SIG Application Checklist

Required Components

The following components must be included as part of the application. Check or initial by each component, and include this form in the application package. These forms can be downloaded at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/regsig09rfa.asp. Please compile the application packet in the order provided below.

Include this completed checklist in the application packet

JL Form 1 Application Cover Sheet
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

JL Form 2 Collaborative Signatures
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the appropriate personnel at each school selected for participation and by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

JL Form 3 Narrative Response

JL Form 4a LEA Projected Budget

JL Form 4b School Projected Budget

JL Form 5a LEA Budget Narrative

JL Form 5b School Budget Narrative

JL Form 6 General Assurances
Drug Free Workplace Certification
Lobbying Certification
Debarment and Suspension Certification

JL Form 7 Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (three pages)

JL Form 8 Waivers Requested

JL Form 9 Schools to Be Served Chart

N/A Form 10 Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

JL Form 11 Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

PDF processed with CutePDF evaluation edition www.CutePDF.com

SIG Form 1–Application Cover Sheet

School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Application for Funding

APPLICATION RECEIPT DEADLINE
July 2, 2010, 4 p.m.

Submit to:
California Department of Education
District and School Improvement Division
Regional Coordination and Support Office
1430 N Street, Suite 6208
Sacramento, CA 95814

NOTE: Please print or type all information.

County Name: Solano County		**County/District Code:** **48-70532**
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name Dixon Unified School District		**LEA NCES Number:** **0611280**
LEA Address 180 South First Street, Suite 6		**Total Grant Amount Requested** **$2,500,000.00**
City Dixon	**Zip Code** **95620**	
Name of Primary Grant Coordinator J Jesus Contreras	**Grant Coordinator Title** Senior Director of Educational Services	
Telephone Number 707-678-5582 Ext. 8029	**Fax Number** **707-678-0726**	**E-mail Address** JContreras@dixonusd.org
CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION: As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I have read all assurances, certifications, terms, and conditions associated with the federal SIG program; and I agree to comply with all requirements as a condition of funding. I certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.		
Printed Name of Superintendent or Designee **Roger A. Halberg**		**Telephone Number** **707-678-5582**
Superintendent or Designee Signature Roger A Halberg		**Date** **7/1/2010**

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 1 of 2)

Collaborative Signatures: The SIG program is to be designed, implemented, and sustained through a collaborative organizational structure that may include students, parents, representatives of participating LEAs and school sites, the local governing board, and private and/or public external technical assistance and support providers. Each member should indicate whether they support the intent of this application.

The appropriate administrator and representatives for the District and School Advisory Committees, School Site Council, the district or school English Learner Advisory Council, collective bargaining unit, parent group, and any other appropriate stakeholder group of each school to be funded are to indicate here whether they support this sub-grant application. Only schools meeting eligibility requirements described in this RFA may be funded. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

Name and Signature	Title	Organization/ School	Support Yes/No

SIG Form 2, Collaborative Signatures, has been removed due to privacy concerns. Each school's SIG Form 2 is on file with the CDE. See the CDE's Public Access Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/cl/pa.asp for information about obtaining access to these forms.

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 2 of 2)

School District Approval: The LEA Superintendent must be in agreement with the intent of this application.

CDS Code	School District Name	Printed Name of Superintendent	Signature of Superintendent
48-70532	Dixon Unified School District	Roger A. Halberg	Roger A Halberg
CERTIFICATION AND DESIGNATION OF APPLICANT AGENCY			

- Applicant must agree to follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the SIG application, federal and state funding, legal, and legislative mandates.

LEA Name:	Dixon Unified School District
Authorized Executive:	J Jesus Contreras
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 3–Narrative Response

Respond to the elements below. Use 12 point Arial font and one inch margins. When responding to the narrative elements, LEAs should provide a thorough response that addresses **all** components of each element. Refer to *Application Requirements*, B. Narrative Response Requirements on page 22 of this RFA, and the SIG Rubric, Appendix A.

i.	**Needs Analysis**
	Response: The Dixon Unified School District (DUSD) conducted a comprehensive needs analysis when identified as a district in Program Improvement (PI). DUSD sought technical assistance from the Solano County Office of Education and the Region IV District and School Support. See attached MOU. With their support the DUSD Senior Director of Educational Services and the DUSD Management Team worked collaboratively to involve all stakeholders in the compilation of student achievement data for the revision of the Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP). The revision of the LEAP included actions focused on rigor for all students. The expectation is that these actions monitored by DUSD district level staff result in implementation of plans focused on improving student achievement. Each site, with their school site council and other key stakeholders involved, engaged in a needs assessment process to revise their Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) in alignment with the LEAP for a coherent and aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment program for all DUSD students. For the comprehensive needs analysis, the following California Department of Education (CDE) tools were used: • District Assistance Survey (DAS) • Academic Program Survey (APS) • English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA) • English Learner Site Level Tool (ELSLT) • Least Restrictive Environment Tool (LRE) Note: The data derived from the tools is included with this application The county office support provider and Senior Director of Educational Services facilitated the completion of the DAS with the DUSD management team and each principal then engaged their school site council and staff to complete the tools at the school site levels. Once the needs assessment tools were completed, key findings and trends across schools and throughout the district were identified. The key findings identified by the Leadership Council indicate a need to: Provide training to support full implementation of standards based SBE-adopted (K-8) and standards aligned (9-12) instruction materials The key findings identified by the Leadership Council indicate a need to: • Provide training to support full implementation of standards based

SBE-adopted (K-8) and standards aligned (9-12) instruction materials

- Provide, support, and monitor full implementation of intensive intervention for students 2 years or more below grade level as well as strategic intervention for students up to 2 years below grade level
- Appropriately place of EL students in leveled ELD instruction
- Align the mission and vision of the district to the Essential Program Components of the Academic Program Survey as well as to the District Assistance Survey
- Provide professional development aligned to needs identified by student achievement data
- Engage all stakeholders in the full implementation of standards based instructional practice, including administrators, teachers parents, students, and the community
- Align human and financial resources to identified needs
- Institutionalize benchmark assessments and fully implement a coherent accountability system
- Implement and support data driven dialogue in all schools across the district
- Ensure student placement is based on multiple measures
- Develop a district wide communication plan that effectively describes the Who, What, and When of the program improvement process and necessary actions to be undertaken-communication venues include:
    * Combined PTO meetings
    * Combined SSC meetings
    * Curriculum committees
    * Superintendent visits to staff
    * Website
    * Newspaper articles
    * ELAC/DELAC

ii. Selection of Intervention Models

Response: None of the four models suggested in the SIG Request for Applications (RFA) meet the needs of our current schools in PI. Since the schools for which we are applying are Tier III, the intervention model selected for our schools in PI is "other" that include activities that will enhance their SPSA

iii. Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models

Response: As a result of the site and district-wide needs analysis, the staff needed to enhance services to students who are not achieving at grade level will operate as follows:

Board Language and Board Math Coach – To provide professional development and feedback to teachers

English Language Development Coach – To provide professional development to staff and focus targeted interventions for English learners

CORE Implementation Coach – To ensure delivery with fidelity of Board adopted instructional materials

iii: Continued: Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models

Response to Instruction and Intervention Coordinator – To secure effective academic and behavior interventions for all students in need of support

Parental Involvement Coordinator – To ensure support to parents to effectively participate in the education of their children

Professional Learning Communities Coach – To facilitate the institutionalization of educational reforms achieved.

iv. Recruitment, Screening, and Selection of External Providers

Response: NA

v. Alignment of Other Resources with the Selected Intervention Models

Response: All resources available to the DUSD and targeted sites will be aligned to increase student achievement as delineated in the DUSD LEAP.

vi. Alignment of Proposed SIG Activities with Current DAIT Process (if applicable)

Response: NA

vii. Modification of LEA Practices or Policies

Response: DUSD will revise all pertinent practices and policies as required for implementation of SIG.

viii. Sustainment of the Reforms after the Funding Period Ends

Response: It is DUSD's expectation to develop capacity along the way to ensure sustainability of SIG goals.

ix. Establishment of Challenging LEA Annual School Goals for Student Achievement

Response: The sites object of this application has clearly established goals for student achievement in their SPSA.

x. Inclusion of Tier III Schools (if applicable)

Response: Please refer to SIG Form 11

xi. Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders

Response: When the SIG was discussed with the DELAC, the membership unanimously supported the SIG application.

SIG Form 4a–LEA Projected Budget

LEA Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of LEA: Dixon Unified School District	
County/District (CD) Code: 48-70532	
County: Solano	
LEA Contact: J Jesus Contreras	Telephone Number: 707-678-5582 Ext. 8029
E-Mail: JContreras@dixonusd.org	Fax Number: 707-678-0726
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1100–	Certificated Personnel Salaries (Sites)	$1,530,000	$1,530,000	$1,530,000
1300	District Academic Reform Coordinator	$85,000	$85,000	$85,000
2200–	Classified Personnel Salaries	$195,000	$195,000	$195,000
3000–	Employee Benefits	$253,950	$253,950	$253,950
3999	District Academic Reform Coordinator Benefits	$11,513	$11,513	$11,513
4000–	Books and Supplies	$120,787	$120,787	$120,787
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
6400–	Capital Outlay	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
7310 &	Indirect Costs (8.15%)	$203,750	$203,750	$203,750
7350				
Total Amount Budgeted		$2,500,000	$2,500,000	$2,500,000

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of School: Linford L. Anderson Elementary	
County/District/School (CDS) Code: 0611280	
LEA: Dixon Unified School District	
LEA Contact: J Jesus Contreras	Telephone Number: 707-678-5582 Ext. 8029
E-Mail: JContreras@dixonusd.org	Fax Number: 707-678-0726
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1100	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$510,000	$510,000	$510,000
2200	Classified Personnel Salaries	$65,000	$65,000	$65,000
3000–	Employee Benefits	$84,650	$84,650	$84,650
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies			
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000–	Capital Outlay			
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Direct Support Costs	$53,762	$53,762	$53,762
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted		$713,412	$713,412	$713,412

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of School: C. A. Jacobs Intermediate	
County/District/School (CDS) Code: 6051023	
LEA: Dixon Unified School District	
LEA Contact: J Jesus Contreras	Telephone Number: 707-678-5582 Ext. 8029
E-Mail: JContreras@dixonusd.org	Fax Number: 707-678-0726
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1100	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$510,000	$510,000	$510,000
2200	Classified Personnel Salaries	$65,000	$65,000	$65,000
3000–3999	Employee Benefits	$84,650	$84,650	$84,650
4000–4999	Books and Supplies			
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000–6999	Capital Outlay			
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Direct Support Costs	$53,762	$53,762	$53,762
Total Amount Budgeted		$713,412	$713,412	$713,412

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of School: Gretchen Higgins Elementary	
County/District/School (CDS) Code: 6120240	
LEA: Dixon Unified School District	
LEA Contact: J Jesus Contreras	Telephone Number: 707-678-5582 Ext. 8029
E-Mail: JContreras@dixonusd.org	Fax Number: 707-678-0726
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1100	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$510,000	$510,000	$510,000
2200	Classified Personnel Salaries	$65,000	$65,000	$65,000
3000–3999	Employee Benefits	$84,650	$84,650	$84,650
4000–4999	Books and Supplies			
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000–6999	Capital Outlay			
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Direct Support Costs	$53,762	$53,762	$53,762
Total Amount Budgeted		$713,412	$713,412	$713,412

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
Board Language and Board Math Coach; English Language Development Coach; CORE Implementation Coach; Response to Instruction and Intervention Coordinator; Parental Involvement Coordinator; Professional Learning Communities Coach; School-Child-Home Counselor (One at each site – Three each total)	$1,530,000.00	1100
District Academic Reform Coordinator – To facilitate and ensure cohesive and aligned implementation of reform action plans districtwide.	$85,000.00	1100
Parental Involvement Coordinators – To ensure support to parents to effectively participate in the education of their children (One at each site – Three total).	$195,000.00	2200
Benefits related to the above positions	$265,463.00	3000-3999
Supplemental materials and Supplies to support the three SIG sites.	$120,787.00	4300
Contracts to provide external coaching from higher education agencies, consultants, and county offices of education.	$50,000.00	5800
Purchase of Instructional Technology to support student achievement.	$50,000.00	6400
Indirect Cost	$203,750.00	7370

SIG Form 5b–School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name: Anderson Elementary School

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
Board Language and Board Math Coach – To provide professional development and feedback to teachers.	$85,000.00	1100
English Language Development Coach – To provide professional development to staff and focus targeted interventions for English learners.	$85,000.00	1100
CORE Implementation Coach – To ensure delivery with fidelity of Board adopted instructional materials.	$85,000.00	1100
Response to Instruction and Intervention Coordinator – To secure effective academic and behavior interventions for all students in need of support.	$85,000.00	1100
Parental Involvement Coordinator – To ensure support to parents to effectively participate in the education of their children.	$65,000.00	2200
Professional Learning Communities Coach – To facilitate the institutionalization of educational reforms achieved.	$85,000.00	1100
School-Child-Home Counselor – To facilitate student centered counseling to the family and serve as a liaison to school and the community.	$85,000.00	1100
Benefits related to the above positions.	$84,650.00	3000-3999
Direct Support Cost.	$53,762.00	7370

SIG Form 5b–School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name: Gretchen Higgins Elementary

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
Board Language and Board Math Coach – To provide professional development and feedback to teachers.	$85,000.00	1100
English Language Development Coach – To provide professional development to staff and focus targeted interventions for English learners.	$85,000.00	1100
CORE Implementation Coach – To ensure delivery with fidelity of Board adopted instructional materials.	$85,000.00	1100
Response to Instruction and Intervention Coordinator – To secure effective academic and behavior interventions for all students in need of support.	$85,000.00	1100
Parental Involvement Coordinator – To ensure support to parents to effectively participate in the education of their children.	$65,000.00	2200
Professional Learning Communities Coach – To facilitate the institutionalization of educational reforms achieved.	$85,000.00	1100
School-Child-Home Counselor – To facilitate student centered counseling to the family and serve as a liaison to school and the community.	$85,000.00	1100
Benefits related to the above positions.	$84,650.00	3000-3999
Direct Support Cost.	$53,762.00	7370

SIG Form 5b–School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name: C. A. Jacobs Intermediate

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
Board Language and Board Math Coach – To provide professional development and feedback to teachers.	$85,000.00	1100
English Language Development Coach – To provide professional development to staff and focus targeted interventions for English learners.	$85,000.00	1100
CORE Implementation Coach – To ensure delivery with fidelity of Board adopted instructional materials.	$85,000.00	1100
Response to Instruction and Intervention Coordinator – To secure effective academic and behavior interventions for all students in need of support.	$85,000.00	1100
Parental Involvement Coordinator – To ensure support to parents to effectively participate in the education of their children.	$65,000.00	2200
Professional Learning Communities Coach – To facilitate the institutionalization of educational reforms achieved.	$85,000.00	1100
School-Child-Home Counselor – To facilitate student centered counseling to the family and serve as a liaison to school and the community.	$85,000.00	1100
Benefits related to the above positions.	$84,650.00	3000-3999
Direct Support Cost.	$53,762.00	7370

SIG Form 6–General Assurances and Certifications

General Assurances

(Required for all Applicants)

Note: All sub-grantees are required to retain on file a copy of these assurances for your records and for audit purposes. Please download the General Assurances form at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/. Your agency should **not** submit this form to the CDE.

Certifications Regarding Drug-Free Workplace, Lobbying, and Debarment and Suspension

Download the following three forms from http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/, and obtain the necessary signatures and include the original forms with your application submission.

1. Drug-Free Workplace
2. Lobbying
3. Debarment and Suspension

Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances

As a condition of the receipt of funds under this sub-grant program, the applicant agrees to comply with the following Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances:

1. Use its SIG to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements of SIG;

2. Establish challenging annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds;

3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

4. Report to the CDE the school-level data as described in this RFA.

5. The applicant will ensure that the identified strategies and related activities are incorporated in the revised LEA Plan and Single Plan for Student Achievement.

6. The applicant will follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the CDE.

7. The applicant will participate in a statewide evaluation process as determined by the SEA and provide all required information on a timely basis.

8. The applicant will respond to any additional surveys or other methods of data collection that may be required for the full sub-grant period.

9. The applicant will use funds only for allowable costs during the sub-grant period.

10. The application will include all required forms signed by the LEA Superintendent or designee.

11. The applicant will use fiscal control and fund accountability procedures to ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid under the sub-grant, including the use of the federal funds to supplement, and not supplant, state and local funds, and maintenance of effort (20 USC § 8891).

12. The applicant hereby expresses its full understanding that not meeting all SIG requirements will result in the termination of SIG funding.

13. The applicant will ensure that funds are spent as indicated in the sub-grant proposal and agree that funds will be used **only** in the school(s) identified in the LEA's AO-400 sub-grant award letter.

14. All audits of financial statements will be conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) and with policies, procedures, and guidelines established by the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), Single Audit Act Amendments, and OMB Circular A-133.

15. The applicant will ensure that expenditures are consistent with the federal Education Department Guidelines Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) under Title 34 Education. http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html (Outside Source)

16. The applicant agrees that the SEA has the right to intervene, renegotiate the sub-grant, and/or cancel the sub-grant if the sub-grant recipient fails to comply with sub-grant requirements.

17. The applicant will cooperate with any site visitations conducted by representatives of the state or regional consortia for the purpose of monitoring sub-grant implementation and expenditures, and will provide all requested documentation to the SEA personnel in a timely manner.

18. The applicant will repay any funds which have been determined through a federal or state audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agrees to pay any

collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or state government.

19. The applicant will administer the activities funded by this sub-grant in such a manner so as to be consistent with California's adopted academic content standards.

20. The applicant will obligate all sub-grant funds by the end date of the sub-grant award period or re-pay any funding received, but not obligated, as well as any interest earned over one-hundred dollars on the funds.

21. The applicant will maintain fiscal procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of the funds from the CDE and disbursement.

22. The applicant will comply with the reporting requirements and submit any required report forms by the due dates specified.

I hereby certify that the agency identified below will comply with all sub-grant conditions and assurances described in items 1 through 22 above.

Agency Name:	Dixon Unified School District
Authorized Executive:	Roger A. Halberg
Signature of Authorized Executive	Roger A Halberg

Drug-Free Workplace

Certification regarding state and federal drug-free workplace requirements.

Note: Any entity, whether an agency or an individual, must complete, sign, and return this certification with its grant application to the California Department of Education.

Grantees Other Than Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:
   a. Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition
   b. Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
      1. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace
      2. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace
      3. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs
      4. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace
   c. Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a)
   d. Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
      1. Abide by the terms of the statement
      2. Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction
   e. Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer or other designee. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.
   f. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:
      1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
      2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a federal, state, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency
   g. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (street address. city, county, state, zip code)

Dixon Unified School District

180 South First Street, Suite 6

Dixon, CA 95620

Check [ ] if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Grantees Who Are Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction to every grant officer or designee, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: Dixon Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: J Jesus Contreras

Signature: _____ Date: 7/1/10

CDE-100DF (May-2007) - California Department of Education

Questions: Funding Master Plan | fmp@cde.ca.gov | 916-323-1544

California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Last Reviewed: Wednesday, May 05, 2010

Lobbying

Certification regarding lobbying for federal grants in excess of $100,000.

Applicants must review the requirements for certification regarding lobbying included in the regulations cited below before completing this form. Applicants must sign this form to comply with the certification requirements under 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying." This certification is a material representation of fact upon which the Department of Education relies when it makes a grant or enters into a cooperative agreement.

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the *U.S. Code*, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

a. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

b. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," (revised Jul-1997) in accordance with its instructions;

c. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: Dixon Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: J Jesus Contreras

Signature: _____ Date: 7/1/10

ED 80-0013 (Revised Jun-2004) - U.S. Department of Education

Questions: Funding Master Plan | fmp@cde.ca.gov | 916-323-1544

California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Last Reviewed: Tuesday, February 24, 2009

Debarment and Suspension

Certification regarding debarment, suspension, ineligibility and voluntary exclusion--lower tier covered transactions.

This certification is required by the U. S. Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," " person," "primary covered transaction," " principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled A Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name of Applicant: Dixon Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: J Jesus Contreras

Signature: _____ Date: 7/1/10

ED 80-0014 (Revised Sep-1990) - U. S. Department of Education

Questions: Funding Master Plan | fmp@cde.ca.gov | 916-323-1544

California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Last Reviewed: Tuesday, February 24, 2009

SIG Form 8–Waivers Requested

Waivers Requested

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement (see page 28 for additional information). If the LEA does not intend to implement a waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which school(s) it will implement the waiver on:

- ❑ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

  Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the LEA to September 30, 2013.

  > **Note**: If the SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs receiving SIG funds.

- ❑ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

  Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to allow its Tier I and Tier II schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

- ❑ Implementing a school wide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

  Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to implement a school wide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the poverty threshold. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

Schools to be Served

Indicate which schools the LEA commits to serve, their Tier, and the intervention model the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. For each school, indicate which waiver(s) will be implemented at each school. **Note**: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools can only use the transformation model in 50 percent or less of those schools. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

SCHOOL NAME	CDS Code	NCES Code	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)				WAIVER(S) TO BE IMPLEMENTED		PROJECTED COST
						Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Start Over	Implement SWP	
Linford L. Anderson Elementary	6051049	061128001252			X							$620,000
Gretchen Higgins Elementary	6120240	061128010679			X							$620,000
C. A. Jacobs Intermediate	6051023	061128001250			X							$620,000

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Anderson Elementary School**

Intervention Model: □ Turnaround □ Restart □ Closure □ Transformation

X Other: Implementation of School-wide services for students and staff to support student achievement. Enchance services identified in the Anderson Elementary Single Plan for Student Achievement.

Total FTE required: _____LEA _____ School __7__ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School	Projected Costs LEA	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Board Language and Board Math Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
English Language Development Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
CORE Implementation Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Response to Instruction and Intervention (Rti) Coordinator	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Parental Involvement Coordinator	8/2010-6/2013	$65,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Rti Counselor	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Professional Learner Communities Consultant	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Gretchen Higgins Elementary School**

Intervention Model: □ Turnaround □ Restart □ Closure □ Transformation

X Other: Implementation of School-wide services for students and staff to support student achievement. Enchance services identified in the Gretchen Higgins Elementary Single Plan for Student Achievement.

Total FTE required: _____LEA _____ School ___7___ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School	Projected Costs LEA	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Board Language and Board Math Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
English Language Development Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
CORE Implementation Coach	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Response to Instruction and Intervention (Rti) Coordinator	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Parental Involvement Coordinator	8/2010-6/2013	$65,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Rti Counselor	8/2010-6/2013	$65,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Professional Learner Communities Consultant	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **C. A. Jacobs Intermediate School**

Intervention Model: □ Turnaround □ Restart □ Closure □ Transformation

X Other: Implementation of School-wide services for students and staff to support student achievement. Enchance services identified in the C. A. Jacobs Intermediate School Single Plan for Student Achievement.

Total FTE required: _____LEA _____ School __7__ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School	Projected Costs LEA	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Board Language and Board Math Coach	8/2010-2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
English Language Development Coach	8/2010-2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
CORE Implementation Coach	8/2010-2013	$85,000	$10,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Response to Instruction and Intervention (Rti) Coordinator	8/2010-2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Parental Involvement Coordinator	8/2010-2013	$65,000	$5,000	Title I; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Rti Counselor	8/2010-2013	$65,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.
Professional Learner Communities Consultant	8/2010-6/2013	$85,000	$5,000	Title I; Title II; EIA	Principal Ed. Services Dir.

Districtwide DAS Results

Human Resources	Average	Responses
1a	1.9	4
1b	1.8	4
2a	2.8	4
2b	2.5	4
2c	2.6	4
2d	2.1	4
3a	2.9	4
3b	2.4	4
3c	2.4	4
4a	1.7	4
4b	1.7	4
4c	2.0	4
5	1.9	4

Professsional Development	Average	Responses
1a	1.3	4
1b	2.0	4
2a	1.5	4
2b	1.4	4
3	1.3	4
4	2.0	4
5a	1.4	4
5b	1.3	4
5c	1.5	4
6a	1.7	4
6b	1.5	4
6c	1.3	4
6d	1.5	4
6e	1.6	4
6f	1.4	4
6g	1.5	4

Governance and Leadership	Average	Responses
1a	1.8	4
1b	1.9	4
2a	1.9	4
2b	1.8	4
2c	1.7	4
2d	1.6	4
3a	2.7	4
3b	1.7	4
3c	1.7	4
3d	2.5	4
3e	1.9	4
3f	1.9	4
4a	1.7	4
4b	1.8	4
4c	1.6	4
5a	1.8	4
5b	1.7	4
5c	1.4	4
5d	1.6	4
5e	1.7	4
6a	1.6	4
6b	1.8	4
6c	1.8	4

Parent and Community	Average	Responses
1a	2.8	4
1b	2.4	4
1c	2.6	4
1d	2.9	4
2a	2.3	4
2b	1.5	4
3	1.9	4

Standards Based C&I and Assessment	Average	Responses
1a	3.4	4
1b	2.1	4
1c	2.6	4
1d	1.7	4
2a	3.1	4
2b	2.0	4
2c	2.6	4
2d	2.0	4
3a	2.0	4
3b	1.5	4
3c	1.6	4
3d	2.1	4
3e	2.0	4
3f	1.6	4
4	1.5	4
5a	2.6	4
5b	2.3	4
5c	1.8	4
6	2.1	4
7a	1.7	4
7b	1.8	4
7c	1.8	4
7d	1.8	4
7e	2.5	4
7f	2.0	4
8a	2.5	4
8b	2.4	4
8c	1.8	4

Data System/Analysis/Monitoring	Average	Responses
1a	2.1	4
1b	1.6	4
1c	1.4	4
1d	1.8	4
2	1.5	4
3a	2.0	4
3b	2.9	4
3c	2.9	4
3d	2.3	4
3e	1.7	4
3f	1.4	4
4	1.7	4
5	2.2	4

Districtwide Results
Academic Program Survey

Objectives	Anderson	Gretchen Higgins	Tremont	CA Jacobs	Dixon High	Maine Prairie	Average	Responses
1.1	3.5	3.17	3.5	4.0	3.1	3.9	3.5	6
1.2	3.7	2.15	1.5	2.0	2.3	1.0	2.1	6
1.3	3.9	3.22	3.1	4.0	3.3	3.1	3.4	6
2.1	3.8	2.97	3.2	2.4	2.9	3.8	3.2	6
2.2	3.5	2.41	1.5	1.0	2.8	3.1	2.4	6
2.3	3.8	2.89	3.3	2.4			3.1	6
2.4	3.2	2.22	1.3	2.9			2.4	6
3.1		1.38	2.2		3.0	1.3	2.0	6
3.2		1.38	2.3				1.9	6
4.1		3.56	3.4	2.9	3.8	3.6	3.5	6
4.2		2.14	1.9	1.0	1.7	1.3	1.6	6
4.3		2.10	1.8	1.0	1.9	1.1	1.6	6
5.1	1.5	2.66	2.3	4.0	3.2	3.9	2.9	6
5.2	1.6	2.45	2.3	3.9	2.6	2.0	2.5	6
6.1	1.9	1.55	1.1	2.1	2.6	2.5	2.0	6
6.2	1.1	1.44	1.1	1.0	2.4	1.0	1.3	6
7.1	1.2	1.79	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.4	6
7.2	1.3	1.54	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.6	2.4	6
8.1	1.0	1.59	2.1	3.9	2.8	1.0	2.1	6
8.2	1.1	1.48	2.1	4.0	2.5	1.0	2.0	6
8.3					2.5	1.1	1.8	6
9.1		2.46	1.1	2.9	2.1	1.0	1.9	6
9.2		2.36	1.1	1.1	1.8	1.0	1.4	6

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
Anderson Elementary

10/8

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses	Averages by Grade Average
1.1	3.6	4	24	3.5
1.2	3.5	4	13	3.7
1.3	3.9	4	24	3.9
2.1	2.8	4	24	3.8
2.2	2.0	1	24	3.5
2.3	3.8	4	24	3.8
2.4	3.5	4	24	3.2
3.1			0	
3.2			0	
4.1			0	
4.2			0	
4.3			0	
5.1	1.5	1	24	1.5
5.2	1.6	1	24	1.6
6.1	2.0	2	24	1.9
6.2	1.1	1	24	1.1
7.1	1.3	1	23	1.2
7.2	1.3	1	24	1.3
8.1	1.1	1	24	1.0
8.2	1.1	1	24	1.1
9.1			0	
9.2			0	

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
Gretchen Higgins Elementary

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses
1.1	3.2	3	29
1.2	2.1	2	27
1.3	3.2	3	27
2.1	3.0	3	29
2.2	2.4	2	29
2.3	2.9	3	27
2.4	2.2	3	27
3.1	1.4	1	13
3.2	1.4	1	13
4.1	3.6	4	25
4.2	2.1	2	29
4.3	2.1	2	29
5.1	2.7	3	29
5.2	2.4	2	29
6.1	1.6	2	29
6.2	1.4	2	27
7.1	1.8	2	29
7.2	1.5	1	28
8.1	1.6	1	27
8.2	1.5	1	27
9.1	2.5	2	26
9.2	2.4	2	25

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
Tremont Elementary

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses
1.1	3.5	4	24
1.2	1.5	1	22
1.3	3.1	3	24
2.1	3.2	4	24
2.2	1.5	1	24
2.3	3.3	4	23
2.4	1.3	1	24
3.1	2.2	1	6
3.2	2.3	1	3
4.1	3.4	4	18
4.2	1.9	2	18
4.3	1.8	2	15
5.1	2.3	3	19
5.2	2.3	3	21
6.1	1.1	1	23
6.2	1.1	1	23
7.1	2.9	3	23
7.2	2.8	3	23
8.1	2.1	1	23
8.2	2.1	1	22
9.1	1.1	1	16
9.2	1.1	1	16

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
CA Jacobs Intermediate

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses
1.1	4.0	4	27
1.2	2.0	2	27
1.3	4.0	4	27
2.1	2.4	2	27
2.2	1.0	1	27
2.3	2.4	2	27
2.4	2.9	3	27
3.1			0
4.1	2.9	3	27
4.2	1.0	1	27
4.3	1.0	1	27
5.1	4.0	4	27
5.2	3.9	4	27
6.1	2.1	2	27
6.2	1.0	1	27
7.1	3.0	3	27
7.2	3.0	3	27
8.1	3.9	4	27
8.2	4.0	4	27
9.1	2.9	3	27
9.2	1.1	1	27

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
Dixon High School

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses
1.1	3.1	3	14
1.2	2.3	2	15
1.3	3.3	3	12
2.1	2.9	3	19
2.2	2.8	3	13
3.1	3.0	3	43
4.1	3.8	4	35
4.2	1.7	1	10
4.3	1.9	1	8
5.1	3.2	4	20
5.2	2.6	2	14
6.1	2.6	3	14
6.2	2.4	1	8
7.1	2.9	4	29
7.2	3.1	4	19
8.1	2.8	4	25
8.2	2.5	2	19
8.3	2.5	4	23
9.1	2.1	2	15
9.2	1.8	1	12

Academic Program Survey
School Wide Results
Maine Prairie

Objectives	Average	Mode	Responses
1.1	3.9	4	7
1.2	1.0	1	7
1.3	3.1	3	7
2.1	3.8	4	7
2.2	3.1	4	7
3.1	1.3	1	7
4.1	3.6	4	7
4.2	1.3	1	7
4.3	1.1	1	7
5.1	3.9	4	7
5.2	2.0	2	7
6.1	2.5	3	7
6.2	1.0	1	7
7.1	2.7	3	6
7.2	2.6	3	7
8.1	1.0	1	7
8.2	1.0	1	7
8.3	1.1	1	7
9.1	1.0	1	7
9.2	1.0	1	

ELSSA
Districtwide Results

Objectives	Average	Responses
2.1	1.8	5
2.2	2.1	5
2.3	2.0	5
2.4	2.0	5
2.5	2.5	5
2.6	2.9	5
2.7	2.5	5
2.8	2.0	5
2.9	2.2	5
2.10	2.5	5
2.11	2.6	5
2.12	2.1	5
2.13	1.9	5
3.1	3.2	5
3.2	2.7	5
4.1	1.2	5
4.2	3.5	5
5.1	3.6	5
5.2	3.6	5
5.3	3.6	5
5.4	2.6	5
5.5	3.1	5
5.6	2.7	5
5.7	2.5	5
5.8	1.4	5
5.9	2.3	5
6.1	2.7	5
6.2	2.1	5
6.3	1.3	5
6.4	2.6	5

ELSSA
School-Wide Results
Anderson

	Average	Mode	Responses
2.1	2.4	2	23
2.2	2.5	3	23
2.3	2.5	3	21
2.4	2.5	2	22
2.5	2.5	3	24
2.6	3.1	3	24
2.7	2.8	3	15
2.8	2.7	3	5
2.9	3.0	3	20
2.10	3.0	3	23
2.11	2.9	3	23
2.12	2.7	3	22
2.13	2.3	3	22
3.1	3.4	4	22
3.2	2.9	3	23
4.1	1.5	1	23
4.2	3.2	3	22
5.1	3.7	4	22
5.2	3.6	4	22
5.3	3.8	4	23
5.4	1.8	2	23
5.5	3.0	3	21
5.6	2.7	3	23
5.7	2.0	2	23
5.8	2.3	2	21
5.9	2.5	2	20
6.1	2.7	3	24
6.2	1.9	1	22
6.3	1.4	1	22
6.4	2.0	2	22

ELSSA
School-Wide Results
Gretchen Higgins

	Average	Mode	Responses
2.1	1.7	2	27
2.2	2.4	2	27
2.3	2.3	1	7
2.4	2.0	1	25
2.5	2.6	3	27
2.6	3.4	4	27
2.7	2.3	3	13
2.8	2.0		1
2.9	2.9	4	16
2.10	3.1	4	27
2.11	2.6	2	27
2.12	2.4	2	27
2.13	1.8	2	21
3.1	3.5	4	26
3.2	2.4	1	25
4.1	1.0	1	27
4.2	3.7	4	27
5.1	3.7	4	27
5.2	3.6	4	27
5.3	3.5	4	27
5.4	1.9	2	27
5.5	2.8	3	27
5.6	2.5	2	27
5.7	2.6	3	24
5.8	1.0	1	27
5.9	1.8	1	24
6.1	2.6	3	27
6.2	1.6	1	27
6.3	1.1	1	22
6.4	2.9	4	26

ELSSA
School-Wide Results
Tremont

	Average	Mode	Responses
2.1	2.1	--	26
2.2	2.1	--	28
2.3	1.9	--	20
2.4	2.4	--	21
2.5	2.2	--	22
2.6	2.1	--	23
2.7	1.8	--	18
2.8	2.2	--	14
2.9	1.9	--	21
2.10	2.7	--	24
2.11	2.3	--	20
2.12	2.2	--	24
2.13	1.4	--	24
3.1	2.8	--	26
3.2	2.2	--	27
4.1	1.3	--	23
4.2	3.1	--	20
5.1	3.5	--	27
5.2	3.6	--	28
5.3	3.4	--	28
5.4	3.0	--	27
5.5	3.2	--	28
5.6	3.3	--	28
5.7	2.8	--	26
5.8	1.0	--	26
5.9	1.2	--	26
6.1	2.6	--	27
6.2	2.2	--	26
6.3	1.8	--	24
6.4	2.1	--	25

ELSSA
School-Wide Results
Dixon High

	Average	Mode	Responses
2.1	2.3	2	15
2.2	2.2	2	21
2.3	2.1	2	12
2.4	2.4	2	18
2.5	2.6	3	27
2.6	2.5	3	29
2.7	2.4	2	25
2.8	2.6	3	22
2.9	2.5	3	20
2.10	2.6	3	22
2.11	2.5	2	12
2.12	2.5	2	11
2.13	2.1	3	15
3.1	3.1	4	12
3.2	2.0	2	11
4.1	1.5	1	33
4.2	3.2	3	27
5.1	3.0	3	42
5.2	3.2	3	45
5.3	3.0	3	44
5.4	2.3	2	42
5.5	2.8	3	41
5.6	2.3	2	43
5.7	2.3	2	36
5.8	1.9	1	31
5.9	2.1	2	41
6.1	1.8	1	25
6.2	1.9	2	28
6.3	1.7	1	23
6.4	2.0	2	30

ELSSA
School-Wide Results
Maine Prairie

	Average	Mode	Responses
2.1	1.0	1	5
2.2	1.3	1	7
2.3	1.2	1	5
2.4	1.2	1	6
2.5	2.7	3	6
2.6	3.0	3	5
2.7	3.0	3	5
2.8	1.0	1	5
2.9	1.0	1	6
2.10	1.3	1	7
2.11	2.7	3	6
2.12	1.0	1	5
2.13	2.0	3	6
3.1	3.2	3	6
3.2	3.2	4	6
4.1	1.0	1	5
4.2	4.0	4	5
5.1	3.6	4	7
5.2	3.4	4	7
5.3	3.6	4	7
5.4	3.7	4	6
5.5	3.4	4	7
5.6	2.3	2	3
5.7	2.4	3	5
5.8	1.3	1	6
5.9	3.7	4	6
6.1	2.7	3	6
6.2	2.8	3	6
6.3	1.0	1	6
6.4	3.3	4	6

