



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

December 18, 2013

George Wilson  
Executive Director  
Green River Regional Educational Cooperative  
230 Technology Way  
Bowling Green, KY 42101

Dear Executive Director Wilson,

I am writing in response to Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (GRREC) request to amend its approved Race to the Top –District grant project. Between April 8, 2013 and December 17, 2013, the grantee held conversations with and submitted amendment requests to the U.S. Department of Education (Department). As you are aware, the Department has the authority to approve amendments to your approved application and budget, provided that such a change does not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. One March 27, 2013, the Department provided the “Scope of Work Grant Amendment Submission Process” document to grantees Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) indicated the process by which amendments would be reviewed and approved or denied. To determine whether approval could be granted, the Department has applied the conditions noted in the document, and compared it with the Race to the Top – District *Principles*, which are also noted in that document.

I approve the following amendments, as well as those in the attached table in Appendix A:

- In Project 2, Leaders Developing Leadership, change the strategy and timeline for coordinating and delivering professional development to district and schools. Originally, professional development coordination and delivery of the professional development was the responsibility of a variety of vendors and contractors with a scheduled start date of April 2013. Upon close review of the professional development schedule GRREC project staff determined that the application included an unrealistic and overly ambitious number of professional

[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*

development events during the first year of the project. Additionally, with outside consultants and vendors providing much of the training, GRREC project staff did not see how this could be sustained after the project period. Now, GRREC project staff will be responsible for coordinating and delivering some professional development. This change allows the project staff to: build internal capacity and support sustainability; coordinate professional development with district professional development calendars; and take into consideration, when scheduling training, time for staff to implement and master a set of skills and processes before introducing new skills and processes. This change in strategy coupled with the delay in hiring project staff will delay the start of professional development until January 2014<sup>1</sup>. As a result of this change, \$1,167,333 of contractual costs in Years 1- 4 will now support other amendments included in this letter.

- In Project 4, Personalized Learning, include funds to support training stipends for teachers participating in out-of-school training and include funds to support substitute teachers to allow for teachers to participate in training during the school year. GRREC will reallocate \$1,280,000, in Years 1-4 to the other cost category, from other amendments included in this letter to support this change.
- Across all projects, provide additional funds to support fringe benefit costs. In the approved budget the fringe benefits costs were calculated at 17 percent but did not include the employee's contribution to the Kentucky teacher retirement fund. The State requires a 14 percent contribution to the teacher retirement fund for all grant funded positions. GRREC will reallocate \$2,108,027 from other amendments included in this letter to Years 1 - 4 fringe cost category in Project 2, Leaders Developing Leadership; Project 3, Competency Based-Instructions; Project 4, Personalized Learning; and Project 5, Management and Evaluation to support this correction.

I approve the follow amendments with the conditions described below:

- In the (A)(4)(a) and (A)(4)(b) Student Outcome Goals, add consortium-wide grade level and subgroup targets that were either missing from the application or not aligned with Kentucky's approved Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) Flexibility Plan in accordance with definitions the Department provided in the Race to the Top - District application. See Appendix B for updated goals and performance measures and Appendix C for the performance measures included in the GRREC Race to the Top - District application.

---

<sup>1</sup>Race to the Top - District project staff began planning for leadership professional development in October 2013 with districts using Innovation Configuration Mapping process.

In accordance with the FY 2012 Notice Inviting Applications, GRREC must submit baseline and annual targets for (A)(4)(a) and (A)(4)(b) Student Outcome Measures for each consortium member by March 31, 2014.

- In accordance with the FY 2012 Notice Inviting Applications, GRREC must submit baseline information and annual targets for all sub-groups for (A)(4)(c): Graduation rates and (A)(4)(d): College enrollment rates by March 31, 2014.
- In accordance with its approved application, GRREC must submit baseline and annual targets for the number of students whose teachers of record and principal are effective and highly effective (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) for each consortium member by September 30, 2014 when needed data will become available.
- In accordance with its approved application, GRREC must submit revisions, as well as baseline and annual targets for participating students by subgroup, as appropriate, for all (E)(3) performance measures by March 31, 2014. In consultation with their local evaluator, GRREC determined the need to revise some of the performance measures included in its Race to the Top – District application based on available data.

It is our understanding that these amendments will not substantially change the scope and objectives of the approved plan. Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments.

