**Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants ALACHUA**

## General Assurances

The Department of Education has developed and implemented a document entitled, **General Terms, Assurances and Conditions for Participation in Federal and State Programs**, to comply with:

   A.  34 CFR 76.301 of the Education Department General Administration Regulations (EDGAR) which requires local educational agencies to submit a common assurance for participation in federal programs funded by the U.S. Department of Education;
   B.  applicable regulations of other Federal agencies; and
   C.  State regulations and laws pertaining to the expenditure of state funds.

In order to receive funding, applicants must have on file with the Department of Education, Office of the Comptroller, a signed statement by the agency head certifying applicant adherence to these General Assurances for Participation in State or Federal Programs. The complete text may be found at http://www.fldoe.org/comptroller/gbook.asp

**School Districts, Community Colleges, Universities and State Agencies**
The certification of adherence filed with the Department of Education Comptroller's Office shall remain in effect indefinitely unless a change occurs in federal or state law, or there are other changes in circumstances affecting a term, assurance, or condition; and does not need to be resubmitted with this application.

**No Child Left Behind Assurances (Applicable to All Funded Programs)**
By signature on this application, the LEA certifies it will comply with the following requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:

✔ Coordinate and collaborate, to the extent feasible and necessary as the LEA determines, with the State Educational Agency and other agencies providing services to children, youth, and families with respect to a school in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116.

✔ Use the results of the student academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), and other measures or indicators available to the agency, to review annually the progress of each school served by the LEA and receiving Title I, Part A funds to determine whether all of the schools are making the progress necessary to ensure that all students will meet the State's proficient level of achievement on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) by the 2013-2014 school year.

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**
**Project Application**

| | |
|---|---|
| TAPS Numbers: | 09A006 |
| | 09A005 |

| Return to: | A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant: | DOE USE ONLY |
|---|---|---|
| Florida Department of Education Bureau of Grants Management Room 325 Turlington Building 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400 Telephone: (850) 245-0496 SunCom: 205-0496 | ALACHUA 620 E UNIVERSITY AVE GAINESVILLE, FL 32601 | Date Received |

**B) Applicant Contact Information:**

| Contact Name: First Name: Dr. Charles MI:F Last Name: Hall | Mailing Address: 620 East University Avenue Gainesville, Fl 32601 |
|---|---|
| *Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):352-955-7634 Ext:243 | |
| Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):352-955-7131 | E-mail Address:hallcf@gm.sbac.edu |

| C) ProgramName (1) 2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)] | C) ProgramName (1) 2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Fund [1003(g)] |
|---|---|
| Project Number: **(DOE Assigned)** | Project Number: **(DOE Assigned)** |
| D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: $396274.99 | D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: $298681.62 |
| Total Approved Funds: **(DOE USE ONLY)** $ | Total Approved Funds: **(DOE USE ONLY)** $ |

**CERTIFICATION**

I **Dr. W. Daniel Boyd, Jr.** do hereby certify that all facts, figures, and representations made in this application are true, correct, and consistent with the statement of general assurances and specific programmatic assurances for this project. Furthermore, all applicable statutes, regulations, and procedures; administrative and programmatic requirements; and procedures for fiscal control and maintenance of records will be implemented to ensure proper accountability for the expenditure of funds on this project. All records necessary to substantiate these requirements will be available for review by appropriate state and federal staff. I further certify that all expenditures will be obligated on or after the effective date and prior to the termination date of the project. Disbursements will be reported only as appropriate to this project, and will not be used for matching funds on this or any special project, where prohibited.

Further, I understand that it is the responsibility of the agency head to obtain from its governing body the authorization for the submission of this application.

E) _____
        Signature of Agency Head

DOE 100B
Revised 12/07

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 53.93

**ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 61.00 | 64.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 57.00 | 64.00 | 63.00 | 68.00 | NA | 82.00 | 92.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 73.00 | 74.00 | 73.00 | 75.00 | NA | 71.00 | 74.00 | 72.00 | 75.00 | NA | | 91.00 | 93.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 37.00 | 39.00 | 33.00 | 43.00 | NA | 28.00 | 38.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | | 92.00 | 83.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 48.00 | 51.00 | 46.00 | 56.00 | NA | 44.00 | 51.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | | 87.00 | 86.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 41.00 | 37.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | 41.00 | 49.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 77.00 | 67.00 | 59.00 | 65.00 | NA | 69.00 | 71.00 | 71.00 | 75.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 48.00 | 63.00 | 62.00 | 65.00 | NA | 58.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 57.00 | 62.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 45.00 | 58.00 | 52.00 | 86.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 62.97

**ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 71.00 | 65.00 | 57.00 | 65.00 | NA | 60.00 | 56.00 | 54.00 | 64.00 | NA | 83.00 | 85.00 | 81.00 | 86.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 82.00 | 75.00 | 71.00 | 75.00 | NA | 76.00 | 70.00 | 64.00 | 68.00 | NA | | 91.00 | | | NA |
| BLACK | 46.00 | 43.00 | 33.00 | 43.00 | NA | 27.00 | 28.00 | 33.00 | 43.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 66.00 | 56.00 | 41.00 | 51.00 | NA | 48.00 | 46.00 | 43.00 | 53.00 | NA | | 81.00 | | | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 46.00 | 43.00 | 15.00 | 25.00 | NA | 37.00 | 37.00 | 30.00 | 40.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 67.00 | 65.00 | 63.00 | 66.00 | NA | 59.00 | 61.00 | 63.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 80.00 | 51.00 | 53.00 | 63.00 | NA | 64.00 | 59.00 | 56.00 | 66.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 64.00 | 80.00 | 56.00 | 65.00 | NA | 56.00 | 47.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:
90.83

**CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 28.00 | 35.00 | 23.00 | 33.00 | NA | 28.00 | 19.00 | 25.00 | 35.00 | NA | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | NA |
| WHITE | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 28.00 | 35.00 | 23.00 | 33.00 | NA | 29.00 | 19.00 | 25.00 | 35.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 28.00 | 35.00 | 20.00 | 30.00 | NA | 28.00 | 17.00 | 22.00 | 32.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 47.00 | 32.00 | 24.00 | 34.00 | NA | 40.00 | 18.00 | 41.00 | 51.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 15.00 | 27.00 | 24.00 | 34.00 | NA | 37.00 | 18.00 | 24.00 | 34.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 26.00 | 42.00 | 20.00 | 30.00 | NA | 11.00 | 21.00 | 7.00 | 25.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

**School Achievement Data**

1. School: **CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.39

**CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 60.00 | 54.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | NA | 44.00 | 47.00 | 41.00 | 51.00 | NA | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 72.00 | 57.00 | 54.00 | 65.00 | NA | 52.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 45.00 | 44.00 | 36.00 | 46.00 | NA | 38.00 | 42.00 | 32.00 | 42.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 57.00 | 50.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | 42.00 | 44.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 62.00 | 52.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | 56.00 | 48.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 48.00 | 62.00 | 28.00 | 38.00 | NA | 53.00 | 56.00 | 38.00 | 48.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 67.00 | 47.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | NA | 26.00 | 35.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:
42.92

**GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 78.00 | 75.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | NA | 76.00 | 65.00 | 62.00 | 68.00 | NA | 95.00 | 98.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 86.00 | 86.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA | 85.00 | 74.00 | 69.00 | 69.00 | NA | | 97.00 | 94.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 64.00 | 52.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | 47.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 71.00 | 60.00 | 56.00 | 65.00 | NA | 64.00 | 55.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | | 35.00 | 34.00 | 44.00 | NA | | 32.00 | 27.00 | 37.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 89.00 | 79.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA | 85.00 | 73.00 | 80.00 | 80.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 71.00 | 73.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | NA | 73.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 76.00 | 74.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 68.00 | 52.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 70.11

**IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 64.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | 70.00 | NA | 59.00 | 61.00 | 57.00 | 68.00 | NA | 89.00 | 98.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 81.00 | 79.00 | 81.00 | 85.00 | NA | 76.00 | 80.00 | 77.00 | 80.00 | NA | | | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 49.00 | 47.00 | 47.00 | 57.00 | NA | 45.00 | 39.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 58.00 | 54.00 | 56.00 | 65.00 | NA | 55.00 | 51.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | | 98.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 33.00 | 24.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | NA | 35.00 | 32.00 | 37.00 | 47.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 77.00 | 66.00 | 71.00 | 75.00 | NA | 67.00 | 71.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 53.00 | 63.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 57.00 | 63.00 | 57.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 62.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 52.00 | 48.00 | 43.00 | 53.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 66.34

**JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 69.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | NA | 63.00 | 64.00 | 62.00 | 68.00 | NA | 100.00 | 90.00 | 87.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| WHITE | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 48.00 | 40.00 | 34.00 | 44.00 | NA | 38.00 | 39.00 | 38.00 | 48.00 | NA | 100.00 | 85.00 | 81.00 | 85.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 54.00 | 44.00 | 34.00 | 44.00 | NA | 44.00 | 42.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | 100.00 | 83.00 | 87.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 35.00 | 47.00 | 24.00 | 34.00 | NA | 27.00 | 36.00 | 26.00 | 36.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 72.00 | 72.00 | 67.00 | 67.00 | NA | 70.00 | 81.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 69.00 | 61.00 | 59.00 | 65.00 | NA | 69.00 | 58.00 | 64.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 66.00 | 63.00 | 54.00 | 65.00 | NA | 52.00 | 51.00 | 53.00 | 63.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 92.33

**LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 41.00 | 49.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | NA | 36.00 | 56.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | NA | 96.00 | | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| WHITE | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 36.00 | 44.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | 30.00 | 51.00 | 41.00 | 51.00 | NA | 94.00 | | 94.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 38.00 | 48.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | 35.00 | 54.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | 95.00 | | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 31.00 | 37.00 | 31.00 | 41.00 | NA | 23.00 | 49.00 | 27.00 | 37.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 57.00 | 61.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | NA | 36.00 | 71.00 | 53.00 | 63.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 33.00 | 48.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 50.00 | 48.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 33.00 | 34.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | 29.00 | 47.00 | 38.00 | 48.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.86

**MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 39.00 | 41.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | 34.00 | 23.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | 72.00 | 78.00 | 76.00 | 80.00 | NA |
| WHITE | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 36.00 | 40.00 | 47.00 | 57.00 | NA | 29.00 | 21.00 | 43.00 | 53.00 | NA | | 77.00 | 75.00 | 80.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 39.00 | 40.00 | 49.00 | 59.00 | NA | 32.00 | 23.00 | 42.00 | 52.00 | NA | | 76.00 | 74.00 | 80.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 45.00 | 55.00 | 48.00 | 58.00 | NA | 43.00 | 44.00 | 68.00 | 78.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 24.00 | 46.00 | 56.00 | 66.00 | NA | 20.00 | 23.00 | 36.00 | 46.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 48.00 | 24.00 | 46.00 | 56.00 | NA | 38.00 | 4.00 | 24.00 | 34.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:
71.07

**MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 58.00 | 63.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 49.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA | 93.00 | 95.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 82.00 | 85.00 | 77.00 | 80.00 | NA | 76.00 | 82.00 | 77.00 | 80.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| BLACK | 39.00 | 46.00 | 48.00 | 58.00 | NA | 26.00 | 35.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 51.00 | 57.00 | 55.00 | 65.00 | NA | 39.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | 64.00 | NA | 91.00 | 95.00 | 92.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 36.00 | 37.00 | 36.00 | 46.00 | NA | 41.00 | 21.00 | 43.00 | 53.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 71.00 | 66.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | NA | 61.00 | 76.00 | 77.00 | 80.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 51.00 | 51.00 | 58.00 | 65.00 | NA | 46.00 | 51.00 | 54.00 | 64.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 52.00 | 71.00 | 53.00 | 65.00 | NA | 41.00 | 43.00 | 43.00 | 53.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:
47.25

**NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 71.00 | 80.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA | 67.00 | 67.00 | 73.00 | 75.00 | NA | 92.00 | 96.00 | 84.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 77.00 | 86.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA | 75.00 | 70.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA | | 97.00 | 87.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| BLACK | | | 40.00 | 50.00 | NA | | | 55.00 | 65.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 62.00 | 71.00 | 68.00 | 68.00 | NA | 53.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 68.00 | NA | | 93.00 | 84.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 30.00 | 50.00 | 59.00 | 65.00 | NA | 33.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | 80.00 | 81.00 | 83.00 | 85.00 | NA | 83.00 | 82.00 | 88.00 | 88.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | 78.00 | 80.00 | 71.00 | 75.00 | NA | 72.00 | 70.00 | 66.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | 55.00 | 79.00 | 84.00 | 85.00 | NA | 44.00 | 51.00 | 63.00 | 68.00 | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **W. W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL W. W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:
51.15

**W. W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

| Academic Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading | | | | | Percent Proficient in Mathematics | | | | | Percent Proficient in Writing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 61.00 | 64.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | NA | 57.00 | 64.00 | 63.00 | 68.00 | NA | 82.00 | 92.00 | 91.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 73.00 | 74.00 | 73.00 | 75.00 | NA | 71.00 | 74.00 | 72.00 | 75.00 | NA | | 91.00 | 93.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 37.00 | 39.00 | 33.00 | 43.00 | NA | 28.00 | 38.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | | 92.00 | 83.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ASIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 48.00 | 51.00 | 46.00 | 56.00 | NA | 44.00 | 51.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | NA | | 87.00 | 86.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 41.00 | 37.00 | 39.00 | 49.00 | NA | 41.00 | 49.00 | 44.00 | 54.00 | NA | | | | | NA |
| Grade Level Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | NA | | | | | NA | | | | | |

## Optional Performance Indicators

For **each** additional Performance Indicator the LEA shall provide the following information:

1. Identify the Performance Indicator that is being addressed.
2. Provide data related to that performance indicator for the past three (3) school years.
3. Provide the target for the 2008-09 school year as a result of implementing strategies funded through this application.

**Indicator: 0**

## Root Cause Analysis

Identify all possible interactions within a system that could be contributing to identified area(s) of low academic achievement. (organizational culture of the school, organizational structure of the school, instructional methods, instructional preparation time, external factors, student demographics, curriculum, etc.)

For each Root Cause identified, provide the following:

1. Provide the root cause being identified as causing low academic achievement.
2. Provide the data/documents reviewed to determine this is a cause of low academic achievement.
3. Explain how strategies implemented through this application will eliminate the root cause.
4. Provide anticipated outcomes of focusing resources to address identified root cause.

### Root Cause: 1

A meeting was held with each school and district staff to determine needs and strategies to be addressed in this project.For all of the 12 schools participating in this grant, a lack of instructional preparation time is a contributing factor to low achievement. Restructuring Plans and School Improvement Plans all identify a need to create Professional Learning Communities. These communities would review benchmark-testing data, plan instruction on data results, review re-teaching strategies, and plan regrouping for strategy implementation. To function optimally these faculties need additional time to review scientifically based research strategies and programs as they implement an FCIM model with fidelity. Additional time will afford teachers the opportunity to provide the best strategies to the lowest performing sub groups. Vision and goals focused on high levels of student learning for all sub groups would improve academic achievement.

### Root Cause: 2

For all 12 schools within this grant, a lack of increased frequency and duration for instruction in math and reading is a cause for low academic achievement. The Restructuring Plans, School Improvement Plans, and Title I Plans at all school sites indicate a need for more instructional intensive instruction within the lowest performing subgroups. Professional development through Reading First recommends interventions that are targeted, additional, and intensive. "The purpose of providing extra instructional time is to help children achieve levels of literacy that will enable them to be successful through their school careers and beyond." (Snow, Burns, & Griffin) By providing an additional qualified teacher to each school staff, the school could deliver explicit and systematic intervention in math and reading. The interventions could be targeted to specific sub groups, specific benchmark skills, and aligned to the core curriculum in reading and math. Funds would also be used to provide after school tutoring in addition to SES tutoring and during school tutoring. With additional small group instruction and appropriate tutorial materials it is expected the student engagement and academic performance would be maximized.

### Root Cause: 3

A lack of student engagement is identified as a root cause for low academic achievement at 12 school sites. School Climate Reports, Classroom Walk Throughs, and Time on Task Records, have determined this to be an area of concern and cause of low academic achievement especially for the lowest performing sub groups. Providing Kagan "Structures" professional development will offer teachers simple instructional strategies that will engage all students. Through discussing, tutoring, and teamwork students from all sub groups will be motivated to attend to learning, and find relevance in their reading and math curriculum. It is expected that this increased engagement and relevance to curriculum will increase student academic performance.

### Data Analysis during Project Period

Describe the process the district will have in place during the project period to analyze student achievement and program outcome data. Your response must include the following:

1. What professional development will be offered to staff to analyze student achievement and program outcome data? Who will offer data analysis professional development?
2. What instrument(s) will be used to assess students' progress in mastering grade-level benchmarks?
3. How many times during the 2008-2009 school year will data analysis take place at schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and/or restructuring?
4. How will the information based on data analysis be used?

**Response:** The district provided professional development to leadership teams at each Title I school in data analysis during the close of the 2007-8 school. Leadership teams provided training in data analysis (Florida Continuous Improvement Model) during pre-planning week prior to the start of the 2008-09 school year. This professional development activity was delivered by a certified FCIM trainer. Data analysis by the District will take place each quarter for schools in need of improvement, corrective action planning for restructuring and restructuring.

Schools will also use the FCIM process to complete focused assessments at grade levels and schoolwide as they plan for redirecting instruction based on data. Each school has a staff member identified as the FCIM facilitator. This facilitator is responsible for schoolwide analysis of data and will provide feedback and analysis to teachers and the administration. The District has implemented a monitoring program known as On Track Testing and data are also analyzed by the Research Department and provided to schools and the Curriculum department. . After each data analysis teachers, grade levels or entire schools will adjust their curriculums to meet the needs of their students

## LEA Support Teams

Describe the LEA support team that will be put in place to provide technical and program assistance for schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and/or restructuring. <u>Click here to see example responses.</u>

| No. | Title & Name of Individual on LEA Support Team | Qualifications of Individual |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Dr. Charles Hall | 5 years classroom teaching, 25 years school administrator, 6 years Title I Director; Doctorate in Education |
| 2 | Mr. Dewitt Lewis | 5 years classroom teaching, 24 years school administrator, 3 years Title I Supervisor; Elem. Classroom Certificate and Educational Leadership, |
| 3 | Mary Ann Myrand | 25 years classroom teaching, 4 years Teacher on Special Assignment for Title I, 3 years Title I Supervisor; Elem. Certificate, Masters in Reading; ESOL endorsement |
| 4 | Kathy Small | 23 years classroom teaching, 9 years Teacher on Special Assignment for Title I; Elem. Certificate, Masters in Elementary Education |
| 5 | Dr. Diana Lagotic | 9 years classroom teaching, 15 years Elementary,# years Title I supervisor,3 years Elementary Curriculum Director,Doctorate in Education |
| 6 | Doris Ann Imler | 25 years classroom teaching, 4 years Teacher on Special Assignment for Title I, 3 years Title I Supervisor; Elem. Certificate, Masters in |
| 7 | Jennifer Homard | 25 years classroom teaching, 4 years Teacher on Special Assignment for Title I,; Elem. Certificate,Reading Endorsement |
| 8 | Melody Hofstetter | 26 years classroom teaching, 3 years Teacher on Special Assignment for Title I, 3 years Title I Supervisor; Elem. Certificate, Masters in |

Describe the activities the LEA Support Team will conduct during the Project Period to provide technical and program support to schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and/or restructuring. For each activity the LEA shall include: the frequency of the activity and the duration of the activity.
**Response:** Each LEA support team member is on a Title I Support Team at several sites assisting schools that are planning for restructuring and monitoring implementation of each school's Restructuring plan. The LEA Support Team will make monthly monitoring site visits and will also communicate with the Title I support team members regarding the school improvement strategies.

Support team members will monitor implementation of the FCIM process and review disaggregated benchmark testing result. Activities taking place in the learning communities will be observed to determine how this process is impacting classroom instruction and student performance on the District's On-Track assessment program. Site visits will be both scheduled and random so as to make observations of strategy implementation.

The classroom run through process will be used to observe teachers delivering instruction in push-in /pull-out activities and to provide coaching and opportunity for reflective thinking. Observations will also be made to assess student engagement and to ensure that Kagan Structures are being used as outlined in the Kagan staff development t.

The support team will us a Data Record and Observation Form to evaluate implementation of the push-in/pull-out model and classroom large group instruction. The form will include observations in the following areas.

1. Students participating in the activity.

2. The subject area and skill being taught

3. Duration and frequency of activities

4. Confirmation of evidenced based curriculum

5. Assessment data form the FCIM and On Track testing

6. Kagan Structures

## Current Capacity of LEA to Support Student Academic Achievement

Current Capacity- resources that are already in place to address academic performance that will be addressed with these funds. For example: a computer lab is in place to implement a newly purchased software program; professional development has been provided in each area of need identified (list professional development activities, when they occurred, and follow-up activities); the district has already changed the organizational structure of a school to address recurring student achievement problems (describe what was done); to get teachers highly qualified, the district has done the following (describe what the district has done); coordination with Title II has provided high-quality professional development for teachers of students with disabilities; the district has collaborated with the Boys and Girls Club to provide tutoring services after school; etc.

1. Describe the current capacity of the LEA to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in reading and how this initiative will assist to enhance/expand that current capacity.
**Response:** The district has adopted Macmillan /McGraw-Hill - Florida Treasures Reading Program. With this adoption the district is offering monthly professional development to facilitate the delivery of this scientifically research based core reading program. An additional training has been offered to Curriculum Resource Specialists at each site emphasizing technology components, intervention components, phonics and phonological awareness. We have partially trained many staff members at each site in Kagan strategies (June 2007, January 2008 and June 2008) and expect the grant to complete the training for each site. Title I has offered professional development related to specific intervention programs (Early Interventions in Reading by SRA and REWARDS by Sopriswest). Title I and Title II have jointly trained FCIM leadership teams at all sites (Spring 2008). Each school has a FCIM facilitator or team that meets and works with disaggregated data and instructional planning. Title I has altered the Title I delivery model for the 2008-2009 school year to ensure that teacher-tutoring is offering supplemental tutoring with research based materials. All teacher-tutors were trained and are required to maintain data documents collecting assessment and attendance for tutorial groups. The district has also created a pacing schedule for the reading core program.

2. Describe the current capacity of the LEA to assist Title I students that are not achieving proficiency in mathematics and how this initiative will assist to enhance/expand that current capacity.
**Response:** All schools that are in Restructuring and those who planned for Restructuring last year are participating in a series of math workshops that will focus on Number Sense, Measurement, and Geometry. Primary teachers and Intermediate teachers will work with a Harcourt Math consultant and former Math Supervisor in September with a follow-up meeting in October and onsite consultation, modeling, and coaching which will continue until May. We will also bring a professor from the University of Florida who will share her research on the performance of African American students in Math and strategies to close the gap between this sub group and the total school population. All schools that have been in Corrective Action have implemented Calendar Math for grades 3 & 4 with professional development provided by Title I. In addition, several schools have used their own funding to implement Calendar Math grades (K-5) throughout the school. Funding from last year's grant has provided training in Numbers World by SRA and provided math kits at two of this year's grant sites. Additionally, the school district has provided a pacing schedule for the district adopted math program. Finally, each school has a FCIM facilitator or team that meets and works with disaggregated data and instructional planning.

3. Describe the current capacity of the LEA to assist Title I students that are not achieving proficiency in writing and how this initiative will assist to enhance/expand that current capacity.
**Response:** 4. The Title I and Title II departments have provided funding to bring in two writing consultant for professional development at schools that did not make AYP in writing. These consultants will provide professional development from February through May. The schools are divided into two teams and the consultant will coach, mentor, review papers, and provide guidance for 3rd and 4th grade teachers from these nine schools. Title I and Title II have also worked together to train 3rd and 4th grade teachers with a rubric/scoring workshop providing teachers with grade level rubrics and anchor papers. (September)

### Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

1b. Select the school/s associated with the strategy (Schools pulled from section IA.)

- ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL
- CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH
- CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL
- LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM
- MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL
- NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- W. W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1c. Select the indicator/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IB.)

1d. Select the root cause/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IC.)

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
**Response:** The FCIM model requires an eight step process which includes teams of teachers meeting to review and disaggregate data, develop goals and objectives, create an instructional timeline, develop instructional focus, plan for assessment, plan for tutorial and enrichment, maintain and monitor student results, and then meet as professional study groups at least every nine weeks. This researched based model will require extra planning time for teachers. We are asking teachers to be change schools from industrial models to learning communities. This requires time to ensure the success of improvement initiatives. The clarifications and promotion of values have been cited as key factors both for effective schools (Sergiovanni, 1984) and for successful principals (Deal & Peterson, 1990). As one study of improving schools (Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 1996) concludes, "Clear shared values and norms, collectively reinforced, increase the likelihood of teacher success." (Research gathered from Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. Professional Leaning Communities at Work; ASCD) To effectively implement the FCIM model and to create Professional Learning communities, we must buy more time for teachers to interact as strategic planning teams.

2. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)
**Response:** Professional Learning Teams would meet monthly from November 2008 through May 2009. The exact amount of time would vary for each school site but would be a minimum of one hour per month and not to exceed five hours per month.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
**Response:** Monitoring will be done by the school principal, FCIM facilitator at each site, and Title I Support Team member.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
**Response:**

There is a district monitoring tool that we will use. See below.

FCIM RECORD OF MEETINGS

School Name _____ SINI Level_____
Principal_____ CIMS Facillitator_____Meeting Date (After Baseline
Data) _____

Meeting Topic

Meeting Attendance

Action /Results


5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
**Response:** Progress monitoring will be done monthly.

6. What measures will be in place to ensure these services supplement existing services that may already be
provided to eligible students.

**Response:** Presently teachers have not been provided extra time to ensure FCIM planning or learning
communities. This will not replace any existing time but only be an addition.

7. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **3.1.b**

8. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading initiative. **No**

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)
**Response:** This strategy will focus on the classroom teachers at the schools in Restructuring or Planning for
Restructuring. Their participation in Professional Learning Communities will focus on their school needs which
are targeting growth for the subgroups of black, SWD, and low SES.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

1b. Select the school/s associated with the strategy (Schools pulled from section IA.)

- ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL
- CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH
- CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL
- LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM
- MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL
- NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- W. W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1c. Select the indicator/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IB.)

1d. Select the root cause/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IC.)

- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
**Response:** This grant would increase time on task for those subgroups of students not meeting AYP in reading, math, or both. Presently most sites have only one teacher/tutor to meet the needs of multiple low performing subgroups. This grant would add an additional teacher/tutor to each staff as well as extending tutorial time after school for low performing students. Research indicates the following: 1) Instructions should be directly tied to assessment; 2) Teacher-led groups out-perform groups led by paraprofessionals or volunteers; 3) Explicit instruction is required for effectiveness of small group instruction. For these reasons the grant would add teacher delivered instruction within the school day and after the school day. Research ( Kosanovich, M. Ladinsky,K. Nelson, L. Torgesen, J. Differentiated Reading Instruction: Small Group Alternative Lesson Structures for All Students, 2007) Reading tutors will implement scientifically based research programs such as REWARDS, Early Interventions in Reading, Triumphs, and Kaleidoscope. Math tutors will use Harcourt interventions, Numbers World by SRA and manipulatives.

2. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)
**Response:** Push-in/Pull-out teacher led tutorials during the school day would vary from sites but minimally would be 30 minutes/3 days a week to a maximum of 60 minutes/5 days a week. After school teacher-led tutorials would vary from site but minimally would be 45 minutes/ 2 days a week to a maximum of 60 minutes/ 3 days a week.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
**Response:** Monitoring and implementations of student progress will be the responsibility of the FCIM facilitator, school principal, and Title I Support Team member.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
**Response:** The Title I district office has a Title I Data Form that it will use at all sites for each tutorial group. It includes the following data: Date, Names of Students in Group, Curriculum Area, Duration & Frequency of Tutorial, Evidence Based Curriculum, Assessment Data (attached to form with attendance record), and

Effectiveness of Intervention. All data sheets will be collected and reviewed for effectiveness in the Title I District Office. In addition, there will be district-wide benchmark testing for reading and math on a quarterly basis as prescribed by the FCIM model.(September, October, January, May)

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
**Response:** The Title I Support Team members will monitor tutorial records on a monthly basis. FCIM facilitators will also be monitoring tutorials monthly at their sites.

6. What measures will be in place to ensure these services supplement existing services that may already be provided to eligible students.

**Response:** Grant tutoring will not replace SES tutoring but will be in addition to SES. Many of our students do not qualify for SES tutoring due to income levels and this will offer tutorial services for those students. At other sites this tutorial will pick up after SES funds are spent and maintain tutorials for high-at-risk populations throughout the school year. Additional in school Push-in/Pull-out tutoring compliments our LEA Title I model and will increase the number of students that are served or the duration and frequency for the most-at–risk populations.

7. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **3.1.b**

8. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading initiative. **Yes**

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)
**Response:** This strategy will target the lowest performing sub groups at each site (black, SWD, and economically disadvantaged). In addition it will provide tutoring opportunities for students that require maintenance to meet AYP standards.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

1b. Select the school/s associated with the strategy (Schools pulled from section IA.)

- ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL
- CARING & SHARING LEARNING SCH
- CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEM. SCHOOL
- LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM
- MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEM. SCHOOL
- NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1c. Select the indicator/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IB.)

1d. Select the root cause/s associated with the strategy (Indicators pulled from section IC.)

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
**Response:** This grant would provide increased student engagement through implementation of "Kagan Structures." Kagan structures lead to cooperative learning, greater academic achievement, improved ethnic relations, enhanced self-esteem, and increased student engagement to classroom learning activities. The importance of engagement to academic achievement is evident and has been commented on by a number of researchers and theorists (Connell, Spencer, & Aber, 1994; Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Marks, 2000; Skinner, Wellborm, & Connell, 1990). Their research supports that increased student engagement, increases academic achievement. (Reference: Marzano,R. The Art and Science of Teaching; 2007) Through Kagan professional development, teachers at these schools will be trained to use multiple strategies and activities which will capture and maintain student engagement and therefore enhance student academic growth.

2. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)
**Response:** Teachers will be trained in June 2009, for two days. Follow-up for training will take place in October 2009. Follow-up will consist of teachers gathering in groups to share at least one strategy that was implemented at their school. Principals will also observe Kagan strategies in classroom walk-throughs through-out the school year.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
**Response:** Title I District Support Teams will monitor the implementation of Kagan strategies as well as school principals and engagement coaches.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
**Response:** Our district "On Track" benchmark testing in reading and math will be used to measure student progress at each site.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
**Response:** Progress monitoring related to student gains will take place quarterly using the FCIM model at all school sites. Principals will monitor Kagan strategies through classroom walk-throughs. Engagement coaches

at nine of these school sites monitor student engagement with "time-on –task" observations. "Time-on-task" observations are done at least twice a year for beginning teachers and as frequently as requested for all teachers.

6. What measures will be in place to ensure these services supplement existing services that may already be provided to eligible students.

**Response:** All of the school sites participating in this grant have participated in Kagan training that has been previously offered. However, not one site has the entire faculty trained and it would be the goal of this grant to implement Kagan strategies with fidelity and as completely as possible at all of these sites. The Title I district office monitors the participation and follow-up for professional development that is funded by Title I. Evaluations of previous Kagan workshops are among the highest evaluations for professional development offered at the district level.

7. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **3.1.a**

8. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading initiative. **No**

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)
**Response:** This strategy targets all teachers who have not been previously trained in "Kagan Structures." As it addresses student engagement, it also targets all students especially the subgroups that are not making adequate AYP (black, SWD, and econonmically disadvantaged).

### Dissemination/Marketing

Describe how this application will be disseminated/marketed to the appropriate populations.

1. Provide the method(s) of dissemination/marketing of this application
2. Provide the population each method will address
3. Provide the frequency of each method used
4. Provide the duration of each method
5. Provide the language(s) each method will be made available

**Response:** District Websites: This will provide information to staff, parents, the community, and students who have access to the internet. This information will be posted upon approval of application and be accessible 24/7 until the project period ends July 31, 2009.

School Websites that receive services from this grant: This will provide information to staff, parents, the community, and students who have access to the internet. This information will be posted upon approval of application and be accessible 24/7 until the project period ends July 31, 2009.

School Newsletters that receive funds: Information on the application will be provided in the monthly newsletter after the approval of the application. This notification will address parents, staff, and students. This will be a one time notification through this method.

Student Advisory Councils and PTAs: The SACs and PTAs will be notified upon approval of the application and receive monthly updates for the remainder of the school year on progress toward meeting student achievement goals...

FLYER: To be displayed in each school that received funding and at the District office.

## Budget

A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: **Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]**
B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **Alachua**
C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

TAPS Number
09A006

| No. | (1) FUNCTION | (2) OBJECT | (3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE | (4) FTE POSITION | (5) AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5100 | 120 | Salaries: Hire additional full or part time teachers to provide pull-out or push-in tutorials to students in the lowest performing subgroups in reading and/or math. | 12.0 | 284610.00 |
| 2 | 5100 | 210 | Retirement @ 9.85% | 0.0 | 28034.09 |
| 3 | 5100 | 220 | FICA @ 7.65% | 0.0 | 21772.67 |
| 4 | 5100 | 230 | Group Insurance | 0.0 | 47571.86 |
| 5 | 7200 | 790 | Indirect Cost @ 3.74% | 0.0 | 14286.37 |
| | | | | Total | 396274.99 |

DOE 101

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

## Budget

A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: **Title I School Improvement Fund [1003(g)]**

B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **Alachua**

C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

| No. | (1) FUNCTION | (2) OBJECT | (3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE | (4) FTE POSITION | (5) AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5900 | 120 | Salaries: Provide before or after school tutoring for students not served in the NCLB supplemental educational services (SES) programs in Reading/Math and Language Arts. | 2.2 | 92622.83 |
| 2 | 5900 | 210 | Retirement @ 9.85% | 0.0 | 9123.35 |
| 3 | 5900 | 220 | FICA @ 7.65% | 0.0 | 7085.65 |
| 4 | 6400 | 120 | Salaries: Stipend teachers to carryout the duties and responsibilities created in the professional learning communities. This may include reviewing benchmark-testing data, planning instruction based on the results of the data analyze, revi | 0.0 | 122622.83 |
| 5 | 6400 | 210 | Retirement @ 9.85% | 0.0 | 12078.35 |
| 6 | 6400 | 220 | FICA @ 7.65% | 0.0 | 9380.64 |
| 7 | 6400 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services: "Kagan Structures"- Professional development will provide teachers with skills and strategies that will keep students engaged and focused in the instruction. | 0.0 | 35000.00 |
| 8 | 7200 | 790 | Indirect Cost @ 3.74% | 0.0 | 10767.97 |
| | | | | Total | 298681.62 |

DOE 101

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner