

## **Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants CLAY**

## General Assurances

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

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

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

### **School Districts, Community Colleges, Universities and State Agencies**

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

### **No Child Left Behind Assurances (Applicable to All Funded Programs)**

By signature on this application, the LEA certifies it will comply with the following requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:

- ✓ Coordinate and collaborate, to the extent feasible and necessary as the LEA determines, with the State Educational Agency and other agencies providing services to children, youth, and families with respect to a school in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116.
- ✓ Use the results of the student academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), and other measures or indicators available to the agency, to review annually the progress of each school served by the LEA and receiving Title I, Part A funds to determine whether all of the schools are making the progress necessary to ensure that all students will meet the State's proficient level of achievement on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) by the 2013-2014 school year.

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

TAPS Numbers:  
09A006  
09A005

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Return to:</b><br><br>Florida Department of Education<br>Bureau of Grants Management<br>Room 325 Turlington Building<br>325 West Gaines Street<br>Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400<br>Telephone: (850) 245-0496<br>SunCom: 205-0496  | <b>A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant:</b><br><br>CLAY<br>900 WALNUT ST<br>GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FL 32043 | <b>DOE USE ONLY</b><br><br>Date Received   |
| <b>B) Applicant Contact Information:</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Contact Name:</b><br>First Name: Sandra MI:<br>Last Name: Emery   |  | <b>Mailing Address:</b> 23 South Green Street<br>Green Cove Springs, FL 32043    |
| *Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):904-529-4927 Ext:   |  |  |
| Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):904-529-4825   |  | E-mail Address:semery@mail.clay.k12.fl.us  |
| <b>C) ProgramName (1)</b><br>2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]   |  | <b>C) ProgramName (1)</b><br>2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Fund [1003(g)] |
| Project Number: <b>(DOE Assigned)</b>  |  | Project Number: <b>(DOE Assigned)</b>  |
| <b>D) Total Funds Requested:</b><br>Allocation: \$145772.14  |  | <b>D) Total Funds Requested:</b><br>Allocation: \$119472.65                      |
| Total Approved Funds:<br><b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b><br>\$   |  | Total Approved Funds:<br><b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b><br>\$                             |
| <p align="center"><b>CERTIFICATION</b></p> <p>I <b>David Owens</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>E) _____<br/>Signature of Agency Head</p> |  |  |

DOE 100B  
Revised 12/07



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

## School Achievement Data

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

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:  
60.00

| GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Academic Indicators          | Percent Proficient in Reading |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Writing |           |           |                   |                    |
|                              | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                         | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL                        | 67.00                         | 65.00     | 62.00     | 65.00             | NA                 | 55.00                             | 61.00     | 62.00     | 68.00             | NA                 | 78.00                         | 89.00     | 78.00     | 80.00             | NA                 |
| WHITE                        | 79.00                         | 74.00     | 74.00     | 79.00             | NA                 | 64.00                             | 68.00     | 71.00     | 76.00             | NA                 |                               | 90.00     |           |                   | NA                 |
| BLACK                        | 53.00                         | 61.00     | 47.00     | 52.00             | NA                 | 42.00                             | 53.00     | 44.00     | 49.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| HISPANIC                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ASIAN                        |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| AMERICAN INDIAN              |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED   | 58.00                         | 57.00     | 57.00     | 62.00             | NA                 | 51.00                             | 55.00     | 59.00     | 64.00             | NA                 |                               | 89.00     | 73.00     | 75.00             | NA                 |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS    |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES   |                               | 44.00     | 31.00     | 36.00             | NA                 |                                   | 36.00     | 37.00     | 42.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| Grade Level Data             |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| K                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 1                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 2                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 3                            | 71.00                         | 70.00     | 62.00     | 67.00             | NA                 | 61.00                             | 79.00     | 72.00     | 77.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 4                            | 63.00                         | 65.00     | 60.00     | 65.00             | NA                 | 64.00                             | 73.00     | 63.00     | 68.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 5                            | 71.00                         | 70.00     | 66.00     | 71.00             | NA                 | 43.00                             | 58.00     | 52.00     | 57.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 6                            | 64.00                         | 57.00     | 61.00     | 66.00             | NA                 | 54.00                             | 40.00     | 59.00     | 64.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 7                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 8                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 9                            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 10                           |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 11                           |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 12                           |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 60.00

