Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants BREVARD

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

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	BREVARD 2700 JUDGE FRAN JAMIESON WAY VIERA, FL 32940	Date Received

B) Applicant Contact Information:	
Contact Name: First Name: Susan MI:R Last Name: Blair	**Mailing Address:** 2700 Jamieson Way Melbourne, FL 32940
*Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):321-633-1000 Ext:353	
Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):321-631-3033	E-mail Address:blair.susan@brevardschools.org

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: $335135.94	D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: $179208.97
Total Approved Funds: **(DOE USE ONLY)** $	Total Approved Funds: **(DOE USE ONLY)** $

CERTIFICATION

I **Richard A. DiPatri** 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: **CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET SCHOOL CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 85.75

CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET 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	58.00	63.00	66.00	NA	52.00	45.00	56.00	59.00	NA	74.00	98.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	72.00	76.00	74.00	77.00	NA	65.00	62.00	72.00	75.00	NA					NA
BLACK	44.00	48.00	53.00	56.00	NA	43.00	34.00	47.00	50.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	50.00	39.00	57.00	60.00	NA	43.00	28.00	47.00	50.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	53.00	54.00	61.00	64.00	NA	48.00	38.00	51.00	54.00	NA		98.00	86.00	87.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS			39.00	42.00	NA		19.00	39.00	42.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	26.00	38.00	55.00	58.00	NA	28.00	26.00	58.00	61.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	59.00	50.00	70.00	73.00	NA	51.00	63.00	68.00	71.00	NA					
4	49.00	64.00	57.00	60.00	NA	60.00	55.00	55.00	58.00	NA					
5	60.00	65.00	60.00	63.00	NA	47.00	42.00	48.00	51.00	NA					
6	63.00	54.00	65.00	68.00	NA	49.00	25.00	54.00	57.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 60.61

COQUINA 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	78.00	82.00	85.00	NA	60.00	71.00	82.00	85.00	NA	88.00	84.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	66.00	81.00	85.00	88.00	NA	63.00	75.00	83.00	86.00	NA		82.00	94.00	95.00	NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	59.00	73.00	76.00	79.00	NA	59.00	65.00	78.00	81.00	NA					NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	37.00	60.00	58.00	61.00	NA	40.00	53.00	53.00	56.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	66.00	84.00	94.00	95.00	NA	82.00	78.00	87.00	90.00	NA					
4	71.00	71.00	74.00	77.00	NA	71.00	76.00	83.00	86.00	NA					
5	65.00	84.00	71.00	74.00	NA	44.00	61.00	68.00	70.00	NA					
6	55.00	72.00	88.00	91.00	NA	45.00	67.00	88.00	91.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHL DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 57.39

DR. W.J. CREEL 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	77.00	76.00	78.00	81.00	NA	65.00	68.00	74.00	77.00	NA	87.00	95.00	74.00	76.00	NA
WHITE	82.00	81.00	85.00	88.00	NA	71.00	75.00	80.00	83.00	NA		95.00	80.00	81.00	NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	68.00	67.00	69.00	72.00	NA	53.00	59.00	66.00	69.00	NA		93.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	42.00	47.00	54.00	57.00	NA	37.00	40.00	48.00	51.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	79.00	69.00	81.00	84.00	NA	75.00	62.00	86.00	89.00	NA					
4	73.00	70.00	79.00	82.00	NA	61.00	67.00	70.00	73.00	NA					
5	71.00	80.00	72.00	75.00	NA	60.00	65.00	64.00	67.00	NA					
6	83.00	82.00	81.00	84.00	NA	65.00	79.00	76.00	79.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 88.71

ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET

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	47.00	39.00	54.00	57.00	NA	36.00	31.00	42.00	45.00	NA	64.00	86.00	68.00	70.00	NA
WHITE	52.00	50.00	63.00	66.00	NA	39.00	36.00	50.00	53.00	NA					NA
BLACK	46.00	36.00	51.00	54.00	NA	35.00	25.00	40.00	43.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	41.00	31.00	45.00	48.00	NA	44.00	40.00	36.00	39.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	44.00	38.00	52.00	55.00	NA	35.00	29.00	41.00	44.00	NA		86.00	69.00	71.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	30.00	21.00	25.00	30.00	NA	25.00	16.00	24.00	30.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	46.00	31.00	52.00	55.00	NA	43.00	35.00	56.00	59.00	NA					
4	38.00	42.00	49.00	52.00	NA	40.00	45.00	34.00	37.00	NA					
5	46.00	39.00	65.00	68.00	NA	26.00	22.00	48.00	51.00	NA					
6	56.00	45.00	50.00	53.00	NA	39.00	22.00	24.00	28.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 44.87

GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL															
	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
Academic Indicators	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	80.00	76.00	78.00	81.00	NA	70.00	73.00	75.00	78.00	NA	90.00	91.00	88.00	89.00	NA
WHITE	89.00	85.00	89.00	92.00	NA	82.00	84.00	85.00	88.00	NA		96.00	91.00	92.00	NA
BLACK	62.00	56.00	51.00	54.00	NA	40.00	51.00	49.00	51.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	66.00	57.00	58.00	61.00	NA	46.00	55.00	51.00	54.00	NA		81.00			NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES		39.00	43.00	46.00	NA		41.00	34.00	37.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	83.00	75.00	82.00	85.00	NA	72.00	79.00	72.00	75.00	NA					
4	69.00	75.00	80.00	83.00	NA	76.00	71.00	78.00	81.00	NA					
5	84.00	76.00	70.00	73.00	NA	63.00	68.00	74.00	77.00	NA					
6	85.00	81.00	81.00	84.00	NA	68.00	76.00	78.00	81.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 71.45

JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY

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	65.00	69.00	66.00	69.00	NA	65.00	56.00	56.00	59.00	NA	92.00	97.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	68.00	74.00	76.00	79.00	NA	69.00	61.00	66.00	69.00	NA		95.00	89.00	90.00	NA
BLACK	62.00	61.00	60.00	63.00	NA	56.00	43.00	41.00	44.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC		61.00	50.00	53.00	NA		55.00	48.00	51.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	60.00	61.00	61.00	63.00	NA	63.00	53.00	51.00	54.00	NA		97.00	87.00	88.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	34.00	43.00	31.00	34.00	NA	39.00	39.00	30.00	33.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	87.00	70.00	61.00	64.00	NA	81.00	67.00	65.00	68.00	NA					
4	58.00	73.00	75.00	78.00	NA	70.00	70.00	66.00	69.00	NA					
5	64.00	62.00	55.00	58.00	NA	60.00	36.00	37.00	40.00	NA					
6	52.00	70.00	72.00	75.00	NA	49.00	51.00	56.00	59.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 70.29

JUPITER 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	67.00	68.00	68.00	71.00	NA	64.00	65.00	68.00	71.00	NA	91.00	99.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE	73.00	67.00	71.00	74.00	NA	70.00	66.00	72.00	75.00	NA		100.00	92.00	93.00	NA
BLACK	57.00	66.00	63.00	66.00	NA	44.00	62.00	61.00	64.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC			52.00	55.00	NA			60.00	63.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	60.00	64.00	64.00	67.00	NA	61.00	63.00	63.00	66.00	NA		98.00	91.00	92.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	38.00	38.00	40.00	43.00	NA	40.00	40.00	38.00	41.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	74.00	70.00	86.00	89.00	NA	73.00	78.00	89.00	92.00	NA					
4	63.00	67.00	57.00	60.00	NA	66.00	67.00	60.00	63.00	NA					
5	63.00	71.00	73.00	76.00	NA	57.00	69.00	59.00	62.00	NA					
6	65.00	65.00	56.00	59.00	NA	59.00	49.00	67.00	70.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **RIVERVIEW ELEM. SCHOOL RIVERVIEW ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 68.62

RIVERVIEW 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	64.00	62.00	64.00	67.00	NA	58.00	59.00	69.00	74.00	NA	81.00	83.00	79.00	81.00	NA
WHITE	80.00	68.00	74.00	77.00	NA	75.00	74.00	79.00	84.00	NA					NA
BLACK	41.00	44.00	48.00	51.00	NA	33.00	31.00	49.00	54.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	57.00	56.00	56.00	59.00	NA	50.00	50.00	63.00	68.00	NA		81.00	80.00	82.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	27.00	32.00	38.00	41.00	NA	33.00	36.00	34.00	39.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	71.00	70.00	66.00	69.00	NA	72.00	70.00	71.00	74.00	NA					
4	55.00	53.00	67.00	70.00	NA	61.00	57.00	81.00	84.00	NA					
5	63.00	61.00	62.00	65.00	NA	47.00	59.00	74.00	77.00	NA					
6	67.00	65.00	62.00	65.00	NA	53.00	51.00	50.00	53.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 61.73