If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top – District, please do not hesitate to contact CCSD's Race to the Top – District Program Officer, Karen Dorsey Hargrove, at 202-453-6695 or Karen.dorseyhargrove@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s///

Ann Whalen  
Director, Policy and Implementation  
Implementation and Support Unit

Attachments: Appendix A –Amendment Table  
Appendix B – Revised Student Outcome Performance Measure  
Appendix C – Original Student Outcome Performance Measures

cc: Janet Hurt, GRREC Project Director

## Appendix A – Amendment Table

Project	Description of Change
Project 1, Students as Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust the timeline for “Leader in Me” training for some schools. All schools were originally expected to receive training in spring 2013. After school leadership was interviewed by the vendor it was determined that not all schools were prepared to begin the intensive training at that time. Based on the vendor’s assessment, training was provided to a select group of schools in spring 2013 (cohort 1) all other schools (cohort 2) received coaching services by the vendor to prepare them for training in spring 2014.</li> <li>• Eliminate three full-time equivalent (FTEs) Leadership Coach positions. Leadership Coaches, under the director of the Leadership Director, were originally tasked with providing leadership coaching services to principals. Consistent with the vendor’s program, contractual staff now will be responsible for all leadership coaching. A total of \$940,154, in Years 1 – 4 in personnel, fringe, travel, supplies and other cost categories, will be available to reallocate to support other amendments described below.</li> </ul>
Project 2, Leaders Developing Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate the Leadership Director position for this project. This position was responsible, in part, for the oversight of Leadership Coaches. Now that the vendor will oversee the Leadership Coaches, the Leadership Director position is no longer needed. Other duties assigned to the Leadership Director and not related to oversight of Leadership Coaches will be assumed by other GRREC Race to the Top – District project staff. Use \$288,346 of Years 2 – 4 personnel costs to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Adjust the timeline for leadership performance coaching. Originally, leadership performance coaching was intended to occur annually. Now performance coaching will occur in Years 3 and 4 of the project. This change will allow district leaders time to complete a cycle of continuous improvement with new skills and processes before they begin to receive one-on-one performance coaching. As a result of this change, \$190,000 in Years 1 and 2 in the contractual cost category will be available to reallocate to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Adjust the timeline for school-level staff to develop personalized learning plans. Originally, the development of school personalized learning plans was to begin in January 2013 with students working with online plans at the start of the 2013-2014 school year (SY). The delay in hiring project staff combined with the change in strategy for coordinating and delivering professional development necessitated the delay as project staff were not fully prepared to provide technical assistance and guidance to school staff until August 2013. This delay also impacted Project 4, Personalized Learning, which had an original implementation start date of August 2013 for staff and students working with online learning plans. Some staff will complete personalized learning plans in November 2013 and all plans will be completed by January 2014; teachers will begin to transition students to personalized learning plans as soon as they are completed.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide funds to support the development and implementation of a superintendent and school board growth and effectiveness system. These activities were included in the application but no funds were allocated to support them. The grantee will use contract support to develop, monitor, and implement effectiveness systems. To support this work \$200,000 in Years 1 – 3 will be reallocated to contractual funds from other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Adjust the plan to conduct cultural assessments. The plan originally called for cultural [environment] assessments in all schools in Year 1 to inform leadership training topics. The assessments include surveys, staff interviews, and observations. The district conducted assessments only in high schools in Year 1 in an attempt to reduce the burden on elementary and middle schools. Elementary and middle schools, as participants in the “Leader in Me” program, are assessed by the “Leader in Me” coaches via observations and discussions with school staff. Project staff will use data from Kentucky’s “Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) survey and from information provided by “Leader in Me” coaches to inform leadership training assessment for elementary and middle school staff. As a result of this change, \$82,000 in Year 1 contractual costs will support other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Adjust the strategy and timeline for annual school data retreats. Originally, contractors were scheduled to conduct annual data retreats with each school during the first two project years starting in March 2013. Project staff determined that the contractor did not have the capacity to deliver data retreats for all schools in Year 1 so the strategy and timeline was adjusted. Consistent with the above timeline change in Project 1, the contractor conducted data retreats with cohort 1 schools in Year 1; cohort 2 schools will participate in data retreats in Year 2. Consistent with the change in delivering professional development, and the focus on building staff capacity and sustaining project activities, project staff will provide professional development to all schools to support their capacity to convene data retreats in future project years as a part of school’s practice. As a result of this change, \$230,000 in Years 1-4 contractual costs are available to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> </ul>
<p>In Project 3, Competency-Based Instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace the Preschool Director position with an Outreach Director position. Originally, the Preschool Director was tasked with coordinating and managing the activities of the Preschool Pals who are responsible for providing research-based resources and strategies to preschool providers to better prepare their children for kindergarten. In reviewing the staffing for this project the grantee determined that this position should also include oversight of the Leadership Mentors (Project 2, Leaders Developing Leadership) who are tasked with supporting teachers with implementing new evidence based strategies and processes. The Outreach Director will focus on the outreach to and support of pre-schools’ and schools’ Race to the Top -District implementation plan. GRREC will reallocate \$17,500 of personnel costs in Years 2-4 to other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of Preschool Pals from 10 FTEs to 8 FTEs. After the award, discussions between project staff, child care providers, and the State director of licensed preschool providers determined that 8 FTEs would be sufficient to meet the need of local preschool providers. Project staff will closely monitor feedback from preschool</li> </ul>

