

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

## 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>  Florida Department of Education Bureau of Grants Management Room 325 Turlington Building 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400 Telephone: (850) 245-0496 SunCom: 205-0496	<b>A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant:</b> COLLIER 5775 OSCEOLA TRL NAPLES, FL 34109	<b>DOE USE ONLY</b>  Date Received
<b>B) Applicant Contact Information:</b>		
<b>Contact Name:</b> First Name: Traci MI: Last Name: Dami		<b>Mailing Address:</b> 5775 Osceola Trail Naples, FL 34109
*Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):239-377-0020 Ext:		
Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):		E-mail Address:damitr@collier.k12.fl.us
<b>C) ProgramName (1)</b> 2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]	<b>C) ProgramName (1)</b> 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> Allocation: \$334884.52	<b>D) Total Funds Requested:</b> Allocation: \$477890.60	
Total Approved Funds: <b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b> \$	Total Approved Funds: <b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b> \$	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CERTIFICATION</b></p> <p>I <b>Dennis Thompson</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) _____                  Signature of Agency Head</p>		

DOE 100B  
 Revised 12/07



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 81.74

AVALON 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	55.00	49.00	58.00	65.00	NA	49.00	47.00	55.00	68.00	NA	84.00	87.00	70.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	68.00	61.00	70.00	73.00	NA	63.00	61.00	60.00	68.00	NA					NA
BLACK	56.00	58.00	59.00	65.00	NA	37.00	37.00	56.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	52.00	43.00	53.00	65.00	NA	48.00	46.00	53.00	68.00	NA		89.00			NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	53.00	49.00	56.00	65.00	NA	47.00	49.00	54.00	68.00	NA		89.00	70.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	27.00	27.00	40.00	65.00	NA	31.00	31.00	38.00	68.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	31.00	17.00	25.00	65.00	NA	28.00	31.00	41.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	56.00	37.00	71.00	74.00	NA	52.00	38.00	74.00	78.00	NA					
4	53.00	47.00	45.00	65.00	NA	55.00	54.00	43.00	68.00	NA					
5	57.00	62.00	56.00	65.00	NA	40.00	49.00	46.00	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: **GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 78.37

GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	57.00	55.00	57.00	65.00	NA	53.00	56.00	60.00	68.00	NA	80.00	81.00	86.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	54.00	51.00	63.00	65.00	NA	41.00	50.00	64.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	56.00	52.00	52.00	65.00	NA	52.00	57.00	56.00	68.00	NA		80.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	56.00	50.00	55.00	65.00	NA	49.00	53.00	58.00	68.00	NA	79.00	82.00	88.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	39.00	30.00	32.00	65.00	NA	34.00	39.00	40.00	68.00	NA	80.00	81.00			NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	69.00	52.00	54.00	65.00	NA	68.00	59.00	60.00	68.00	NA					
4	48.00	58.00	53.00	65.00	NA	55.00	64.00	64.00	68.00	NA					
5	53.00	54.00	65.00	68.00	NA	37.00	42.00	58.00	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: **HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.01

HIGHLANDS 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	59.00	58.00	62.00	65.00	NA	54.00	59.00	57.00	68.00	NA	87.00	87.00	87.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	62.00	58.00	59.00	65.00	NA	57.00	62.00	59.00	68.00	NA	92.00	91.00		94.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	59.00	55.00	60.00	65.00	NA	54.00	56.00	55.00	68.00	NA	87.00	87.00		90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	54.00	47.00	50.00	65.00	NA	45.00	52.00	47.00	68.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	29.00	35.00	36.00	65.00	NA	46.00	40.00	43.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	61.00	66.00	69.00	74.00	NA	61.00	68.00	71.00	74.00	NA					
4	56.00	43.00	58.00	65.00	NA	51.00	54.00	62.00	68.00	NA					
5	61.00	63.00	56.00	65.00	NA	52.00	53.00	31.00	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: **IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 82.92

IMMOKALEE HIGH 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	14.00	17.00	17.00	65.00	NA	35.00	36.00	41.00	68.00	NA	73.00	82.00	82.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	10.00	11.00	10.00	65.00	NA	21.00	23.00	24.00	68.00	NA		66.00	69.00	90.00	NA
HISPANIC	15.00	19.00	18.00	65.00	NA	39.00	39.00	45.00	68.00	NA		86.00	86.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	13.00	17.00	15.00	65.00	NA	35.00	35.00	40.00	68.00	NA		79.00	81.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	5.00	5.00	5.00	65.00	NA	15.00	16.00	27.00	68.00	NA		46.00	56.00	90.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	18.00		5.00	65.00	NA	24.00				NA		67.00	56.00	90.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	NA	0.00	0.00	7.00	7.00	NA					
9	13.00	19.00	20.00	65.00	NA	29.00	29.00	40.00	68.00	NA					
10	15.00	15.00	14.00	65.00	NA	43.00	45.00	45.00	68.00	NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

