Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants BROWARD

## 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:

V 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.
$\checkmark$ 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

| Return to: <br> Florida Department of <br> Education <br> Bureau of Grants Management <br> Room 325 Turlington Building <br> 325 West Gaines Street <br> Tallahassee, Florida 32399- <br> 0400 <br> Telephone: (850) 245-0496 <br> SunCom: 205-0496 | A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant: BROWARD <br> 600 SE 3RD AVE FL 10 <br> FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301 |  | DOE USE ONLY <br> Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B) Applicant Contact Information: |  |  |  |
| Contact Name: <br> First Name: Vera MI:W Last Name: Ginn |  | Mailing Address: 701 NW 31 Avenue Ft. Lauderdale , FL 33311 |  |
| *Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):754-321-1420 Ext:2062 |  |  |  |
| Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):754-321-1441 |  | E-mail Address:vera.ginn@browardschools.com |  |
| 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: \$986644.49 |  | D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: \$1373935.46 |  |
| Total Approved Funds:(DOE USE ONLY)$\$$ |  | Total Approved Funds:(DOE USE ONLY)$\$$ |  |

CERTIFICATION

I James Notter 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

## School Achievement Data

1. School: BAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL BAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 55.56

BAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008-2009 } \\ & \text { Outcomes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 57.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA | 58.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA | 98.00 | 98.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 72.00 | 72.00 | 74.00 | 75.00 | NA | 76.00 | 75.00 | 78.00 | 79.00 | NA |  | 99.00 | 99.00 | 100.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 44.00 | 42.00 | 44.00 | 45.00 | NA | 44.00 | 39.00 | 43.00 | 44.00 | NA | 98.00 | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 63.00 | 63.00 | 60.00 | 62.00 | NA | 60.00 | 63.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 46.00 | 47.00 | 47.00 | 48.00 | NA | 47.00 | 46.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 96.00 | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 37.00 | 42.00 | 41.00 | 42.00 | NA | 42.00 | 32.00 | 43.00 | 44.00 | NA | 91.00 | 97.00 |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 23.00 | 29.00 | 36.00 | 37.00 | NA | 30.00 | 22.00 | 37.00 | 38.00 | NA | 85.00 |  | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 58.00 | 56.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 49.00 | 47.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 61.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | 70.00 | NA | 59.00 | 56.00 | 68.00 | 69.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 51.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA | 64.00 | 61.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: BETHUNE MARY M ELEMENTARY SCHL BETHUNE MARY M ELEMENTARY SCHL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 87.41

BETHUNE MARY M ELEMENTARY SCHL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 56.00 | 54.00 | 47.00 | 48.00 | NA | 58.00 | 56.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 88.00 | 94.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 50.00 | 49.00 | 41.00 | 42.00 | NA | 54.00 | 52.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 87.00 | 88.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 54.00 | 51.00 | 43.00 | 44.00 | NA | 53.00 | 55.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA |  | 94.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | 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 | 61.00 | 48.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 66.00 | 62.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 56.00 | 60.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA | 65.00 | 62.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 50.00 | 54.00 | 47.00 | 48.00 | NA | 45.00 | 42.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | 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: C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.10

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 42.00 | 38.00 | 48.00 | 49.00 | NA | 54.00 | 59.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA | 100.00 | 100.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 36.00 | 31.00 | 43.00 | 44.00 | NA | 49.00 | 48.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA |  | 100.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 47.00 | 48.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 59.00 | 74.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 37.00 | 37.00 | 48.00 | 49.00 | NA | 51.00 | 58.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA |  | 100.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 41.00 | 33.00 | 39.00 | 40.00 | NA | 48.00 | 55.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 44.00 | 31.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA | 49.00 | 58.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 46.00 | NA | 71.00 | 70.00 | 58.00 | 60.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 37.00 | 44.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | NA | 47.00 | 49.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | 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: CASTLE HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CASTLE HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 88.29

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Targets | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 59.00 | 60.00 | 56.00 | 59.00 | NA | 53.00 | 57.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | NA | 88.00 | 97.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 59.00 | 60.00 | 55.00 | 57.00 | NA | 53.00 | 56.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 58.00 | 59.00 | 55.00 | 57.00 | NA | 53.00 | 58.00 | 53.00 | 54.00 | NA |  | 96.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | 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 | 63.00 | 58.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 60.00 | 52.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 57.00 | 63.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA | 65.00 | 73.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 55.00 | 59.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 36.00 | 45.00 | 44.00 | 45.00 | 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: CHARLES DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARLES DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 88.00