	<p>providers and Preschool Pals and revisit staffing as needed. Due to time needed by project staff to meet with preschool providers and the State director, hiring of the Preschool Pals was delayed until summer 2013, originally these positions were to be hired in spring 2013. As a result of the reduction in FTEs and delay in hiring \$526,154, in Years 1-4 personnel costs, are available to support other amendments included in this letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust the timeline for competency-based training (including the use of instructional software), implementation, and establishing model classrooms. Originally, contracted vendors and project staff were to provide initial training on competency-based instructional strategies during spring and summer of 2013. Due the change in strategy for delivering professional development, project staff initiated the delivery of training on competency-based instruction in the fall of 2013. Training specific to the use of instructional software and the establishment of model classrooms was delayed until after project staff could assess school staff’s level of understanding competency-based instruction and ensure school staff had thoroughly analyzed student data to identify student needs. The delay also allowed for school staff to research and select software specific to student needs. Also, hiring Cognitive Coaches, tasked with supporting teachers’ implementation of personalized learning and competency-based instructions, was delayed until after teacher received initial training from project staff; Cognitive Coaches were hired at the start of summer 2013 instead of spring 2013. Cognitive Coaches were trained during the summer and prepared to begin working with teachers at the start of the 2013-2014 SY. As a result of this timeline change, reallocate \$455,000 in Year 1 supply costs and \$138,562, in Year 1 personnel costs, to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Eliminate funds allocated to develop a website to support superintendent and principal leadership collaboration (i.e., posting ideas or asking questions). The project’s evaluator will develop a portal for leadership collaboration and project staff will promote and encourage the use of the website. Funds to support this activity are included in the local evaluation budget. GRREC will reallocate \$220,000, in Years 1-4 contractual cost category to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> </ul>
<p>In Project 4, Personalized Learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust the strategy and timeline for providing LEA access to technology outside of school buildings. The application stated that Wi-Fi would be added to all school buses to create mobile “hot spots.” However, some buses were parked in remote locations and would not provide needed access to Wi-Fi, and some LEAs leased buses which did not allow for adding Wi-Fi. Funds allocated for adding Wi-Fi to school buses will be used instead to provide LEAs with an annual allocation to support student access to Wi-Fi outside of school buildings, including on school buses. Adjust the start date of this work from Year 1 to Year 2, as time will be needed to develop process for annual allocation and for schools to develop and operationalize personalized learning plans. Additionally, increase the amount of funds available to support this activity by reallocating \$150,000 in Year 3 to the supply category from other amendments included in this letter.</li> <li>• Adjust the timeline for hiring of an Information Technology Director until Year 2. The primary role of the Information Technology Director is to support schools providing technology access to its students. Given the</li> </ul>