ELSLT – Leadership Council

1.0 Instructional Program		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
1.a.	ELs have DAILY access to a core Reading/Language Arts (R/LA) program (E) or standards-aligned English/language arts textbooks (HS). Students identified for intensive intervention have access to materials at their assessed level of need.		5	4		9
1.b.	The school has implemented an effective research-based literacy plan for ELs.			6	3	9
1.c.	ELs have DAILY access to a core mathematics program (E/M) or standards-aligned mathematics textbooks (HS).	2	5		1	8
1.d.	ELs receive systematic instruction in English Language Development (ELD) targeted to their proficiency levels.		4	2	3	9
1.e.	ELs receive ELD, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), and/or Primary Language instruction based on each student's assessed language and academic needs and program enrollment.		2	7		9
1.f.	The most recent R/LA, reading intervention, and mathematics State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted (standards aligned grades nine through twelve [9-12]) materials, including Universal Access and ELD components appropriate for ELs, are used daily.			5	4	9
1.g.	Standards aligned supplemental ELD materials are used in classroom instruction (e.g., Assembly Bill 1802).		1	5	2	8
1.h.	The criteria for placing ELs in ELD and SDAIE classes at the secondary level are explicit and used.		3	1	1	5
1.i.	The school uses specific instructional strategies to help ELs progress beyond the intermediate proficiency level on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).			5	3	8
1.j.	The school uses specific instructional strategies to help long-term ELs meet all criteria for reclassification to fluent-English proficient (FEP) status.			4	3	7
1.k.	Differentiated instruction focuses on both the identified language proficiency and academic needs of ELs in R/LA, reading intervention, mathematics, and mathematics intervention.			6	2	8
1.l.	Teachers have explicit, high expectations for ELs' linguistic and academic progress and achievement.			5	2	7
1.m.	The curriculum is academically challenging for ELs.	1	6			7

Issues to Consider:
What does "Daily" really mean?
What does challenging really mean? "Level of Difficulty", difficult because of student ability?
Are SDAIE strategies REALLY being implemented?
Is there a districtwide standard for intensive, strategic, and benchmark intervention placement? Focus on inter. CELDT
At HS level, math and ELA are moving toward adoption of core state approve materials for all grade levels
Students are appropriately identified and placed in EL support
The curriculum may be challenging but is it meeting their needs?

2.0 Instructional Time		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
2.a.	E and M ELs receive the appropriate amount of instructional time in the R/LA program on a daily basis as defined by the state framework.	1	4	3		8
2.b.	E and M ELs receive the appropriate amount of instructional time in the mathematics program on a daily basis as defined by the state framework.	1	3	4		8
2.c.	E and M ELs enrolled in intervention reading programs receive the appropriate amount of instructional time in the intervention daily based on individual student assessed needs.	1	2	4	1	8
2.d.	E and M ELs enrolled in the intervention mathematics program receive the appropriate amount of instructional time in the intervention daily based on individual student assessed needs.		1	6		7
2.e.	HS ELs have the appropriate amount of instructional time to master the required skills to pass the language arts and writing components of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).		4	2		6
2.f.	HS ELs have the appropriate amount of instructional time to master the required skills to pass the mathematics component of the CAHSEE.		3	3		6
2.g.	Time is allocated during the regular school day for ELs to receive systematic ELD instruction.		8		1	9
2.h.	The master schedule in departmentalized settings accommodates the needs of ELs (e.g., rigorous ELD and SDAIE content area courses are offered).		3	4		7
2.i.	Additional ELD instructional time is provided based on assessed language needs and English proficiency levels. Note: The 2008 R/LA Framework publishers criteria requires instructional materials providing for one hour of ELD instruction daily.		4	5	1	10

The majority of our schools are providing time for ELD instruction – is it effective?
Majority of people disagree that ELS are receiving appropriate amount of math intervention in E and M
Overall there is a mix of agree and disagree on EL Instructional times. Schools are doing different things.
Not all HS and M ELs getting daily ELD instruction, especially in mainstream
Is there enough time for systematic ELD instruction?

3.0 Principals' Instructional Leadership Training		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
3.a.	The school principal and vice-principal have completed AB 75 or AB 430 training in order to provide appropriate instructional leadership for EL programs in ELD, R/LA, reading and mathematics interventions, and mathematics adoptions, when available.		6	5		11
3.b.	The principal and vice-principal have completed training on the implementation of EL programs, principles of second language acquisition, current EL research, catch-up and acceleration plans, EL pedagogy, and methods of high quality instruction, when available.	1	2	6	1	10
3.c.	The principal and vice-principal have completed training on the use of classroom observational tools for ELD and SDAIE instruction.	1	3	6	1	11
3.d.	School administrators implementing alternative programs are knowledgeable of research on bilingual instructional programs and use tools to actively monitor the effectiveness of programs (e.g., Evaluator's Toolkit for Dual Language Programs).					

About 50% of admin at sites have done AB 475 or AB 430/Less than 50% for speech teachers/0% for IAs
Less than half have training in EL research/instruction and in observational tools
Most of our teachers have CLAD/SDAIE
Prof. Development for SB 472, SDAIE strategies literacy for teachers and IAs is lacking.

4.0 Credentialed Teachers and Professional Development Opportunity		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
4.a.	All ELs are taught by teachers with the appropriate ELD and SDAIE authorization.	4	4	3		11
4.b.	All ELD, R/LA, and mathematics teachers are provided Senate Bill 472 EL follow-up professional development when available.			7	4	11
4.c.	All teachers are provided training in ELD, academic literacy for ELs, and SDAIE.			10	1	11
4.d.	All the school's paraprofessionals and/or instructional aides who work with ELs receive specific training in curriculum, instructional methods, and interventions appropriate for ELs.			5	6	11
4.e.	All ELs in alternative programs are taught by fluent and appropriately-authorized Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) teachers.					

4.d. has the biggest need
SB 472 needed
No time/budget to train IAs
No IAs for EL

5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
5.a.	A school-wide assessment plan is based on the instructional programs in place and is strictly adhered to, including, but not limited to, the California Standards Test (CST), CELDT, Aprenda/Standards-based Test in Spanish (STS), and CAHSEE.		2	6	3	11
5.b.	Curriculum-embedded assessments are used for placement and ongoing monitoring of ELs' progress in ELD, R/LA, and mathematics.		1	8	2	11
5.c.	Teachers use the information from ongoing assessments to plan and provide instruction based on student language proficiency and academic performance levels.		2	7	2	11
5.d.	Students are monitored to achieve AMAO progress and proficiency goals on the CELDT each school year.		1	9	1	11

Lack of consistent monitoring system district wide
Time and structure needed for productive collaboration
Area of growth throughout district
CST, CLDT, STS
Curriculum Embedded Assessments
Assessment guiding instruction

6.0 Ongoing Instructional Assistance and Support for Teachers		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
6.a.	Content experts and coaches knowledgeable in ELD and SDAIE support and assist teachers instructing ELs in ELD.		2	7	2	11
6.b.	Content experts and coaches knowledgeable in ELD and SDAIE support and assist teachers instructing ELs in R/LA.		5	4	2	11
6.c.	Content experts and coaches knowledgeable in ELD and SDAIE support and assist teachers instructing ELs in mathematics.		1	4	6	11

Lack of District and site level coaching to improve EL instruction for all content areas

7.0 Monthly Collaboration for Teachers by Grade Level or Department		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
7.a.	ELD and R/LA teachers collaborate to review assessment data and plan instruction for ELs.		2	7	2	11
7.b.	ELD and mathematics teachers collaborate to plan instruction for ELs.			6	3	9
7.c.	ELD teachers are included in grade level/department meetings.		9	1		10
7.d.	Structures or schedules are organized and supported to assure adequate time for staff collaboration regarding instruction for ELs.			7	3	10
7.e.	ELD and R/LA teachers meet regularly to monitor student achievement using formative assessments to plan instruction.		1	8	2	11
7.f.	Alternative program teachers collaborate with SEI and ELM teachers to ensure consistency between programs.					

Strength- EL teachers collaborate w/ grade and dep. level colleagues
Area for Growth time is lacking/not structured to enhance collaborate about EL

8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule and Intervention		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
8.a.	The school's R/LA and mathematics pacing schedule takes into account the differentiated instruction necessary to target students' English proficiency levels.	1		9	1	11
8.b.	Pacing schedules for ELD instruction are used throughout the school.			7	4	11
8.c.	Intervention programs are offered to all 9-12 EL students unable to pass any part of the CAHSEE.	4	2	1		7

9.0 Fiscal Support		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	RESPONSES
9.a.	General and categorical funds are used to support the academic needs of ELs in the areas of ELD, R/LA, and mathematics.		9	2		11
9.b.	The school budget fully supports the identified needs of ELs.			9	2	11
9.c.	A portion of the budget is allocated to staff (e.g., additional teaching support, coaching, aides, professional development, etc.) that are engaged in activities required to address the needs of ELs.		9	1	1	11

Not enough money to support EL students

Dixon Unified School District LRE Survey Results 2008-2009

Anderson	Gretchen Higgins	Tremont	CA Jacobs	Maine Prairie HS	Dixon HS
Strengths: 0.0 Vision, Expectations, Leadership & Climate (3); 1.0 Instructional Program (3); 2.0 Instructional Time (4); 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System (3); 9.0 Fiscal Support (3)	**Strengths:** 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training (3);	**Strengths:** 1.0 Instructional Program; (4); 2.0 Instructional Time (4); 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training (4); 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System (4); 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support (4); 8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule (4); 9.0 Fiscal Support (4)	**Strengths:** : 0.0 Vision, Expectations, Leadership & Climate (4); 1.0 Instructional Program (3); 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training (4); 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System (3); 7.0 Monthly Collaboration (3); 8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule (3); 9.0 Fiscal Support (3)	**Strengths:** : 0.0 Vision, Expectations, Leadership & Climate (4); 1.0 Instructional Program (4); 2.0 Instructional Time (4); 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training (4); 4.0 Professional Development Opportunity (3); 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System (3); 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support (4); 7.0 Monthly Collaboration (3); 8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule (3); 9.0 Fiscal Support (3)	**Strengths:** : 0.0 Vision, Expectations, Leadership & Climate (3); 1.0 Instructional Program (3); 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training (4); 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System (3); 7.0 Monthly Collaboration (3); 8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule (3); 9.0 Fiscal Support (3)
Weaknesses: 3.0 Instructional Leadership Training; 4.0 Professional Development Opportunity; 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support; 7.0 Monthly Collaboration; 8.0 Lesson Pacing Schedule **Concerns:** 0.5 Students not involved in IEP/LRE discussions	**Weaknesses:** 1.0 Instructional Program; 2.0 Instructional Time; 4.0 Professional Development Opportunity; 5.0 Student Achievement Monitoring System; 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support; 7.0 Monthly Collaboration	**Weaknesses:** **Concerns:** AB 466 training for special education teachers and paraprofessionals; 0.1 Cultural awareness/student diversity; SST process: accommodations and modifications in general education	**Weaknesses:** 4.0 Professional Development Opportunity; 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support; **Concerns:** 9. general education teachers not at every IEP meeting; 1. lack email maintenance and working telephones	**Weaknesses:** **Concerns:** AB 466 training for paraprofessionals	**Weaknesses:** 2.0 Instructional Time; 4.0 Professional Development Opportunity; 6.0 Instructional Assistance/Support; **Concerns:** Students not always involved in IEP/LRE discussion

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

R4SDSS – Dixon Unified School District - Solano County Office of Education
PROJECT FOCUS

2009 - 2010

The Region IV System of District & School Support (R4SDSS) agrees to:

- support Dixon Unified School District and the Solano County Office of Education in its efforts to provide district-level and site-level administrators and support staff with comprehensive professional development related to instructional program monitoring through assessment cycles and data analysis that improves the district's internal systemic capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-AMOs) in English/Language Arts and mathematics,
- provide coaching for district-level and site-level administrators and support staff related to implementation and monitoring feedback on delivery and design of BoardMath strategies that improves the district's internal systemic capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-AMOs) in mathematics,
- support C.A. Jacobs Middle School in Dixon Unified School District as a Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project to build site and district capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-AMOs) in English/Language Arts,
- provide easier access to ELA and Mathematics Strategies trainings for school staff by scheduling trainings in close proximity to the district (i.e. Solano County Office of Education),
- support selected Dixon Unified School District site and district level staff in becoming R4SDSS Certified Strategies Trainers.

R4SDSS Deliverables

1. R4SDSS staff will provide district-level and site-level administrators and support staff with comprehensive professional development related to instructional program monitoring through assessment cycles and data analysis for a total of **4 days** (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.) Administrators will be guided through assessment and data analysis protocols that they can replicate during collaborative staff professional development meetings. Training is specifically designed to improve the district's internal systemic capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-AMOs) in English/Language Arts and mathematics,
2. R4SDSS staff will provide coaching for district-level and site-level administrators and support staff related to implementation and monitoring feedback on delivery and design of BoardMath strategies that improves the district's internal systemic capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-AMOs) in mathematics for a total of **2 days.** (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.)
3. R4SDSS staff will provide support to C.A. Jacobs Middle School in Dixon Unified School District as a Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project to build site and district capacity to support students in meeting or exceeding the Annual Measurable Objectives (AYP-

AMOs) in English/Language Arts for a total of **4 days**. (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.)

4. R4SDSS staff will provide easier access to ELA and Mathematics Strategies trainings for school staff by scheduling trainings in close proximity to the district. **The following trainings are scheduled at Solano County Office of Education: Math Strategies for Success 9/26/09 and 12/0/09; English Language Arts Strategies for Success 10/13/09.** It is understood that these trainings are offered on a first come –first serve basis and participants must register at the R4SDSS website – www. r4sdss.org. There is a separate charge for each participant that registers for these trainings. The cost of this training is not included in this agreement.
5. R4SDSS staff will support selected Dixon Unified School District site and district level staff in becoming R4SDSS Certified Strategies Trainers for a total of **2-4 days.** (Days determined by number of staff requesting certification.)
6. R4SDSS staff will provide a total of **12-14 days** of support services beginning August 2009 to be completed by June 30, 2010.

Dixon Unified School District (DUSD) Deliverables

1. The DUSD will collaborate with R4SDSS to identify a plan of professional development delivery for site administrators no later than September 30, 2009. (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.)
2. The DUSD will guarantee that all appropriate district and site administrators will participate in activities mutually determined by R4SDSS and the District. (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.

CA Jacobs Middle School, Dixon Unified SD Deliverables

1. The CA Jacobs Middle School and the DUSD will collaborate with R4SDSS to identify a plan of professional development delivery for site administrators no later than September 30, 2008. (See attached R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar 2009-2010 for details.)
2. The School and District will guarantee that a professional development/coaching structure exits that will ensure, ***at minimum***, the site principal and assistant principal participate in activities mutually determined by R4SDSS and the principal.

Expected Outcomes

1) Improved SCHOOL and DISTRICT capacity to meet the academic needs of basic, below basic and far-below basic students relative to California Standards Test-CST results).
2) Improved student achievement (Relative to CST results).
3) Attainment of district and priority school API and AYP targets.
4) SCHOOL and DISTRICT internal capacity to provide related professional development; demonstration lessons and classrooms; and program assessment, implementation and monitoring support.

R4SDSS Program Check Points

1. On November 17, 2009; February 16, 2010 and April 16, 2010; the R4SDSS staff/consultants - using data collected from on-site visitations; evidence of participation by District Administration and support personnel for the purposes of capacity building, sustainability, and institutionalization; and input from CA Jacobs Middle School leadership, Dixon Unified School District leadership and Solano County Office of Education Educational Services leadership;

will make a determination to continue or terminate the R4SDSS – CA Jacobs Middle School and Dixon Unified School District 2009/2010-Project Focus Agreement.

2. **Changes in the CA Jacobs Middle School principal and/or educational services district administrators, including the superintendent, following the first day of 2009-2010 instruction will activate an immediate evaluation of continued services to CA Jacobs Middle School and/or Dixon USD.**

Fee for Services Provided

1. The fee for service will be **$14,000**. There is a fee for service for professional development and coaching days beyond the stated program descriptions. Contact Robin Hall, *510.670.4170/rhall@acoe.org* for more information regarding such additional fees for service.
2. **The first payment of $10,000 will be made payable to the Regional System of District & School Support - Alameda County Office of Education, and shall be sent to Region IV System of District & School Support – Room 273, c/o the Alameda County Office of Education, 313 W. Winton Ave., Hayward, CA, 94544, no later than October 15, 2009.**
3. **The second and final payment of $4,000 will be made payable to the Regional System of District & School Support – Alameda County Office of Education, and shall be sent to Region IV System of District & School Support – Room 273, c/o the Alameda County Office of Education, 313 W. Winton Ave., Hayward, CA, 94544, no later than February 18, 2010. Payment may be reduced by $2,000.00 to reflect number of days needed for Trainer certification.**

Indemnification:

Dixon Unified SD and R4SDSS each agree to hold harmless, indemnify and defend the other and their respective officers, employees and agents from any and all claims, damages, losses and expenses arising from or resulting from injury, damage or death to any person firm or corporation in connection with its performance of this agreement.

Dixon Unified SD and R4SDSS each also agree to hold harmless, indemnify and defend the other, it officers, employees and agents from any and all claims or losses incurred by any supplier, contractor, or subcontractor furnishing work, services or materials to Dixon Unified SD in connection with the performance of this agreement.

Dixon Unified SD and R4SDSS each shall hold harmless and indemnify the other and its officers, employees and agents from any damages of every nature and description caused by negligent or willful acts or omissions by the other related to its performance under this agreement.

Signature Assurances

Dixon Unified School District

Roger Halberg
Superintendent

Date: 8-4-09

Jason Hofhenke
Principal, CA Jacobs Middle School
Date: 8-4-09

Jesus Contreras
Senior Director of Student Services
Date: 8-4-09

R4SDSS

Robin Hall
Executive Director,
Region IV System of District & School Support
Date: 8·13·09

Solano County Office of Education

Lisette Estrada-Henderson
Assistant Superintendent
Solano County Office of Education
Date: 8/11/09

R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar
2009-2010

Date	Time	Location	Activity	Participants	Details
August 17, 2009	9:00-4:00	CA Jacobs	Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project	Principal, Carlisle. Selected Site and District Staff	Plan for details of Demonstration project, Professional Development,. Classroom Observations, Data Review, Implementation Support, Meetings with Selected Staff
September 10, 2009	3:00-5:00	District Office	Assessment & Data Analysis Series; Session #1	District Staff, Principals, Shannon, Lynn	Overview of the assessment cycle; Administrators will gain knowledge in benchmark data protocols.
September 11, 2009	9:00-4:00	CA Jacobs	Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project	Principal, Carlisle. Selected Site and District Staff	Professional Development,. Classroom Observations, Data Review, Implementation Support, Meetings with Selected Staff
September 14-18, 2009	TBA	CA Jacobs	Fall Benchmark-Secondary	Secondary Students	Curriculum Associates
September 26, 2009	8:30-3:00	SCOE	BoardMath Training	Elementary Teachers	Training to include BoardMath, Math Actions, Problem Solving
October 5-9, 2009	TBA	Elementary Schools	K-6th Fall Benchmark	Elementary Students	Curriculum Associates
October 9, 2009	9:00-4:00	CA Jacobs	Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project	Principal, Carlisle. Selected Site and District Staff CAJ only	Professional Development,. Classroom Observations, Data Review, Implementation Support, Meetings with Selected Staff
October 13, 2009	8:30-3:00	SCOE	ELA Training	Elementary Teachers	Training to include BoardLanguage, Reading Tools, Vocabulary
October 16, 2009	TBA	TBA	Implementation Feedback on BoardMath design and delivery	Elementary Principals/Coaches/ District Office Personnel	Training for principals/coaches/support providers on how to give feedback. Selected sites/teachers based on training and implementation level.)

R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar
2009-2010

Date	Time	Location	Activity	Participants	Details
October 21, 2009	8:30-12:30	District Office	Data Analysis Series; Session #2-Fall Benchmark Analysis	District Staff, Principals K-8, Shannon, Lynn	Administrators will engage in Data Analysis protocols for Benchmark #1 with school data. Administrators will replicate this process with their staff in the afternoon
November 7, 2009	8:30-3:00	SRVCC	ELA Training	Elementary Teachers	Training to include BoardLanguage, Reading Tools, Vocabulary
November 9, 2009	TBA	TBA	Implementation Feedback on ELA strategies design and delivery	Elementary Principal/Coaches/ District Office Personnel	Training for principals/coaches/support providers on how to give feedback. Selected sites/teachers based on training and implementation level.)
December 4, 2009	9:00-4:00	CA Jacobs	Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project	Principal, Carlisle. Selected Site and District Staff CAJ	Professional Development, Classroom Observations, Data Review, Implementation Support, Meetings with Selected Staff
December 8, 2009	8:30-3:00	SCOE	BoardMath	Elementary Teachers	Training to include BoardMath, Math Actions, Problem Solving
January 25-29, 2010	TBA	CA Jacobs	Winter Benchmark-Secondary	Secondary Students	Curriculum Associates
February 8-12, 2010	TBA	Elementary Schools	Winter Benchmark-K-6th	Elementary Students	Curriculum Associates
February 24, 2010	8:30-12:30	District Office	Data Analysis Series; Session #3-Winter Benchmark Analysis Follow-Up Support with Shannon & Lynn at sites 1:30-3:30	District Staff, Principals K-8, Shannon, Lynn	Administrators will engage in Data Analysis protocols for Benchmark #2 with school data. Administrators will replicate this process with their staff in the afternoon.

R4SDSS/Dixon USD Support Calendar
2009-2010

Date	Time	Location	Activity	Participants	Details
March 4, 2010	3:00-5:00	District Office	Data Analysis Series; Session #4	District Staff, Principals K-8, Shannon, Lynn	Administrators will reflect on the data cycle and be introduced to protocols for formative assessments; data series wrap-up
TBA	TBA	School Site and Classroom	Trainer Certification	Teachers recommended for certification by Site and District Leadership.	Teachers complete R4SDSS Trainer Certification process

Summary:

- Assessment & data analysis series: 4 days: 9/10/09, 10/28/09, 2/24/10, 3/4/10
- Secondary Board Strategies Demonstration Project; CA Jacobs: 4 days: 8/17/09, 9/11/09, 10/9/09, 12/4/09
- Implementation Feedback for Administrators: 2 days: 10/16/09, 11/9/09
- Trainer Certification: 2-4 days TBA
- Strategy Trainings: 4 days: 9/26/09, 10/3/09, 11/7/09, 12/8/09