#### STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL 1

# Academic Excellence

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	SY 2015-16 (BASELINE)	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18	SY 2018-19 TARGET	2018-19	2019-20 TARGET	2020-21 TARGET	2021-22 TARGET	NOTES
Smarter Balanced Reading Grade 3: Students Who Are Proficient	49%	45%	47%	59%	46%	50%	54%	60%	
Smarter Balanced Reading Grade 4: Students Who Are Proficient	47%	45%	47%	58%	51%	55%	59%	63%	
Smarter Balanced Reading Grade 5: Students Who Are Proficient	54%	54%	53%	63%	55%	59%	63%	67%	
Smarter Balanced Math Grade 3: Students Who Are Proficient	45%	43%	45%	56%	44%	48%	52%	56%	
Smarter Balanced Math Grade 4: Students Who Are Proficient	39%	39%	43%	51%	42%	46%	50%	54%	
Smarter Balanced Math Grade 5: Students Who Are Proficient	33%	37%	37%	48%	39%	43%	47%	51%	
Reading Inventory Grade 3: Students Who Meet Growth Target	59%	44%	56%	67%	56%	60%	64%	68%	
Reading Inventory Grade 4: Students Who Meet Growth Target	64%	42%	59%	71%	61%	65%	69%	73%	
Reading Inventory Grade 5: Students Who Meet Growth Target	67%	36%	62%	74%	69%	73%	77%	81%	
Math Inventory Grade 3: Students Who Meet Growth Target	73%	68%	55%	78%	42%	46%	50%	54%	15-16> accounted by hand for - MI, 17-18 baseline test (fall) was different than post test (winter, spring)
Math Inventory Grade 4: Students Who Meet Growth Target	71%	66%	65%	77%	52%	56%	60%	64%	15-16> accounted by hand for - MI, 17-18 baseline test (fall) was different than post test (winter, spring)
RTI Implementation (Metric TBD)*	-			TBD					RTI Implementation (Metric TBD): The district plans to develop an implementation checklist and begin monitoring the level of RTI implementation in 2017-18.
Total Number of Classroom Walkthroughs Documented in DSC	4,749	4,375	3,537	4,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Many schools utilize a Google Form tailored to school specific needs (specific look-fors, targeted feedback and data gathering). While we still require a minimum of 5 documented walkthroughs per week, the trend to use school specific forms is increasing and is supported by the C & I Department.

#### STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL 2

### Future Ready

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR		SY 2016-17			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	NOTES
	(BASELINE)			TARGET		TARGET	TARGET	TARGET	
# of Students Enrolled in Dual Enrollment Coursework	240	273	306	300	458	400	400	400	Peaked in 18-19 but dual enrollment has changed in
									popularity due to the university-level changes in
									acceptance of dual enrollment credits.
# of Passing AP Tests and Combined	1782 AP	1692 AP	1747 AP	1700 AP	1555 AP	1600 AP	1625 AP	1650 AP	
# of IB Diplomas Earned	2	5	5	6	1	5	8	11	
SAT Average Score*	1060 (535 Rdg,	1057 (536 Rdg,	1033 (525 Rdg,	1010 (480 Rdg,	1018 (516 Rdg, 502	1010 (480 Rdg,	1020 (485 Rdg,	1030 (490 Rdg,	*SAT average score: The district's target reflects
	525 Math)	523 Math)	504 Math)	530 Math	Math	530 Math)	535 Math)	540 Math)	the College Board's SAT College and Career
									Readiness Benchmarks: Evidence-Based Reading
									and Writing: 480, Math 530 (combined score of
									1010).
High School Graduation Rate	89%	89%	91%	91%	90%	91%	92%	93%	year lag
High School Drop-Out Rate	1.7%	0.9%	1.1%	1.6%	0.80%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	year lag
% CTE Programs with Business Partnership	15%	15%	20%	75%	93%	95%	95%	95%	
% CTE Programs with Certifications	10%	10%	60%	50%	86%	90%	92%	95%	
AVID Enrollment	170	220	405	450	519	500	500	500	
# of AP Boot Camps	1	1	1	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	AP Boot Camps were discontinued in 2018-19 due to
									lack of enrollment.
% of Secondary Students in Club, Sport or Activity	50%	50%	58%	75%	75%	82%	85%	90%	
Number of Students in Work Study Program	Na	Na	Na	25	25	35	50	65	Work study programs began in 2018-19.
% Students with Disabilities with Individualized,	N/A	73%	82%	90%	87%	90%	93%	96%	
Measurable Post-Secondary Goal and Activities									
% Students with Disabilities in Vocational	2%	2%	7.5% (47/621)	12%	10.6% (67/630)	13%	16%	19%	*Students with disabilities in vocational
Opportunities Beyond the Traditional Career Pathway									opportunities: Measure taken from Indicator 13
Experience*									Transition Audit reporting 9th grade through 18-21
									program.

