23,411,881.00
<b>C. Federal Funds Expended In:</b>	
1. IDEA, Part B, Basic Grant	\$4,183,586.00
2. IDEA Preschool	\$173,428.00
3. IDEA Transition/TQM	\$0.00
4. Title I Basic Concentration	\$4,594,751.00
5. Title I, School Improvement	\$171,721.00
6. Title I, Neglected & Delinquent	\$0.00
7. Title I, Migrant	\$0.00
8. Bilingual/LEP Education	\$0.00
9. Other:	\$248,911.00
<b>Subtotal C, Federal</b>	<u>\$13,771,392.00</u>

List for Item II. under Excess Cost Computation;  
include subtotals A, B and C. Total # 1 (A+B+C) \$89,133,877.00

List for total funds expended under Non Supplanting/ Maintenance of Effort  
Computation;  
include only subtotals A and B. (NO FEDERAL FUNDS) Total #2 (A+B) \$75,362,485.00

## Excess Cost

611(g) Excess Cost - Computation for school year 2005-2006 (For FY2008 IDEA Part B application)

Requirement:

(a)(1) General. An LEA meets the excess cost requirement if it has spent at least a minimum average amount for the education of its children with disabilities before funds under Part B of the Act are used.

(2) The amount described in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is determined using the formula in 611(g); (20 U.S.C. 1401(7); 1413(a)(2)(A)). This amount may not include capital outlay or or debt servic

Procedure:

On the Funding Totals Worksheet below, list expenditures from State, local and federal funding sources which must be deducted from total current expenditures to obtain net excess cost expenditures calculated below.

I	List Total Current Expense, NOT including capital outlay, debt, service, outgoing within State tuition payments, community services (see Report of Educational Statistics, Total Expenses Summary by District, Table 37).	\$221,814,777.00	(A)
		<b>(Funds for 2005-2006)</b>	
II	List total Expenditures To Be Deducted (From Funding Totals Worksheet, page #6, Total #1).	\$89,133,877.00	(B)
		<b>(page 6 - Total 1 (A+B+C))</b>	
	NET EXPENDITURES (A) less (B)	\$132,680,900.00	(C)
III	Divide the Net Expenditures (C) by the Average Daily Membership (Total K-12 ADM as reported in the Report of Educational Statistics, Average Daily Membership).		
	School District Average Daily Membership (ADM) Total:	\$17,292.00	
	Net Expenditures = PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE (Average Daily Membership)	\$7,672.96	(D)

**Non-Supplanting**

611(18);(20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(18)(A)-(D); 20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(2)(A)-(C) Non-Supplanting/Maintenance of Effort - Computation for school year 2005-2006 [For FY 2008 (school year 2007-2008) IDEA Part B applications]

Requirement:

(a) Each [local] application must provide assurance satisfactory to the State educational agency that the local educational agency uses funds provided under Part B of the Act to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State and local funds expended for the education of handicapped children, and in no case to supplant those State and local funds.

(b) To meet the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section:

(1) The total amount or average per capita amount of State and local school funds budgeted by the local educational agency for expenditures in the current fiscal year for the education of handicapped children must be at least equal to the total amount or average per capita amount of State and local school funds actually expended for the education of handicapped children in the most recent preceding fiscal year for which the information is available. Allowance may be made for:

(i) Decreases in enrollment of handicapped children; and

(ii) Unusually large amounts of funds expended for such long-term purposes as the acquisition of equipment and the construction of school facilities, and

(2) The local educational agency must not use Part B funds to displace State and local funds for any particular cost.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(1)(2)(A)-(D)

Procedure:

For first (baseline) amount (A), refer to application of year indicated below.

For second line amount (B), refer to the Funding Totals Worksheet.

Total # 2 on the Worksheet includes State and local funding sources for last preceding year.

This total must be subtracted from the baseline amount to obtain a difference (C).

2004-05            \$65,741,531.00 (A) (Obtain from FY 2007 proposal file for 2004-2005)

**(Funds for 2005-2006)**

2005-06            \$75,362,485.00 (A) (Obtain from FY 2007 proposal file for 2004-2005)

Difference            (\$9,620,954.00) (C) (If result is "0" or a negative number, the agency has met non-supplanting requirements of Reg. 300-230 (b-c). If result is a positive number, the agency has spent less in the following year. A written explanation, as to why the lesser amount of funds, must be attached).  
(A) less (B)

NOTE: To meet requirement of Reg. 300.230(c), the agency must not use Part B funds to displace State or local funds for any particular cost, and must maintain records to demonstrate compliance.