| <b>J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL</b> |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Academic Indicators                   | Percent Proficient in Reading |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Writing |           |           |                   |                    |
|                                       | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                         | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL                                 | 61.00                         | 59.00     | 63.00     | 65.00             | NA                 | 51.00                             | 52.00     | 64.00     | 68.00             | NA                 | 80.00                         | 80.00     | 70.00     | 72.00             | NA                 |
| WHITE                                 | 61.00                         | 60.00     | 63.00     | 68.00             | NA                 | 51.00                             | 52.00     | 63.00     | 68.00             | NA                 |                               | 80.00     | 71.00     | 73.00             | NA                 |
| BLACK                                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| HISPANIC                              |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ASIAN                                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| AMERICAN INDIAN                       |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED            | 52.00                         | 52.00     | 61.00     | 66.00             | NA                 | 47.00                             | 49.00     | 61.00     | 66.00             | NA                 | 77.00                         | 74.00     | 66.00     | 67.00             | NA                 |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS             |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES            | 39.00                         | 38.00     | 43.00     | 48.00             | NA                 | 35.00                             | 35.00     | 52.00     | 57.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| Grade Level Data                      |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| K                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 1                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 2                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 3                                     | 76.00                         | 66.00     | 74.00     | 79.00             | NA                 | 63.00                             | 65.00     | 80.00     | 85.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 4                                     | 56.00                         | 59.00     | 62.00     | 67.00             | NA                 | 50.00                             | 56.00     | 60.00     | 65.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 5                                     | 53.00                         | 63.00     | 58.00     | 63.00             | NA                 | 48.00                             | 45.00     | 60.00     | 65.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 6                                     | 57.00                         | 48.00     | 60.00     | 65.00             | NA                 | 39.00                             | 40.00     | 56.00     | 61.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 7                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 8                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 9                                     |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 10                                    |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 11                                    |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 12                                    |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |

# School Achievement Data

1. School: **MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:  
49.00

| MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Academic Indicators        | Percent Proficient in Reading |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Mathematics |           |           |                   |                    | Percent Proficient in Writing |           |           |                   |                    |
|                            | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                         | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes | 2005-2006                     | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 Targets | 2008-2009 Outcomes |
| TOTAL                      | 79.00                         | 78.00     | 77.00     | 82.00             | NA                 | 72.00                             | 70.00     | 66.00     | 68.00             | NA                 | 93.00                         | 88.00     | 98.00     | 100.00            | NA                 |
| WHITE                      | 79.00                         | 78.00     | 77.00     | 82.00             | NA                 | 73.00                             | 70.00     | 66.00     | 68.00             | NA                 |                               | 88.00     | 98.00     | 100.00            | NA                 |
| BLACK                      |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| HISPANIC                   |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ASIAN                      |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| AMERICAN INDIAN            |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 74.00                         | 74.00     | 70.00     | 75.00             | NA                 | 69.00                             | 63.00     | 62.00     | 67.00             | NA                 |                               | 85.00     |           |                   | NA                 |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS  |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES | 65.00                         | 56.00     | 54.00     | 59.00             | NA                 | 58.00                             | 51.00     | 43.00     | 48.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |
| Grade Level Data           |                               |           |           |                   |                    |                                   |           |           |                   |                    |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| K                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 1                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 2                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 3                          | 85.00                         | 82.00     | 69.00     | 74.00             | NA                 | 76.00                             | 91.00     | 76.00     | 81.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 4                          | 78.00                         | 73.00     | 89.00     | 94.00             | NA                 | 81.00                             | 73.00     | 85.00     | 90.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 5                          | 71.00                         | 83.00     | 74.00     | 79.00             | NA                 | 69.00                             | 65.00     | 54.00     | 59.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 6                          | 78.00                         | 74.00     | 79.00     | 84.00             | NA                 | 64.00                             | 59.00     | 61.00     | 66.00             | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 7                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 8                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 9                          |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 10                         |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 11                         |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |
| 12                         |                               |           |           |                   | NA                 |                                   |           |           |                   | NA                 |                               |           |           |                   |                    |

## Optional Performance Indicators

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

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

**Indicator: 0**

## Root Cause Analysis

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

For each Root Cause identified, provide the following:

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

### Root Cause: 1

The district has identified a minimal amount of small group instruction as a root cause for low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, Ed in reading and SWD, Black, ED in math. The district reviewed student achievement data (FCAT/Think-link/DIBELS for 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th grade and compiled information from classroom observations. This grant will add teacher allocations to increase opportunities for small group instruction in 3 low performing Title I schools. Student achievement will increase in reading and math by 5%.