# School Achievement Data

1. School: **IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.30

IMMOKALEE MIDDLE 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	29.00	36.00	36.00	65.00	NA	23.00	28.00	30.00	68.00	NA	89.00	90.00	93.00	96.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	16.00	28.00	29.00	65.00	NA	17.00	16.00	20.00	68.00	NA	89.00	81.00	86.00	90.00	NA
HISPANIC	30.00	36.00	37.00	65.00	NA	24.00	31.00	32.00	68.00	NA	89.00	92.00	92.00	93.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	28.00	35.00	35.00	65.00	NA	23.00	28.00	29.00	68.00	NA	89.00	89.00	93.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	12.00	19.00	21.00	65.00	NA	15.00	18.00	19.00	68.00	NA	79.00	74.00	81.00	90.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	11.00	11.00	12.00	65.00	NA	5.00	5.00	9.00	68.00	NA	70.00	64.00			NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	37.00	40.00	38.00	65.00	NA	20.00	21.00	21.00	68.00	NA					
7	33.00	40.00	38.00	65.00	NA	25.00	27.00	33.00	68.00	NA					
8	18.00	28.00	31.00	65.00	NA	24.00	35.00	38.00	68.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					



## School Achievement Data

1. School: **LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.95

LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	45.00	49.00	43.00	65.00	NA	47.00	53.00	42.00	68.00	NA	89.00	86.00	88.00	91.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK			33.00	65.00	NA			30.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	43.00	47.00	44.00	65.00	NA	49.00	53.00	44.00	68.00	NA	85.00	93.00		96.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	45.00	50.00	43.00	65.00	NA	46.00	53.00	42.00	68.00	NA	85.00	89.00		92.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	37.00	32.00	29.00	65.00	NA	41.00	44.00	32.00	68.00	NA	86.00	87.00		90.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	44.00	48.00	36.00	65.00	NA	48.00	60.00	28.00	68.00	NA					
4	41.00	45.00	64.00	65.00	NA	54.00	60.00	67.00	68.00	NA					
5	52.00	55.00	34.00	65.00	NA	39.00	33.00	36.00	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: **MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:  
88.75

MANATEE 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	47.00	45.00	58.00	65.00	NA	45.00	40.00	59.00	68.00	NA	84.00	79.00	93.00	96.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	42.00	52.00	53.00	65.00	NA	40.00	41.00	53.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	45.00	43.00	56.00	65.00	NA	46.00	40.00	60.00	68.00	NA	85.00	81.00	94.00	97.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	45.00	45.00	53.00	65.00	NA	44.00	41.00	57.00	68.00	NA	84.00	82.00	92.00	95.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	37.00	32.00	50.00	65.00	NA	41.00	31.00	53.00	68.00	NA	84.00	80.00			NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	21.00	15.00	23.00	65.00	NA	21.00	14.00	20.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	54.00	47.00	66.00	69.00	NA	53.00	53.00	72.00	75.00	NA					
4	42.00	42.00	53.00	65.00	NA	45.00	36.00	54.00	68.00	NA					
5	45.00	47.00	50.00	65.00	NA	36.00	29.00	43.00	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: **MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 83.28

MANATEE MIDDLE 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	31.00	34.00	45.00	65.00	NA	34.00	39.00	40.00	68.00	NA	86.00	88.00	90.00	93.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	40.00	34.00	47.00	65.00	NA	28.00	35.00	39.00	68.00	NA		97.00	90.00	93.00	NA
HISPANIC	26.00	31.00	44.00	65.00	NA	31.00	39.00	40.00	68.00	NA		85.00	90.00	93.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	30.00	33.00	43.00	65.00	NA	32.00	40.00	39.00	68.00	NA		86.00	90.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	17.00	20.00	21.00	65.00	NA	24.00	28.00	21.00	68.00	NA		83.00	84.00	90.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES			16.00	65.00	NA			17.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	44.00	39.00	49.00	65.00	NA	34.00	29.00	31.00	68.00	NA					
7	31.00	40.00	49.00	65.00	NA	30.00	44.00	44.00	68.00	NA					
8	22.00	23.00	34.00	65.00	NA	37.00	46.00	49.00	68.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

## School Achievement Data

1. School: **PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.43

PINECREST 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	40.00	37.00	42.00	65.00	NA	37.00	31.00	40.00	68.00	NA	74.00	83.00	71.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	55.00	47.00	40.00	65.00	NA	45.00	37.00	42.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	36.00	34.00	43.00	65.00	NA	34.00	29.00	40.00	68.00	NA	73.00	83.00	70.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	40.00	37.00	42.00	65.00	NA	37.00	31.00	40.00	68.00	NA	74.00	86.00	70.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	31.00	30.00	40.00	65.00	NA	30.00	23.00	35.00	68.00	NA	74.00	91.00	73.00	90.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	49.00	43.00	41.00	65.00	NA	47.00	45.00	45.00	68.00	NA					
4	32.00	31.00	45.00	65.00	NA	32.00	28.00	42.00	68.00	NA					
5	41.00	36.00	39.00	65.00	NA	31.00	16.00	32.00	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: **SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey:  
82.20