### 5.3 Distribution of Funds

---

#### **Federal LEA Distribution**

	<b>Perkins</b>	<b>IDEA 3-5</b>	<b>IDEA 6-21</b>	<b>Title I</b>	<b>Title II (Part A)</b>	<b>Title II (Part D)</b>	<b>Title III</b>	<b>Title IV</b>
Indirect Cost	\$9,508.00	\$35,311.00	\$258,682.00	\$372,706.00	\$138,574.00	\$5,344.00	\$3,554.00	\$4,801.00
Audit Fee	\$2,064.00		\$2,064.00	\$2,064.00	\$2,064.00			
LEA-wide Programs	\$76,371.65	\$548,314.00	\$2,932,435.40	\$2,119,448.00	\$1,958,751.95	\$81,893.35	\$176,695.00	\$31,298.61
Part B funds used for EIS			\$641,274.00					
Administration Cost				\$210,384.00	\$33,465.00		\$1,000.00	\$4,770.00

#### **Federal Public School Distribution**

	<b>Title I</b>	<b>Title IV</b>	<b>Perkins</b>	<b>IDEA 3-5</b>	<b>IDEA 6-21</b>	<b>Title II (Part A)</b>	<b>Title II (Part D)</b>	<b>Title III</b>
Bancroft Elem	217874.00	0.00						
Bayard Middle	398322.00		25138.09			43000.00		
Brader Elem	0.00	0.00		0.00	15000.00	11000.00		
Brookside Elem	209186.00	0.00			75000.00			
Downes Elem		0.00			15000.00	11000.00		
Elbert-Palmer Elem	187799.00	0.00			75000.00			
Gallaher Elem	165866.00	0.00						
Jones Elem	167689.00	0.00						
Keene Elem	129412.00	0.00			30000.00	11000.00		
Leasure Elem	199282.00	0.00						
Maclary Elem	84756.00	0.00			30000.00	11000.00		
Marshall Elem	0.00	0.00			15000.00	11000.00		
McVey Elem	162828.00	0.00						
Pulaski Elem	263988.00	0.00						
Smith Elem	179840.00	0.00						
Stubbs Elem	233914.00	0.00						

	Title I	Title IV	Perkins	IDEA 3-5	IDEA 6-21	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title III
West Park Place Elem	0.00	0.00			15000.00	11000.00		
Wilson Elem	114223.00	0.00			30000.00	11000.00		
Christiana High	89070.00		67348.80					
Networks			14252.00					
Gauger-Cobbs Middle	81293.00		51130.06					
Glasgow High	86761.00		66000.00					
Kirk Middle	59542.00		28333.00					
Newark High	104988.00		70000.00					
Shue-Medill Middle	65982.00		62934.00					
Pyle Academy			11374.00					
Sterck School					116028.00			
Douglass School		97608.00			25000.00			
Porter Road ES	332826.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00

**Federal Private School Distribution**

	Title II (Part A)	Title II (Part D)	Title IV
Caravel	10689.00	3447.00	8097.00
Christ the Teacher	5749.00	1854.00	4355.00
College School	594.00	192.00	450.00
Elementary Workshop	451.00	145.00	342.00
Holy Angels	4243.00	1368.00	3214.00
Pike Creek	2726.00	879.00	
St. Elizabeth's Elem	4355.00	1405.00	3300.00
St. Elizabeth's High	4540.00	1464.00	3439.00
St. Michael's Day	164.00	53.00	124.00
St. Peter's Cathedra	2019.00	651.00	1529.00
Nativity Preparatory	441.00	142.00	334.00
Early Learning Center	92.00	30.00	70.00

	<b>Title II (Part A)</b>	<b>Title II (Part D)</b>	<b>Title IV</b>
Harvest Academy Wilm	430.00	139.00	326.00
Lab Preschool (UD)	184.00	59.00	140.00
Newark Creative	820.00	264.00	621.00

**State LEA Distribution**

	<b>Professional Development</b>
LEA-wide Programs	30000.00
Administration Cost	185041.00

**State Public School Distribution**

**2% limit on Title III Administrative Costs; 2% limit on Title IV Administrative Costs; 5% limit on Perkins Administrative Costs**

