

U.S. Department of Education
RTT-D Annual Performance Report
Budget Information (524B Section B)
Based on ED 524B OMB No. 1894-0003 Exp. 06/19/2014

Budget Information

For each project, describe how funds were spent during the reporting period and provide an explanation of any substantive budget changes anticipated in future years. Refer to the Budget Information section in the instructions document for additional information.

Summary Budget Narrative

Brief summary of your overall budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in 2014-15 were on personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. Personnel funded included media specialists and literacy and math coaches at every site. Additionally, teacher leaders earned stipends as curriculum leaders, assessment leaders, and evaluation support coaches. We invested funding in staff at the Kids' Zone, hired to support children and families most in need. The money was also used for teacher hourly and substitute costs for teachers to attend professional development to implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), personalized learning, and Academic Parent Teacher Teams.

To support implementation of the common core state standards and personalizing learning we spent a large amount of funding on contracts for consultants to engage teachers in professional learning.

Funding was provided to purchase equipment and supplies, primarily student devices (Chromebooks for students in grades 3-12 and Nexus 7 Tablets for students in Transitional Kinder - 2nd grade), carts and cases to help personalize learning.

A small amount was spent on travel to attend conferences that focus on personalized learning.

Summary Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years as a result.

We had no significant discrepancies, with the exception of carryover, which will be described in the Budget Narrative sections below.

Project Budget 1 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in Project 1 (Literacy and the Common Core) continue to be in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. We used carryover funds to continue paying for Media Specialists at each site. We paid for a math and literacy coach at each site to support implementation of the common core state standards (CCSS) and technology integration and support. In addition, funds were spent to pay teachers or to provide substitutes for them to attend common core aligned professional development and planning in literacy and math. They were also used to release teachers and/or pay them hourly to develop common core units of study, using the Rigorous Curriculum Design (RCD) process. Funds were also allocated for an English Learner support class at James Logan High School.

In the supplies category, we used carryover funds to continue purchasing document cameras for K-12 classrooms to support delivery of CCSS instruction that teachers are implementing based on the professional development they are receiving.

New Haven Unified contracted with professional development experts in literacy (Stephanie Harvey and West Ed) and mathematics (Teachers Development Group), to provide teachers and coaches with ongoing, common core aligned professional development. We also contracted with the New Teacher Center to provide ongoing professional development and support for our coaches. In addition, we funded licences for our on-line credit recovery courses for students at the high schools.

We will have significant carryover in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. There are a few reasons for the carryover. First, we overestimated the cost of Media Specialists in our original budget. Second, due to difficult contract negotiations with our teachers' association, teachers began dropping out of optional professional development. We also experienced difficulties securing substitutes, making it impossible for sites to schedule grade level common core planning days on several occasions.

We will have also have carryover in supplies, which was allocated for the purchase of document cameras. Again, we overestimated the cost of the document cameras, which is the reason for the carryover.

We will have carryover in contractual because we were unable to hold a couple of sessions of Math Studio at two elementary sites. We will be making up those sessions this year, using the carryover money.

Project 1 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

Carryover funds in personnel costs will be used to continue funding the Media Specialists' salaries and the literacy coach salaries, which will start to receive less funding this coming year. We will also use the funds to continue paying for substitute release and hourly costs associated with the RCD common core until design process, which includes lesson planning, collaboration time, and observations.

We will have approximately \$50,000 in carryover in supplies. We would like to move about \$40,000 from that area to contracts. We need to add additional professional development days for math due to site requests. Our student summative and formative assessment data indicates that Math is the greatest area of need for instructional improvement. This is in addition to the carryover money in contracts that we will use to make up Math Studio sessions from last year, as mentioned above.

Project Budget 2 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in Project 2 (Community Connections), as identified in the Project 2 Budget Expenditures Worksheet, was in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. These positions support students and families in the Kids' Zone area, including community liaisons, childhood development staff, and administrative support and leadership staff. Funds were spent on Parent Project in Spanish at the Adult School. In addition, money was spent to continue supporting Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) at Kids' Zones sites, and was allocated to begin APTT at the remaining elementary sites. However, we encountered significant delays in implementing APTT due to difficulties in contract negotiations. We will use the carryover funds to pay for teacher hourly and release time to support APTT in 2015-16.

Supply funds were spent to enhance resources and materials available to families at the Kids' Zone offices, as well as for materials for Parent Project, and for Chromebooks, curriculum and materials to support the 21st Century After-School Grant at Kids' Zone sites.

In order to implement APTT, New Haven Unified contracted with West Ed to provide initial professional development to staff, as well as follow-up coaching and consulting to teachers leaders and principals at the Kids' Zone schools. Much of the funding for consultant costs will be carried over to 2015-16 due to the delays in implementing APTT mentioned above. We also contracted with the Fremont Family Resource Center (FRC) to support counseling interns at two Kids' Zone sites. In addition, New Haven entered into a contract with Spark Point to provide Kids' Zone families with assistance in benefits eligibility, financial literacy, college budgeting and saving, budget planning and goal setting, savings matching, and tax help.