### Root Cause: 2

The district has identified limited instructional time as a root cause for low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, Ed in reading; SWD, Black, ED in math and two of the three schools in writing. The district reviewed student achievement data (FCAT/Think-link, Clay Writes) for 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th grade reading, writing, and math. Increasing instructional time by extending the school year through a "Saturday Scholars" program in 3 low performing Title I schools and Summer Learning Camps in 2 low performing Title I schools currently implementing restructuring will increase student achievement in reading and math by 5% and writing by 2%.

### Root Cause: 3

The district has identified limited opportunities for evidenced based computer assisted programs (Success Maker and Fasttmath) as a root cause for students with disabilities in math. The district reviewed student achievement data (FCAT/Think-link/Success Maker) for 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th grade in the area of math. The district has documented evidence demonstrating 92% of students in grades 3-6, meeting target math goals in the Success Maker program, scored a level 3 or higher on the 2008 FCAT. Increasing opportunities (additional software licenses) for computer assisted instruction for students with disabilities in low performing Title I schools will increase student achievement in math by 5%.

### Root Cause: 4

The district has identified limited time for data analysis and alignment of curriculum and instruction as a root cause for low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, Ed in reading; SWD, Black, ED in math and two of the three schools in writing. The district reviewed school daily schedules to determine limited time devoted to data analysis. Extending teacher contract time in 2 low performing Title I schools to review student achievement data and align curriculum and instruction will increase student achievement for 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th grade in the areas of reading and math by 5% and writing by 2%.



## Data Analysis during Project Period

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

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

**Response:** The district provided professional development to all teachers in data analysis during the Spring of the 07/08 school year and to all administrators during the 08 Summer Leadership Training. The professional development was implemented by the district's School Improvement Office. Data analysis will take place each quarter for the 1 school in need of improvement. The 2 schools currently implementing a restructuring plan, will have data analysis twice per quarter. Think-link, Success Maker, classroom work and teacher input have been identified as the monitoring tools for student progress. After each data analysis meeting, teachers will adjust their curriculum to meet the needs of their students.

## LEA Support Teams

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

| No. | Title & Name of Individual<br>on LEA Support Team  | Qualifications of Individual   |
|-----|--|--|
| 1   | Sharon Chapman, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction                                 | 40 years experience in education, Masters Degree in Elementary Education and a Masters Degree in Administration and Supervision.   |
| 2   | Diane Kornegay, Director of School Improvement, Professional Development, and Assessment | 21 years experience in education, 2 years Director of School Improvement, elementary principal for 8 years, assistant principal for 6 years. Masters Degree in Administration and Supervision. |
| 3   | Cheryl Oliver, Director of Elementary Education  | 13 years experience in education, 2 years Director of Elementary Education, 3 years elementary principal, 3 years assistant principal. Masters Degree in Administration and Supervision.       |
| 4   | Sandra Emery, Title I Supervisor   | 29 years experience in education, 5 years Supervisor of Title I, 12 years Title I Curriculum Specialist, 12 years teacher. Masters Degree in Education, certified K-12 reading.                |

Describe the activities the LEA Support Team will conduct during the Project Period to provide technical and program support to schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and/or restructuring. For each activity the LEA shall include: the frequency of the activity and the duration of the activity.