**The LEA may use up to 15% of its IDEA Part B funds to provide early intervening services (EIS) to develop and implement coordinated, early intervening services for general education students in grades K-12 who need additional academic or behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment. The LEA may use a proportional share of its Part B funds to support Title I schoolwide programs. (20 U.S.C . &sect;1413(f); 20 U.S.C. &sect;6314(a)(3)(A); and 34 C.F.R. &sect;300.226 and ) &sect;200.29).**

#### 5.4 Consolidation Administrative Funds

---

Check one of the following statements:

Check one of the following statements:

- \* The LEA is consolidating administrative funds for IASA programs (Titles I, II, IV, and V)

These funds are included in the consolidated administrative costs:

OR

- The LEA is not consolidating administrative funds for IASA programs (Titles I, II, IV, and V)

\* For detailed explanation, see the ESEA Act at 20 U.S.C. § 9203 “Consolidation of Funds for Local Administration.”

## 7.0 Certification of Compliance and Assurances

Sign electronically below and also print and sign two copies of this form (see link entitled "Click here for printable signature pages" below). Submit one signed original to "Consolidated Application Grant Manager; Career, Technical, and Consolidated Programs Workgroup; Delaware Department of Education; 35 Commerce Way, Ste 1; Dover, DE 19904" and file one signed original in the LEA central office for review upon request by state and federal officials and members of the public. The chief school officer and any other personnel who may be responsible for activities or funds covered by these Certifications must read and understand each certification and all assurances below.

### Principal Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I have reviewed this application and that it is aligned with the District and Schools Plans.
2. All assurances and certifications contained in the application will be adhered to.

**Principal:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Approval Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Chief School Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief school officer of the LEA. I am authorized to apply for the funds identified in this Consolidated Application. I am also authorized to obligate the LEA to conduct any program or activity approved under this Consolidated Application in accordance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, program assurances, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.
2. I have read this Consolidated Application. The information contained in it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. The LEA is applying for funding under the programs indicated in Section 1 of this Consolidated Application.
3. I have also read the attached Assurances for FY09. I understand that those Assurances are incorporated into and made a part of this Consolidated Application as though they were fully set out in this Consolidated Application with regard to those programs for which funding is sought.
4. The LEA and each of its schools, programs, and other administrative units, will conduct the programs and activities for which funding is sought in this Consolidated Application as represented in this Consolidated Application. Further, the LEA and each of its schools, programs and other administrative units, will comply with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.
5. I understand that compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09 and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application, is a condition of receipt of federal and state funding. I understand that such compliance continues through the duration of the funding period, including any extensions to that period.
6. I understand that state and federal funding may be withheld, terminated and recovered, and future funding denied, if the LEA fails to comply with applicable federal and state requirements as promised in this Certification.

**Chief School Officer:** Lyles, Marcia **Approval Date:** Thursday, August 27, 2009

**Chief Financial Officer Certification of Compliance**

I certify that:

- 1. I am the chief financial officer of the LEA and I am authorized to submit the budget and financial information contained in this Consolidated Application on its behalf.
- 2. I have read this Consolidated Application and specifically read and reviewed the budget and financial information contained in or made part of the Consolidated Application. The information contained in the Consolidated Application it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
- 3. The LEA is applying for funding under the following programs:

**Federal Programs**

**State Programs**

Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary	Curriculum and Professional Development
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)	
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)	
Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work	
Title II, Part A - Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment	
Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology	
Title III - Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students	
Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	

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

**Chief Financial Officer:** Silber, Robert **Approval Date:** Tuesday, August 25, 2009

**Assurances**

01. General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)

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

02. Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)

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

03. Additional Federal

- A.** All regulations as stated in OMB Circular A-133 and OMB Circular A-87 will be adhered to and records will be readily made available when audited for a period of time of at a minimum of three years after successful audit.