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 64.00 | 49.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA | 64.00 | 64.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | NA | 100.00 | 97.00 | 95.00 | 96.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 64.00 | 46.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | NA | 62.00 | 65.00 | 46.00 | 48.00 | NA |  | 98.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  | 55.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA |  | 57.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 63.00 | 49.00 | 47.00 | 49.00 | NA | 62.00 | 63.00 | 49.00 | 51.00 | NA |  | 98.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 61.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | NA | 66.00 | 60.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 71.00 | 53.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 72.00 | 73.00 | 59.00 | 61.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 62.00 | 55.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA | 53.00 | 61.00 | 45.00 | 47.00 | 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: CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 71.30

| CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 57.00 | 62.00 | 60.00 | 62.00 | NA | 54.00 | 69.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | NA | 92.00 | 95.00 | 95.00 | 96.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 68.00 | 76.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA | 64.00 | 81.00 | 77.00 | 78.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 50.00 | 52.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | NA | 40.00 | 56.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA | 85.00 |  | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 54.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA | 53.00 | 71.00 | 71.00 | 72.00 | NA |  | 95.00 |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 53.00 | 57.00 | 55.00 | 57.00 | NA | 50.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 55.00 | 46.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA | 45.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 44.00 | 40.00 | 31.00 | 32.00 | NA | 38.00 | 58.00 | 42.00 | 43.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 58.00 | 60.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 53.00 | 65.00 | 78.00 | 79.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 53.00 | 56.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 57.00 | 76.00 | 65.00 | 67.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 62.00 | 71.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | NA | 49.00 | 65.00 | 61.00 | 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: CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 79.23

| CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Targets | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 58.00 | 48.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | NA | 59.00 | 66.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | NA | 88.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  | 58.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |  | 77.00 | 83.00 | 84.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 55.00 | 45.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | NA | 46.00 | 63.00 | 58.00 | 60.00 | NA | 85.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 53.00 | 46.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 68.00 | 62.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA |  | 91.00 |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 51.00 | 45.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 54.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  | 88.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 49.00 | 36.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 56.00 | 57.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA |  | 88.00 |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 63.00 | 48.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA | 66.00 | 71.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 48.00 | 45.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 52.00 | 62.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 59.00 | 54.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA | 58.00 | 64.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | 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: DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 55.22

DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

| Academic <br> Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 64.00 | 63.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA | 67.00 | 70.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA | 86.00 | 95.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 73.00 | 75.00 | 74.00 | 75.00 | NA | 78.00 | 79.00 | 83.00 | 84.00 | NA |  | 96.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 47.00 | 46.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 49.00 | 55.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA |  | 91.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 69.00 | 56.00 | 53.00 | 55.00 | NA | 70.00 | 73.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 55.00 | 55.00 | 53.00 | 55.00 | NA | 58.00 | 61.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  | 91.00 | 92.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 58.00 | 62.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 60.00 | 67.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 35.00 | 45.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA | 34.00 | 49.00 | 53.00 | 54.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 73.00 | 56.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA | 73.00 | 74.00 | 79.00 | 80.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 62.00 | 63.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA | 72.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | 75.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 56.00 | 69.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 58.00 | 64.00 | 67.00 | 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: DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.52

DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 59.00 | 50.00 | 56.00 | 67.00 | NA | 62.00 | 58.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA | 97.00 | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 59.00 | 50.00 | 54.00 | 56.00 | NA | 60.00 | 57.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 58.00 | 49.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 62.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA |  | 96.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | 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 | 59.00 | 47.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | NA | 56.00 | 50.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 65.00 | 45.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 69.00 | 60.00 | 53.00 | 54.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 53.00 | 62.00 | 57.00 | 59.00 | NA | 62.00 | 65.00 | 49.00 | 51.00 | 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: DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.90

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 49.00 | 47.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA | 54.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA | 88.00 | 87.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 49.00 | 47.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA | 54.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  | 87.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 46.00 | 44.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 52.00 | 64.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA |  | 87.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 57.00 | 43.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 53.00 | 68.00 | 68.00 | 69.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 49.00 | 43.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA | 61.00 | 58.00 | 71.00 | 72.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 40.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA | 50.00 | 72.00 | 61.00 | 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: IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 82.10

| IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | 2007- <br> 2008 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 63.00 | 56.00 | 44.00 | 50.00 | NA | 56.00 | 47.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA | 79.00 | 99.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 61.00 | 54.00 | 40.00 | 42.00 | NA | 54.00 | 43.00 | 36.00 | 37.00 | NA |  | 98.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 62.00 | 56.00 | 41.00 | 47.00 | NA | 59.00 | 47.00 | 38.00 | 39.00 | NA |  | 100.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | 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 | 70.00 | 46.00 | 30.00 | 32.00 | NA | 70.00 | 46.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 59.00 | 62.00 | 55.00 | 57.00 | NA | 63.00 | 51.00 | 53.00 | 54.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 61.00 | 63.00 | 43.00 | 45.00 | NA | 34.00 | 42.00 | 25.00 | 27.00 | 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: LAUDERDALE MANORS ELEMENTARY LAUDERDALE MANORS ELEMENTARY
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 97.47