We moved \$10,200 from the "other" line, which was designated for Technology of Participation Training (ToP) to the Travel line. We did this because more appropriate leadership professional

development was being offered at the National Family and Community Engagement conference. This did not modify the project activities in any way.

Project 2 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

As mentioned above, we will not be making any changes to the Project 2 Budget. We will, however, have a large carryover in personnel costs. We will use this money to pay for teacher hourly and release time for APTT, which was put on hold in 2014-15 due to contract negotiations. We will also use it to cover the cost of fringe benefits, which exceeded the allocated amount in the original budget.

In addition, as previously mentioned, we will use carryover funds from contracts to pay for APTT consulting costs that were pushed back a year due to contract negotiations.

Project Budget 3 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in Project 3 (Teacher/Principal Evaluation), were in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. Money for hourly, substitutes costs and stipends was used to support time for the Evaluation Task Force (ETF) to meet, plan, and guide the work of the teacher evaluation system. Time for ETF members to create professional practice and student growth rubrics, as well as new contractual guidelines and forms, was paid for using grant funds. Evaluation support coaches received stipends to attend professional development on coaching and supporting teachers when the new teacher evaluation system begins this year.

We contracted with the New Teacher Center to provide professional development to site and district administrators and evaluation support coaches.

Carryover funds in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits will be used to support release time and hourly for the ETF and evaluation support coaches to support implementation of the new teacher evaluation system in 2015-16.

Project 3 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

There were no changes made to the Project 3 Budget. As mentioned above, carryover funds will be used to support release time and hourly for the ETF and evaluation support coaches to support implementation of the new teacher evaluation system in 2015-16.

Project Budget 4 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

Funds spent in Project 4 (Technology and Personalization), as identified in the Project 4 Budget Expenditures Worksheet, were used in a variety of areas.

Much of the money in Project 4 was spent in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. All positions created in 2013-14 to support the rollout of devices (Chromebooks and Android tablets) and to provide staff professional development have continued. The positions include a technology program specialist, a staff developer, a data analyst and additional technicians to support the sites. Money was used to pay teachers to attend professional development, time for follow-up planning and meeting time, and time for ongoing implementation (hourly and release time). We will have carryover funds of **????** for a few reasons. First, the cost of the technicians was less than originally budgeted. Second, we were unable to spend all of the funding allocated for technology professional development. Sites knew they had the funding, but many of them found it difficult to find time for the professional development because of the common core professional development in literacy and math. It was also difficult to spend funding allocated for creating common formative assessments due to the contract negotiations.

We spent more money than was allocated for travel. We sent staff to educational technology and assessment conferences, as well as visits to schools and districts that have already implemented Project Based Learning. We moved funds from contractual that were not needed to cover the costs.

Equipment funds were spent to purchase network equipment and the hardware refreshes needed to support the increased use of 10,000 devices. Network equipment purchases included additional wireless access points and upgraded WAN connections to school sites.

The majority of funding in Project 4 was spent in supplies, which included the purchase of student Chromebooks, Nexus 7 tablets and storage carts for the K-5 devices. Chromebooks were purchased for two thirds of our students in grades 3-5. The ratio for student devices is 1:1 for students in grades 6-12 and 2:1 for students in grades K-5. Nexus 7 tablets were purchased for students in grades K-2 at a ratio of 2:1, and we purchased 7 devices for each Transitional Kinder classroom. We also spent a considerable amount of money on replacement Chromebooks for devices that were lost or damaged beyond repair. Money was also spent on supplies needed for the devices, including power strips, covers and replacement parts for damaged devices. We will have a large carryover in supplies because, although we were able

to select the new teacher and administrator devices, we were unable to purchase them until after July 1, 2015. The carryover will be used to purchase those devices, as well as replacement student devices that have been lost or damaged, which is costing us far more than anticipated.

Funding was used for contracts with Northwest Educational Assessments (NWEA) and Illuminate, who are the vendors for our student assessment systems. New Haven also contracted with various vendors to support the Chromebooks for IT consultation, web filtering services, network equipment support and Google Vault. We will have a carryover of ??????? in contracts, because some of the contracts are not costing as much as originally budgeted. In addition, although we budgeted for an LMS and Hapara, we are using Google Classroom, which is free of charge. We are looking at using funds originally targeted for an LMS for a device security, teacher live oversight of students working on devices, and device recovery system, like GoGuardian.

Project 4 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

We would like to make one change to the Project 4 budget. We would like to move carryover money of ????? from unspent contractual funds to supplies. That money, when combined with the carryover money left after purchasing the teacher devices, will pay for replacement student devices and repair costs.