04. State of Delaware

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

05. General Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

- A.** It is assured that each ESEA program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications.
- B.** It is assured that the control of funds provided under each ESEA program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency or in a nonprofit private agency, institution, organization, or Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and that the public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization will administer the funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing statutes
- C.** It is assured that the applicant will adopt and use proper methods of administering each ESEA program, including ? (A) the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program; and (B) the correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation
- D.** It is assured that the applicant will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each ESEA program conducted by or for the State educational agency, the Secretary, or other Federal officials
- E.** It is assured that the applicant will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the applicant under each ESEA program
- F.** It is assured that the applicant will ? (A) submit reports to the State educational agency (which shall make the reports available to the Governor) and the Secretary as the State educational agency and Secretary may require to enable the State educational agency and the Secretary to perform their duties under each ESEA program; and (B) maintain such records, provide such information, and afford such access to the records as the State educational agency (after consultation with the Governor) or the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out the State educational agency's or the Secretary's duties
- G.** It is assured that before the application was submitted, the applicant afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment
- H.** It is assured that the LEA will comply with the all of the legislative and regulatory requirements of ESEA programs for which it receives funds, including all applicable sections of Title IX.
- I.** It is assured that the LEA will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1991, and all regulations, guidelines, and standards lawfully adopted under the above statutes by the United States Department of Education.
- J.** It is certified that the LEA does not have any policy that prevents or otherwise denies participation in constitutionally protected prayer in the elementary and secondary schools under its authority as set forth in the U.S. Department of Education guidance to the extent that the guidance does not conflict with controlling precedent.
- K.** It is assured that in any publication or public announcements, the LEA will clearly identify any program assisted under the No Child Left Behind Act (ESEA) as a federal program funded under the specific title.

06. Specific Curriculum/Professional Development

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

07. Specific IDEA

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

08. Specific Perkins

- A.** It is assured that the career and technical education program is of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to result in improvement in the quality of education.

09. Specific Title I

- A.** The agency will participate, if selected, in the State National Assessment of Educational Progress in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics carried out under section 411(b)(2) of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994;
- B.** The local educational agency will inform eligible schools and parents of schoolwide program authority and the ability of such schools to consolidate funds from Federal, State, and local sources;
- C.** The local educational agency will provide technical assistance and support to schoolwide programs;
- D.** The local educational agency will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop the schools' plans pursuant to section 1114 and assist schools as the schools implement such plans or undertake activities pursuant to section 1115 so that each school can make adequate yearly progress toward meeting the State student academic achievement standards;
- E.** The local educational agency will fulfill such agency's school improvement responsibilities under section 1116, including taking actions under paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 1116(b);
- F.** The local educational agency will provide services to eligible children attending private elementary schools and secondary schools in accordance with section 1120, and timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials regarding such services;
- G.** The local educational agency will take into account the experience of model programs for the educationally disadvantaged, and the findings of relevant scientifically based research indicating that services may be most effective if focused on students in the earliest grades at schools that receive funds under this part;

- H.** The local educational agency will in the case of a local educational agency that chooses to use funds under this part to provide early childhood development services to low-income children below the age of compulsory school attendance, ensure that such services comply with the performance standards established under section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act;
- I.** The local educational agency will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop and implement their plans or activities under sections 1118 and 1119;
- J.** The local educational agency will comply with the requirements of section 1119 regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development;
- K.** The local educational agency will inform eligible schools of the local educational agency's authority to obtain waivers on the school's behalf under title IX and, if the State is an Ed-Flex Partnership State, to obtain waivers under the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999;
- L.** The local educational agency will coordinate and collaborate, to the extent feasible and necessary as determined by the local educational agency, with the State educational agency and other agencies providing services to children, youth, and families with respect to a school in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 if such a school requests assistance from the local educational agency in addressing major factors that have significantly affected student achievement at the school;
- M.** The local educational agency will ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers;
- N.** The local educational agency will use the results of the student academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), and other measures or indicators available to the agency, to review annually the progress of each school served by the agency and receiving funds under this part to determine whether all of the schools are making the progress necessary to ensure that all students will meet the State's proficient level of achievement on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) within 12 years from the end of the 2001-2002 school year;
- O.** The local educational agency will ensure that the results from the academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) will be provided to parents and teachers as soon as is practicably possible after the test is taken, in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand;
- P.** The local educational agency will assist each school served by the agency and assisted under this part in developing or identifying examples of high-quality, effective curricula consistent with section 1111(b)(8)(D).
- Q.** The local educational agency will provide (i) a local educational agency-wide salary schedule; (ii) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff; and (iii) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum materials and instructional supplies.

10. Specific Title I, Part D

- A.** It is assured that each agency shall reserve not less than 15 percent and not more than 30 percent of the amount such agency receives under this subpart for any fiscal year to support? (1) projects that facilitate the transition of children and youth from State-operated institutions to schools served by local educational agencies; or(2) the successful reentry of youth offenders, who are age 20 or younger and have received a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, into postsecondary education, or vocational and technical training programs, through strategies designed to expose the youth to, and prepare the youth for, postsecondary education, or vocational and technical training programs, such as? (A) preplacement programs that allow adjudicated or incarcerated youth to audit or attend courses on college, university, or community college campuses, or through programs provided in institutional settings; (B) worksite schools, in which institutions of higher education and private or public employers partner to create programs to help students make a successful transition to postsecondary education and employment; and (C) essential support services to ensure the success of the youth, such as? (i) personal, vocational and technical, and academic counseling; (ii) placement services designed to place the youth in a university, college, or junior college program; (iii) information concerning, and assistance in obtaining, available student financial aid; (iv) counseling services; and (v) job placement services.

**B.** It is assured that any State agency that desires to receive funds to carry out a program under this subpart shall submit an application to the State educational agency that: (1) describes the procedures to be used, consistent with the State plan under section 1111, to assess the educational needs of the children to be served under this subpart; (2) provides an assurance that in making services available to children and youth in adult correctional institutions, priority will be given to such children and youth who are likely to complete incarceration within a 2-year period; (3) describes the program, including a budget for the first year of the program, with annual updates to be provided to the State educational agency; (4) describes how the program will meet the goals and objectives of the State plan; (5) describes how the State agency will consult with experts and provide the necessary training for appropriate staff, to ensure that the planning and operation of institution-wide projects under section 1416 are of high quality; (6) describes how the State agency will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 9601 and how the results of the most recent evaluation will be used to plan and improve the program; (7) includes data showing that the State agency has maintained the fiscal effort required of a local educational agency, in accordance with section 9521; (8) describes how the programs will be coordinated with other appropriate State and Federal programs, such as programs under Title I of Public Law 105-220, vocational and technical education programs, State and local dropout prevention programs, and special education programs; (9) describes how the State agency will encourage correctional facilities receiving funds under this subpart to coordinate with local educational agencies or alternative education programs attended by incarcerated children and youth prior to their incarceration to ensure that student assessments and appropriate academic records are shared jointly between the correctional facility and the local educational agency or alternative education program; (10) describes how appropriate professional development will be provided to teachers and other staff; (11) designates an individual in each affected correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth to be responsible for issues relating to the transition of children and youth from such facility or institution to locally operated programs; (12) describes how the State agency will endeavor to coordinate with businesses for training and mentoring for participating children and youth; (13) provides an assurance that the State agency will assist in locating alternative programs through which students can continue their education if the students are not returning to school after leaving the correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth; (14) provides assurances that the State agency will work with parents to secure parents' assistance in improving the educational achievement of their children and youth, and preventing their children's and youth's further involvement in delinquent activities; (15) provides an assurance that the State agency will work with children and youth with disabilities in order to meet an existing individualized education program and an assurance that the agency will notify the child's or youth's local school if the child or youth: (A) is identified as in need of special education services while the child or youth is in the correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth; and (B) intends to return to the local school; (16) provides an assurance that the State agency will work with children and youth who dropped out of school before entering the correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth to encourage the children and youth to reenter school once the term of the incarceration is completed or provide the child or youth with the skills necessary to gain employment, continue the education of the child or youth, or achieve a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent if the child or youth does not intend to return to school; (17) provides an assurance that teachers and other qualified staff are trained to work with children and youth with disabilities and other students with special needs taking into consideration the unique needs of such students; (18) describes any additional services to be provided to children and youth, such as career counseling, distance learning, and assistance in securing student loans and grants; and (19) provides an assurance that the program under this subpart will be coordinated with any programs operated under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) or other comparable programs, if applicable.

11. Specific Title II, Part A

**A.** It is assured that the LEA shall conduct an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring.

- B.** It is assured that the LEA shall target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of highly-qualified teachers, the largest class size particularly at the primary level, and/or are identified for school improvement.
- C.** It is assured that the LEA shall comply with Section 9501 regarding consultation with private schools in order to provide professional development services for private school teachers.
- D.** It is assured that all teachers paid by the LEA with Title II, Part A funds for class size reduction are highly qualified.