**Response:** The LEA Support Team, known as the District Oversight Team, will meet bi-monthly with the principal of the 1 school in need of improvement and monthly with the principals and outside experts assigned to the 2 schools in restructuring. These meetings along with random monthly visits to the school sites will document that:

- \* School leader is highly visible in classrooms
- \* Formative student assessment data is being used to drive instruction
- \* Summative student assessment data is being used to make curriculum decisions
- \* Priority areas have been identified for instructional focus
- \* Professional development is targeted to teacher need as reflected in Individual Professional

### Development Plans

- \* Professional development is targeted to subject areas identified for instructional improvement and teachers of subgroup populations
- \* Curriculum alignment with state standards is in progress
- \* Students are engaged in the learning process
- \* Project-based activities are taking place
- \* Instruction is being differentiated
- \* Reviews of attendance data
- \* Reviews of discipline data

## Current Capacity of LEA to Support Student Academic Achievement

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

1. Describe the current capacity of the LEA to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in reading and how this initiative will assist to enhance/expand that current capacity.

**Response:** The School District of Clay County utilizes several evidenced-based reading programs and instructional strategies to Assist Title I students. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Treasures is the Comprehensive Core Reading Program for grades K-6. Reading Mastery Plus is used at the two Title I Reading First schools for grades K and 1. Specific skill and strategy instruction for phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency is supported through the Macmillan Treasures as well as supplemental programs such as Open Court Reading. Macmillan Triumphs will be used to provide intensive intervention for our most struggling readers. Additionally schools use Quick Reads, Read Naturally, Great Leaps, leveled books and classroom libraries to support reading instruction in the five areas of reading.

Technology is used to enhance the reading program. Students have access to the following supplemental software programs that provide individualized reading skill development:

Orchard (grades K-3)

New Century Learning

Academy of Reading

FCAT Explorer

NCS Pearson Successmaker

Waterford Early Reading Program

Fast ForWord

Reading programs designed to provide intrinsic motivation for reading include Accelerated Reader, Reading Counts and Academy of Reading. Classroom libraries that offer a variety of levels, authors and genres as well as media center materials, are available for student selection. Students are provided time for pleasure reading daily as defined in the District Strategic Plan. Schools utilize effective instructional strategies such as guided reading, buddy reading, read-alouds, think-alouds, literature circles and learning centers with specific skill activities provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR).

In September 2008, the district will initiate a district-wide professional learning community using the book entitled, *Strategies That Work* (2nd Edition) by Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis. Elementary school administrators, all K-6 teachers, curriculum specialists, K-12 reading coaches, and members of the district staff will participate in the year-long learning community. The goal of the learning community is to provide all learning leaders with the tools needed to bring about significant change in student achievement regardless of position or content area specialty. School and district staff will be able to identify areas where students are not successful, and identify the knowledge and strategies that they need to address those deficiencies.

Throughout the year, professional development "Hot Topics" will be conducted by the District Curriculum

Specialists. These sessions will focus on specific math reading concepts and or strategies. Additionally, Blackboard courses and discussion boards will allow for ongoing discussions of teaching and learning topics.

The strategies implemented through this school improvement grant (increasing small group instruction, extending instructional time, and extending teacher contract time for data analysis) will not only enhance the LEA's current capacity to support student achievement in reading, but will also expand the current capacity with the offering of Summer Learning Camps and Saturday Scholars.

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:** The School District of Clay County utilizes several evidenced-based math programs and instructional strategies to assist Title I students. The adopted textbooks are selected from the state's approved textbook list. Clay County utilizes Harcourt Math for grades K-5 and McDougal Littell for grades 6-8.

The LEA supports their mathematic instruction through individualized and self-paced software programs such as FCAT Explorer for grades 3 - 10; Orchard for grades K-3; Plato and New Century. Some schools utilize units from Math Investigations to develop deep conceptual knowledge and skill building. Title I schools use Success Maker, an evidenced-based computer software program to supplement the core instruction.

District curriculum specialists have developed curriculum maps for mathematics aligned to the State Standards including the new course descriptions for grades K-2 and high school. Supplemental programs and materials that provide a variety of hands-on learning opportunities include Math Their Way, Box It and Bag It and ETA manipulatives for grades K-2. Mountain Math for K-Algebra, Drops in a Bucket and Every Day Counts for grades K-6, Number Wonders for K-1, AIMS for K-12 and Hands-on Equations for grades 6-9.

With the change in math standards which require deep conceptual understanding and application, the district established a professional learning community using the book entitled Experiences in Math for Your Children for K-2. Teachers have the opportunity to actively and collaboratively share ideas and learn from an analysis of their own practices resulting in a higher standard of teaching excellence.

Throughout the year, professional development "Hot Topics" will be conducted by the District Curriculum Specialists. These sessions will focus on specific math concepts and or strategies. Additionally, Blackboard courses and discussion boards will allow for ongoing discussions of teaching and learning topics.

The strategies implemented through this school improvement grant (increasing small group instruction, extending instructional time, extending teacher contract time for data analysis, and computer assisted instruction) will not only enhance the LEA's current capacity to support student achievement in math, but will also expand the current capacity with the offering of Summer Learning Camps and Saturday Scholars.

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:** Throughout the year, professional development "Hot Topics" will be conducted by the District Curriculum Specialists. These sessions will focus on specific writing concepts and or strategies. Additionally, Blackboard courses and discussion boards will allow for ongoing discussions of teaching and learning topics.

The district instructional reading block is designed to ensure writing takes place on a daily basis. The LEA will administer writing assessments 3 times during the school year. Rubrics will be utilized to give students specific feed-back on improving writing strategies.

The strategies implemented through this school improvement grant (increasing small group instruction, extending instructional time, and extending teacher contract time for data analysis) will not only enhance the LEA's current capacity to support student achievement in writing, but will also expand the current capacity with

the offering of Summer Learning Camps and Saturday Scholars.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** In the classroom, research findings clearly support the use of small groups as part of instruction. This approach can result in increased student learning as measured by traditional achievement measures, as well as in other important outcomes. When using small groups for mathematics instruction, teachers should: • choose tasks that deal with important mathematical concepts and ideas; • select tasks that are appropriate for group work; • consider having students initially work individually on a task and then follow this with group work where students share and build on their individual ideas and work; • give clear instructions to the groups and set clear expectations for each; • emphasize both group goals and individual accountability; • choose tasks that students find interesting; • ensure that there is closure to the group work, where key ideas and methods are brought to the surface either by the teacher or the students, or both. Finally, as several research studies have shown, teachers should not think of small groups as something that must always be used or never be used. Rather, small-group instruction should be thought of as an instructional practice that is appropriate for certain learning objectives, and as a practice that can work well with other organizational arrangements, including whole-class instruction.

Cohen, E.G. 1994. Restructuring the classroom: conditions for productive small groups. Review of educational research (Washington, DC), vol. 64, p. 1—35.

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:** Additional small group instruction will take place 5 days a week in the areas of reading and math for identified students upon the approval of this grant. Small group instruction will be a minimum of 15 minutes either during, or in addition to the designated instructional reading or math block.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

**Response:** The principal, reading coach, and math coach will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the strategy on a daily basis. The LEA support team will conduct random classroom visits on a monthly basis to ensure implementation of this strategy. The district has required each elementary school to submit a daily schedule for all grade levels. This schedule must reflect a 90 minute uninterrupted reading block for core reading instruction, as well as additional small group time for immediate intensive reading intervention.

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

**Response:** FCAT data reports and Think-link, an on-line assessment and progress monitoring tool, will be

used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in reading and math

In addition, DIBELS will be used to assess and monitor the effectiveness of this strategy in reading.

Progress monitoring using assessments from the evidenced based texts will be administered weekly.

Following each scheduled assessment window, district curriculum specialists will analyze the data and provide professional development specific to areas of student weakness.

Data Star is another district on-line resource that allows each teacher, school and district staff to monitor individual students and student subgroups, Detailed student reports show students in each subgroup and their current and past levels of achievement in reading and math. This tool allows teacher to provide individualized and differentiated instruction to address the specific needs of the student or group of students.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** The frequency of the progress monitoring of this strategy is as follows:

FCAT will be administered annually

Think-link will be administered 3 times a year

DIBELS will be administered 3 times a year.

Assessments from evidenced based texts will be administered on a weekly basis.

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

**Response:** Increasing small group instruction will be accomplished by adding instructional personnel. The instructional personnel are supplementary to local, state and other federal education funds. The LEA tracks all instructional allocations through the Districts TERMS data base to ensure that these positions are supplementary.

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

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

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

**Response:** The target population for this strategy will be low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, ED in reading and SWD, Black, ED in math. All three schools contain on or more of these subgroups in reading and/or math and have been identified as a root cause for low achievement.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** A major study in 1994 by the National Education Commission on Time and

Learning, Prisoners of Time, found that:

“...Time is the missing element in our great national debate about learning and the need for higher standards for all students....We have been asking the impossible of our students – that they learn as much as their foreign peers while spending only half as much time in core academic subjects. The reform movement of the last decade is destined to founder unless it is harnessed to more time for learning.”

The report urged a major reform in the 6-hour day, 180-day school year not only to offer more time to students and teachers but also to use time in new and better ways. Coupled with high standards for students and improved curricula, additional time, if wisely used, was viewed as an important key to educational improvement and student learning. 3

Marzano, Robert J. What Works in Schools – Translating Research into Action, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003

Prisoners of Time – Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. April 2004. Reprinted October 2005



Cotton, Kathleen. Educational Time Factors. NW Archives, Regional

Educational Library. November 1989

Smith, BetsAnn. It's About Time: Opportunities to Learn in Chicago's

Elementary Schools. Consortium on Chicago Schools Research, December

1998

Key State Education Policies on PK-12 Education: 2004 Council

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:** Saturday Scholars will take place at all 3 schools on Feb. 2, Feb. 9, Feb. 16, Feb. 23, and March 2 from 9:00-12:00.

Summer Learning Camps will take place at 2 schools for a minimum of 10 days from 8:00-12:00.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

**Response:** The principal and assistant principal will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy, as well as the student progress. The LEA support team will conduct random visits during Saturday Scholars and Summer Learning Camp to ensure implementation of this strategy.

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

**Response:** FCAT data reports will be used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in reading, writing and math

Think-link, an on-line assessment and progress monitoring tool, will be used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in reading and math

In addition, DIBELS will be used to assess and monitor the effectiveness of this strategy in reading.

Following each scheduled assessment window, district curriculum specialists will analyze the data and provide professional development specific to areas of student weakness.

Data Star is another district on-line resource that allows each teacher, school and district staff to monitor individual students and student subgroups, Detailed student reports show students in each subgroup and their current and past levels of achievement in reading and math. This tool allows teacher to provide individualized and differentiated instruction to address the specific needs of the student or group of students.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** The frequency of the progress monitoring of this strategy is as follows:

FCAT will be administered annually

Think-link will be administered 3 times a year

DIBELS will be administered 3 times a year.

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

provided to eligible students.

**Response:** Extending the instructional time through the implementation of Saturday Scholars and Summer Learning Camps will be supplementary to local, state and other federal education funds. The LEA tracks all expenditures through the Districts TERMS data base to ensure that these strategies are supplementary and do not supplant other funding sources.

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

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

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

**Response:** The target population for this strategy will be low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, ED in reading and SWD, Black, ED in math and two of the three schools in writing. All three schools contain on or more of these subgroups in reading and/or math and have been identified as a root cause for low achievement.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** The single best-supported finding in the research literature is that the use of CAI as a supplement to traditional, teacher-directed instruction produces achievement effects superior to those obtained with traditional instruction alone. Generally speaking, this finding holds true for students of different ages and abilities and for learning in different curricular areas. As summarized in Stennett's 1985 review of reviews, "well-designed and implemented D&P [drill-and-practice] or tutorial CAI, used as a supplement to traditional instruction, produces an educationally significant improvement in students' final examination achievement"

As well as enabling students to achieve at higher levels, researchers have also found that CAI enhances learning rate. Student learning rate is faster with CAI than with conventional instruction. In some research studies, the students learned the same amount of material in less time than the traditionally instructed students; in others, they learned more material in the same time. While most researchers don't specify how much faster CAI students learn, the work of Capper and Copple (1985) led them to the conclusion that CAI users sometimes learn as much as 40 percent faster than those receiving traditional, teacher-directed instruction.

(Batey 1986; Capper and Copple 1985; Edwards, et al. 1975; Grimes 1977; Hasselbring 1984; Kulik 1983, 1985; Kulik, Bangert, and Williams 1983; Kulik and Kulik 1987; Rapaport and Savard 1980; Rupe 1986; Stennett 1985; White 1983.)

Lower SES students, too, benefit greatly from opportunities to interact privately with CAI drill-and-practice and tutorial programs.

(Bangert-Drowns, et al. 1985; Becker 1990; Mevarech and Rich 1985; Ragosta, Holland, and Jamison 1982; Stennett 1985.)

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:** This strategy will be implemented at a minimum of 20 minutes a day/ 5 days a week upon approval of the grant.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

**Response:** The principal, math coach and lab manager will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy, as well as the student progress. The LEA support team will conduct random visits to ensure

implementation of this strategy.

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

**Response:** FCAT data reports and Think-link, an on-line assessment and progress monitoring tool, will be used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in math. An additional computer and printer for two school sites will be needed to progress monitor student achievement.

In addition, Success Maker data reports will provide a daily account of progress achieved by individual students.

Following each scheduled assessment window, district curriculum specialists will analyze the data and provide professional development specific to areas of student weakness.

Data Star is another district on-line resource that allows each teacher, school and district staff to monitor individual students and student subgroups. Detailed student reports show students in each subgroup and their current and past levels of achievement in reading and math. This tool allows teacher to provide individualized and differentiated instruction to address the specific needs of the student or group of students.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** The frequency of the progress monitoring of this strategy is as follows:

FCAT will be administered annually

Think-link will be administered 3 times a year

Success Maker progress reports will be available on a daily basis.

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

**Response:** Increasing evidence based computer assisted instruction through the purchase of additional computer site licenses will be supplementary to local, state and other federal education funds. The LEA tracks all expenditures through the Districts TERMS data base to ensure that these strategies are supplementary and do not supplant other funding sources.

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:** The target population for this strategy will be the low performing subgroup of SWD in math. All three schools contain this subgroup have been identified as a root cause for low achievement.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL

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 4

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** Data analysis is the process of collecting, reviewing, and dissecting multiples sources of data to determine specific areas of need, potential strategies, and the impact of school improvement efforts

Miller and Pine (1990) suggest that when teachers become agents of inquiry, the locus of knowledge about teaching shifts from sources external to the classroom (e.g., researchers, textbook publishers, administrators) to sources of practical classroom experience (i.e., teachers). This shift enhances the professional status of teaching because teachers, through this knowledge-construction, actively help to shape the knowledge base of their own profession (Johnson, 1993). Generally, teacher research is driven by the practitioner's desire to improve his or her own practice with respect to a specific problem and a specific set of students. Thus, students reap immediate benefits from the teacher's learning (Shalaway, 1990; Williamson, 1992).

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:** Data analysis will take place in two hour blocks of time, bi-weekly beyond the contracted day for grade level teams to disaggregate data and plan for differentiated instruction. This time will be allocated for the months of October, November, January, February, March and April.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?

**Response:** The principal and assistant principal will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy. The LEA support team will conduct random visits to ensure implementation of this strategy.

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

**Response:** FCAT data reports used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in reading, math, and writing.

Think-link, an on-line assessment and progress monitoring tool, will be used to track the effectiveness of this strategy in reading and math.

In addition, DIBELS will be used to assess and monitor the effectiveness of this strategy in reading.

Following each scheduled assessment window, district curriculum specialists will analyze the data and provide professional development specific to areas of student weakness.

Data Star is another district on-line resource that allows each teacher, school and district staff to monitor individual students and student subgroups, Detailed student reports show students in each subgroup and

their current and past levels of achievement in reading and math. This tool allows teacher to provide individualized and differentiated instruction to address the specific needs of the student or group of students.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** The frequency of the progress monitoring of this strategy is as follows:

FCAT will be administered annually

Think-link will be administered 3 times a year

DIBELS will be administered 3 times a year.

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

**Response:** Extending the teacher contract time for data analysis will be documented with an "after hours" payroll certification. The additional contract hours are supplementary to local, state and other federal education funds. The LEA tracks all payroll activities through the Districts TERMS data base to ensure that these hours are supplementary and do not take place during the contracted day.

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

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

9. Targeted Population(s) of this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

**Response:** The target population for this strategy will be low performing subgroups: SWD, Black, ED in reading and SWD, Black, ED in math and two of the three schools in writing. All three schools contain on or more of these subgroups in reading, math, or writing and have been identified as a root cause for low achievement.

## 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:** This application will be available on the district and applicable school websites upon approval until the end of the grant period, June 30 2009. Web access is obtainable through many homes, at the school media centers, and public libraries. The target population being addressed is the community and parents of applicable schools.

Each applicable school will summarize the grant in a school newsletter to be sent out during the month of November. Target population being addressed is the parents of Title I Schools.

The grant will be provided to School Advisory Councils for comments on school improvement initiatives. School improvement initiatives are part of the monthly agenda items. The target population is school personnel and parents of the Title I school.

The grant will be presented to one of the weekly District Instructional Staff meetings. The target population is district staff.

Interpreters will be available on an as needed basis for any individual requiring assistance. The ELL population in Clay County is less than 1% but interpreters are readily available at all times in any language.

## Budget

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

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| TAPS Number<br>09A006 |
|-----------------------|

| No. | (1)<br>FUNCTION | (2)<br>OBJECT | (3)<br>ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE   | (4)<br>FTE POSITION | (5)<br>AMOUNT   |
|-----|-----------------|---------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|
| 1   | 5100            | 120           | Supplemental Teachers for small group instruction(1.8 FTE) Saturday Scholars (.5 FTE) (Strategy # 1 & 2) | 2.3                 | 80938.00        |
| 2   | 5100            | 210           | Retirement (Strategy # 1)  | 0.0                 | 8865.00         |
| 3   | 5100            | 220           | Social Security (Strategy # 1 & 2)   | 0.0                 | 8951.00         |
| 4   | 5100            | 230           | Insurance (Strategy 1)   | 0.0                 | 12246.00        |
| 5   | 5100            | 510           | Supplies: (leveled readers, math manipulatives, paper, toner, award stickers) (Strategy 2)               | 0.0                 | 6000.14         |
| 6   | 5100            | 390           | Printing (Strategy 2)  | 0.0                 | 772.00          |
| 7   | 5100            | 643           | Capitalized Computer Hardware & Accessories: computer (Strategy 3)                                       | 0.0                 | 1000.00         |
| 8   | 5100            | 644           | Non-Capitalized Computer Hardware & Accessories: printer (Strategy 3)                                    | 0.0                 | 1000.00         |
| 9   | 5100            | 691           | Capitalized Software : instructional math (Strategy 3)   | 0.0                 | 26000.00        |
|     |                 |               |  |                     | Total 145772.14 |

DOE 101



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner



## Budget

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

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

C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

TAPS Number  
09A005

| No.   | (1)<br>FUNCTION | (2)<br>OBJECT | (3)<br>ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE  | (4)<br>FTE POSITION | (5)<br>AMOUNT |
|-------|-----------------|---------------|---|---------------------|---------------|
| 1     | 5100            | 120           | Supplemental Teacher (.6); Summer School Teachers (.5); Strategy 1 & 2)                   | 1.1                 | 70000.00      |
| 2     | 5100            | 210           | Retirement (Strategy 1)   | 0.0                 | 2955.00       |
| 3     | 5100            | 220           | Social Security (Strategy 1, 2, & 4)  | 0.0                 | 8951.00       |
| 4     | 5100            | 230           | Insurance (Strategy 1)  | 0.0                 | 4082.00       |
| 5     | 5100            | 510           | Supplies (leveled readers, math manipulatives, paper, toner, award stickers) (Strategy 2) | 0.0                 | 6784.65       |
| 6     | 5100            | 390           | Printing (Strategy 2)   | 0.0                 | 1000.00       |
| 7     | 5100            | 643           | Capitalized Computer Hardware & Accessories: computer (Strategy 3)                        | 0.0                 | 1000.00       |
| 8     | 5100            | 644           | Non-Capitalized Computer Hardware & Accessories: printer (Strategy 3)                     | 0.0                 | 500.00        |
| 9     | 5100            | 691           | Capitalized software: instructional math (Strategy 3)                                     | 0.0                 | 1200.00       |
| 10    | 6300            | 120           | Teacher (Data Analysis Meetings (.5) Strategy 4   | 0.5                 | 18977.00      |
| 11    | 6300            | 210           | Retirement (Strategy 4)   | 0.0                 | 2265.00       |
| 12    | 6300            | 220           | Social Security (Strategy 4)  | 0.0                 | 1758.00       |
| Total |                 |               |   |                     | 119472.65     |

DOE 101



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