RIVIERA 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	69.00	75.00	78.00	NA	60.00	59.00	64.00	67.00	NA	83.00	78.00	94.00	95.00	NA
WHITE	73.00	74.00	81.00	84.00	NA	68.00	65.00	68.00	71.00	NA					NA
BLACK	57.00	61.00	64.00	67.00	NA	42.00	43.00	46.00	49.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	72.00	62.00	70.00	73.00	NA	58.00	60.00	64.00	67.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	67.00	67.00	67.00	70.00	NA	55.00	50.00	56.00	59.00	NA		75.00	94.00	95.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	48.00	35.00	38.00	41.00	NA	40.00	30.00	38.00	41.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	72.00	71.00	87.00	90.00	NA	68.00	76.00	82.00	85.00	NA					
4	59.00	64.00	66.00	69.00	NA	63.00	51.00	59.00	62.00	NA					
5	68.00	76.00	75.00	78.00	NA	48.00	69.00	49.00	52.00	NA					
6	82.00	65.00	68.00	71.00	NA	60.00	43.00	70.00	73.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **UNIVERSITY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL UNIVERSITY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 64.59

UNIVERSITY PARK 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	67.00	59.00	62.00	65.00	NA	59.00	57.00	58.00	61.00	NA	91.00	83.00	77.00	79.00	NA
WHITE	68.00	69.00	63.00	66.00	NA	68.00	68.00	67.00	69.00	NA		77.00	70.00	72.00	NA
BLACK	65.00	43.00	61.00	64.00	NA	44.00	40.00	49.00	52.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	65.00	51.00	54.00	57.00	NA	56.00	50.00	52.00	55.00	NA		82.00	75.00	77.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	39.00	34.00	23.00	28.00	NA	43.00	32.00	30.00	33.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	69.00	47.00	71.00	74.00	NA	70.00	56.00	66.00	69.00	NA					
4	64.00	63.00	51.00	54.00	NA	75.00	70.00	56.00	59.00	NA					
5	56.00	72.00	64.00	67.00	NA	39.00	49.00	59.00	62.00	NA					
6	77.00	58.00	62.00	65.00	NA	49.00	52.00	51.00	54.00	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
The district has identified instructional methods as a root cause for low academic achievement. The current practice of using global strategies during reading instruction without specialization based on the needs of specific subgroups is prohibiting students from meeting required proficiency levels. The district reviewed the student achievement data for grades 3-6 in reading and found a consistent pattern of deficit achievement for students with disabilities (SWD) and English language learners (ELL) among schools identified as in need of improvement. By studying districts with like demographics it was found that SWD and ELL students achieve in classrooms where teachers employ specific instructional interventions designed to address the unique needs of these student populations. Focusing resources on providing teachers at Correct I and II schools with professional development on employing appropriate intervention strategies within the framework of Response to Intervention (RtI) will increase student achievement for these subgroups in reading by an anticipated 3%. Implementing RtI will guarantee a focus on the specific intervention needs of SWD and ELL and allow for increased student achievement in reading.

Root Cause: 2
The district has identified instructional setting as a root cause of low academic achievement. The current practice of using a pull-out or self-contained model for instructing students with disabilities (SWD) impedes progress toward proficiency. A review of district student achievement data for SWD reflects limited progress for students not receiving instruction in an inclusive environment. Schools in the district implementing full inclusion programs supported by the Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) demonstrate higher achievement levels for SWD. The Correct I and II schools not implementing full inclusion will work with FIN to train staff and develop a plan to provide an inclusive instructional setting for all students for the benefit of improved student achievement. This will eliminate instructional setting as a root cause of poor achievement for SWD. It is expected that the overall achievement levels of SWD in grades 3-6 will improve by 3% by implementing inclusion as the instructional setting.

Root Cause: 3
Limited instructional time is identified as a root cause for poor academic achievement. The overwhelming requirements of the instructional day negatively impact the amount of available instructional time for core subject areas. Student achievement data for grades 3-6 in reading and math at district Title I schools was reviewed and there is a pattern of improved achievement for students who participated in extended day or summer school programs. In addition, district staff conducted a literature review of the research on the effects of additional instructional time through extended day programs and/or the school year, and found it to be an effective means of improving student achievement. Resources will be committed to provide extended day and summer school opportunities for students at the Correct II schools and select Correct I schools. This will eliminate the root cause of limited instructional time by increasing instruction time for students. The anticipated outcome is a 5-10% improvement in overall achievement of students.

Root Cause: 4
The district has identified instructional process as a root cause for low academic achievement. There is not a defined process that includes using student assessment data to drive instruction. The district reviewed student achievement data for grades 3-6 in all subject areas and found that the highest performing Title I

schools have a defined instructional process that includes using student assessment data to determine instructional planning and strategies. These schools commit time to studying achievement data and using this information to make decisions and improve classroom instruction. Focusing resources to train administrators and teacher leaders on using Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Lesson Study Groups (LSG) to improve instruction will positively impact academic achievement. Implementing these strategies in Correct I and II schools will benefit student achievement and eliminate instructional processes as a root cause for poor academic success. It is anticipated that these schools will show a 5-10% improvement in overall achievement of students in each core subject.

Root Cause: 5
The district has identified instructional methods as the root cause of poor math achievement. The current instructional methods do not match the cognitive complexity required to demonstrate math proficiency as required by FCAT. A review of district math achievement in grade 5 shows consistent underperformance for students in the following subgroups: students with disabilities (SWD), English language learners (ELL), and black students. A review of the Florida Department of Education information on cognitive complexity of FCAT Mathematics shows that 20-30% of the fifth grade test includes high complexity items as compared to 5-15% at grades 3 and 4. Professional development that focuses on training teachers to use instructional methods that facilitate students' ability to demonstrate understanding of math at the analytical and synthesis levels will eliminate instructional methods as a root cause for poor math achievement. It is anticipated that SWD, ELL, and black students will demonstrate a 3% increase in math achievement.

Root Cause: 6
The district has identified teacher perceptions about poverty as a root cause for low academic achievement. Many teachers working in Title I schools have limited training and understanding of the unique needs of students living in generational poverty. A review of the district student achievement data shows that the schools with the highest levels of poverty have the lowest levels of student achievement. High achieving, high poverty schools in the district have more teachers on staff with training in understanding the needs of student living in poverty. By committing time and resources to providing professional development for staff at Correct I and II schools in meeting the unique needs of impoverished students and their families, the root cause of teacher perceptions about poverty will be eliminated and student achievement will improve. It is anticipated that the achievement of economically disadvantaged students will improve by 5-10% in each core subject at grades 3-6 as measured by FCAT.

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: All principals have received By the Numbers and Beyond the Numbers training in data analysis. The schools participating in this grant have also received training from the 95% Group in analysis of reading data and outcomes. The district Office of Testing and Accountability provides updated training as needed to assist schools in analyzing and interpreting newly available data. This will continue during the term of this project. District staff in Elementary Programs, ESE and Professsonal Development are also available at all times to assist schools with the analysis and interpretation of data related to identified subgroups that are performing below expectations. Instruments used for assessing and monitoring student progress include but are not limited to DIBELS, FCAT, benchmark tests in core academic subjects, assessments incorporated in computer-assisted instructional programs, and district writing assessments. With the exception of FCAT, these assessments are conducted at least three times each year. Benchmarking is done quarterly. This is true in all schools, including those identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. Results of these assessments will be used for making adjustments as needed in curriculum pacing and alignment, instructional focus and methods, and targeted supplemental instruction for individual students and subgroups.

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. Click here to see example responses.

No.	Title & Name of Individual on LEA Support Team	Qualifications of Individual
1	Early Childhood & Title I Programs Director- Teresa Wright	22 years in education including experience at the preschool, elementary, and middle school levels; 10 years as a building level administrator; 2.5 years as district administrator.
2	Elementary Program Director- Lynn Spadaccini	27 years of experience in Elementary Education including 6 years as an Elementary School Principal; District Administrator since 2002, including Director of Early Childhood and Title I Programs.
3	School Choice Director-Vicki Mace	An educator for 31 years, including 8 years as an elementary school principal; served as the Director of School Choice (Senior Staff position) since 2003 which includes coordinating AYP Public School Choice with Transportation.
4	ESE Director – Eva Lewis	24 years of experience in Exceptional Student Education Program Support Services including 5 years as principal and 10 years as teacher at sites to include both economically deprived, Title I schools and Private, for profit facilities.
5	Title I Coordinator- Susan Blair	10 years as a classroom teacher; 20 years in Title I at the state and district levels, including 13 years as a Resource Teacher and 2 as Title I Coordinator; Specialist degree in Career Teaching, with Educational Leadership certification.
6	District ESE Resource Teacher for Inclusion-Lyn Cheney	21 years in Exceptional Student Education, 10 years as a Staffing Specialist; specializes in implementation of least restrictive environment and education in regular classroom for ESE students
7	Title I Literacy Trainer – Rick Dillon	12 years of experience in Elementary Education including 6 years as a Literacy Trainer; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership; Specializes in Professional Development.
8	Title 1 Literacy Trainer – Dr. Jacqueline Fraser	31 years of experience in Elementary Education, 4 years as a Literacy Trainer; Master's Degree in Reading, Specialist degree in Educational Leadership, Doctorate in Organizational Leadership.
9	District ESOL Resource Teacher (K-12) – Jeannie Judnich	6 years of ESE full time intermediate teacher (4-6); 1 year Elementary Specialist (K-6); 4 years Resource Teacher for the ESOL program Masters in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.
10	District Resource Teacher for School Improvement - Sylvia Mijuskovic	27+ years educational experience including 10 years as a teacher, 10 years as an assistant principal, and work as Administrative Director in Miami Dade where she supervised the School Improvement office.

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: The LEA Support Team is comprised of personnel from various departments, to ensure the successful implementation of the grant. The team will meet quarterly to review school progress toward implementing improvement strategies. Team members will visit schools bi-monthly to monitor and ensure corrective action and restructuring components are being implemented with fidelity. The visits will focus on observing and assessing the following:

• School leader highly visible in classrooms, including conducting classroom walk-throughs;

• Formative student assessment data being used to drive instruction;

• Summative student assessment data being used to make curriculum decisions;

• Instructional focus is identified and made a priority;

• Professional development is targeted to subject areas identified for instructional

improvement and teachers of subgroup populations;

• Curriculum alignment with state standards is evident;

• Students are engaged in the learning process;

• Instruction is being appropriately differentiated;

• Inclusion model is used to provide implementation of least restrictive environment and education in regular classroom for ESE students;

• Reading coach is being used only for professional development.

The LEA Support Team will serve as a liaison with the district office to provide additional assistance and resources, as deemed necessary by visitations, observations, and articulation with school leadership teams.

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: Reading coaches provide professional development, model instructional strategies, and assist teachers in planning supplemental instruction and intervention for students performing below grade level (BGL) in reading. District reading staff also provide professional development to schools in instructional strategies for reading, intervention strategies, and curriculum implementation. Outside experts are brought in as needed to assist in identifying and addressing specific needs related to reading instruction and student achievement. Each school has computer-assisted instructional labs and current software such as Successmaker and Classworks that provides supplemental instruction in reading, allowing students to progress at their optimal rate and assisting teachers in early identification of problem areas by providing frequent student progress data for targeted skills. Coordination among Titles I and II, Elementary Programs, ESE and Professional Development ensures that resources are maximized to address the needs of students and teachers in the area of reading, especially for under-achieving subgroups. Funds provided by this initiative will be used to supplement state and local funds in order to extend existing programs in order to decrease the timeline for securing needed resources and provide additional professional development. In the focus areas of reading, math and writing, this initiative will also provide assistance for further implementation of RtI and the inclusion model, both of which are state-endorsed models for improving the achievement of at-risk students. Support is also provided in the form of parental choice through full implementation of choice with transportation (CWT) and SES Collaborative partners including the Kennedy Space Center, Brevard Community College, and the University of Central Florida provide additional funding and support for administrator and teacher training, instructional materials and supplies, and the alternative certification program to assist teachers in becoming highly qualified. The NAACP and United Third Bridge participate in district-sponsored distribution of books and materials to parents to enable them to support their children's reading progress.