12. Specific Title II, Part D

- A.** It is assured that all students and teachers served by the LEA have increased access to educational technology.
- B.** It is assured that students in high poverty and high needs schools or schools identified under Section 1116 have access to technology.
- C.** It is assured that the LEA is assisting every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade regardless the student's race, ethnicities, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
- D.** It is assured that successful and useful technology will be put into effect with the acquisition of supporting resources (such as services, software, other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources).
- E.** It is assured that funds will be used to prepare teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.
- F.** It is assured that 25 percent of funds received will be spent on high quality professional development in technology unless the LEA is exempted by the Delaware Department of Education.
- G.** It is assured that the LEA has a new or updated long-range strategic educational technology plan that is consistent with the objectives of the statewide technology plan and that addresses the statutory local plan requirements. The LEA does not have to develop a new technology plan for the Ed Tech program but may use its current technology plan, modified as necessary, to comply with the new requirements of the Ed Tech legislation. As appropriate, an LEA may seek a waiver of this requirement in order to receive funds to develop the plan.

13. Specific Title III

- A.** It is assured that the LEA will not use more than 2 percent of the funds for the cost of administration.
- B.** (1) It is assured that the LEA shall, not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year, inform the parent or guardian of an English language learner ;(ELL) student in language that is understandable, and to the extent practicable, in the native language: a. the reasons for the identification of their child(ren) of English proficiency, b. the assessment used and the level of English proficiency, c. the type of program or instruction and how that program will assist in the development of English proficiency and meet the state content standards, d. the exit criteria for the program, e. how the program meets the objectives of the IEP for the ELL/Special Education student, f. the right that parents have upon request to remove or to refuse to enroll their ELL child(ren) in a program. (2) It is assured that the LEA shall inform the parent or guardian of an ELL student of the failure of the program to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives set by the state, no later than 30 days after the failure occurs. (3) It is assured that if a student registers after the beginning of a school year, the parent or guardian shall be informed of 1) (a) through (f) within two weeks of placement in a program.
- C.** It is assured that the LEA shall comply with Section 9501 regarding consultation with private schools to provide special educational services or other benefits that address their needs under Title III to students and staff or other educational personnel.
- D.** It is assured that the LEA will annually assess the English proficiency of all identified English language learners (ELLs).

14. Specific Title IV

- A.** It is assured that a comprehensive plan of drug and violence prevention programs for students in each grade K-12 has been developed in accordance with the federal and state laws and complies with the ?Principles of Effectiveness.?
- B.** It is assured that the LEA has reviewed curricula that it intends to use and that such curricula conveys a clear and consistent message that the illegal use of alcohol and other drugs is wrong and harmful. (Section 4132.) The LEA will identify and implement drug and violence prevention programs of demonstrated effectiveness.
- C.** It is assured that the LEA will have appropriate and effective discipline policies, security procedures, prevention activities, and a student code of conduct.
- D.** It is assured that the LEA is in compliance with the Gun-Free Schools Act and Department of Education Regulation 603.
- E.** It is assured that the LEA is in compliance with the Delaware Unsafe School Choice Option Regulation 608.
- F.** It is assured that the LEA has identified an LEA-level person to coordinate the Title IV LEA district program and a school-level coordinator for each building.

**Federal Programs**

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (6 - 21)**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Touchette, Brian	9/8/2009

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (3 - 5)**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Lesko, James	8/27/2009

**Title I, Part A - Making High Poverty Schools Work**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Hodges, Amelia	9/9/2009

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

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Pieshala, Erin	7/23/2009
Shockley, Dusty	8/27/2009

**Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Modzelewski, Wendy	8/28/2009

**Title III - Language Instruction for ELL and Immigrant Students**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Loveland, Margie	8/27/2009

**Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities**

*Initial Approvals*

<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
Ray, Janet	9/8/2009

**Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education – Secondary**

*Initial Approvals*

**Program Manager**

Hutchison, Karen

**Approval Date**

9/1/2009

**State Programs**

**Curriculum and Professional Development**

*Initial Approvals*

**Program Manager**

Harper, Juley

**Approval Date**

9/1/2009

**Finance**

**Federal Programs:**

**Approval Date:** (none)

**State Programs:**

**Approval Date:** (none)

**Director(s)**

**Director**

**Title**

**Approval Date**

Toomey, Martha

9/10/2009

Hodges, Amelia

9/10/2009

Hartschuh, Wayne

9/10/2009

Stetter, Michael

9/10/2009

**Secretaries**

**Associate Secretary:**

**Approval Date:** (none)

**Secretary:**

Lillian Lowery

**Approval Date:** 9/15/2009