SHADOWLAWN 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	55.00	58.00	52.00	65.00	NA	49.00	51.00	53.00	68.00	NA	72.00	78.00	73.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	67.00	68.00	66.00	68.00	NA	55.00	68.00	59.00	68.00	NA					NA
BLACK	43.00	49.00	44.00	65.00	NA	35.00	35.00	40.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	52.00	55.00	52.00	65.00	NA	52.00	50.00	56.00	68.00	NA		79.00	80.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	51.00	53.00	47.00	65.00	NA	47.00	45.00	49.00	68.00	NA		79.00	70.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	27.00	31.00	39.00	65.00	NA	36.00	30.00	40.00	68.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	51.00	56.00	56.00	65.00	NA	41.00	58.00	64.00	68.00	NA					
4	54.00	55.00	50.00	65.00	NA	57.00	52.00	49.00	68.00	NA					
5	60.00	63.00	51.00	65.00	NA	48.00	42.00	45.00	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: **VILLAGE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL VILLAGE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.80

VILLAGE OAKS 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	54.00	56.00	56.00	65.00	NA	45.00	47.00	52.00	68.00	NA	94.00	91.00	91.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	47.00	53.00	46.00	65.00	NA	34.00	47.00	51.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	58.00	56.00	58.00	65.00	NA	51.00	48.00	51.00	68.00	NA		93.00	93.00	96.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	54.00	55.00	54.00	65.00	NA	45.00	46.00	51.00	68.00	NA	94.00	92.00	92.00	95.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	45.00	44.00	48.00	65.00	NA	31.00	41.00	44.00	68.00	NA	93.00	89.00			NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	29.00		26.00	65.00	NA	29.00		33.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	62.00	59.00	61.00	65.00	NA	53.00	61.00	68.00	71.00	NA					
4	47.00	54.00	63.00	66.00	NA	40.00	49.00	63.00	68.00	NA					
5	51.00	57.00	44.00	65.00	NA	38.00	30.00	25.00	68.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

## 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 reviewed student FCAT achievement data for students in lowest performing Title I schools and compared this data with ELL students at higher performing and non-title I schools. ELL student performance is an area of very weak academic performance and instructional methods are identified as a root cause in Collier's Three Year Academic Plan. Focusing resources to provide teachers with supplemental training, tools and materials to differentiate instruction using a sheltered model for ELL students will increase student achievement by an anticipated 4-8% in Reading. In addition, FCAT achievement data for students in the lowest performing Title I schools document that a great need exists for reading intervention training and materials. Lastly, providing teachers with reading intervention staff development and on-site training on data analysis will further increase student achievement in this area by 3-7%.

### Root Cause: 2

The district reviewed student achievement data for students in lowest performing Title I schools and found that six of the low performing Title 1 schools did not make 1% increase in Writing proficiency and several schools missed the opportunity to achieve AYP through "safe harbor" due to fact they did not achieve 1% proficiency gain in Writing. Providing teachers at these schools with Write Traits staff development and additional Write Traits kits will increase student achievement in Writing by an anticipated 3-7% for each participating school. Providing teachers with on-site training on data analysis will further increase student achievement in this area by 3-7%.

### Root Cause: 3

The district reviewed student achievement data for students in lowest performing Title I schools and compared this data with students at higher performing and non-title I schools. Math student performance is an area of very weak academic performance and instructional methods are identified as a root cause. Focusing resources to provide teachers with staff development to differentiate mathematics instruction will increase student Math achievement by an anticipated 5-8% in Mathematics. Providing teachers on-site training on data analysis will further increase student achievement in this area by 3-7%.



## 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 schools in data analysis during pre-planning week prior to the start of the 2008-2009 school year. This activity was headed by Chief Instructional Officer and the Planning & Accountability/Staff Development department.

Schools in corrective action and restructuring will have data analysis on a monthly basis as part of their district oversight team meetings.

Classroom walkthrough observations, stakeholder (teacher, student, parent) input and Collier's Data Warehouse will be tools used to monitor student progress. In addition, as part of district-wide initiative, formative assessments will be used by teachers to adjust instruction to meet the needs of 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 on LEA Support Team	Qualifications of Individual
1	Director of Federal and State Grants, Traci Dami	15 years experience, including 7 years classroom, 3 years as Instructional Tech Specialist, 4 years as Coord. School Impr./Staff Dev. and 1 year Dir. Federal & State Grants
2	Executive Director of Planning & Accountability/Staff Development, Dr. Joe Abalos	35 years experience, high school math teacher, Dir. of a UNICEF Regional Teacher Training Center, Dir. School Impr., Chap. I (now Title I) evaluator for NREL, Dir. of Research & Evaluation, Executive Director of Planning & Accountability/Staff Dev.
3	Executive Director of Elementary Schools, Beth Thompson	19 years in the basic and ESE education in grades K-8 with additional 17 years in a leadership role
4	Executive Director of Secondary Schools, Susan McNally	23 years experience, including 16 years classroom, 5 years FLDOE and BSI, and 2 years administrative experience at the District level
5	Director of ESE, Dr. Victoria Sartorio	42 years of experience, including 14 years of administrative, 20 years of teaching and 8 years of learning resource specialist experience
6	Director of Instructional Technology/Staff Development/Media Services, Randi Zwicker	30 years experience, including 13 years teaching experience and 17 years administrative experience primarily with instructional technology
7	Coordinator of Gifted Programs, Irene Benfatti	38 years experience in education, including 15 years teaching experience, 11 years administrative experience, 12 years experience as school superintendent
8	Director of ELL and Diversity, Dr. Maria Torres	34 years of experience in education (12 classroom teacher and 22 as administrator). Taught English honors, ESOL, Foreign Languages, science, social studies secondary level and college level courses.
9	Assistant Superintendent of Alternative Schools and Programs, Dr. Cynthia M. Janssen	35 years experience in public education in a variety of teaching and administrative assignments, including 16 years supervising schools and principals
10	Coordinator of Leadership Development, Dr. Shari Huene-Johnson	34 years experience in education, 17 years as principal and 4 years as Coordinator, Temple University adjunct instructor for 5 years, Educational Leadership

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:** In order to meet No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements, District Oversight Teams will continue for Immokalee High School, Pinecrest Elementary School, Avalon Elementary, Golden Gate Elementary, Golden Terrace Elementary, Immokalee Middle, Manatee Elementary, Manatee Middle, Shadowlawn Elementary, and Village Oaks Elementary for the 2008-2009 school year.

The purpose of District Oversight Teams is to provide assistance with meeting Adequate Yearly Progress expectations at each school. Oversight Teams meet monthly with the identified schools. With this in mind, key activities were identified and include the following:

Conduct a thorough data analysis to guide decisions for improvement.

Evaluate the effectiveness of current programs and make changes as needed.

Evaluate utilization of funding available and make changes as needed; ensure that planned expenditures reflect school improvement and Differentiated Accountability Model activities.

Assist in the development of a school improvement plan for each school which meets DOE and NCLB requirements.

Oversee the implementation of each school's corrective action plan, restructuring plan, or restructuring school improvement plan.

Provide assistance with implementing a continuous improvement system of frequent progress monitoring and redirecting instruction.

Identify and facilitate provision of additional resources to support school improvement.

Review professional development needs and organize professional development as needed.

## 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 (Chief Instructional Officer and Department of Accountability & Staff Development) has already provided professional development in area of data analysis through school improvement plan training at beginning of school year and a data analysis meeting with school administrators prior to start of school year. This focus helped schools identify needs and strengths in area of Reading. Through coordination with Title II, all elementary and middle school teachers are provided customized, high-quality professional development in reading via reading coaches. Through coordination with Title I Part C, identified migrant students that are performing below grade level are provided supplemental extended learning opportunities. Through coordination with Title I Part A supplemental reading resource teachers or reading coaches are funded at some low performing Title I schoolwide schools. Through coordination of both Title I Part A and previous school improvement grant extended day is funded at two low performing Title I schools (IHS and PCR). This extended day provides extended learning opportunities for academically needy students as well as extra planning and staff development time for teachers. Classroom walkthrough observations, stakeholder input and Collier's Data Warehouse are tools already in place that will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, as part of district-wide initiative, formative assessments will be used by teachers to adjust instruction to meet student needs.

Additional Sheltered Instruction Protocol (SIOP) training and materials (i.e. Reading Horizons and other scaffolded reading materials) for facilitators and teachers in Title I schools will help regular classroom teachers make content-area material comprehensible for ELL students.

Intervention programs currently in use in Collier County Elementary for students identified as at-risk include Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Triumphs, SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Reading Mastery and Voyager Passport. Intervention programs are utilized to increase student achievement in reading when use of Comprehensive Core Reading Program do not provide sufficient support to accelerate student learning. Additional MacMillan/Mc-Graw Hill materials will provide teachers with greater access to these intervention resources.

Junior Great Books is part of a district initiative to scaffold all students to greater proficiency in critical reading and writing, inductive reasoning and higher-level thinking skills. The Junior Great Book curriculum assists teachers in guiding students to critically examine and respond to literature. By purchasing additional Junior Great Books curriculum sets, teachers at Title I schools will gain greater access to this resource while continuing to receive district-provided professional development.

Through Title I Basic, the school district provided Marzano's High Yield Strategy training opportunity to administrators in all eligible Title I schools. In Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, Robert Marzano (2001) and his colleagues identify nine high-yield instructional strategies through a meta-analysis of over 100 independent studies. They determined that these nine strategies have the greatest positive affect on student achievement for all students, in all subject areas, at all grade levels. By offering additional professional development opportunities, eligible Title I instructional staff will also have the training in High Yield Strategies.

Classroom walkthrough observations, stakeholder input and Collier's Data Warehouse are tools already in place that will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, as part of a district-wide initiative, formative assessments will be used by teachers to adjust instruction to meet student needs.

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 (Chief Instructional Officer and Department of Planning & Accountability/Staff Development) has already provided professional development in area of data analysis through school improvement plan training at beginning of school year and a data analysis meeting with school administrators prior to start of school year. This focus helped schools identify needs and strengths in area of Math. Through coordination with Title II, math coaches are funded at all middle schools. They provide teachers with customized high-quality professional development in Math. Through coordination with Title I Part C supplemental extended learning opportunities are provided to identified migrant students that are performing below grade level in Math.