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: District resource staff provide professional development, model instructional strategies, and assist teachers in planning supplemental instruction and intervention for students performing below grade level (BGL) in reading. District staff also provide professional development for school administrators and teachers in instructional strategies for math, intervention strategies, and curriculum implementation. Outside experts are brought in as needed to assist in identifying and addressing specific needs related to math instruction and student achievement. Each school has computer-assisted instructional labs and current software such as Successmaker and Classworks that provides supplemental instruction in math, allowing students to progress at their optimal rate and assisting teachers in early identification of problem areas by providing frequent student progress data for targeted skills. Coordination among Titles I and II, Elementary Programs, ESE and Professional Development ensures that resources are maximized to address the needs of students and teachers in the area of math, especially for under-achieving subgroups. Funds provided by this initiative will be used to supplement state and local funds in order to extend existing programs in order to decrease the timeline for securing needed resources and provide additional professional development. In the focus areas of reading, math and writing, this initiative will also provide assistance for further implementation of RtI and the inclusion model, both of which are state-endorsed models for improving the achievement of at-risk students. Support is also provided in the form of parental choice through full implementation of choice with transportation (CWT) and SES. Collaborative partners including the Kennedy Space Center, Brevard

Community College, and the University of Central Florida provide additional funding and support for administrator and teacher training, instructional materials and supplies, and the alternative certification program to assist teachers in becoming highly qualified.

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: District staff provide professional development, model instructional strategies, and assist teachers in planning supplemental instruction and intervention for students performing below grade level (BGL) in writing. Outside experts are brought in as needed to assist in identifying and addressing specific needs related to writing instruction and student achievement. Each school has computer-assisted instructional labs and current software such as Successmaker and Classworks that provides supplemental instruction in vocabulary and reading comprehension, which are essential to student success in writing. Coordination among Titles I and II, Elementary Programs, ESE and Professional Development ensures that resources are maximized to address the needs of students and teachers in the area of writing, especially for under-achieving subgroups. Funds provided by this initiative will be used to supplement state and local funds in order to extend existing programs in order to decrease the timeline for securing needed resources and provide additional professional development. In the focus areas of reading, math and writing, this initiative will also provide assistance for further implementation of RtI and the inclusion model, both of which are state-endorsed models for improving the achievement of at-risk students. Support is also provided in the form of parental options through full implementation of choice with transportation (CWT) and SES. Collaborative partners including the Kennedy Space Center, Brevard Community College, and the University of Central Florida provide additional funding and support for administrator and teacher training, instructional materials and supplies, and the alternative certification program to assist teachers in becoming highly qualified.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET SCHOOL
- COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET
- GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY
- JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- RIVERVIEW ELEM. SCHOOL
- RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- UNIVERSITY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 4
- Root Cause 5

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: The effectiveness of including students with disabilities in regular classes for reading instruction is described in "Coordination for Reading Instruction: General Education and Special Education Working Together," published by the Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts in 2000. A more exhaustive report, based on a large-scale review of the research and including other content areas in addition to reading, is "Special Education Inclusion: Making It Work," written by Wesley Sharpe and published in Education World in 2005.

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: The inclusion model is at different stages of implementation in different schools. When fully implemented, it operates five days per week during the regular school year, or less as determined by the student's IEP.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: Principals and district support team, including ESE staff, will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: The effectiveness of this strategy will be monitored by student performance on the progress monitoring tools identified previously in this application (DIBELS, benchmark tests, etc.), or by other instruments as determined by the student's IEP.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: The frequency of progress monitoring will be determined by the instruments used, as specified earlier in this application.

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

Response: No services currently in place, or funding for these services, will be discontinued due to the approval of this grant. Students will continue to receive the services they currently receive unless a replacement strategy is indicated by their progress or lack thereof. No student or staff member will receive services provided through this grant that were already available from other funding sources or are provided to non-Title I schools by other funding sources.

Funding from this initiative will not be used to help teachers attain highly qualified status, but rather to increase teachers' effectiveness in the strategies targeted by this grant. Expertise in the Inclusion Model is not a factor in achieving highly qualified status under NCLB.

Budgeted items include: 1.Reading coaches (assist with implementation by modeling appropriate classroom strategies for teachers who have ESE students in their classrooms); these coaches are in addition to the coaches funded by all other state and federal funds. 2.On a limited basis, substitutes (allow grade level teams to work collaboratively on curriculum alignment and data analysis to support the inclusion model). 3.Instructional assistants (for focused small-group tutoring in reading as needed). 4. Instructional materials to meet identified student needs. 5.Instructional software (ensure that the needs of students at every instructional level are met). 6.Teachers will be paid a stipend (after-hours professional development). 7.Substitutes will be hired if necessary (allow teachers to participate in professional development during the school day). 8.Consultants (conduct training in the inclusion model at participating schools). This will supplement training provided by district staff and the Florida Inclusion Network. 9.If training necessary for this strategy cannot be provided in the district, travel expenses will be paid to allow teachers and administrators to attend regional and state training.

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: The target population for this strategy is students with disabilities.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET SCHOOL
- COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET
- GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY
- JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- RIVERVIEW ELEM. SCHOOL
- RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- UNIVERSITY PARK 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
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 5

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: There are many resources currently available through the Regional Educational Laboratories. In addition, two of the many books containing research-based information on implementation of this model are "Using RtI for School Improvement: Raising Every Student's Achievement Scores" by Cara Shores and Kim Chester, published in 2008 by Corwin Press, and "Implementing Response to Intervention, A Principal's Guide" by Dr. Susan Hall, also published in 2008 by Corwin Press.

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: During the 2008-09 school year the district's focus will be on training school staff for implementing RtI. Classroom implementation will begin in the 2009-10 school year and proceed according to the state-mandated timeline. When fully implemented, RtI will be implemented throughout the school year at intervals appropriate to students' identified needs and achievement levels. Specific timelines will be determined by progress monitoring aligned with the Continuous Improvement Model.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: Principals and the district support team, including ESE staff, will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the RtI model.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: The effectiveness of this strategy will be monitored by student performance on the progress monitoring tools identified previously in this application (DIBELS, benchmark tests, etc.) or by other instruements as determined by the student's IEP.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: The frequency of progress monitoring will be determined by the instruments used, as specified earlier in this application.

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

Response: No services currently in place or funding for these services will be discontinued due to the approval of this grant. Students will continue to receive the services they currently receive unless a replacement strategy is indicated by their progress or lack thereof. No student or staff member will receive services provided through this grant that were already available from other funding sources or are provided to non-Title I schools by state or local funding sources.

Funding from this initiative will not be used to help teachers attain highly qualified status, but rather to increase teachers' effectiveness in the strategies targeted by this grant. Expertise in the RtI model is not a factor in the attainment of highly qualified status under NCLB.

Budgeted items include: 1.Reading coaches (assist with implementation by modeling appropriate RtI classroom strategies; these coaches are in addition to the coaches funded by all other state and federal funds. 2.On a limited basis, substitutes (allow grade level teams to work collaboratively on curriculum alignment and data analysis to support the RtI model). 3.Instructional assistants (for focused small-group tutoring in reading as needed). 4. Instructional materials to meet identified student needs. 5.Instructional software (ensure that the needs of students at every instructional level are met). 6.Teachers will be paid a stipend (after-hours professional development). 7.Substitutes will be hired if necessary (allow teachers to participate in professional development during the school day). 8.Consultants (conduct training in RtI at participating schools). This will supplement training provided by district staff. 9.If training necessary for this strategy cannot be provided in the district, travel expenses will be paid to allow teachers and administrators to attend regional and state training.

