

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Title:** Approval of Grants**Type of Executive Summary:**

- Action Action on First Reading Discussion Information

Policy Implications:

- Constitution _____
 General Statute # _____
 SBE Policy # _____
 SBE Policy Amendment
 SBE Policy (New)
 APA # _____
 APA Amendment
 APA (New)
 Other Grants

Presenter(s): Mr. Philip Price (Associate Superintendent, Financial and Business Services), Mr. Robert Logan, Associate Superintendent, Innovation and School), Dr. Wandra Polk (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instructional Services), Ms. Everly Broadway (Section Chief, K-12 Mathematics), Ms. Meta Phelps-Hodges (Section Chief, Reading First), and Dr. Lynn Warren, Director, Student Support Services Division)

Description:

The grants listed below are being submitted for approval of distribution of funds to selected school systems. Please see attachments for description of grants.

- Attachment 1 – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grant Cohort V
- Attachment 2 – 2007-2008 Reading First Grant Allocations
- Attachment 3 – Title I Distinguished Schools' Recognition

Resources:

See attachments

Input Process:

See attachments

Stakeholders:

See attachments

Timeline For Action:

Action on First Reading is being recommended in order to allow funding to be distributed to selected school systems in a timely manner.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board approve these grants.

Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:

- Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)
Specify: _____
- Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)
Specify: _____
- Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)

Motion By: _____ Seconded By: _____
Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Abstain _____
Approved _____ Disapproved _____ Postponed _____ Revised _____

*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Amy Betsill, 807-3817, Tina Marcus, 807-3898, and Michelle Holliday, 807-3762.

SUMMARY OF GRANT

Title: Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grant Cohort V

Policy Implications:

- Constitution _____
- General Statute # _____
- SBE Policy # EEO-O-001
- SBE Policy Amendment
- SBE Policy (New)
- APA # _____
- APA Amendment
- APA (New)
- Other Grant

Presenter(s): Mr. Robert L. Logan (Associate Superintendent, Innovation and School Transformation), Dr. Wandra Polk (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instructional Services), and Ms. Everly Broadway, (Section Chief, K-12 Mathematics)

Description:

Title II, Part B, Sections 2201-2203 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110) describes the Mathematics Science Partnership (MSP) Program of NCLB. MSP Grants are provided on a competitive basis to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with demonstrated need in mathematics and science. Local Education Agencies must propose a program of professional development in partnership with Mathematics and/or Science Departments in Institutions of Higher Education. Grants are given for one year, with the possibility of renewal for two subsequent years.

Resources:

Federal

Input Process:

The criteria used for evaluation were based on the specifications and guidelines provided by the federal Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant Program. The rubric for evaluation was included in the Request for Proposals. Policy EEO-O-001 was followed without deviation.

Stakeholders:

Local Education Agencies with demonstrated need for advanced professional development in mathematics and science.

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to grant approval of continued funding to the existing projects and initial funding of new projects for the amounts stipulated in the attachment. The State Board of Education is asked to take action on first read.

Motion By: _____	Seconded By: _____
Vote: Yes _____ No _____	Abstain _____
Approved _____ Disapproved _____	Postponed _____ Revised _____

*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Amy Betsill, 919-807-3817

Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grants 2008-2009

Based on progress made during the 2007-2008 grant cycle, thirteen projects are recommended for continued funding for the 2008-2009 fiscal year at the amount indicated. (Project Name and Fiscal agents are in bold print.) Four new projects are recommended for first year funding.

MSP Projects Recommended for Continued Funding in 2008-2009

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE	
POST (Preparing Outstanding Science Teachers: A Guilford County Schools – University of North Carolina at Greensboro Partnership) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort III)	Guilford County Schools (5)	University of North Carolina at Greensboro College of Arts and Sciences and School of Education	\$287,697.00
ENVISIONS (Educational Network Venture into Science/Math Instruction, Outreach, and North Carolina Standards) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort III)	Onslow County Schools (2)	North Carolina State University College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences – The Science House	\$391,372.00
Mountain Valley Partnership (supplement to original funding) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Ashe County Schools (7), Alleghany County Schools (7), Catawba County Schools (7), Elkin City Schools (7), Hickory City Schools (7), Watauga County Schools (7), Wilkes County Schools (7), Yadkin County Schools (7)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center, Catawba Valley Community College, Surry Community College	\$489,570.00
Quality Teaching and Learning Equal High Levels of Mathematics and Science Instruction (QTL=^MS) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Cleveland County Schools (6), McDowell County Schools (8), Rutherford County Schools (8)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$294,319.00
Partnerships for Improving Mathematics Understanding of Students and Teachers (PIMUST) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Columbus County Schools (4)	University of North Carolina at Wilmington Science and Mathematics Education Center	\$400,000.00
Physics Project Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Winston-Salem/Forsyth (5), Guilford (5), Robeson (4), plus additional districts as space is available	University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, American Association of Physics Teachers	\$ 95,000.00

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE	
Partners for Mathematics Learning: Disseminating North Carolina's 2008 Mathematics Curriculum Standards Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Roanoke Rapids (3) , Buncombe(8), Charlotte-Mecklenburg (6), Columbus (4), Durham (3), Winston-Salem/Forsyth (5), Guilford (5), Harnett (4), McDowell(8), Union (6), STATEWIDE PROJECT	Meredith College	\$809,516.00
Teacher Algebra Network Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Avery (7) , Alleghany County Schools (7), Ashe County Schools (7)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences	\$ 90,000.00
Project MATH (Making Algebraic Thinking Happen) Year 2 of 2 (Cohort IV)	Person (5)	UNC Chapel Hill Department of Mathematics; UNC Chapel Hill Center for Mathematics and Science Education	\$ 61,000.00
Trajectory of Science Scholars Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Durham (3)	NC State University Department of Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, NC State University Department of Zoology	\$ 191,000.00
Preparing Geometry Teachers in Union County Year 2 of 2 (Cohort IV)	Union (6)	The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Center for Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education	\$ 35,000.00
Empowering Teachers and Students through Problem Based Mathematics Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Buncombe (8), Asheville City (8)	Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina at Asheville	\$ 413,056.00
NC STEM Year 2 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Weldon City Schools (3) , Warren(3), Duplin (2), Bertie (1), Durham (3), Winston-Salem/Forsyth (5), Wayne (2), Northampton (3), Hoke (4), Cumberland (4), Scotland (4), plus additional districts as space is available	North Carolina State University, North Carolina New Schools Project	\$335,000.00
Total for Continuing Projects			\$3,892,530.00

MSP Projects Recommended for New Funding in 2008-2009

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE	
TEAMS Partnership (K-8 Math/Sci) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort V)	Alamance Burlington School System (5), Orange (5), Vance (3)	Elon College, Vance Community College	\$212,225.00
CSI Teams Project (K-8 Math) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort V)	Polk County Public Schools (8), Cherokee (8), Henderson (8), Madison (8), Cherokee (8), Swain (8), Transylvania (8), Yancey (8)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$215,510.00
Modeling Instruction in Physics, Physical Science, and Chemistry Year 1 of 3 (Cohort V)	Watauga County Schools (7), Buncombe (8), Durham (3), Caldwell (7), Martin (1), STATE-WIDE project	North Carolina State University, Science House	\$401,665.00
Collaborative and Sustainable Ventures in Implementing the NC SCS (Mathematics 9-12) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort V)	Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools (5), Ashe (7), Burke (7), Caldwell (7) Cherokee (8), Elkin (7), Henderson (8) Hickory (7), Madison (8), Orange (5), Wilkes (7) STATE-WIDE project	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$215,000.00
Total for New Projects			\$1,044,400.00

MSP 2008-2009 Funding Summary

Total for Continuing Projects	\$3,892,530.00
Total for New Projects	\$1,044,400.00
Total To Be Awarded with this SBE Action	\$4,936,930.00

**Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grants
Review Process
February 2008**

The table below indicates all proposals submitted for new funding in the 2008-2009 NC Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program. All projects were reviewed using a rubric¹. The table below indicates the quality band rating for each proposal that met the technical specifications in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Four projects are recommended for funding in 2008-09: Alamance-Burlington, Polk, Watauga, and Winston-Salem/Forsyth. NC SBE Policy #EEO-O-001 was followed without deviation.