We will use carryover funds in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits to fund another technician to support Chromebook repairs. We will also use carryover funds to fund technology professional development, as well as funding for common assessment development as part of the Rigorous Curriculum Design (RCD) process.

Project Budget 5 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

Most of the funds spent in Project 5 (Grading and Assessment), as identified in the Project 5 Budget Expenditures Worksheet, were in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. We funded stipends for Assessment Leaders at each site. Money was also used to support the ongoing work of the Grading and Assessment Task Force (GATF). The GATF is a team of teachers and administrators working together to research best practices in grading and assessment and create new grading policies aligned to the research and the common core state standards (CCSS). Funds were used to release teachers to attend GATF meetings, as well as hourly pay for those teachers to work on implementing new Board policies with teachers and administrators. Additionally, hourly and subs costs were used for teachers to revise common

core aligned report cards. We have carryover funds of approximately **????** because we overestimated the amount needed for release time and hourly for the GATF.

Contractual funds were used to fund consultants who provided professional development for the GATF and the Assessment Leaders on integrated performance based assessments.

Project 5 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

The only change we will would like to make in 2015-16 is to move \$30,000 of the carryover in personnel costs to supplies to cover additional costs for our new reading benchmark system.

The remaining carryover funds will be used to continue the Grading and Assessment Task Force work in 2015-16.

Project Budget 6 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in Project 6 (College and Career), as identified in the Project 6 Budget Expenditures Worksheet, was in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. Several positions that were created in 2013-14 continued in 2014-15. The positions were created to support student readiness for college and careers, including teachers for AP Bootcamp, curriculum leaders to help implement the common core state standards (CCSS), two Restorative Justice (RJ) Coordinators, and a college and career counselor. A stipend was funded for STEM coordination, and release periods were funded for creating curriculum for the school-within-a-school program, Institute of Community Leaders (ICL), a lead teacher for ICL, and credit recovery support for students. Release time for additional counseling and sections of Puente was also funded. Money was used to support STEM classes at James Logan High School and both middle schools, which included professional development, follow-up planning and meeting time, and time for ongoing implementation (hourly and release time). We will have carryover funding of approximately **??????** because salaries did not cost as much as expected, and we did not use all of the release time and hourly that was allocated.

Supply funds were spent to support the STEM classes, paying for hardware and software costs, as well as costs for STEM kits, curriculum and materials. We will have some carryover in this area, as the costs weren't as much as we budgeted.

New Haven Unified contracted with the College Board to pay for the PAST exam for all 10th grade students, and to supplement the cost of AP testing for low-income students.

Project 6 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

Using carryover in personnel and fringe benefit costs, we would like to add a third Restorative Justice (RJ) social worker to support the K-8 sites. We have seen dramatic reductions in the number of students suspended at our high schools since the RJ social workers have begun. We believe that adding RJ practices at more K-8 sites will help reduce suspensions system-wide, particularly for our African American and Latino ethnic subgroups. In addition, we believe restorative practices will positively influence school climate overall. Our guiding principle is that if students remain in class, their academic achievement will improve.

Carryover funds in the supply category will be used to purchase materials and supplies for the STEM classes.

Project Budget 7 - Narrative

Brief summary of your project budget, including whether you are on track or have made any revisions that impact any of your spending categories.

The majority of funds spent in Project 7 (Implementation, Program Evaluation), as identified in the Project 7 Budget Expenditures Worksheet, was in personnel costs and the associated fringe benefits. Positions were created to support the implementation and evaluation, including the project director and a staff secretary. Portions of the salaries for the Chief Business Official and the Director of Fiscal Services are being funded for fiscal management of the grant. There are carryover funds in this category, as salary costs were lower than anticipated, and we were late in hiring staff during the first year of grant implementation.

Travel funds were used for program and site leadership to attend conferences that support 21st century learning and implementing the 5 C's (communication, collaboration, critical thinking, cultural competence and creativity) and personalization. We have carryover funds in this area because we did not have at RTT-D convening last year.

Funding was spent on contracts for implementation coaching and membership in Ed Leader 21, all of which support implementation and sustainability of the grant and 21st century learning and personalization.

Project 7 Budget - Explanation of Changes

Describe the reasons for changes made; and particularly for any significant discrepancies in your project spending for the categories noted above. Include an explanation of changes that may occur in subsequent years of the grant.

We moved funding from fringe benefits to contractual because additional contracts were needed for our external evaluation partners. We had our external evaluators gather data on teacher effectiveness. We did this because we had not yet implemented our new teacher evaluation system, and we wanted to share some observational data on our progress in that area. Because of this, we overspent in this category.

The remaining carryover funds in personnel and fringe benefits will be used to support consulting costs for program evaluation, which were more costly than anticipated in the original approved budget. In addition, funds will be spent in the latter years of the grant, when funding for the project director and secretary positions decrease.