	<p>adjustment to the strategy for providing LEAs access to technology outside of school buildings (as described above) the hiring date for this position has been adjusted to be consistent with the change to this project’s strategy. As a result of this timeline adjustment, a total of \$65,769, in Year 1 personnel cost category will be available to reallocate in support of other amendments included in this letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adjust timeline and participants for the kick-off training in the culture of poverty. Since the award, several LEAs have some schools that have completed the poverty training and that the area of need is staff certification. Additionally, the preferred trainers were not available for the timeframe included in the application (summer 2013). As a result, the kick-off training will take place summer 2014 and only will include those schools that had not yet completed the selected curriculum. Finally team certification originally planned for project staff will now be expanded to include school-level staff. The net result of this change is a decrease in contractual funds for this project budget of \$100,000 in Years 1 and 2 which support other amendments included in this letter.</li><li>• Reduce funds allocated for 24 FTE College and Career Readiness Counselors (CCRC). Salaries for this position were adjusted to align with district-level salaries. GRREC will reallocate \$166,400 in Years 1-4 personnel costs to support other amendments included in this letter.</li><li>• Provide funds to support the project’s CCRC professional certification. Since the beginning of the grant period, the State has considered legislation that will mandate every high school in the State to have a certified CCRC. This requirement is expect to be in place in 2017. In anticipation of the State enacting this legislation, GRREC will shift \$195,000, in Years 1-4 to the stipend cost category from other amendments included in this letter to provide funds for staff certification. The grantee believes this will improve the likelihood that schools will retain their CCRC after the project has ended.</li><li>• Eliminate the Family Services Director position. The role of this Director was to work with schools, districts, and rural communities to implement family and community strategies related to personalized learning. The Family Services Director position is no longer necessary because these responsibilities are aligned with the duties and responsibilities of the newly created Outreach Director position (as described above in Project 3). Reallocate \$230,000, in Years 1-4 in the personnel cost category to support other amendments included in this letter.</li><li>• Reduce funds allocated for CCCR software. Cost estimates exceeded actual amount and software was purchased for only those schools that began “Leader in Me” in Year 1. GRREC will reallocate \$273,000, in Years 1-4 in the contractual cost category to support other amendments included in this letter.</li></ul>
--	---

<p>Project 5, Management and Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate funds to support additional project personnel and supplement fringe benefits. Increase the number of Project Managers from two to three and increase the annual salary for Project Managers. In addition, eliminate the Director of Data/Financial Systems position and replace it with a full-time Director of Financial Systems and a part-time Data Specialist. The grantee believes this staff configuration is better suited to support the GRREC Race to the Top – District consortium which includes 22 districts and 112 schools. GRREC will reallocate \$796,739 in Years 1-4 in personnel and fringe cost categories from other amendments to support this change.</li> <li>• Use Innovation Configuration Mapping (ICM) process to plan, deliver, and continuously improve the delivery of professional development at the district and school level. GRREC will reallocate \$46,250, in Years 1-3 to the contractual cost category from other amendments included in this letter to support this change.</li> <li>• Provide additional funds to support training and professional development of project staff as they will assume a larger role in delivering professional development to teachers and leaders. GRREC will reallocate \$102,000 in contractual funds in Years 1-4 from other amendments included in this letter to support this change.</li> <li>• Reduce funds allocated for contracts. GRREC overestimated costs to support the project’s evaluation. GRREC will reallocated \$496,058, in Years 1-4 contractual cost category, to support other amendments included in this letter.</li> </ul>
<p>Optional Budget Supplement, Preschool Resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce funds allocated for supplies and add two part-time Elementary Liaisons. GRREC project staff interviewed child care providers and State directors of licensed preschools who indicated that dedicated staff would be needed to support the use of materials in the field. GREEC will reallocate \$483,463, in Years 1-4 from supplies and shift to personnel, to support this change.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B – Revised Student Outcome Performance Measure**

**(A)(4)(a) – Performance on Summative Assessments**

<b>Elementary Reading</b>	<b>Baseline SY 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	51.3	56.7	62.1	67.5	72.9	78.4
African American	27.5	35.6	43.6	51.7	59.7	67.8
Hispanic	37.1	44.1	51.1	58.1	65.1	72.0
Asian	63.7	67.5	71.3	75.2	79.0	82.8
Limited English Proficiency	23.3	31.8	40.3	48.9	57.4	65.9
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	37	44.0	51.0	58.0	65.0	72.0
Disability-With IEP (Total)	26.8	34.9	43.1	51.2	59.3	67.5
All Students	48	53.8	59.6	65.3	71.1	76.9
All Students (Unduplicated)	37.5	44.4	51.4	58.3	65.3	72.2

<b>Middle Reading</b>	<b>Baseline 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	49.9	55.5	61.0	66.6	72.2	77.7
African American	25.9	34.1	42.4	50.6	58.8	67.1
Hispanic	36.5	43.6	50.6	57.7	64.7	71.8
Asian	59.4	63.7	67.9	72.2	76.5	80.8
Limited English Proficiency	9.5	19.6	29.6	39.7	49.7	59.8
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	34.7	42.0	49.2	56.5	63.7	71.0
Disability-With IEP (Total)	16.9	26.1	35.4	44.6	53.8	63.1
All Students	46.8	52.7	58.6	64.5	70.4	76.4
All Students (Unduplicated)	34.8	42.0	49.3	56.5	63.8	71.0

<b>High School English</b>	<b>Baseline SY 2011-2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012-2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013-2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014-2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015-2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016-2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	55.2	60.2	65.2	70.1	75.1	80.1
African American	31.7	39.3	46.9	54.5	62.1	69.6
Hispanic	41.4	47.9	54.4	60.9	67.4	74.0
Asian	61.8	65.8	69.8	73.9	77.9	81.9
Limited English Proficiency	6.5	16.9	27.3	37.7	48.1	58.4
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	38.6	45.4	52.2	59.1	65.9	72.7
Disability-With IEP (Total)	11.3	21.2	31.0	40.9	50.7	60.6
All Students	52.2	57.5	62.8	68.1	73.4	78.8
All Students (Unduplicated)	38.4	45.2	52.1	58.9	65.8	72.6

<b>Elementary Mathematics</b>	<b>Baseline 2011-2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012-2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013-2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014-2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015-2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016-2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	43.1	49.4	55.7	62.1	68.4	74.7
African American	22.4	31.0	39.6	48.3	56.9	65.5
Hispanic	30.6	38.3	46.0	53.7	61.4	69.2
Asian	67.4	70.8	74.3	77.7	81.1	84.6
Limited English Proficiency	22.7	31.3	39.9	48.5	57.1	65.6
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	29.8	37.6	45.4	53.2	61.0	68.8
Disability-With IEP (Total)	19.9	28.8	37.7	46.6	55.5	64.4
All Students	40.4	47.0	53.6	60.3	66.9	73.5
All Students (Unduplicated)	30.3	38.0	45.8	53.5	61.3	69.0

<b>Middle School Mathematics</b>	<b>Baseline SY 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	43.5	49.8	56.1	62.3	68.6	74.9
African American	20.2	29.1	37.9	46.8	55.7	64.5
Hispanic	31.4	39.0	46.6	54.3	61.9	69.5
Asian	66.7	70.2	73.7	77.2	80.7	84.2
Limited English Proficiency	15.9	25.2	34.6	43.9	53.3	62.6
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	28.5	36.4	44.4	52.3	60.3	68.2
Disability-With IEP (Total)	15.1	24.5	34.0	43.4	52.8	62.3
All Students	40.6	47.2	53.8	60.4	67.0	73.6
All Students (Unduplicated)	28.7	36.6	44.5	52.5	60.4	68.3

<b>High School Mathematics</b>	<b>Baseline 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	42.1	48.5	55.0	61.4	67.8	74.3
African American	24.4	32.8	41.2	49.6	58.0	66.4
Hispanic	35	42.2	49.4	56.7	63.9	71.1
Asian	66.4	69.9	73.5	77.0	80.5	84.1
Limited English Proficiency	23	31.6	40.1	48.7	57.2	65.8
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	27.9	35.9	43.9	51.9	59.9	68.0
Disability-With IEP (Total)	11.1	21.0	30.9	40.7	50.6	60.5
All Students	40	46.7	53.3	60.0	66.7	73.3
All Students (Unduplicated)	27.9	35.9	43.9	51.9	59.9	68.0

**(A)(4)(b) – Achievement Gap Targets**

<b>Reading Elementary</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline</b> <b>SY 2011-</b> <b>2012</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2012-</b> <b>2013</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2013-</b> <b>2014</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2014-</b> <b>2015</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2015-</b> <b>2016</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2016-</b> <b>2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	12.4	10.8	9.2	7.6	6.0	4.4
African American	36.2	32.0	27.7	23.5	19.3	15.0
Hispanic	26.6	23.4	20.3	17.1	13.9	10.8
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	40.4	35.7	31.0	26.3	21.6	16.9
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	26.7	23.5	20.3	17.2	14.0	10.8
Disability-With IEP (Total)	36.9	32.6	28.3	24.0	19.7	15.3
All Students	15.7	13.7	11.8	9.8	7.9	5.9
All Students (Unduplicated)	26.2	23.1	20.0	16.8	13.7	10.6

<b>Reading Middle School</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline</b> <b>SY 2011-</b> <b>2012</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2012-</b> <b>2013</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2013-</b> <b>2014</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2014-</b> <b>2015</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2015-</b> <b>2016</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2016-</b> <b>2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	9.5	8.2	6.9	5.6	4.3	3.0
African American	33.5	29.5	25.6	21.6	17.7	13.7
Hispanic	22.9	20.1	17.3	14.6	11.8	9.0
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	49.9	44.1	38.3	32.6	26.8	21.0
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	24.7	21.7	18.7	15.8	12.8	9.8
Disability-With IEP (Total)	42.5	37.5	32.6	27.6	22.7	17.7
All Students	12.6	11.0	9.3	7.7	6.1	4.4
All Students (Unduplicated)	24.6	21.6	18.7	15.7	12.7	9.7