Project	Met RFP Requirements	Review Team Rating	Final Selection/Rank
Watauga	Y	strong	1
Winston-Salem/Forsyth	Y	strong	2
Polk	Y	average	3
Alamance Burlington	Y	average	4
Catawba	Y	average	5
Johnston	Y	average	6
Cabarrus	Y	average	7
Brunswick	Y	weak	8
Guilford	Y	weak	9

¹A copy of the **MSP Rating Form** is attached to this memo.

MSP Rating Form Feb 08

Proposal # _____ Reviewer: _____

LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____ Date: _____

1. High-Need School District The criteria used will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of children served from families with incomes below poverty level. Percentage of children on free or reduced lunch Low Wealth LEA High teacher turnover and retention particularly with regard to the targeted teachers. District and School progress toward meeting AYP targets. 	Your Rating Here
5 Points	
+5-4 • Demonstrates greatest need based on criteria above.	
+3-1 • Demonstrates an average degree of need based on criteria above.	
+0 • Demonstrates least amount of need based on criteria above.	
Point justification / Review comments (required):	

2. Demonstration of Need and Alignment of Project Goals and Objective with Professional Development Needs Points will be awarded for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated teacher need for the proposed professional development. A clear relationship between the “needs” the “Program Goals and Objectives” section of the Program Narrative. 	Your Rating Here
10 points	
+10-6 • Need for proposed Professional Development is well documented and is clearly aligned with the needs stated in the Program Goals and Objectives.	
+5-1 • Need for proposed Professional Development is well documented but is not clearly aligned with the needs stated in the Program Goals and Objectives.	
+0 • Need for proposed Professional Development is not well documented and is not clearly aligned with the needs stated in the Program Goals and Objectives.	
Point justification / Review comments (required):	

3. Partnership Management Planning Points will be awarded for clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining responsibilities and contributions. Delineating the experience and capability of partners. 	Your Rating Here
10 points	
+10-6 • The role of the IHE partners is seen not only as a service provider but as a partner in decision-making. • Commitment of LEA leadership is evident and support is defined in the proposal. • Communication between IHEs and LEAs and other partners is clearly planned and realistic. • Time commitment of key personnel is documented and realistic to accomplish project goals.	
+5-1 • The role of the IHE partners is only as a service provider and is not clearly defined as a partner in decision-making. • Commitment of LEA leadership is mainly the responsibility of a curriculum coordinator and the commitment of top-level leadership is not evident; however, LEA support is defined. • Communication between IHEs and LEAs and other partners is planned and realistic but lacks sufficient detail. • Time commitment of key personnel is not well documented or realistic to accomplish project goals.	
+0 • The role of the IHE partners is unclear. • Commitment of LEA leadership is not evident and LEA support is not defined. • Time commitment of key personnel is not well documented and not realistic to accomplish project goals.	
Point justification / review comments (required):	