## School Achievement Data

1. School: LAUDERHILL PAUL TURNER ELEM. LAUDERHILL PAUL TURNER ELEM.
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.20


## School Achievement Data

1. School: LLOYD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHL LLOYD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 91.20


## School Achievement Data

1. School: MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.10


## School Achievement Data

1. School: MEADOWBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MEADOWBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 85.90

MEADOWBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | 2007- <br> 2008 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 57.00 | 58.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | NA | 64.00 | 67.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | NA | 88.00 | 90.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 50.00 | 52.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA | 62.00 | 68.00 | 54.00 | 56.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| HISPANIC | 59.00 | 58.00 | 52.00 | 54.00 | NA | 62.00 | 63.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  | 90.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 57.00 | 56.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | NA | 62.00 | 65.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA |  | 88.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | 50.00 | 47.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | NA | 52.00 | 52.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA |  | 87.00 | 86.00 | 87.00 | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  | 38.00 | 39.00 | NA |  |  | 48.00 | 49.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 64.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA | 73.00 | 70.00 | 74.00 | 75.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 52.00 | 60.00 | 67.00 | 69.00 | NA | 69.00 | 70.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 54.00 | 63.00 | 41.00 | 42.00 | NA | 52.00 | 60.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | 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: MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 57.40

MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008-2009 } \\ & \text { Outcomes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 67.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | NA | 66.00 | 63.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA | 89.00 | 91.00 | 85.00 | 87.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 71.00 | 68.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA | 70.00 | 71.00 | 71.00 | 72.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 63.00 | 56.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 59.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA |  | 98.00 |  |  | NA |
| HISPANIC | 67.00 | 61.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | NA | 70.00 | 71.00 | 68.00 | 70.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 68.00 | 55.00 | 58.00 | 60.00 | NA | 61.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | NA |  | 90.00 | 87.00 | 89.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 34.00 | 36.00 | 42.00 | 43.00 | NA | 46.00 | 38.00 | 37.00 | 38.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 73.00 | 57.00 | 71.00 | 72.00 | NA | 70.00 | 66.00 | 75.00 | 76.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 61.00 | 63.00 | 53.00 | 55.00 | NA | 70.00 | 59.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 69.00 | 65.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 59.00 | 64.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | 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: MORROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MORROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 79.30


## School Achievement Data

1. School: NORTH SIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NORTH SIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 98.90

| NORTH SIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 52.00 | 48.00 | 35.00 | 37.00 | NA | 51.00 | 51.00 | 42.00 | 44.00 | NA | 96.00 | 98.00 | 98.00 | 99.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 51.00 | 50.00 | 35.00 | 37.00 | NA | 49.00 | 53.00 | 42.00 | 44.00 | NA | 96.00 | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA | - |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 50.00 | 48.00 | 34.00 | 36.00 | NA | 51.00 | 51.00 | 42.00 | 43.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 49.00 | 40.00 | 30.00 | 32.00 | NA | 46.00 | 49.00 | 33.00 | 34.00 | NA | 97.00 | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 52.00 | 49.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA | 53.00 | 49.00 | 40.00 | 41.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 55.00 | 53.00 | 44.00 | 45.00 | NA | 60.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 50.00 | 41.00 | 23.00 | 24.00 | NA | 39.00 | 48.00 | 31.00 | 32.00 | 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: OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 74.63

OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 66.00 | 61.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | NA | 65.00 | 63.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA | 96.00 | 93.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 75.00 | 69.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA | 75.00 | 65.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 55.00 | 51.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA | 53.00 | 53.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA |  | 87.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 68.00 | 62.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | NA | 66.00 | 65.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  | 94.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 65.00 | 57.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 65.00 | 59.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA |  | 94.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | 60.00 | 41.00 | 43.00 | 44.00 | NA | 55.00 | 52.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 37.00 | 31.00 | 25.00 | 26.00 | NA | 39.00 | 44.00 | 34.00 | 35.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 69.00 | 68.00 | 70.00 | 71.00 | NA | 71.00 | 75.00 | 76.00 | 77.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 67.00 | 47.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA | 68.00 | 56.00 | 65.00 | 66.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 63.00 | 67.00 | 51.00 | 53.00 | NA | 57.00 | 57.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | 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: ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.20

| ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 49.00 | 47.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA | 53.00 | 53.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 85.00 | 94.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 49.00 | 45.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 53.00 | 52.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA |  | 94.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 49.00 | 45.00 | 48.00 | 49.00 | NA | 53.00 | 52.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA |  | 96.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | 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 | 53.00 | 44.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 58.00 | 65.00 | 74.00 | 75.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 47.00 | 45.00 | 47.00 | 48.00 | NA | 48.00 | 48.00 | 70.00 | 71.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 46.00 | 51.00 | 42.00 | 43.00 | NA | 52.00 | 46.00 | 48.00 | 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: PARK LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PARK LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.04

| PARK LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 52.00 | 46.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 60.00 | 54.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA | 85.00 | 95.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 53.00 | 46.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | NA | 58.00 | 54.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 90.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 53.00 | 45.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 60.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | 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 | 62.00 | 43.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 67.00 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 43.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | NA | 61.00 | 60.00 | 59.00 | 61.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 51.00 | 51.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA | 51.00 | 51.00 | 48.00 | 50.00 | 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: PARKWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL PARKWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 80.60


## School Achievement Data

1. School: PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 87.70

| PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic <br> Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2008- \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ <br> Targets | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 53.00 | 58.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 55.00 | 61.00 | 56.00 | 58.00 | NA | 94.00 | 92.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 53.00 | 57.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | NA | 54.00 | 60.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA |  | 93.00 | 89.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 52.00 | 59.00 | 49.00 | 51.00 | NA | 53.00 | 61.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA |  | 94.00 | 90.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 66.00 | 57.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 70.00 | 59.00 | 76.00 | 77.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 50.00 | 51.00 | 44.00 | 45.00 | NA | 52.00 | 65.00 | 45.00 | 46.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 42.00 | 66.00 | 48.00 | 49.00 | NA | 41.00 | 59.00 | 50.00 | 52.00 | 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: ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.30


## School Achievement Data

1. School: SMART SCHOOL CHARTER MIDDLE SMART SCHOOL CHARTER MIDDLE
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 83.49

SMART SCHOOL CHARTER MIDDLE

| Academic <br> Indicators | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 44.00 | 34.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA | 40.00 | 46.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 99.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 43.00 | 33.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA | 38.00 | 45.00 | 62.00 | 63.00 | NA | 99.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 45.00 | 34.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA | 41.00 | 47.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 98.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 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 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 52.00 | 29.00 | 42.00 | 43.00 | NA | 46.00 | 41.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 46.00 | 51.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | NA | 36.00 | 59.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 32.00 | 21.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | NA | 36.00 | 38.00 | 70.00 | 71.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHL STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 65.08

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 70.00 | 70.00 | 68.00 | 69.00 | NA | 68.00 | 77.00 | 75.00 | 76.00 | NA | 91.00 | 92.00 | 92.00 | 93.00 | NA |
| WHITE | 80.00 | 81.00 | 82.00 | 83.00 | NA | 80.00 | 88.00 | 88.00 | 89.00 | NA |  | 91.00 | 91.00 | 92.00 | NA |
| BLACK | 61.00 | 60.00 | 51.00 | 53.00 | NA | 50.00 | 65.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| HISPANIC | 61.00 | 63.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | NA | 65.00 | 73.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 95.00 | 96.00 | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 63.00 | 66.00 | 61.00 | 63.00 | NA | 64.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA |  | 93.00 | 93.00 | 94.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 34.00 | 36.00 | 32.00 | 33.00 | NA | 46.00 | 52.00 | 49.00 | 50.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 73.00 | 78.00 | 70.00 | 71.00 | NA | 77.00 | 89.00 | 83.00 | 84.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 70.00 | 66.00 | 69.00 | 70.00 | NA | 75.00 | 78.00 | 84.00 | 85.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 65.00 | 64.00 | 66.00 | 67.00 | NA | 53.00 | 63.00 | 58.00 | 59.00 | 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: SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 70.48

| SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| Academic Indicators | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 65.00 | 63.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 75.00 | 74.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | NA | 89.00 | 97.00 | 89.00 | 91.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 66.00 | 62.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 73.00 | 71.00 | 70.00 | 71.00 | NA |  | 98.00 | 86.00 | 88.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC | 63.00 | 62.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA | 78.00 | 74.00 | 76.00 | 77.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 94.00 | 95.00 | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 61.00 | 60.00 | 61.00 | 62.00 | NA | 70.00 | 71.00 | 68.00 | 69.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 88.00 | 90.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 75.00 | 68.00 | 72.00 | 73.00 | NA | 81.00 | 75.00 | 82.00 | 83.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 60.00 | 59.00 | 64.00 | 65.00 | NA | 82.00 | 76.00 | 63.00 | 65.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 61.00 | 64.00 | 55.00 | 57.00 | NA | 63.00 | 71.00 | 73.00 | 74.00 | 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: THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEM. SCHOOL THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEM. SCHOOL
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 96.50

|  | Percent Proficient in Reading |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |  |  |  |  | Percent Proficient in Writing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008- } \\ 2009 \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Targets | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes | $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008-2009 } \\ \text { Targets } \end{gathered}$ | 2008-2009 <br> Outcomes |
| TOTAL | 40.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 38.00 | 50.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA | 93.00 | 96.00 | 96.00 | 97.00 | NA |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| BLACK | 40.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 38.00 | 49.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | NA |  | 97.00 | 97.00 | 98.00 | NA |
| HISPANIC |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ASIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 38.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 51.00 | NA | 35.00 | 50.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 | NA |  | 95.00 | 95.00 | 96.00 | NA |
| ENGLISH <br> LANGUAGE <br> LEARNERS | 35.00 | 39.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | NA | 24.00 | 39.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |
| Grade Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 46.00 | 38.00 | 44.00 | 45.00 | NA | 40.00 | 60.00 | 52.00 | 53.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 46.00 | 56.00 | 57.00 | 58.00 | NA | 49.00 | 51.00 | 67.00 | 68.00 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 28.00 | 58.00 | 51.00 | 52.00 | NA | 27.00 | 37.00 | 46.00 | 47.00 | 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: WESTWOOD HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY WESTWOOD HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.50


## 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 gaps in the ability of school leaders to develop and implement a comprehensive plan as a root cause for low academic achievement. The district reviewed and compared school improvement plans of corrective action schools and those of high performing schools in terms of needs assessment, objectives and strategies to target AYP subgroups. Lack of data, incorrect data and nonalignment of objectives with specific strategies for AYP subgroups was evident in plans of low performing schools. Focusing resources needed to develop a working plan including the use of a response to intervention model in corrective action schools, will increase student achievement by an anticipated 1-2\% for each subgroup by aligning data with specific strategies targeting AYP subgroups. Consultants will advise schools regarding progress toward making AYP and assist in developing a plan to address areas of concern. Consultants will conduct instructional reviews to include programs as well as fidelity of implementation of programs. Consultants will evaluate professional development needs of teachers and administrators and assist with the development of an implementation plan for professional development. Consultants will evaluate schools' ability to analyze data and assist in identifying measurable targets for improvement for each subgroup not meeting the criteria for AYP. Consultants will identify specific measures to close the performance gaps for each subgroup not meeting the criteria for AYP. Consultants will assist schools with development of response to intervention, assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement. This action will eliminate ineffective alignment of data and strategies and allow for effective planning for increased student achievement. Consultants provided will be Principal Leaders (retired administrators and administrators from outside the district with a proven record of school reform) and outside experts (CDDRE) experienced with school reform. A portion of one Principal Leader's time will be to act as Project Coordinator to coordinate/schedule retired principals and outside district administrators and to assist as a liaison to HRD in coordinating the professional development described in Root Cause 2.

## Root Cause: 2

The district has identified implementation of core curriculum programs by teachers with poor fidelity as a root cause for continued low academic achievement. District fidelity check data elements were compared for low, average, high, and highest risk schools. Fidelity checks indicate that in high-risk schools $30 \%$ of elements reviewed and in highest risk schools $50 \%$ of elements reviewed needed improvement. Focusing resources to provide staff development at corrective action schools in implementing research-based programs with fidelity is expected to increase student achievement in core academic areas by 2-3\%. Targeting appropriate implementation will eliminate use of ineffective strategies and ensure increased student achievement in core content areas.

## 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 provides data analysis training through the training for the 8 Step Instructional Process (Florida Continuous Improvement Model - FCIM.)

Mini-assessments in reading, mathematics and science will be conducted after each benchmark is taught as a part of the 8-Step Process. Dates for mini-assessments as well another assessments (i.e., SRUSS ESI-K Kindergarten, DIBELS, ILS reports and monthly writing prompts) are aligned to schools' instructional focus calendars. Teachers use a variety of data to guide instruction. Data is derived from daily lessons, homework, class work and interaction within the classroom, along with Sunshine State Standards (SSS) scores, the Norm Reference Test (NRT) scores, Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) results, mini BATs and teacher assessments and observations. Teachers then meet with Administration and the Leadership Team to determine the effectiveness of instruction. Collaboratively, it is decided if changes need to be made to curriculum for the student or an in-depth evaluation needs to be initiated to determine if a learning problem might be evident. Broward Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) is given twice before the FCAT. The BAT is a good predictor of how a student is progressing toward mastery of the Sunshine State Standards. Schools receive the data for individual students and then can tailor their instruction to meet the student's needs. Additionally, mini-BAT's are administered on a regular basis. The data analysis is part of the discussions of the leadership team. Our data drives our instruction to allow each student to have his/her educational needs met.

