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What Disciplinary Disproportionality Looks Like in Schools

- Exclusionary practices:
  - Restraint, seclusion, suspension, expulsion, referral to law enforcement
- Used more frequently for certain racial/ethnic groups
  - Black and Hispanic students are disciplined more harshly
- But also used differentially more depending on offense
  - Black and Hispanic students are suspended disproportionately more than White students for non-violent offenses, ranging from dress code violations to acts of disrespect

Data from U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2011-2012)
Disciplinary Disproportionality is a National Concern

• Nationally, Black students are suspended and expelled at a rate three times greater than White students
  – 16 states and DC reported even higher gaps than the nation between suspension rates of Black and White students
• Disciplinary disproportionality is present from preschool to high school and for both male and female students
• Findings extend to other minorities (Hispanic, American Indian, Native-Alaskan)

Data from U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2011-2012)
Risk of Out-of-School Suspension by Race/Ethnicity

- White
- Black
- American Indian
- Latino
- Asian American

1973 vs 2010
Impact of the Discipline Gap

- Lost classroom learning time
- Removal from supportive school resources
- Social exclusion from prosocial peers
- Increased time in unstructured, unsupervised contexts
- Direct links to juvenile justice system involvement
National Attention and Building Momentum

• The Discipline Disparities Research-to-Practice Collaborative at Indiana University (Russ Skiba)
• Center for Civil Rights Remedies at UCLA (Dan Losen)
• CSG Justice Center’s School Discipline Consensus Project
• President Obama’s Supportive School Discipline, MBK, RTT Initiatives
• Reinvigorated ED Office of Civil Rights Civil Rights Data Collection
• Districts and states abandoning zero-tolerance policies
• Black Lives Matter in education movement
National and Regional Reports

- Are we closing the school discipline gap?
  - Civil Rights Project @ UCLA, 2015

- Disproportionate impact of K-12 school suspension and expulsion on Black students in Southern states
  - Center for the Study of Race and Equity @ UPenn, 2015

- Racial disproportionality in school discipline: Implicit bias heavily implicated
  - Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity @ OSU, 2015

- Disproportionality in school discipline: An assessment of trends in Maryland
  - Institute of Education Sciences, 2014
State of the Science

• Only 10 out of 179 peer-reviewed articles on in-service models for culturally responsive practices reported results of an empirical study of an intervention
  – Tendency to focus on teacher characteristics or theory-based recommended strategies rather than outcomes
  – Majority of studies (6 of 10) published in the past 5 years

• No studies met necessary standards of evidence to allow statements regarding promising and evidence-based strategies
  – No studies with rigorous outcomes focused designs

(Bottiani, Larson, Debnam, & Bradshaw, under review)
What is the Double Check Model?

• A *professional development* and *coaching* framework that builds on *SW-PBIS* to help teachers enhance 5 core components of culturally responsive practices.

• Addresses overrepresentation of culturally diverse students in disciplinary referrals, suspensions, special education referrals etc.

  • Assumptions:
    - Classroom management and SWPBIS are necessary but not sufficient
    - Traditional focus of diversity training has been on power and privilege, not skill development
Double Check (Rosenberg, 2007) is a self-reflection process that promotes culturally responsive practices through five components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Connection to the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Authentic Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reflective Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sensitivity to Students’ Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals:**
- Increase staff cultural proficiency
- Increase student engagement
- Increase teacher classroom management skills
- Reduce disproportionality
Double Checkers

DOUBLE CHECKER ON Perspective Taking

What is Perspective Taking?
- Recognizing and understanding the thoughts of others
- Identifying and understanding how another person is feeling
- Relating through empathy, a vicarious response to the emotion of another person
- Building shared meaning of thoughts, words, messages, and behaviors

How Does Perspective Taking Connect to Behavior Management and Double Check?

As adults, we may lose sight of what it was like to be a child. We may also have difficulty understanding our students’ behaviors which may represent different cultural practices than our own. Our students may not understand our directions, instructions, or disposition. When teachers and students do not understand each other, communication breaks down and stress increases. We can take steps to alleviate our misunderstandings by consciously practicing perspective taking in the classroom which can reduce our stress and move toward improved understanding of our students.

Steps to Practice Perspective Taking

1. De-“SUN”-itize: Consider that your intentions are not at the center of the interaction, but only a part of it.

2. Declare your perspective…. For example, say “If I was in your shoes, I would think…”

3. Dialogue with students to create a shared reality of the circumstance.

“We can complain because rose bushes have thorns, or rejoice because thorn bushes have roses.” - Abraham Lincoln
Double Check Tip of the Week;

Sent: 
To: 

Double Check CARES – Connection to the Curriculum:
The Wingman:
How do you engage students in your class who ordinarily do not participate, are left out of conversations, or who shut down when it is their turn to talk? Using the wingman strategy, Mr. Paris, an 8th grade teacher, demonstrates how he engages students in a lesson in a way that does not make students feel uncomfortable, but makes them accountable. This technique allows students to contribute their knowledge about a designated topic without feeling threatened. Check out how he utilizes the wingman strategy on the Teaching Channel: https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos стратегии для активации студентов?fd=1
Using Motivational Interviewing Strategies to Engage Teachers in Coaching
“The most challenging part of consulting with teachers is getting them to do what I want them to do.”