MSP Rating Form Feb 08

Proposal # _____ Reviewer: _____

LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____ Date: _____

4. Efficacy of Plan Points will be awarded for:		Your Rating Here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thoroughness of planning. • Likelihood of effectiveness. • Maximum impact of the program. 		35 points
+35-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities work plan shows thorough and extensive planning involving all partners (professional development activities are clearly described, timeline is reasonable, incentives likely to encourage teacher participation have been included). • Project activities are likely to be effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They follow research base on teacher professional development. ○ They are sustained over time and include follow-up related to classroom teaching. ○ They include no inappropriate activities. • Plans that address sustainability of partnerships, improved science and math instruction, and teacher retention beyond the 3 funded years to maximize long term impact are clearly addressed in the proposal and appear to be realistic and achievable. • Plan includes appropriate ideas for dissemination at national or NC conferences. Plan also includes appropriate ideas for dissemination in North Carolina beyond conferences. 	
+29-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities work plan shows evidence of some planning but some important elements are unclear or have not been addressed. • Most project activities are likely to be effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They follow research based on teacher professional development. ○ They are sustained over time and include follow-up related to classroom teaching. ○ They include one or two project activities of questionable value without appropriate research documentation of their appropriateness. • Plans that address sustainability of partnerships, improved science and math instruction, and teacher retention beyond the 3 funded years to maximize long term impact are evident in the proposal but appear to be more wishful thinking that a well thought out plan. • Plan includes appropriate ideas for dissemination at national or NC conferences. Plan also includes appropriate ideas for dissemination in North Carolina beyond conferences, but lacks sufficient detail. 	
+15-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities work plan shows evidence of some planning but some important elements are not identified. • Most project activities are not likely to be effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They do not follow research based on teacher professional development. ○ They are not likely to be sustained over time and include poorly planned follow-up related to classroom teaching. ○ They include one or two project activities of questionable value but activities are not documented with appropriate research. • Plans that address sustainability of partnerships, improved science and math instruction, and teacher retention beyond the 3 funded years to maximize long term impact, lack sufficient detail. • Plans for dissemination are weak or lack sufficient detail. 	
+8-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities work plan shows little evidence of some planning but some important elements are not identified. • Most project activities are not likely to be effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They do not follow research based on teacher professional development. ○ They can not be sustained over time and do not include follow-up related to classroom teaching. ○ No project activities of substantial value are included. • Plans that address sustainability of partnerships, improved science and math instruction, and teacher retention beyond the 3 funded years to maximize long term impact, lack sufficient detail. • Plans for dissemination are not appropriate or lack sufficient detail. 	
+0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities work plan shows no evidence of some planning and important elements have not been addressed. • Project activities are not likely to be effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They do not follow research based on teacher professional development. ○ They can not be sustained over time and do not include follow-up related to classroom teaching. ○ Project activities have not been included. • Plans that address sustainability of partnerships, improved science and math instruction, and teacher retention beyond the 3 funded years to maximize long term impact, are not evident. • Plan does not include appropriate ideas for dissemination. 	
Point justification / review comments (required):		

MSP Rating Form Feb 08

Proposal # _____ Reviewer: _____

LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____ Date: _____

5. Research Design and Evaluation Plan		Your Rating Here
Points will be awarded for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness and thoroughness of the activity proposed in the “Evaluation Plan” section of the Program Narrative. 		20 points
+20-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Design is rigorous including quantitative experimental design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research design includes an appropriate use of treatment and control groups. ○ Variables of interest are clearly defined and identified. ○ Plan for analysis of data is clear. • Evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative measures of both process and outcomes. • Formative Evaluation feedback plan is clear and detailed. • Data collection for evaluation purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes valid and reliable mechanisms for capturing quantitative and qualitative aspects of project. ○ Evidence of attention to locate and use valid and reliable instruments is present. ○ Includes teacher content knowledge measure – pre and post. • Outside evaluator has appropriate credentials and experience 	
+15 -10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Design demonstrates a high level of rigor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research design includes an appropriate use of treatment and control groups. ○ Variables of interest are identified. ○ Plan for analysis of data exists but lacks sufficient detail. • Evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative measures of both process and outcomes. May not be appropriately balanced. • Formative Evaluation feedback plan evident but not clear and detailed. • Data collection for evaluation purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes valid and reliable mechanisms for capturing quantitative and qualitative aspects of project. ○ Evidence of attention to locate and use valid and reliable instruments is present. ○ Includes teacher content knowledge measure – pre and post. • Outside evaluator has appropriate credentials but may not have extensive experience 	
+9-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Design demonstrates some rigor but may be qualitative or poorly defined. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Variables of interest are mentioned. ○ Little depth in plan for analysis of data. • Evaluation lacks sufficient mechanisms to measure process towards project goals and objectives. • Formative Evaluation feedback plan is unclear. • Data collection for evaluation purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes valid and reliable mechanisms for capturing quantitative and qualitative aspects of project. ○ Little or no evidence of attention to locate and use valid and reliable instruments is present. ○ Includes teacher content knowledge measure. • Outside evaluator has insufficient credentials and little or no experience. 	
+0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Design demonstrates little rigor – is poorly defined. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Variables of interest are not identified. ○ No plan for analysis of data. • Evaluation lacks mechanisms to measure process towards project goals and objectives. • Formative Evaluation feedback plan is not evident. • Data collection for evaluation purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lacks reliable mechanisms for capturing quantitative and qualitative aspects of project. ○ No evidence of attention to locate and use of valid and reliable instruments is present. • Outside evaluator has insufficient credentials and little or no experience. 	
Point justification / review comments (required):		