### Success for All

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	SY 2015-16 (BASELINE)	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18	SY 2018-19 TARGET	2018-19			2021-22 TARGET	NOTES
ACCESS Testing Growth (Progress in English Language Proficiency)	50%	40%	42% met target 64% made growth	50%	6 36% met target 62% made growth	e 65% growth	44% target 69% growth	,	ACCESS Testing: The State of Delaware is developing a target for ESSA plan. We will wait to align our district goal and target to the state's ACCESS growth measure.  *WIDA raised the bar for language proficiency where students needed to showcase higher language sckills to achieve the same proficiency level scores (standard setting); this resulted in lower scores and fewer students exiting the program
ACCESS Testing Attainment (Meeting Exit Criteria)	11%	*6%	7%	109	6 8%	10%	12%	15%	*WIDA raised the bar for language profciency where students needed to showcase higher language sckills to achieve the same proficiency level scores (standard setting); this resulted in lower scores and fewer students exiting the program
Reading Inventory Growth: Students with Disabilities (Grades 3-8)	39%	42%	37%	499	6 41%	45%	49%	54%	
Reading Inventory Growth: English Learners (Grades 3-8)	44%	59%	46%	549	6 45%	49%	54%	59%	1
Math Inventory Growth: Students with Disabilities (Grades 3-8)	52%	38%	36%	629	6 32%	38%	42%	46%	Measure change related to scoring for SY 16- 17, 17-18 baseline test (fall) was different than post test (winter, spring)
Math Inventory Growth: English Learners (Grades 3-8)	65%	Not available	50%	759	6 42%	48%	52%	56%	Measure change related to scoring for SY 16- 17, 17-18 baseline test (fall) was different than post test (winter, spring)
Kindergarten DIBELS: Students with Disabilities at Benchmark*	36%	37%	32%	469	% 34%	38%	42%	46%	1
Grade 1 DIBELS: Students with Disabilities at Benchmark*	25%	19%	24%	359	6 19%	25%	29%	33%	
Kindergarten DIBELS: English Learners at Benchmark*	67%	44%	60%	779	6 56%	60%	64%	68%	
Grade 1 DIBELS: English Learners at Benchmark*	56%	52%	40%	669	6 44%	50%	54%	58%	

PreK Growth Measure*	N/A	N/A	Emotional Regulation 18.85%, Positive Relationships 18.85%, Group Participation 31.97%	Emotional Regulation 20%, Positive Relationships 20%, Group Participation 40%	Emotional Regulation 68.6%, Positive Relationships 68.6%, Group Participation 86.6% *Starting in 18- 19, data collected in the spring	Positive Relationships 75%, Group Participation 88%	Positive Relationships 77%, Group Participation	Relationships Cognitive, Literacy & Mathematics. RPLC's 79%, Group Building Leadership Team is working with Participation TSG on options for aggregate reporting.
RTI System Implementation Measure*	N/A	SY 17-18 Baseline Year	TBD	TBD	Removed			District MTSS Academic (RTI) team is reviewing potential measures for tiered implementation. Baseline will be added for SY 17-18 after the measure is selected.
Reduction of Discipline Referrals: All Students (In-school referrals)	29,898	27,551	26,324	23,918	26,870	23880	20890	17900 Overall goal to reduce discipline referrals by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 2990 referrals per year reduction for all students).
Reduction of Discipline Referrals: Students with Disabilities (In-school referrals)	8,001	8,976	9,167	6,401	9,414	8614	7814	7014 Overall goal to reduce discipline referrals by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 800 referrals per year reduction for students with disabilities).
Reduction of Out-of-School Suspensions: All Students	3,356	2,975	2,585	2,500	2760	2382	2004	1626 Overall goal to reduce out of school suspensions by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 378 OSS per year reduction for all students). Revised 18-19 SY target.
Reduction of Out of School Suspensions: Students with Disabilities	894	1103	1037	940	1040	860	680	500 Overall goal to reduce out of school suspensions by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 180 OSS per year reduction for students with disabilities).
School Climate Survey (Multiple Metrics)*	Student 4% (1/24); Home 33% (7/21); Staff 19% (5/26)	Student 4% (1/24); Home 27% (6/22); Staff 12% (3/26)		40% avg across reporting areas	Student 0% (0/24); Home 43% (10/23); Staff 15% (4/26)	Home 48%; Staff 20%	Home 53%;	Home 58%; Percentage of Red Clay Schools over 3.4