Programs currently in use in Collier County elementary schools for students identified as at-risk are the Scott Foresman Online Intervention Program and the Scott Foresman Math Diagnostic and Intervention System. The intervention programs are utilized to diagnose student math performance weaknesses and increase student achievement in math when use of the core materials do not provide sufficient support to accelerate student learning. Additionally, in grades 1 – 5, quarterly benchmark assessments are provided by the District, as well as curriculum correlated Diagnostic and Cumulative assessments.

A variety of programs, including math educational software, provide additional support in math growth for all children. As such, mathematics professional development for elementary and secondary teachers in Title I schools will provide the theory, practice and hands-on experiences necessary for differentiated instruction.

Classroom walkthrough observations, stakeholder input and Collier's Data Warehouse are tools already in place that will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, as part of district-wide initiative, formative assessments will be used by teachers to adjust curriculums to meet the needs of students.

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:** The school district (Chief Instructional Officer and Department of Planning & Accountability/Staff Development) has already provided professional development in area of data analysis through school improvement plan training at beginning of school year and a data analysis meeting with school administrators prior to start of school year. In regards to writing, the school district has implemented a Collier Writes process where students at non-tested grade levels answer an FCAT-like writing prompt. Tests are scanned into the district's Data Warehouse system and teachers are randomly assigned to grade the tests online. Additional training and materials (i.e. Write Traits kits) will provide Title I teachers with instructional strategies and assessments in the areas of idea development, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions.

Classroom walkthrough observations, stakeholder input and Collier's Data Warehouse are tools already in place that will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, as part of district-wide initiative, formative assessments will be used by teachers to adjust instruction to meet student needs.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS 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:** To differentiate instruction is to recognize students varying background knowledge, readiness, preferences in learning, interests, and to react responsively. Differentiated instruction is a process to approach teaching and learning for students of differing abilities in the same class. The intent of differentiating instruction is to maximize each student's growth and individual success by meeting each student where he or she is, and assisting in the learning process. The focus of the mathematics professional development is to differentiate mathematics instructional strategies utilizing the district's intervention programs, materials, and formative assessments.

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:** Title I Secondary Mathematics teachers will have the opportunity to attend an intensive summer program (during the month of June) focusing on differentiated instruction. Eligible Title I teachers will attend a 3-day workshop for 6 hours each day.

Title I Elementary Mathematics teachers will have the opportunity to attend 2-hour monthly after school meetings (November - April) focusing on differentiated instruction and intensive mathematics programs.

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

**Response:** The Coordinators of Elementary and Secondary mathematics as well as math intervention specialists/coaches will be in charge of the professional development sessions. Administrators at the building and district level conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess fidelity of implementation using TeachScape software. Lastly, all targeted schools have a district oversight team that assists with the monitoring and implementation of the District Assistance & Intervention Plan, school improvement plan as well as data analysis of student achievement.

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

**Response:** District created benchmark tests are provided in the Data Warehouse. Progress monitoring reports are generated at the teacher, school and district level. Reviews are completed at grade level

Professional Learning Community meetings, school-based administrator meetings, monthly district oversight meetings and through reports submitted to the Dept. of Education.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Progress monitoring is completed at least quarterly. Overall progress monitoring reports are submitted quarterly to the Chief Instructional Officer for review.

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

**Response:** The SI grant will further enhance the opportunities for our Title schools to receive support. It is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly-qualified set asides.

Summary:

School improvement is based upon data, collaboration and focus. As a district, we have thoroughly analyzed our data. Under the direction of our Chief Instructional Officer and through collaboration with all curriculum and instruction departments, we have written a new 3-year Academic Plan. Now, it is time for focus. Our school district has gone through an intensive academic planning process. We want to supplement what is currently going on in the school district with our focused, scientifically-based programs. The SI grant will allow us to provide additional intensive services/programs, materials, and instructional practices to our most needy students in Title I schools.

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:** Opportunities for differentiated instruction in mathematics will be available to all Title I teachers. All subgroups of students will benefit from differentiated instructional strategies.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS 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:** Write Traits Classroom Kits provide a clear process and a common language for using the six traits to discuss and evaluate writing including trait-specific lessons, guidelines and writing models. "Writing assessment is a genuine challenge . . . [and] assessment systems have an important role to play in the improvement of the teaching and learning of writing. While individual students need to know their strengths and weaknesses, their teachers also need to understand when students are writing effectively and when they are experiencing difficulty. With new rubrics and other evaluation guides for teachers, considerable progress has been made in recent years toward improving the writing evaluation in the classroom" (National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, 2003). The six traits offer an assessment model that is meaningful and effective because it is aligned with the learning goal of producing better writing (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Stiggins, 1996; Strickland & Strickland, 1998). The six traits of good writing are ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions (Spandel, 2001). Six-trait assessment and instruction "help students take charge of their own writing process; understand the difference between strong and weak writing—and use that knowledge to write stronger drafts; [and] revise and edit their own writing because they can 'read' it and know what to do to make it better" (Spandel, 2001). In addition to providing common writing assessment across grade levels and curriculum areas, the six traits provides teachers and students with a common vocabulary to discuss writing. "How different writing instruction—and assessment—can be when teachers of writing and their students share a common vocabulary that allows them to think, speak, assess, and plan like writers" (Spandel, 2001).

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:** Each school in the district has a Write Traits trainer. The trainer provides annual professional development sessions as well as weekly follow-up coaching. District-level trainers assist schools upon request. All Title I students in grades 3 - 10 benefit from the Write Traits instructional practices. In addition, sending at least three instructional staff to a Write Traits conference will further enhance their skills as a Write Traits facilitator to Title I Schools. Also, the purchase of additional Write Traits materials will assist Title I teachers with implementing writing strategies to improve student writing across the curriculum. The six traits writing model teaches writing as a process—prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and publishing. By following these steps, all subgroups of students will not only improve their writing, but also increase their understanding

of the subject matter.

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

**Response:** The Coordinators of Elementary and Secondary Reading/Language Arts and school-level trainers are in charge of implementation, follow-up and modeling of these instructional materials. Other individuals that will monitor implementation include administrators at the building and district level who conduct classroom walkthroughs using TeachScape software. Lastly, all targeted schools have a district oversight team that assists with the monitoring and implementation of district initiatives, the school improvement plan as well as data analysis of student achievement.

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

**Response:** District-created writing prompts are provided to all schools at least twice per year while site-based writing assessments happen more frequently. Student writing results are entered into the school district's Data Warehouse for further data analysis during Professional Learning Community meetings.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** District-created writing prompts are provided to all schools at least twice per year while site-based writing assessments happen more frequently. Student writing reviews are completed at grade level Professional Learning Community meetings, school-based administrator meetings, monthly district oversight meetings and through reports submitted to the Dept. of Education. In addition, overall progress monitoring reports are submitted quarterly to the Chief Instructional Officer for review.

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

**Response:** The SI grant will further enhance the opportunities for our Title schools to receive support. It is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly qualified set asides.

Summary:

School improvement is based upon data, collaboration and focus. As a district, we have thoroughly analyzed our data. Under the direction of our Chief Instructional Officer and through collaboration with all curriculum and instruction departments, we have written a new 3-year Academic Plan. Now, it is time for focus. Our school district has gone through an intensive academic planning process. We want to supplement what is currently going on in the school district with our focused, scientifically-based programs. The SI grant will allow us to provide additional intensive services/programs, materials, and instructional practices to our most needy students in Title I schools.

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:** Additional Write Traits materials will assist Title I teachers with implementing writing strategies to improve student writing across the curriculum. The six traits writing model teaches writing as a process—prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and publishing. By following these steps, all subgroups of students will not only improve their writing, but also increase their understanding of the subject matter.



## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** The SIOP Model was developed in a national research project sponsored by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE), a national research center funded by the U.S. Department of Education from 1996 through 2003 to assist the nation's population of diverse students, including those at risk of educational failure, to achieve academic excellence .

One of the goals of CREDE was to develop an explicit model of sheltered instruction. When the research began, sheltered instruction was widely advocated as an effective instructional strategy for language minority students, but there was little agreement among practitioners as to what constitutes an effective sheltered lesson.

Through literature review and with the collaboration of practicing teachers, researchers at California State University, Long Beach (Jana Echevarria and Mary Ellen Vogt), and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) identified instructional features of high-quality sheltered lessons. The model was refined over several years of field testing.

Early research found the SIOP Model to be effective with English Language Learners (ELLs) as measured by narrative and expository writing assessments. CAL is currently conducting further research in schools by facilitating professional development on the SIOP Model and examining the effects of SIOP-based instruction on student achievement in core content areas and in English language development.

The SIOP Model consists of eight interrelated components:

Lesson Preparation

Building Background

Comprehensible Input

Strategies

Interaction

Practice/Application

Lesson Delivery

Review/Assessment

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:** Through the use of Title III funds, Curriculum Facilitators provide bi-weekly training and modeling with the SIOP intervention model. By providing additional Sheltered Instruction materials to eligible Title I teachers, teachers will be better able to design and deliver lessons that address the academic and linguistic needs of English learners.

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

**Response:** The Executive Director of ELL and her Curriculum Facilitators will follow up and monitor classroom implementation. In addition, all targeted schools have a district oversight team that assists with the monitoring and implementation of district initiatives as well as data analysis of student achievement.

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

**Response:** District created benchmark tests are provided in the Data Warehouse. Progress monitoring reports which may also include CELLA and GRA+DE results are generated at the teacher, school and district level. Reviews are completed at grade level Professional Learning Community meetings, school-based administrator meetings, monthly district oversight meetings and through reports submitted to the Dept. of Education.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Progress monitoring/benchmark assessments are completed at least quarterly. Overall progress monitoring reports are submitted quarterly to the Chief Instructional Officer for review.

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

**Response:** The additional SIOP training materials for Title I schools extend beyond what the district is currently doing with everyone. Utilizing the SI grant will allow additional opportunities for our Title I teachers to gain access to training and additional student materials to support ELL instruction and is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly-qualified set asides.

Summary:

School improvement is based upon data, collaboration and focus. As a district, we have thoroughly analyzed our data. Under the direction of our Chief Instructional Officer and through collaboration with all curriculum and instruction departments, we have written a new 3-year Academic Plan. Now, it is time for focus. Our school district has gone through an intensive academic planning process. We want to supplement what is currently going on in the school district with our focused, scientifically-based programs. The SI grant will allow us to provide additional intensive services/programs, materials, and instructional practices to our most needy students in Title I schools.

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:** Instructional materials and strategies used in the SIOP model have been documented as positively impacting the achievement level of ELL students.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS 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 Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, Robert Marzano (2001) and his colleagues identify nine high-yield instructional strategies through a meta-analysis of over 100 independent studies. They determined that these nine strategies have the greatest positive affect on student achievement for all students, in all subject areas, at all grade levels. Marzano's nine high-yield instructional strategies are:

Identifying similarities and differences

Summarizing and note taking

Reinforcing effort and providing recognition

Homework and practice

Nonlinguistic representations

Cooperative learning

Setting objectives and providing feedback

Generating and testing hypothesis

Questions, cues, and advance organizers

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:** High Yield Strategy training will be open to all eligible instructional staff in the identified Title I schools. Training will take place for five days during the month of June. Each training day will last 6 hours. In addition, the High Yield Strategy training will take place at multiple site locations within the school district. District staff that have completed the original Marzano training will conduct the district-wide training sessions.

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

**Response:** Administrators at the building and district level conduct classroom walkthroughs using TeachScape software and other observation rubrics. In addition, all targeted schools have a district oversight team that assists with the monitoring and implementation of Title I district initiatives as well as data analysis of student achievement.

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

**Response:** Student achievement reviews are completed at grade level Professional Learning Community meetings, school-based administrator meetings, district oversight meetings and through reports submitted to the Dept. of Education.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Progress monitoring is completed at least quarterly. Overall progress monitoring reports are submitted quarterly to the Chief Instructional Officer for review.

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

**Response:** The SI grant will further enhance the opportunities for our Title schools to receive support. It is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly qualified set asides.

Summary:

School improvement is based upon data, collaboration and focus. As a district, we have thoroughly analyzed our data. Under the direction of our Chief Instructional Officer and through collaboration with all curriculum and instruction departments, we have written a new 3-year Academic Plan. Now, it is time for focus. Our school district has gone through an intensive academic planning process. We want to supplement what is currently going on in the school district with our focused, scientifically-based programs. The SI grant will allow us to provide additional intensive services/programs, materials, and instructional practices to our most needy students in Title I schools.

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:** Marzano's High Yield Strategies impact the instructional practices of teachers who in turn positively impact the learning all subgroups of students.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** The supplemental reading intervention program, Macmillan/McGraw-Hill's Reading Triumphs, is a research-based intervention program designed for K-6 students reading two or more years below grade level. Reading Triumphs provides explicit instruction for tested skills to ensure reading mastery. Because struggling readers face different challenges and gaps in knowledge, Reading Triumphs offers targeted resources so teachers have what they need when they need it.

The program builds a strong foundation with carefully sequenced, highly scaffolded lessons that model each skill in an "I do, we do, you do" structure. A teacher will model the skill ("I do"), then lead the students in guided practice ("we do"), and finally the students apply the skill on their own ("you do").

In addition, struggling readers are given multiple opportunities to master and retain words. High frequency words are introduced using the Read/Spell/Write technique, creating a stronger mental model of the word. After the word is introduced, it appears at least 40-50 times in context within the upcoming weeks.

Lastly, Reading Triumphs meets the requirements of the Response to Intervention (RtI) model.

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 Triumphs curriculum kits will enable more Title I teachers to gain access to reading materials and instructional supports when working with the lowest performing FCAT readers.

All elementary and middle school teachers are provided customized, high quality professional development in reading via Reading coaches. These site-based coaches provide on demand professional development and modeling as necessary. Reading Coaches document their time via the PRMN website/Reading Coach logs.

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

**Response:** The Supervisor of Reading and the Reading Coaches are in charge of the professional development sessions and distribution of materials. Administrators at the building and district level conduct

classroom walkthroughs and host data discussions. Lastly, all targeted schools have a district oversight team that assists with the monitoring and implementation of the school improvement plan as well as data analysis of student achievement.

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

**Response:** Ongoing assessments are critical for effective reading intervention. The informal and formal assessments in Reading Triumphs match instruction to students' needs and monitor their growth.

Quick Checks allow a teacher to monitor each student's progress daily. If a student has difficulty grasping a concept, Corrective Feedback provides at-the-moment lesson modifications. Additional Instruction Lessons in the Teacher's Edition provide more instruction and guided practice.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** The Triumphs curriculum incorporates daily student progress checks. In addition, District created benchmark tests are provided in the Data Warehouse. Progress monitoring reports are generated at the teacher, school and district level. Reviews are completed at grade level Professional Learning Community meetings, school-based administrator meetings, monthly district oversight meetings and through reports submitted to the Dept. of Education.

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

**Response:** The SI grant will further enhance the opportunities for our Title schools to receive support. It is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly-qualified set asides.

Summary:

School improvement is based upon data, collaboration and focus. As a district, we have thoroughly analyzed our data. Under the direction of our Chief Instructional Officer and through collaboration with all curriculum and instruction departments, we have written a new 3-year Academic Plan. Now, it is time for focus. Our school district has gone through an intensive academic planning process. We want to supplement what is currently going on in the school district with our focused, scientifically-based programs. The SI grant will allow us to provide additional intensive services/programs, materials, and instructional practices to our most needy students in Title I schools.

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:** Reading Triumphs uses a sound instructional philosophy that has been proven to work with all subgroups of struggling readers. Reading Triumphs not only provides teachers the tools to teach students to read, it helps students learn to enjoy reading. All of the materials are sensitive to students' age and interest levels. The content and design of the materials help engage and motivate young learners.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL
- IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- VILLAGE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** The Florida Department of Education facilitates the use of data analysis to improve instruction via progress monitoring requirements. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance. A significant body of research conducted over the past 30 years has shown this method to be a reliable predictor of subsequent performance on a variety of outcome measures, and thus useful for a wide range of instructional decisions (Deno, 2003; Fuchs, Deno, & Mirkin, 1984; Good & Jefferson, 1998). Partially funding and/or contracting with a programmer for Collier County's Data Warehouse will assist progress monitoring for Title I as well as assist with the school district's Choice & SES placement process.

2. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)

**Response:** The programmer's responsibilities will be completed as per consultant contract or through the regular work day.

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

**Response:** The Director of Assessment and Data will monitor the progress and schedule of the programmer. In addition, the Chief Instructional Officer will monitor the quality and ease of use within Data Warehouse.

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

**Response:** The effectiveness of the progress monitoring tool and SES/Choice data screens within Data Warehouse will be documented via subsequent student achievement results in the progress monitoring reports.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Progress monitoring reports are sent directly to the Florida Department of Education. In addition,



general progress monitoring reports are sent quarterly to the Chief Instructional Officer for review. End-user feedback will be a part of the monitoring process.

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

**Response:** With improvements in the programming and progress monitoring screens, additional students may qualify for Choice and SES services. Other school districts actually contract out for programs to support Choice and SES placements. We are already saving our Title I budget a significant amount of money by supporting this process internally. The SI grant will further enhance the opportunities for our Title schools and most importantly, the students to receive improved academic support. It is building upon current district capacity and supplements local, state, and other federal education funds.

This strategy does not include after-school services or affect highly-qualified set asides.

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:** In today's education climate, school success is defined as ensuring achievement for every student. To reach this goal, educators need tools to help them identify students who are at risk academically and adjust instructional strategies and school placements to better meet all student subgroup needs.

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

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

## Budget

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

TAPS Number  
09A006

No.	(1) FUNCTION	(2) OBJECT	(3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE	(4) FTE POSITION	(5) AMOUNT
1	5100	510	Reading/Math intervention materials (e.g., books, workbooks, flash cards, flip charts)	0.0	122870.00
2	6400	100	Salaries - Staff Development - Marzano's High Yield Strategies Professional Development Workshop	0.0	178500.00
3	6400	220	Social Security/Medicare	0.0	13655.21
4	6400	240	Workers Compensation	0.0	1785.00
5	6400	330	Travel - Travel expenses related to professional development	0.0	2000.00
6	6400	510	Supplies - related to professioan development (e.g., workbooks, books, planners)	0.0	5000.00
7	7200	790	Indirect Cost (3.42%)	0.0	11074.31
Total					334884.52

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: **Collier**

C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

TAPS Number  
09A005

No.	(1) FUNCTION	(2) OBJECT	(3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE	(4) FTE POSITION	(5) AMOUNT
1	5100	360	Software users fees - Reading Horizons online for windows (lessons, mastery drill and practice)	0.0	12008.00
2	5100	510	Instructional supplies - Treasure TE's and Components, Leveled Readers, Flipcharts, Practice Books, Creole/Haitian Books, Flash Cards, Materials for sheltered classroom instruction, Intervention Tool Kits for Language Arts, Hands-on Strategies for RTI, Write Trait Kits, Headphones, Classroom pointers, Student pointers, Write & Wipe Boards	0.0	338811.43
3	5100	622	AV Materials - CD's That Teach, CD's & Book Sets	0.0	47859.00
4	5100	642	Equipment - Headphones with Microphones, CD/Cassette Players, Mobile Teaching Easels	0.0	14381.00
5	6300	310	Professional/Technical - Programmer/Evaluator	0.0	20000.00
6	6400	100	Salaries - Staff Development - Mathematics Professional Development Workshops (Elementary & Secondary)	0.0	9384.00
7	6400	220	Social Security/Medicare - Mathematics Professional Development Workshops	0.0	718.00
8	6400	240	Workers Compensation - Mathematics Professional Development Workshops	0.0	94.00
9	6400	310	Professional/Technical - Reading Horizons Two-Day Intensive Phonics Workshop	0.0	4000.00
10	6400	330	Travel - Registration/Travel Expensives for staff attending Write Traits ELL Sheltered Model Workshop	0.0	5000.00
11	6400	510	Supplies - Staff Development - Curriculum Pacing Guides (printing), Workbooks, Planners, Books	0.0	10500.00
12	7200	790	Indirect Cost (3.42%)	0.0	13745.17
13	6300	360	Software Users Fee - Reading Horizon (Administrative Access Fee)	0.0	1390.00
				Total	477890.60

DOE 101



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