Classroom Coach
General Principles of Motivational Interviewing

• Develop Discrepancy
  – Listen for values
  – Accentuate discrepancies between where they are and where they want to be

• Express Empathy

• Roll with Resistance

• Support Self-Efficacy

• Listen for Change Talk
The Classroom Check-Up (CCU): Individual Teacher & the Teacher-to-Teacher Model

Developed by Wendy Reinke & Keith Herman
# The Classroom Check-Up

## Step 1
- Teacher Interview
- Teacher Completes Ecology Checklist

## Step 2
- Coach Conducts Classroom Visits
- Coach Trains Teachers on Observations
- Teachers Observe Each Other

## Step 3
- Personalized Feedback Session
- Develop Menu of Options

## Step 4
- Collaborative Goal Setting (Teachers include partners in goal setting)

## Step 5
- Teacher Monitors Daily Implementation
- Teachers Provide Continued Support to Each Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Card Sort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accepting Differences in People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Hard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Organized</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Fair</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Honest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Liked by Everyone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Respected by Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Giving Up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being a Good Listener</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Real/Genuine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Kind</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Self Reflective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking Care of My Family</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staying in Control</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Ecology Checklist

Teachers fill out the Ecology Checklist after the Interview is complete, but prior to feedback.
Step 2: Assess the Classroom

✓ Classroom Observations-- Critical Classroom “Look For’s”
  • Opportunities to Respond (OTR)
  • Correct Academic Responses
  • Disruptions
  • Praise (Behavior Specific and General)
  • Reprimands
  • Student Engagement
Step 2: Training Teachers to Observe Each Other

- Coach meets with partner teachers together and instructs teachers on data to be collected during classroom visits.
- Terms are identified and defined.
- Teachers practice collecting data while viewing videos.
- Teachers observe each other’s classrooms during this step of the process and collect data.
**Step 2: Classroom Observation Form**

**CCU Observation Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Observation period</th>
<th>Total for each interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct Academic Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Optional) Alignment with Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*During a 10-minute observation period (divided into two 5-minute intervals, record tally marks for each of the following behaviors.*
**Step 2: Tallying Student Engagement**

Classroom Academic Engagement—5 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom ID:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Observer: WR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Time:</td>
<td>9:50am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+1) indicates engaged  
(0) indicates not engaged

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Doing group work during reading  
then switched to worksheets

16 off task  
44 on task

\[ \frac{44}{60} = 73\% \text{ classroom engagement} \]
Step 3: Personalized Feedback

• Meet with Teachers Together
• Teachers Share Out Feedback from Visits to Each Other’s Classes
• Coach Summarizes Data
  – Identify Strengths
  – Identify Areas for Improvement
• Provide Visual and Verbal Feedback
# Personalized Feedback Form

## Positive Behavior Supports/Classroom Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacemaking Opportunities to Respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonthreatening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Double Check Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to the Curriculum</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective thinking about culture, racial/ethnic, and class differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to student's culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Step 3: Menu of Options**

- During the feedback, identify possible areas for intervention
  - Identify areas that the teacher sees as important
- Partner teacher writes down all possible intervention ideas
  - Provide a *Menu of Options*
  - Interventions build from teacher strengths
  - Interventions guided by coach’s knowledge of research and effective practices
Step 4: Collaborative Goal Setting

Double Check Goal Setting Plan

Teacher Code: Partner Code: Coach: Grade: School: Date: 

**Those things going well in your classroom:**

**Areas you would like to focus on improving in your classroom:**

**Specifically, your goal is to:**

**What actions will you take to meet this goal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task: What needs to be done by you?</th>
<th>Description of Plan</th>
<th>Resources: What is needed to get it done?</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task: What needs to be done with your partner?</th>
<th>Description of Plan</th>
<th>Resources: What is needed to get it done?</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What evidence is needed to show that goal has been met?
Importance & Confidence Rulers

• How important would you say it is for you to _________? On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all important and 10 is extremely important, where would you say you are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– Why are you at a ____ and not zero?
– What would it take for you to go from ___ to [a higher number]?