<b>High School English</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline SY 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	6.6	5.6	4.7	3.7	2.8	1.8
African American	30.1	26.5	23.0	19.4	15.8	12.3
Hispanic	20.4	17.9	15.4	12.9	10.4	7.9
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	55.3	48.9	42.6	36.2	29.8	23.5
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	23.2	20.4	17.6	14.8	12.0	9.2
Disability-With IEP (Total)	50.5	44.7	38.8	33.0	27.2	21.3
All Students	9.6	8.3	7.0	5.7	4.4	3.1
All Students (Unduplicated)	23.4	20.6	17.8	14.9	12.1	9.3

<b>Mathematics Elementary</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline SY 2011- 2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012- 2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013- 2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014- 2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015- 2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016- 2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	24.3	21.4	18.5	15.6	12.7	9.8
African American	45.0	39.8	34.6	29.4	24.2	19.0
Hispanic	36.8	32.5	28.2	24.0	19.7	15.4
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	44.7	39.5	34.4	29.2	24.1	18.9
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	37.6	33.2	28.9	24.5	20.1	15.8
Disability-With IEP (Total)	47.5	42.0	36.6	31.1	25.6	20.2
All Students	27.0	23.8	20.6	17.4	14.2	11.0
All Students (Unduplicated)	37.1	32.8	28.5	24.2	19.8	15.5

<b>Mathematics Middle School</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline</b> <b>SY 2011-</b> <b>2012</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2012-</b> <b>2013</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2013-</b> <b>2014</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2014-</b> <b>2015</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2015-</b> <b>2016</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2016-</b> <b>2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	23.2	20.4	17.7	14.9	12.1	9.3
African American	46.5	41.1	35.8	30.4	25.1	19.7
Hispanic	35.3	31.2	27.1	22.9	18.8	14.7
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	50.8	45.0	39.1	33.3	27.4	21.6
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	38.2	33.8	29.3	24.9	20.4	16.0
Disability-With IEP (Total)	51.6	45.7	39.7	33.8	27.9	22.0
All Students	26.1	23.0	19.9	16.8	13.7	10.6
All Students (Unduplicated)	38.0	33.6	29.2	24.7	20.3	15.9

<b>Mathematics High School</b> <i>(compared to Asian subgroup)</i>	<b>Baseline</b> <b>SY 2011-</b> <b>2012</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2012-</b> <b>2013</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2013-</b> <b>2014</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2014-</b> <b>2015</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2015-</b> <b>2016</b>	<b>Target</b> <b>SY 2016-</b> <b>2017</b>
White (Non-Hispanic)	24.3	21.4	18.5	15.6	12.7	9.8
African American	42.0	37.1	32.3	27.4	22.5	17.7
Hispanic	31.4	27.7	24.0	20.3	16.7	13.0
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Limited English Proficiency	43.4	38.4	33.4	28.3	23.3	18.3
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	38.5	34.0	29.6	25.1	20.6	16.1
Disability-With IEP (Total)	55.3	49.0	42.6	36.3	29.9	23.6
All Students	26.4	23.3	20.1	17.0	13.9	10.8
All Students (Unduplicated)	38.5	34.0	29.6	25.1	20.6	16.1

**Appendix C – Original Student Outcome Performance Measures**

**(A)(4)(a) – Performance on Summative Assessments**

<b>Goal area</b>	<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Baseline SY 2010-2011 (optional)</b>	<b>Baseline SY 2011-2012</b>	<b>Target SY 2012-2013</b>	<b>Target SY 2013-2014</b>	<b>Target SY 2014-2015</b>	<b>Target SY 2015-2016</b>	<b>Target SY 2016-2017 (Post Grant)</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency	Overall	83.2%	Unavailable	85%	87%	90%	92%	95%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency	Rural	82.5%	Unavailable	85%	87%	90%	92%	95%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency	Overall	64.8%	Unavailable	65%	70%	74%	78%	80%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency	Rural	64.3%	Unavailable	65%	70%	74%	78%	80%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics Proficiency	Overall	43%	Unavailable	45%	55%	60%	65%	70%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics Proficiency	Rural	45%	Unavailable	45%	55%	60%	65%	70%