MSP Rating Form Feb 08

Proposal # _____ Reviewer: _____
 LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____ Date: _____

6. Budget		Your Rating Here
Points will be awarded for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness and clarity of the program budget • Appropriateness of expenditures as described in the Budget and the Budget Narrative. 		10 points
+10-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers add up. Partner plans and Total are consistent. • Budget narrative is complete – purpose of each line item is clear. • Each element in program plan appears adequately budgeted for in budget. • No funds are budgeted for unrelated projects. • Project expenditures are reasonable and focus on meeting teacher professional development needs. • Budget is consistent with roles of partners. • Adequate but not excessive spending on peripheral project needs (i.e. computer for project director, advertising, and web master.) 	
+6-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers add up. Partner plans and Total are consistent. • Budget narrative is complete, however expenditure for some items require more detailed explanation. • Most elements in program plan appear adequately budgeted for in budget. • Budget expenditures appear higher than expected for some proposed professional activities. • Project expenditures are reasonable and focus on meeting teacher professional development needs. • Budget is consistent with roles of partners. • Adequate but not excessive spending on peripheral project needs (i.e. computer for project director, advertising, and web master.) 	
+0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers don't add up. Partner plans and Total are inconsistent. • Budget narrative is incomplete – purpose of some line items is unclear. • Many elements in program plan appear inadequately funded. • Funds are budgeted for unrelated projects. • Project expenditures don't focus on meeting teacher professional development needs. • Budget is inconsistent with roles of partners. • Excessive or inadequate spending on peripheral project needs (i.e. computer for project director, advertising, and web master.) 	
Point justification / review comments (required):		

Focus area of the 1/30/08 RFP (mark all that apply)

___ Math Leadership for the 2008 Revision of the Mathematics SCS

___ Physical Science K-8

___ High School Biology

___ High School Geometry

___ High School Integrated Mathematics

___ Modeling Physics

___ Graduate level university courses in mathematics, science, or mathematics and science related education courses

Comments:

SUMMARY OF GRANT

Title: 2007-08 Reading First Grant Allocations

Policy Implications:

- Constitution _____
- General Statute # _____
- SBE Policy # _____
- SBE Policy Amendment
- SBE Policy (New)
- APA # _____
- APA Amendment
- APA (New)
- Other NCLB: Reading First

Presenter(s): Dr. Wandra Polk (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instruction) and Ms. Meta Phelps-Hodges (Section Chief, Reading First)

Description:

The Reading First Grant provides federal funds to schools identified through the grant process. This is the annual allocation for the Reading First Grant schools. Due to the federal budget cuts for 2007-08, the allocations process reflects a reduction in previous funding of approximately 58%. The adjusted allocated funds uses the same algorithm used in the past (base plus percentage of remaining based on Average Daily Membership), except the base is \$75,000 rather than \$200,000.

Resources:

Federal

Input Process:

DPI staff, principals, LEA contacts, and Reading First coaches

Stakeholders:

Teachers, students, reading coaches, administrators, parents, and students

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the proposed 2007-08 allocations with federal funding reductions.

Motion By: _____	Seconded By: _____
Vote: Yes _____ No _____	Abstain _____
Approved _____ Disapproved _____	Postponed _____ Revised _____

*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Tina Marcus, 919-807-3898.

**PROPOSED FUNDING READING FIRST SUBGRANTS
2007-2008**

Region	LEA Number	LEA	School Name	2007-2008
6	40	Anson	Lilesville Elementary	\$92,223.00
6	40	Anson	Morven Elementary School	\$88,583.00
6	40	Anson	Wadesboro Primary	\$112,020.00
5	761	Asheboro City	Charles W. McCrary	\$100,834.00
1	70	Beaufort	S.W. Snowden Elem	\$83,966.00
1	80	Bertie	Colerain Elementary	\$94,886.00
1	80	Bertie	West Bertie Elementary	\$99,236.00
1	80	Bertie	Windsor Elementary	\$99,946.00
2	90	Bladen	Bladen Lakes Primary	\$99,769.00
2	90	Bladen	Booker T. Washington	\$90,270.00
2	90	Bladen	East Arcadia	\$81,303.00
2	90	Bladen	Elizabethtown Primary	\$113,706.00
2	240	Columbus	Cerro Gordo Elem	\$90,713.00
2	240	Columbus	Williams Township	\$101,278.00
4	260	Cumberland	Manchester Elementary	\$95,685.00
4	260	Cumberland	Margaret Willis Elem	\$96,040.00
4	260	Cumberland	Pauline Jones Elementary	\$85,919.00
4	260	Cumberland	Sunnyside Elem	\$93,554.00
2	310	Duplin	Warsaw Elementary School	\$106,427.00
3	320	Durham	Fayetteville Street	\$92,578.00
3	320	Durham	Glenn Elementary	\$121,430.00
3	320	Durham	Lakewood Elementary	\$100,035.00
3	320	Durham	RN HARRIS	\$100,124.00
3	330	Edgecombe	Coker-Wimberly	\$103,941.00
3	330	Edgecombe	Princeville Elem	\$98,970.00
3	330	Edgecombe	*Roberson Elementary	#####
3	330	Edgecombe	Stocks Elementary	\$136,256.00
1	700	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank	P. W. Moore Elem	\$101,278.00
1	700	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank	Pasquotank Elementary	\$100,212.00
1	700	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank	Sheep - Harney	\$90,536.00
3	350	Franklin	Franklinton Elementary	\$113,085.00
3	350	Franklin	Laurel Mill Elem	\$93,377.00
3	350	Franklin	Louisburg Elementary	\$104,829.00
3	420	Halifax	Aurelian Springs	\$99,236.00
3	420	Halifax	Scotland Neck Primary and Bakers Elementary	\$91,690.00
1	460	Hertford	Bearfield Primary School	\$139,452.00

Region	LEA Number	LEA	School Name	2007-2008
1	460	Hertford	Riverview Elem	\$98,792.00
3	470	Hoke	J.W. McLaughlin	\$97,460.00
3	470	Hoke	Sandy Grove Elem	\$118,056.00
3	470	Hoke	Scurlock Elementary	\$103,675.00
3	470	Hoke	South Hoke Elem	\$104,207.00
1	480	Hyde	Mattamuskeet Elementary	\$88,139.00
6	132	Kannapolis City	Shady Brook-Kannapolis City Schools	\$96,928.00
4	530	Lee	Broadway Elementary	\$112,996.00
2	540	Lenoir	La Grange Elementary	\$109,623.00
1	580	Martin	East End Elementary	\$93,110.00
1	580	Martin	Edna Andrews School	\$85,387.00
1	580	Martin	Jamesville Elem	\$91,779.00
1	580	Martin	Williamston Primary and EJ Hayes Elementary	\$125,425.00
4	620	Montgomery	Candor Elementary	\$111,576.00
4	620	Montgomery	Mount Gilead Elementary	\$95,685.00
4	620	Montgomery	Star-Biscoe Elem	\$107,936.00
4	620	Montgomery	Troy Elementary and Page Street	\$117,613.00
4	640	Nash/Rocky Mount	DS Johnson and Fairview Early Childhood Center	\$103,053.00
4	640	Nash/Rocky Mount	O.R. Pope Elem	\$89,826.00
4	640	Nash/Rocky Mount	Swift Creek Elementary	\$84,233.00
2	650	New Hanover	Rachel Freeman	\$106,249.00
2	650	New Hanover	Snipes Elementary	\$102,876.00
3	660	Northampton	Rich Square Creecy Elementary	\$89,914.00
3	660	Northampton	Squire Elem	\$93,732.00
3	660	Northampton	Willis Hare Elementary	\$94,353.00
1	740	Pitt	Belvoir Elem	\$109,001.00
1	740	Pitt	G.R. Whitfeild Elem	\$97,105.00
4	780	Robeson	Janie C Hargrave	\$93,377.00
4	780	Robeson	Rex-Rennert Elementary	\$101,899.00
4	780	Robeson	Southside-Ashpole	\$96,395.00
4	780	Robeson	W. H. Knuckles	\$96,484.00
2	820	Sampson	Charles E. Perry	\$98,437.00
4	830	Scotland	Gardner Elem	\$98,171.00
4	830	Scotland	IE Johnson Elem	\$94,087.00
4	830	Scotland	North Laurinburg	\$93,110.00
4	830	Scotland	Wagram Primary School	\$108,114.00

Region	LEA Number	LEA	School Name	2007-2008
5	292	Thomasville City	Thomasville Primary School and Liberty Drive	\$151,170.00
3	910	Vance	Aycock School	\$108,469.00
3	910	Vance	Clark Street	\$86,807.00
3	910	Vance	New Hope Elem	\$86,985.00
3	910	Vance	PINKSTON ST	\$96,040.00
3	930	Warren	Mariam Boyd Elem	\$95,596.00
3	930	Warren	Northside Elem	\$97,638.00
3	930	Warren	South Warren Elem	\$85,919.00
1	940	Washington	Creswell Elementary	\$83,878.00
1	940	Washington	Pines Elem	\$119,033.00
2	960	Wayne	Carver Heights	\$97,194.00
2	960	Wayne	School Street Elem.	\$91,069.00
3	422	Weldon City	Weldon Elementary	\$103,408.00
3	980	Wilson	Margaret Hearne	\$101,899.00
3	980	Wilson	Vick Elementary	\$94,176.00
3	32C		Carter Community	\$81,481.00
3	32B		Healthy Start Academy	\$90,802.00
3	98A		Sallie B Howard School	\$106,249.00
3	92I		**SPARC ACADEMY	#####
			Totals:	\$8,900,000.00

This allocation uses the same algorithm used in the past (base plus percentage of remaining based on Average Daily Membership), except the base is \$75,000 rather than \$200,000.

*Robeson Elementary has closed.

**SPARC Academy's license is not being renewed due to low performance.

Two Schools Receive Title I Distinguished Schools Recognition

Morehead City Primary School (Carteret County) and Longview Elementary School (Hickory City) were recently recognized as Title I Distinguished schools for 2008. Longview Elementary was nominated for Category 2-Closing the Achievement Gap between groups of students and Morehead City Primary School was nominated for Category 1- Exceptional Student Performance for two or more consecutive years.

Morehead City Primary School, Principal Renne Newman
Superintendent: Mr. Brad Sneed
Morehead City, North Carolina; Carteret County
Recognition: Category 1: Exceptional Student Performance
Award: \$7,500

Working as a strong instructional team, Morehead City Primary has sustained a high level of student achievement over a period of years. Morehead City Primary School serves a diverse population of 700 pre-kindergarten through third grade children living in coastal North Carolina. In addition to mainstreamed regular education, our school supports several unique populations including a special education pre-kindergarten program, two self contained Life Skills classes and the system's cluster for English Language Learners. The diversity of students' abilities and needs mandates differentiated instruction to take place in the classroom. The Title I services are fully integrated throughout our school to support the at-risk learners and the variety of needs for our population.

The greatest contributing factor in our school's success is the skilled and focused application of collaboration. Morehead City Primary School has a clearly defined mission: to meet the needs of each child by providing motivation, knowledge, and basic life skills.

Longview Elementary, Principal; John Black
Superintendent: Dr. Ric Vandett
Hickory, North Carolina Hickory Public Schools
Recognition Category: Closing the Achievement Gap
Award: \$7, 500

Longview Elementary is located in Hickory, North Carolina, in the foothills region of the Appalachian Mountains. Our enrollment is approximately 380 students in grades pre K-5, with 95% qualifying for free/reduced lunch. Our student population is 29% White, 27.5% African American, 26.4% Hispanic, 10.6% Multi-racial, and 6.3% Asian.

Eighty-five percent of our 5 year olds are at risk, scoring below the 50th percentile on the DIAL-R screening. Led by Kindergarten staff, our Bridge to Tomorrow program gives students a positive start to their education by providing a two week summer program. Bridge orients students to the school, provides information to parents regarding the education of their children, exposes children to daily routines, and provides time for teachers to get to know some of their students before the school year starts.

Numerous activities and partnerships are credited with our success, but the greatest contributing factor is the staff. They collectively, and individually, share three necessary ingredients: a love of children, a passion for teaching, and missionary heart.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Title:** Individual Class Size Exceptions Waiver Requests**Type of Executive Summary:**

Action Action on First Reading Discussion Information

Policy Implications:

- Constitution _____
 General Statute #115C-301
 SBE Policy # _____
 SBE Policy Amendment
 SBE Policy (New)
 APA # _____
 APA Amendment
 APA (New)
 Other _____

Presenter(s): Mr. Philip Price (Associate Superintendent, Financial and Business Services), Mr. Paul LeSieur (Director, School Business Division), and Mrs. Alexis Schauss (Assistant Director, School Business Division)

Description:

It shall be the responsibility of local boards of education to assure that the class size and teaching load requirements set forth in G.S. 115C-301 are met. Requests for individual class size waivers are required to be submitted to the State Board of Education after the second school month and the remainder of the school year, if the individual class exceeds the allotment ratio by three students so long as the LEA-wide average class size maximums is not exceeded. There may be additional waivers submitted for the April SBE meeting. If there are class size waivers reviewed after the submission of this report but prior to the April Board meeting, they will be provided to the State Board as a late item.

Resources:

Additional teacher(s), if the local board cannot organizationally correct the exception. Within 45 days of receipt of the request, the State Board within funds available, may allot additional positions or grant a waiver for the excess class size or daily load.

Input Process:

A request from an LEA for an individual class size waiver in grades 4-12, or request for additional positions to restructure and alleviate the class size overage situation. The request is reviewed by DPI staff to validate the reason for a request by the LEA by looking at classes offered and class sizes of the school through reports generated from the student information submitted by the LEA at the end of the 2nd month of school. A determination is made based on the information available or additional information is requested to validate the decision of whether the waiver should be approved or denied.

Stakeholders:

Teachers, students, parents, LEAs and DPI staff

Timeline For Action:

This item is being presented for Action on First Reading of the Individual Class Size Waiver request at the April 2008 SBE meeting.

Recommendations:

The Department recommends that the State Board of Education approve the attached waiver pertaining to the class size exception request submitted by Alexander County, the Department will then notify the LEA(s) of the action taken by the State Board of Education.

 Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:

Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)
Specify: _____

Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)
Specify: _____

Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)

Motion By: _____

Seconded By: _____

Vote: Yes _____ No _____

Abstain _____

Approved _____ Disapproved _____

Postponed _____ Revised _____

*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Doris McCain, 807-3700

**Requests for Individual Class Size Waivers for the 2007-2008 School Year
Students Over the Allowable Maximum as Required by G.S. 115C-301(g)
As of March , 2008**

Note (1) DPI comments are denoted by bold text. Alexander County comments from the Individual Class Size Waiver request are in regular text.

LEA	School	Grade	Number of Students	Over by	Type of class	# Other Classes ⁽¹⁾	Other Classes Affected and Reason for Request(1)	Recommendation	Date of Request
020 Alexander	Sugar Loaf Elementary	K	25	1	Self Contained	none	This school has two Kindergarten classes with 24 and 25 students. This class was at 22 students on the 40 th day. This is a small school with 277 students in Kindergarten through 5 th grade and is located in a remote area. Changing the configuration of the classes would cause a disruption to the school at all levels. Geographic Isolation	Approve	2/20/2008

Notes:

(1) Other class overages (music, art, media, foreign language, etc.) that are created in addition to this class size exception.