• And how confident would you say you are, that if you decided to _________, you could do it? On the same scale from 0-10, where would you say you are?
### Step 5: Implementation Support

#### Teaching Partner Meeting Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What actions did I take this week to progress towards my goal/s?</th>
<th>Impact of actions or inactions on Student Behavior: Explanation</th>
<th>Impact on Student Behavior: Explanation</th>
<th>Actions I will take next week to progress further towards my goal/s:</th>
<th>Actions my partner can take to support my goal/s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: Date of meeting with Partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: Date of meeting with Partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: Date of meeting with Partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4: Date of meeting with Partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges/ Success of Teacher to Teacher Model

Challenges
  – Teacher Schedules
  – Teacher Efficacy

Successes
  – Support Within Building
  – Less Reliance on Coach for Follow Up
Efforts to Sustain Double Check

• Support to Teachers
  – Professional development boosters
  – Tip sheets
  – Emails
  – Training on coaching

• Leadership support
Research Projects

• **Year 1:** Development work in 4 schools (2 ES & 2 MS)

• **Year 2:** Pilot 6 schools (3 ES & 3 MS)

• **Year 3:** Test of coaching model in 12 schools (6 ES & 6 MS)
  – All schools received Double Check Professional Development and SW-PBIS
  – Outcome data collected
    • Staff reports, classroom observations, ODR data

• **Year 4:** Test “teacher-to-teacher” coaching model in 6 schools (3 ES & 3 MS)- currently in sustainability year
  – Simultaneously coach two teachers
  – Examined sustainability

• **Year 5 (current):** IES Goal 3 RCT of Double Check in middle schools
### Allotment of Coaches’ Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Activity</th>
<th>Percent of Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check-in</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU Qualitative Data Observation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Data Observation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Goal Setting</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Observations</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Feedback</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Teacher Meetings</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time with Teacher</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coaching Time Spent on Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Stages</th>
<th>Average Minutes Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU Quantitative Observations</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Data Observations</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Feedback</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Goal Setting</td>
<td>35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Observations</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Feedback</td>
<td>38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Time Per Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>308 (≈5.1 hours)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>165</em> (≈2.75 hours)</em>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates actual time spent meeting with and directly working with teacher.
## Feedback about Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coach (n = 147)</th>
<th>Teacher (n = 127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Relationship</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Process</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Investment</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Benefits</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Likert scale ranging 0=never to 4 = always
Feedback from Teachers (n=127)

• The coach was approachable
  – 99%

• The coach and I worked together collaboratively
  – 95%

• The coach was accessible
  – 95%

• The coach made suggestions that were appropriate for my classroom culture
  – 98%

Note: Likert scale of never, seldom, sometimes, often, always
Year 2: Pilot Sample and Measures

- 166 Teachers
  - 52 coached
- Classroom observations were conducted by outside assessors
- Teachers provided self-reports
Year 2: Findings

- Significant improvements comparing coached teachers pre- and post-tests:
  - Observers tallied an additional 3.7 opportunities to respond (i.e., in 15 minute) at post-test, on average ($p = .05, d = 0.32$)
  - Fewer instances of student verbal aggression were tallied by observers ($p = .03, d = -0.73$)
  - Observers rated teachers more positively on proactive behavior management ($p = .01, d = 0.66$), teacher anticipation ($p = .04, d = 0.46$), and meaningful participation ($p < .01, d = 0.76$)
  - Teacher self-report of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy ($p < .01, d = 0.48$)
Year 3: Randomized Sample and Measures

- 12 elementary and middle schools
- 159 teachers randomized
  - 65.8% in MS
  - 85.4% female
- 100 were randomly assigned to receive coaching
  - 66% taught in middle school
  - 88% female
- Classroom observations were conducted
Year 3: Findings

- Significant improvements comparing coached to non-coached teachers:
  - Fewer observed instances of student non-compliance ($\beta = -0.86$, ERR = 0.42, $p = .003$)
  - Tallies of student aggression and profanity and teacher use of approvals approached significance
  - Improved observer ratings of student compliance ($\beta = 0.34$, $p = .01$) and social disruption ($\beta = -0.19$, $p = .01$)
  - Improved observer ratings of behavior management ($\beta = 0.34$, $p = .01$) and anticipation of student problems ($\beta = 0.29$, $p = .04$)
Year 3: Differential Effects in MS

• Cross-level interactions between elementary versus middle school and treatment status were run, to determine whether there were differential effects based on the setting.

• Findings indicated enhance effects for middle school teachers with regard to:
  • Tallies of non-compliance
  • Observer ratings of student compliance
  • Observer ratings of teacher control of the classroom.

• Other outcomes (e.g., opportunities to respond) also approached significance
Other Related Projects

- Research Studies in Progress:
  - IES Goal 3 RCT of Double Check in middle schools
  - National Institute of Justice Grant: 40 middle schools engaging in 3-tiered PBIS and coaching
- Other adaptations of CCU (coming soon):
  - Blending with mixed-reality simulator for guided practice to target bullying (2016) and teachers in special education settings (to be submitted)
- Guilford Book on Double Check
District Level Support & Perspectives: Anne Arundel County Public Schools
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• Successes
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