MTSS Implementation Measure - Tiered Fidelity Inventory*	N/A		40% avg Total Score for the Tiered Fidelity Inventory report includes 11 schools)	Score across domain areas	48.6% avg Total Score for the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (11 non-PBS school scores reported previously); 66.1% avg Total Score for TFI (13 PBS school scores - baseline year)	54% avg (non- PBS schools); 71% avg (PBS schools)	59% avg (non- PBS schools); 76% avg (PBS schools)	64% avg (non-MTSS Tiered Fidelity Inventory is used for all PBS schools); non-PBS schools annually. The Total Score 81% avg (PBS (percentage) out of 100% reflects progress schools) toward 3 domain areas: Teams, Intervention & Evaluation. PBS schools will utilize the Key Feature Evaluation tool that is completed cyclically (not annual measure).
Reduction of Out-of-School Suspensions: Male Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	na	1882	1694	1525	1373 Overall goal to reduce out of school suspensions by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 188 OSS per year reduction for male students ).
Reduction of Out-of-School Suspensions: Black Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	na	1705	1535	1382	1244 Overall goal to reduce out of school suspensions by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 170 OSS per year reduction for black students).
Reduction of Discipline Referrals: Male Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18285	16457	14812	13331 Overall goal to reduce discipline referrals by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 1828 referrals per year reduction for male students).
Reduction of Discipline Referrals: Black Students (Inschool referrals)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	15514	13963	12570	11313 Overall goal to reduce discipline referrals by 50% in 5 years (i.e. 1551 referrals per year reduction for black students).
Preschool Growth: Communication/Language (Teaching Strategies Gold)	N/A	N/A	Receptive language 28.69%, Expressive language 28.69%	Receptive language 35%, Expressive language 35%	Receptive language 74.67%, Expressive language 74.67% *Starting in 18- 19, data collected in the spring	Receptive language 80%, Expressive language 80%	Receptive language 82%, Expressive language 82%	Receptive language 84%, Expressive language 84%

STRATEGIC PLAN FOCUS AREA 1

## High-Quality Educators

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18	SY 2018-19	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	NOTES
	(BASELINE)			TARGET		TARGET	TARGET	TARGET	
% of Specialists Rated Highly Effective using RCCSD Performance Rating Program	<u>. ·</u>	30%	48%	44%	51%		*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of	School year 2016-17 was the first year of performance level DPAS II formative calibration and performance level professional development. For the 2017-18 school year, data was collected, and the result was 48%. There were 98 evaluations. There were 47 rated highly effective. Data Service Center was the data source. 129 total summatives for 18-19 school year, 66 were highly effective.
% of Teachers Rated Highly Effective using RCCSD Performance Rating Program	25%	17%	30%	35%	32%	under review	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	defined in early 2020 upon review of	The 2017-18 school year target was 26%. There were 584 evaluations. There were 178 rated highly effective. Data Service Center was the data source. 2018-2019 515 summatives with 166 highly effective
% of Administrators Rated Highly Effective	49%	14%	23%	60%		under review	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	defined in early 2020 upon review of	School year 2016-17 was the first year that administrators used the smarter balance assessment as a student performance goal. For SY 2017/18, There were 73 evaluations compled. There were 17 highly effective ratings. Data Service Center was the data source.
# of Participants in Aspiring Administrator Cohort*	11	N/A	18	20	NA	19	NA		Data Service Center was the data source. Program runs every other year.
# of Participants in Aspiring Principal Cohort	13	13	15	20	7	11	NA	,	Data Service Center was the data source. Program runs every other year.
# of Professional Learning Workshops Targeted to Individualized Professional Development Needs	N/A	N/A	40	25	100	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	*Targets to be defined in early 2020 upon review of measure	

% of Staff Reporting That Professional Learning Had a Positive Impact on Student Academic Achievement	N/A	N/A	80%	65%	83%	90%	90%	90%	The 3-week professional development follow-up survey was launched on February 1, 2018. From February 1, 2018 through June 29, 2018 there were 636 survey responses. DSC was the data source.
% of Staff Reporting That After Professional Learning They Used the Strategies/Content Learned	N/A	N/A	87%	65%	85%	90%	90%	90%	The 3-week professional development follow-up survey was launched on February 1, 2018. From February 1, 2018 through June 29, 2018 there were 636 survey responses. DSC was the data source.
% of Staff Reporting That After Professional Learning Their Job Performance Improved Because of the Content Learned	N/A	N/A	77%	65%	83%	90%	90%	90%	The 3-week professional development follow-up survey was launched on February 1, 2018. From February 1, 2018 through June 29, 2018 there were 636 survey responses. DSC was the data source
# of DPAS II Expert Evaluator Formative Reviews	161	176	170	191	183	NA	NA	NA	Google Drive was used as a data source. This measure is no longer applicable as the district is refocusing the expert evaluator process to look more closely at the impact of DPAS II in the classroom.
% of Satisfactory DPAS II Expert Evaluator Formative Reviews	93%	94%	96%	96%	96%	NA	NA	NA	Google Drive was used as a data source. This measure is no longer applicable as the district is refocusing the expert evaluator process to look more closely at the impact of DPAS II in the classroom.
# of Professional Learning Opportunities Planned for New Administrators (Mentoring Program)	6	6	10	12	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*	Google Drive was the a data source through 2017-28. *The district transitioned to the state model for new administrator mentoring. A new measure will be defined.
% of new administrators rating the mentoring program as having a positive impact on their effectiveness as a new administrator	-		-	-	-	85%	90%	90%	Targets are approximate as the target depends on the program's enrollment each year.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOCUS AREA 2

## Operational Effectiveness

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	SY 2015-16 (BASELINE)	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18	SY 2018-19 TARGET	2018-19	2019-20 TARGET	2020-21 TARGET	2021-22 TARGET	NOTES
Average age of maintenance work orders [Facilities and Maintenance] (days)	NA	NA	19	14	6.5	10	10	10	School Dude Work Order Reports
Minor Capital Improvement funds allocated based on principal request in support of the strategic plan	NA NA	NA.	NA.	20%	45%	Discontinue performance target due to funding change. Keep as an action item as part of our processes for available funds.			Minor Cap Request, Facilities Committee Review
Chromebook Repair SLA (14 days)	91%	85%	81%	90%	91%	90%			TrackIt Work Order Reports
Overall Technology Repair SLA (14 days)	91%	87%	88%	90%	93%	90%			TrackIt Work Order Reports
School bus arrival and departure rates [Transportation]	NA	NA	NA	Baseline year	97%	99% High 95% Middle 98% Elem.			GPS Software based on stated standards
Average Daily Participation (Lunch) [Nutrition]	66%	64%	66%	67%	64%	65%			Nutrition Department reporting
Average Daily Participation (Breakfast) [Nutrition]	38%	37%	37%	39%	43%	44%			Nutrition Department reporting, a change in start time is expected to negatively impact the participation in the breakfast program. The addition of Thomas Edison Charter school is expected to have a positive effect on average daily participation.
Total Dinners/after school snacks served [Nutrition]	76,578	58,874	92,787	100,000	104,628	108,000			Nutrition Department reporting
Community Feeding Opportunities [Nutrition]	NA NA	44,689	57,774	62,000	57,443	55,000			Summer feeding program and food truck engagements. These opportunities are typically a part of the CAFP (School Year At Risk Feeding Program), or SFSP (Summer At Risk Feeding Program)

STRATEGIC PLAN FOCUS AREA 3

# Community Engagement

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	SY 2015-16 (BASELINE)	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18	SY 2018-19 TARGET	2018-19	2019-20 TARGET		2021-22 TARGET	NOTES
# of Parents Participating in Community Engagement Programming	N/A	N/A	8	20	13	20	20	20	
# of Parents from Underepresented Populations Participating in Community Engagement Programming	N/A	N/A	8	13	4	10	10	10	
# of Parents Reporting That Programming Resulted in Learned Strategies of Effective Advocacy for Child	N/A	N/A	8	17	13	18	18	18	
# of Parents Providing Continued Support of RCCSD Parent Advisory Council	15	15	17	20	16	15	15	15	
# of Parents Reporting That Programming Resulted in Increased Understanding of Topics Presented Monthly	15	15	17	20	16	18	18	18	
Employee Engagement Metrics TBD Community Engagement Metrics TBD									