## 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 | Sayra Hughes Executive Director, Multicultural, ESOL \& Program Services Department | Over 19 years of experience in the teaching field. Master's Degree in Educational Leadership. worked as classroom teacher, school principal, curriculum coordinator and director of federal programs. |
| 2 | Leslie M. Brown Executive Director, Educational Programs | 24 years of experience elementary, middle, high; 3 year K-8 state recognized "Turnaround" School Principal; seven years district administrator in innovative practices for magnet programs, curriculum and student assignment processes. |
| 3 | Denise Rusnak ESE Director | 29 years of experience in special education including 19 years as a classroom teacher and 10 as a district administrator. Bachelors and Masters degree in Special Education with additional certification in Educational Leadership. |
| 4 | Veda Hudge Director, A++ NCLB | 19 years experience, Elementary Reading Coach struggling schools 4 years, Elementary Principal 5 years, Principal on Special Assignment, Superintendents schools, Masters in Psychology and Elementary Education |
| 5 | David Hall North Area Director | 19 years experience; Years: music/band teacher, 9; Performing and Visual Arts Department Chairperson, 3; Assistant Principal, 4; Principal, 5; Area Director, 1 1/2. Certified in Music, ESOL, Educational Leadership, and School Principal. |
| 6 | Jacquelyn Haywood North Area Director | 35 years experience, Years: ESE, 5; Guidance Counselor, 4 ; School Psychologist, 2 ; Assistant Principal, 3; Principal, 9; Area Director, 3. Certified in Education Leadership, ESOL, Guidance/Counseling, MH, Psychology, School Principal, SLD |
| 7 | Ulysses Jackson North Area Director | 39 years of experience including 16 years as a Biology teacher; 6 years as an Assistant Principal; 3 years as a Principal; and 14 years as an Director/Area Director. Certified in Biology (6-12) and School Principal. |
| 8 | Debbie L. Friedman Coordinator A++NCLB | 20+ years experience, 7 years in the department of School Improvement, and Strategic Planning; two years working as a Coordinator k-12 serving high needs schools, now known as A++/NCLB. Masters in Elementary Education |
| 9 | Michaelle Valbrun-Pope Area Director School Improvement | 20 years experience; 9 years teacher, teacher leader, Curriculum Facilitator; 9 highly effective school administrator, Now oversee operations of 20 schools and monitor effectiveness and development of school leaders Masters of Science in Education |
| 10 | Shelley Lunde Coordinator A++NCLB | Over 23 years of teaching experience in elementary and middle school. Thirteen years of teacher coaching experience at the school level and at the district level. Extensively trained in the coaching and mentoring process. |
| 11 | Valerie S. Wanza South Area Director | 17 yrs. exp; Principal Achiev Award; increase stud. achiev. at alternative center four consecutive years; BA Eng, M. Ed. Leadership; 45 hours in EdD. in Ed. Leadership; On FAU team conducting action learning project for FDOE to improve stud. achiev. |
| 12 | Desmond Blackburn, Ph.D. Area Director, School Improvement | 12+ years experience. Masters and Ph.D. in Ed. Leadership. High school and middle school teacher, assistant principal,middle school. District trainer, adjunct professor. |
| 13 | Margaret Underhill Ed.D. Director, School Improvement | 40 years of experience in education at all levels. District positions- Elementary Director of Education and School Improvement. Currently 10th year as Area Director of School Improvement. Doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction from FAU. |

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 support team will meet monthly to review school progress toward implementation of training provided by consultants. Schools will be visited three times per month by team members and a checklist will be used to document observations and interviews with school staff. School visits will be random and on a varied schedule so that team members may make observations and conduct interviews throughout the day.

## Checklist Includes:

- Professional development plan for the schools based on school data
- $100 \%$ of the lower 30th percentile identified and owned by appropriate leadership team member
- 90 minute uninterrupted reading block consistently implemented (elementary)


## - Response to intervention process implemented

- Classroom walkthrough completed by end of September and professional development needs identified
- Professional development plans developed and monitor
- Classroom walkthrough is institutionalized at the school
- Reading/instructional coaches performing coaching and mentoring $100 \%$ of the time
- Required coaches hired and in place
- ELO aligned with daytime instruction
- All students scheduled appropriately according to K-12 Reading and ESOL Plans
- Teachers have necessary textbooks and materials
- Benchmark assessment data analyzed/changes made as a result
- All positions filled with highly qualified teachers
- Digital tools are used for instruction
- Core subjects revised to address AYP subgroups


## 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: Each corrective action school has a school based reading coach whose responsibilities include curriculum planning, modeling of best practices. Six Correct I/Correct II schools receive services through the Reading First program. One Correct II school will receive Teach First professional development. One school receives the services of a district reading coach two days per week. District ELL resource teachers assist in eleven schools one to two days per week. Additional ELL materials have been provided to schools through the use of Title III funds. The district provides schools with a Struggling Reader Chart that lists recommended interventions and diagnostic assessment tools. Teachers have access to the district created Broward Enterprise Education Portal (BEEP) for a variety of lesson plans and online resources such as A+ Rise, Learning Village and netTrekker. The district provides ongoing professional development throughout the year in reading content, the eight-step process, and the use of technology to provide differentiated instruction. For 2008-09, Differentiated Instruction has been added to professional development offerings to assist teachers in targeting the needs of different learners and/or subgroups not meeting the criteria for AYP at their schools. Eleven schools receive Reading First resources. One school partners with the Fire Department and Rotary Club, each providing employees to read to first and second grade students one hour monthly. One school received a Broward Education Foundation Grant for a "Take Home Book Program" for PreK-5. Nova Southeastern University provides $\$ 500$ to a school for the book fair and school supplies. A high school provides student reading tutors to one elementary school one afternoon per week.

These funds will assist in targeting all resources based on thorough data analysis to increase achievement of target subgroups in reading in corrective action schools.
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: Twenty-three schools have been identified as not meeting AYP in mathematics in at least one subgroup. Five schools have a school based mathematics coach and based on need, the LEA has targeted three schools to receive assistance from a district mathematics coach one to two days per week. The district provides a Struggling Mathematics chart that teachers use to determine effective intervention resources and diagnostic assessment tools. Teachers also have access to the BEEP lesson plans and online resources as well as professional development as described above. The district has a plethora of materials available to teachers and this initiative will assist schools to implement programs with specific measures to close the performance gap for subgroups not making AYP. The district coordinates with various publishers to provide pilot programs in mathematics for selected schools. Two schools receive Hands on Equations. One school funds a supplementary mathematics program through the Broward Education Foundation grant. Two schools receive FASTT Math and a majority of the schools receive First in Math. The YMCA partners with one school to provide math tutors for 4th grade students three times per week. The YMCA partners with a school to provide incentives for the Math Superstars Program.
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: Four corrective action (all Prevent I) schools did not make AYP in writing. The district provides professional development in the six traits of writing and in the use of the FCAT rubric throughout the year. These four schools will use Title I Part A fund a Mary Lewis writing consultant for each school. Three schools receive dictionaries from their local Kiwenis organizations. The Community Hope Center of the Fort Lauderdale First Baptist Church provides tutors for one school.

This initiative will provide professional development to teachers to ensure fidelity of implementation of this writing program.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

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

- BAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL
- BETHUNE MARY M ELEMENTARY SCHL
- C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY
- CASTLE HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CHARLES DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
- CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
- DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE
- LAUDERDALE MANORS ELEMENTARY
- LAUDERHILL PAUL TURNER ELEM.
- LLOYD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY
- MEADOWBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MORROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NORTH SIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PARK LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PARKWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SmART SChOOL CHARTER MIDDLE
- STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHL
- SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEM. SCHOOL
- WESTWOOD HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY

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

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Research indicates schools need more than just school improvement to have significant turn around. Need assistance with systemic change.

Regional Education Laboratory (REL) West has released two new reports for the Issues \& Answers series. Characteristics of Arizona School Districts in Improvement and Characteristics of California School Districts in Program Improvement are both descriptive analyses, which provide statistical profiles of Arizona and California school districts in improvement. Characteristics of these districts differed from other districts in that they were generally larger, both in the number of schools and students, they were more likely to be in cities or
urban areas, and had a higher proportions of Hispanic, American Indian, and English language learner students. A key finding of the report is that the district level accountability in both states was found to be identifying problems that were missed at the school level.
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: Consultants will provide services one day per week for twenty-three weeks for Prevent I corrective action schools and two days per week for Correct 1 corrective action schools. Contracted agency will provide services for 3 days per week for twenty three weeks for Correct II schools.
3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

Response: The LEA team in collaboration with the consultants will monitor the implementation of this strategy.
4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress. Response: Consultants will be required to submit logs and reports to the LEA team. The LEA team will use a checklist and school database to report and collect monitoring information.
5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: LEA visits will occur three times each month. Consultants will complete visitation logs as needed and a minimum of three reports indicating status and progress.
6. What measures will be in place to ensure these services supplement existing services that may already be provided to eligible students.

Response: These services will be available only to select Prevent I and Correct I and II corrective action schools. These schools do not receive outside expert support in planning from any other funding source.
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 directly targets administrators and teacher leaders to increase knowledge of planning and data analysis. Ultimately, teachers and students are targeted for increase student achievement resulting from this strategy.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

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

- BAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL
- BETHUNE MARY M ELEMENTARY SCHL
- C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY
- CASTLE HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CHARLES DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
- CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL
- DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE
- LAUDERDALE MANORS ELEMENTARY
- LAUDERHILL PAUL TURNER ELEM.
- LLOYD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY
- MEADOWBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MORROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NORTH SIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PARK LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PARKWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SMART SCHOOL CHARTER MIDDLE
- STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHL
- SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEM. SCHOOL
- WESTWOOD HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY

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

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Fidelity of implementation is of utmost importance when using research-based programs. The research evidence that most programs use to support the use of their program is based upon strict adherence to a particular model. Failure to utilize the programs under the same conditions as the original research will limit the success with the program.
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: Training will be available based on two hours per week for twenty weeks for select Prevent I and

Correct I \& II corrective action schools.
3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

Response: This strategy will be monitored by the LEA support team in collaboration with the consultants and the school administrative team.
4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress. Response: Tools used to monitor the effectiveness of this strategy wil include classroom walkthroughs, review of lesson plans, and student achievement evaluations.
5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will consist of weekly classroom walkthroughs and review of lesson plans, end of book tests, two benchmark tests administered before FCAT, and other student evaluations.
6. What measures will be in place to ensure these services supplement existing services that may already be provided to eligible students.

Response: This training will be specific to the needs of teachers in select Prevent I and Correct I \& II corrective action schools relating to programs used in those schools. These workshops are not offered at these schools through any other funding source.
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 specifically targets teachers and their instructional delivery thus impacting student achievement particularly of AYP subgroups.

## 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 Title I website 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 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.

Information on the application will be provided in the school newsletters after the approval of the application. This notification will address parents, staff, and students. This will be a one-time notification through this method.

Information on the application will be provided to SACs This notification will address parents, staff, students, and the community. The SACs 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.

There will be a note on each of these methods that the application will be available in hard copy format for the home language of the parent. The copy of the application will be available at the school their child attends or at the district office. This notation will be provided in English, Spanish, Haitian Creole and Portuguese.

## Budget

A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]
B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: Broward

TAPS Number
C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):


Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

## Budget

A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: Title I School Improvement Fund [1003(g)]
B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: Broward

TAPS Number
C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

| No. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FUNCTION | OBJECT | ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE | FTE POSITION | AMOUNT |
| 1 | 6400 | 130 | Strategy 2, Salaries - Staff Development Training for Curriculum Specialist and Teacher on Special Assignment. | 15.0 | 175000.00 |
| 2 | 6400 | 140 | Strategy 2, Salaries - Instructional Staff Training Classroom Subs | 0.0 | 10000.00 |
| 3 | 6400 | 160 | Strategy 1, Salaries - Clerk Specialist assisting with office duties for staff develpoment training (part time) | 0.1 | 4000.00 |
| 4 | 6400 | 210 | Strategies 1, 2, Employee Benefits Retirement | 0.0 | 34034.00 |
| 5 | 6400 | 220 | Strategies 1, 2, Employee Benefits Social Security | 0.0 | 26554.00 |
| 6 | 6400 | 240 | Strategies 1, 2, Employee Benefits Workers Compensation | 0.0 | 8602.00 |
| 7 | 6400 | 250 | Strategies 1, 2, Employee Benefits Unemployment Compensation | 0.0 | 1496.00 |
| 8 | 6400 | 311 | Strategies 1, 2, Professional and Technical Services Consultants - Outside agency/CDDRE up to \$25,000 | 0.0 | 25000.00 |
| 9 | 6400 | 312 | Strategies 1, 2, Professional and Technical Services Consultants - Outside agency/CDDRE | 0.0 | 904249.46 |
| 10 | 6400 | 120 | Strategy 2, Salaries - Staff Development Training for teachers. | 15.6 | 185000.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | 1373935.46 |



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