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: The target population for this stratgegy includes students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and African-Anmerican students working below grade level.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- CAMBRIDGE ELEM MAGNET SCHOOL
- COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHL
- ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET
- GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- JOHN F. TURNER, SR. ELEMENTARY
- JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- RIVERVIEW ELEM. SCHOOL
- RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- UNIVERSITY PARK 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
- Root Cause 3
- Root Cause 5

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Resources for research-based information on the efficacy of a high-quality summer school program include "Summer School: Research-Based Recommendations for Policymakers" by Harris Cooper, published by SERVE in 2001; and "Summer School Programs: A Look at the Research, Implications for Practice, and Program Sampler" by Boss and Railsback, published in 2002 by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

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: Summer instruction will be 5 hours per day, 5 days per week for 4 weeks.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: Principals will have the primary responsibility for monitoring summer school during its implementation. The district support team will be responsible for monitoring its effectiveness based on student progress once the summer program ends.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: Summer school progress is monitored by student portfolios, the Stanford Achievement Test, and student placement for the 2009-10 school year.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: Student progress in summer school is monitored by informal weekly reviews, student portfolio reviews, and weekly reports generated by computer-assisted instructional programs such as SuccessMaker. Due to the short duration of the program, the primary monitoring occurs at the end of summer school.

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

Response: The district will provide state-funded summer school only for third graders who are below grade level in reading or at risk of being retained. Funds from this grant will be used to extend the program to level 2 third graders and to other grade levels, as determined by each school's student achievement results.

Budgeted items include: 1. Teacher stipends for summer school; 2. Instructional materials for implementation of the summer curriculum.

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: Primary target populations for this strategy include African-American students working below grade level and economically disadvantaged students working below grade level.

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: The district website will be used to provide information to the community, including parents, students and school staff who have internet access. Information will be posted upon approval of the application and updated as appropriate for the duration of the project.

The websites of the schools participating in this initiative will also provide information to the comunity, parents and students who have internet access. Information will be posted upon approval of the application and updated as appropriate for the duration of the project.

School newsletters will include notices of the grant award and periodic updates on the progress of the initiative. These notices will address parents and students. This notification will be included upon approval of the application and again at the beginning of the second semester, with interim updates as appropriate.

Each method of notification will include notice that the information is available in hard copy from participating schools in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole, which are the most-requested home languages of Brevard families. Upon request, information will also be made available by translation into other languages or by other methods as appropriate.

Each participating school will notify its SAC and staff of the receipt of this grant award. Regular updates will be provided by the principal to the SAC and school faculty as appropriate.

Budget

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

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

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	121	Teacher stipends for summer school and extra duty; Strategies 2 and 3	65.0	69960.00
2	5100	141	Substitutes for teachers engaged in curriculum alignment and data analysis; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	4617.00
3	5100	161	Salaries for instructional assistants to provide focused small-group tutoring; Strategies 1 and 2	3.0	32998.00
4	5100	210	Retirement for positions above; Strategies 1,2 and 3	68.0	12294.00
5	5100	220	FICA for positions above; Strategies 1,2 and 3	68.0	9931.00
6	5100	511	Instructional materials to support grant activities; Strategies 1, 2 and 3	0.0	41007.94
7	5100	691	Instructional software for computer labs; Strategies 1, 2	0.0	91250.00
8	5100	692	Additional licenses for instructional software; Strategies 1, 2	0.0	18500.00
9	6300	121	Reading coach salary; Strategies 1 and 2	1.2	33824.00
10	6300	210	Retirement for reading coaches; Strategies 1 and 2	1.2	4039.00
11	6300	220	FICA for reading coaches; Strategies 1 and 2	1.2	3137.00
12	6400	511	Materials and supplies for professional development; ; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	5788.00
13	7200	799	Indirect cost @ 3.58%	0.0	7790.00
				Total	335135.94

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: **Brevard**

C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

TAPS Number
09A005

No.	(1) FUNCTION	(2) OBJECT	(3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE	(4) FTE POSITION	(5) AMOUNT
1	6400	121	Teacher stipend for professional development; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	40788.00
2	6400	141	Substitutes for teachers attending professional development; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	24638.00
3	6400	210	Retirement for teachers' extra duty; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	1811.00
4	6400	220	FICA for teachers and substitutes above; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	3449.00
5	6400	311	Consultants for professional development; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	25000.00
6	6400	332	Travel for teachers and administrators to attend professional development training; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	13000.00
7	6400	511	Materials and supplies for professional development; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	10322.97
8	6400	737	Registration and fees for professional development training; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	9000.00
9	6400	312	Consultants for professional development; Strategies 1 and 2	0.0	51200.00
				Total	179208.97

DOE 101

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner