Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants COLUMBIA

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 Number: |
| 09A006 |

Return to:	A) Program Name:	DOE USE ONLY
Florida Department of Education Office of Grants Management Room 332 Turlington Building 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400 Telephone: (850) 245-0496 Suncom: 205-0496	**2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]**	Date Received

B) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant: COLUMBIA 372 W DUVAL ST LAKE CITY, FL 32055	**Project Number (DOE Assigned)**

C) Total Funds Requested: $179189.28 ———————— DOE USE ONLY **Total Approved Project:** $	D) **Applicant Contact Information**	
	Contact Name: First Name: Frank MI: Last Name: Moore	E-mail Address: moore_f@firn.edu
	Address: 372 West Duval St. Lake City, FL 32055	
	Telephone Number: 386-755-8036 Ext:	Fax Number: 386-755-8016

CERTIFICATION

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

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

E) _____
    Signature of Agency Head

DOE 100A

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

School Achievement Data

1. School: **COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 49.65

COLUMBIA CITY 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	80.00	77.00	81.00	82.00	NA	65.00	70.00	74.00	75.00	NA	85.00	89.00	93.00	93.00	NA
WHITE	80.00	80.00	85.00	86.00	NA	68.00	74.00	78.00	79.00	NA		90.00	93.00	93.00	NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	75.00	72.00	77.00	78.00	NA	60.00	60.00	67.00	68.00	NA		85.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	46.00	39.00	53.00	62.00	NA	54.00	43.00	47.00	55.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	87.00	77.00	89.00	90.00	NA	82.00	83.00	85.00	86.00	NA					
4	71.00	79.00	81.00	82.00	NA	60.00	70.00	72.00	73.00	NA					
5	83.00	75.00	74.00	75.00	NA	52.00	58.00	65.00	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: **FIVE POINTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FIVE POINTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 73.33

FIVE POINTS 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	69.00	78.00	76.00	77.00	NA	59.00	72.00	71.00	72.00	NA	84.00	93.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE	74.00	83.00	80.00	81.00	NA	63.00	77.00	71.00	72.00	NA		92.00	94.00	95.00	NA
BLACK	48.00	63.00	62.00	65.00	NA	36.00	50.00	68.00	69.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	61.00	77.00	69.00	70.00	NA	51.00	67.00	68.00	69.00	NA		91.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	23.00	49.00	52.00	57.00	NA	25.00	48.00	50.00	55.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	80.00	78.00	82.00	83.00	NA	77.00	82.00	84.00	85.00	NA					
4	57.00	81.00	74.00	75.00	NA	50.00	77.00	73.00	74.00	NA					
5	67.00	76.00	71.00	72.00	NA	45.00	53.00	58.00	62.00	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: **MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 73.88

MELROSE 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	60.00	70.00	75.00	76.00	NA	40.00	58.00	74.00	75.00	NA	91.00	91.00	91.00	91.00	NA
WHITE	72.00	76.00	80.00	81.00	NA	54.00	70.00	88.00	89.00	NA		86.00	91.00	91.00	NA
BLACK	43.00	56.00	64.00	65.00	NA	20.00	37.00	55.00	62.00	NA		97.00			NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	54.00	64.00	68.00	69.00	NA	35.00	54.00	69.00	70.00	NA	90.00	88.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	53.00	56.00	49.00	54.00	NA	33.00	49.00	57.00	61.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	69.00	73.00	82.00	83.00	NA	52.00	72.00	86.00	87.00	NA					
4	56.00	65.00	78.00	79.00	NA	45.00	65.00	84.00	85.00	NA					
5	55.00	73.00	64.00	65.00	NA	23.00	35.00	51.00	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: **NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.31

NIBLACK 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	44.00	48.00	55.00	65.00	NA	27.00	38.00	59.00	68.00	NA	76.00	97.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	42.00	46.00	53.00	60.00	NA	26.00	36.00	59.00	68.00	NA		97.00	91.00	92.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	42.00	47.00	56.00	62.00	NA	26.00	38.00	59.00	68.00	NA		97.00	91.00	92.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	63.00	55.00	53.00	65.00	NA	43.00	64.00	73.00	74.00	NA					
4	40.00	53.00	67.00	68.00	NA	24.00	44.00	62.00	68.00	NA					
5	31.00	39.00	45.00	65.00	NA	17.00	13.00	31.00	49.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 58.33

SUMMERS 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	68.00	72.00	73.00	74.00	NA	64.00	68.00	77.00	78.00	NA	84.00	93.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE	74.00	77.00	83.00	84.00	NA	69.00	74.00	85.00	86.00	NA		92.00	91.00	92.00	NA
BLACK	56.00	57.00	53.00	60.00	NA	47.00	47.00	60.00	68.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	63.00	64.00	66.00	67.00	NA	56.00	60.00	71.00	72.00	NA		89.00	92.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	37.00	40.00	45.00	55.00	NA	28.00	35.00	58.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	75.00	75.00	70.00	71.00	NA	76.00	82.00	84.00	85.00	NA					
4	61.00	71.00	81.00	82.00	NA	61.00	72.00	80.00	81.00	NA					
5	70.00	72.00	67.00	68.00	NA	55.00	51.00	63.00	68.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

School Achievement Data

1. School: **WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 43.70

WESTSIDE 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	75.00	76.00	82.00	83.00	NA	60.00	66.00	74.00	75.00	NA	85.00	92.00	86.00	87.00	NA
WHITE	77.00	79.00	84.00	85.00	NA	64.00	69.00	75.00	76.00	NA		91.00	85.00	86.00	NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	65.00	65.00	75.00	76.00	NA	45.00	55.00	65.00	68.00	NA	74.00	88.00	74.00	75.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	52.00	53.00	57.00	65.00	NA	34.00	41.00	46.00	55.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	80.00	77.00	89.00	90.00	NA	75.00	71.00	84.00	85.00	NA					
4	77.00	73.00	77.00	78.00	NA	57.00	73.00	69.00	70.00	NA					
5	70.00	77.00	77.00	78.00	NA	51.00	53.00	68.00	69.00	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
Root Cause #1—Lack of Mathematics, Reading/Writing experiences

The district has identified lack of Mathematics, Reading/Writing experiences as a root cause for low academic achievement. The district examined Reading and Mathematics data for grades 3, 4, and 5 and Writing data for grade 4 over the past 3 years and determined that the subgroups not making AYP for 2008 (SWD and Black) need additional time focusing on their individual areas of deficit. The district compared the performance of these subgroups to high performing subgroups in other elementary schools in the district and concluded that more intensive intervention time focused on the individuals' areas of need would benefit the subgroups who did not make AYP. Alternative, research-based, high interest, skill-related instructional materials will be utilized. Writing will be incorporated throughout the reading process to strengthen the students' skills in transforming information subsequent to reading activities. Implementing the plan for additional tutoring for students in these subgroups will assist them in reaching proficiency levels of 65% in Reading, 68% in Mathematics, and 3.0 or higher in Writing.

Root Cause: 2
Root Cause #2—Instructional Methods

The district has identified Instructional Methods as a root cause for low academic achievement. The district examined Reading and Mathematics data for grades 3, 4, and 5 over the past 3 years and determined there was a lack of consistency in high quality Instructional Methods from classroom to classroom. The district compared schools where the subgroups (SWD and Black) did not make AYP to the schools where the subgroups (SWD and Black) did make AYP in 2008. It has been noted that reading achievement has increased due to the initiative of the office of Just Read, Florida! through Reading First and the Florida Reading Initiative. A similar proactive approach is necessary to increase student achievement in Mathematics. The district determined that providing substitutes and releasing teachers for professional development on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in Mathematics would empower teachers with a strong, consistent Instructional Method for curriculum delivery.

In addition, forming Learning Communities will provide a common tool to improve mathematics education. Professional books will be purchased with the allocation to use in the Learning Communities. The targeted selections are:

* Children's Mathematics: Cognitively Guided Instruction by Carpenter, Fennema, Franke, and Levi, 1999, for teachers in grades K-1 and

* Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics: Teachers' Understanding of Fundamental Mathematics in China and the United States (Studies in Mathematical Thinking and Learning), by Liping Ma, 1999, for teachers in grades 2-5.

Implementing professional development and Learning Communities will assist teachers in raising students'
performance to proficiency levels of 68% or higher in Mathematics.

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: 1. Each elementary school principal has established data analysis meeting schedules for the school year. Principals, reading coaches, leadership team members, and grade level teachers received broad data analysis training in earlier years from Dr. Laura Hassler and the Literacy Institute of Florida State University. In subsequent years, various forms of data notebooks were developed and utilized by classroom teachers throughout these elementary schools. The local consortium, North East Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC), has provided data analysis training for the district. Classroom teachers were trained to further analyze student performance data in terms of their own teaching performance and student needs. In addition, year-end student performance was analyzed, and areas of professional development need were identified. Teachers incorporated those areas of professional development need into their Individual Professional Development Plans. The principal/reading coach/leadership team at each elementary school will provide additional professional development to teachers who need further data analysis training.

2. Each school has acquired ThinkLink as a progress monitoring tool for Reading and Math. The service offers online or paper assessments which schools will administer three times a year. Baseline data will be gathered in September 2008; mid-year data will be assembled in January 2009; end of the year assessments will be administered in May 2009. Additionally, teachers have the ability to assess students on a more frequent basis through ThinkLink benchmark-specific probes. The district-developed Columbia Writes! assessment will be administered in the same time frames as a progress monitoring tool for Writing.

3. Progress monitoring data analysis will take place three times a year for all students at each elementary school. For those students identified as needing intervention, progress monitoring will be more frequent (weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly) as deemed appropriate for individual students.

4. Information gleaned from progress monitoring data analyses will be used to drive instruction for intervention students. The frequency of intervention, the duration of the intervention, the group size, the instructor, or the instructional materials used will be changed as deemed necessary.

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	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction – Lex Carswell	23 years in education: 11 years K-12 instructor, 7 years secondary assistant principal, 1 year high school principal, 3 years FLDOE administrator, 1 year assistant superintendent; B.S. Physical Education, M.S. Educational Administration/Leadership
2	Coordinator of Elementary Education – Wanda Conner	17 years of experience in education including 7 years elementary teacher; 7 years curriculum resource teacher, 3 years elementary education coordinator; B.A. Elementary Education, M.Ed. Elementary Education; Ed.S., Educational Leadership
3	Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability – Kitty McElhaney	34 years in education: 20 years middle school math teacher, 5 years middle school assistant principal, 9 years secondary education/curriculum, assessment & accountability director; B.S., M.A., Ed.S. Educational Leadership
4	Director of Human Resources- Frank Moore	12 years of experience in education including 5 years middle school math teacher, 7 years elementary, middle, high, and district administrator; B.A., Business Administration; M.S., 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: The support team will meet monthly to assess schools' progress on stated strategies of tutoring, acquisition of instructional materials and professional development. Additionally, a support team member is assigned as a liaison to a school that is planning for restructuring. The liaison will meet with the school's team as it discusses progress and assesses revisions to meet AYP requirements. Informal contact is made on a regular basis with each of the schools on various issues. The progress monitoring reports are reviewed by one or more of the LEA Support Team. Reading fidelity checks are made to school sites on a quarterly basis to ascertain implementation of the District Reading Plan. Included in the checks are reviews of professional development in the area of reading and classroom observations, which provide data on the learning process, instructional methods and curriculum alignment with the state standards. One or more members of the LEA Support Team will participate in the professional development strategy addressed in the proposal.

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 LEA's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in reading includes providing:

* computer labs and modern computers to implement software programs and assessment programs funded through general school and Title I funds.

* reading professional development through Reading First and the Florida Reading Initiative funded through NEFEC, Reading First, and Title II funds.

* Reading Coaches (supported by Title I, Title II, Reading First, and Reading Allocation funds) at each school to deliver reading professional development.

This additional School Improvement Initiative will provide a motivating, disguised learning software program (Practice Planet) which increases students' desires to practice reading in an enjoyable, game-like atmosphere. The ThinkLink assessment software program provides teachers with an easily-used online student data analysis tool and the ability to produce reading probes that target identified student areas of need. This grant will provide additional reading tutors at school sites, thereby enlarging the scope of each school's reading intervention plan.

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 LEA's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in mathematics includes providing:

* funding for professional development and materials for Students Using Mathematics and Science (SUMS), a NEFEC project designed to increase student proficiency in Mathematics and Science (supported by NEFEC, Title II).

* computer labs and modern computers to implement software programs and assessment programs funded through Title I and general school funds.

* professional development training to assist teachers in understanding and implementing the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as it becomes available (funded by NEFEC, Title II, Title I).

* appropriate content materials for Learning Communities at each school site, organizing those Learning Communities to provide teachers a meaningful, extensive mathematics experience relevant to the Learning Communities (supported by Title II, SAC allocation, Title I funds).

* assistance in locating and hiring additional tutors to assist Title I students in achieving proficiency in mathematics (funded through SAI funds).

This additional School Improvement Initiative will provide a motivating, disguised learning software program (Practice Planet) which increases students' desires to practice mathematics in an enjoyable, game-like atmosphere. The ThinkLink assessment software program provides teachers with an easily-used online student data analysis tool and the ability to produce mathematics probes that target identified student areas of need. This grant will also provide funding for high quality mathematics professional development in the area of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards implementation for K-5 teachers at each school site. It will allow the purchase of grade-appropriate professional mathematics books for learning communities in the six elementary schools, allowing for common mathematics discussions throughout not only each school, but also throughout the district. This initiative will provide additional mathematics tutors at school sites, thereby enlarging the scope of each school's mathematics intervention plan.

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 LEA's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in writing includes providing:

* district-wide Columbia Writes! demand writing prompts (supported by general school funds).

* writing professional development for schools (Title I funds).

* updated writing manuals for every elementary writing teacher (general schools funds).

This additional initiative will provide writing tutors at targeted school sites, thereby enlarging the scope of each school's writing intervention plan.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- FIVE POINTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Research has shown that students with below average reading skills who are tutored "show significant gains when compared to similar students who do not receive tutoring in a high-quality tutoring program."(America Reads Challenge Resource Kit)

One powerful way to provide low achieving students with needed practice- with

the opportunity to learn to read- is to tutor them (Morris, 2006). Citing use of an

evidence-based model, Morris explores the possibility of utilizing paraprofessionals or

teacher assistants as tutors to work with at-risk students. According to Morris (2006),

over the past decade, several first-grade intervention programs, including Reading

Recovery (Pinell, Lyons, DeFord, Byrk, & Seltzer, 1994), Success for All (Slavin et al,

1996), and Early Steps (Santa and Hoein, 1999), have demonstrated that one-to-one

tutoring can significantly raise the achievement of at-risk beginning readers. (DOCTORAL FORUM

NATIONAL JOURNAL FOR PUBLISHING AND MENTORING DOCTORAL STUDENT RESEARCH VOLUME 3 NUMBER 1, 2006)

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: Tutoring will be provided for students individually or in small groups during the school day for a total of 4 hours per day for a total of 70 days in a structured setting. Tutoring sessions for small groups of 3-5 students will meet for thirty (30) minutes, and individual tutoring will also meet for thirty (30) minutes. Tutoring will begin once funds are made available to the district.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: The principal will be responsible for placing tutors in the appropriate area with eligible students. The progress monitoring data will be evaluated by the classroom teacher, the principal of the school and other site designated personnel. Additionally, an LEA Support Team member is responsible for curriculum and for reviewing the data.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: The progress monitoring assessment, ThinkLink, will be administered three times during the school year to track student achievement in the areas of reading and math. In the area of writing, a district-developed writing assessment will be administered three (3) times during the school year to determine student achievement in that content area. The writing instrument is similar to the format of Florida Writes! Essay and is graded using the Department of Education FCAT Writing Rubrics.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: The administration windows for ThinkLink and the writing assessment are: September 2008, January 2009 and May 2009. Additionally, teachers have the ability to assess students on a more frequent basis through ThinkLink benchmark-specific probes.

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

Response: The tutors will be in addition to any tutors or other instructional support provided by other federal programs. These services will be supplemental to existing services being provided to eligible students, which are monitored by district personnel who manage federal programs and programs supported with Supplemental Academic Instructional funds.

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 district examined Reading and Mathematics data for grades 3, 4, and 5 and Writing data for grade 4 over the past 3 years and determined that the subgroups not making AYP for 2008 (SWD and Black) need additional time focusing on their individual areas of deficit

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- FIVE POINTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Prfessional development:

"Studies suggest that integrated professional development activities have a more positive impact on teacher skills and knowledge because they allow sustained, intensive, and active learning, and teachers tend to integrate such learning into their daily professional lives (Garet et al.1999;Garet et al.2001).

Learning Communities:

"When a school begins to function as a professional learning community, however, teachers

become aware of the incongruity between their commitment to ensure learning for all students

and their lack of a coordinated strategy to respond when some students do not learn. The staff

addresses this discrepancy by designing strategies to ensure that struggling students receive

additional time and support, no matter who their teacher is. In addition to being systematic and

schoolwide, the professional learning community's response to students who experience

difficulty is:

• Timely. The school quickly identifies students who need additional time and support.

• Based on intervention rather than remediation. The plan provides students with help as soon

as they experience difficulty rather than relying on summer school, retention, and remedial

courses.

• Directive. Instead of inviting students to seek additional help, the systematic plan requires

students to devote extra time and receive additional assistance until they have mastered the

necessary concepts" (Richard DuFour, Educational Leadership, May 2004).

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 professional development will be provided by an outside consultant for a full day for K-5 teachers with a half day to focus on making sense of the K-5 Next Generation Standards for Mathematics and a half day on teaching the K-5 grade content deeply. This proposal will provide funds for substitutes for teachers to attend the professional development. Learning communities at the school sites will be an extension of the professional development and will meet at least quarterly. Professional books will be purchased with the allocation to use in the Learning Communities. The targeted selections are: Childrens' Mathematics: Cognitively Guided Instruction by Carpenter, Fennema, Franke, and Levi, 1999 for teachers in grades K-1 and Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics: Teachers' Understanding of Fundamental Mathematics in China and the United States (Studies in Mathematical Thinking and Learning), by Ma, 1999, for teachers in grades 2-5.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: The principal at the site will be responsible for monitoring attendance at the professional development activities. Participants will be required to sign in at the professional development session. Members of the LEA Support Team will also serve as monitors. The school principal will designate teacher leaders for the Learning Communities.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: The effectiveness of the professional development will be measured by student gains as demonstrated with the progress monitoring tools used in the project: ThinkLink and the district-developed writing assessment. Monitoring of professional development effectiveness will also be demonstrated in lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: The administration windows for the student progress monitoring tools of ThinkLink and the writing assessment are: September 2008, January 2009 and May 2009. Monitoring of professional development effectiveness will also be demonstrated in lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.

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

Response: The professional development offered through this funding will be in addition to any professional development funded through required set-asides. These services will be supplemental to existing services being provided to eligible students, which are monitored by district personnel who manage federal programs and programs supported with Supplemental Academic Instructional funds.

7. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **1.2.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 targeted population of this strategy includes: all classroom teachers in grades K-5, the school administrators, other appropriate school personnel who impact student instruction (Reading Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher, and Guidance Counselor) and members of the LEA Support Team.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a.Name of strategy

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

- COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- FIVE POINTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)
Response: Dr.Ash(2006)examined the impact of an additional hour of weekly computer instruction, using Practice Planet,concluding "computer-assisted instruction boosts math skills.""Research reveals an effective reading program must teach decoding principles and provide opportunities for practice.High Noon Chapter Books provide massive opportunities for practicing decoding skills"(Academic Therapy Publications,2008)."Soar to Success contains instruction in four critical components of reading:phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension and is designed to develop students' skills in applying specific strategies to independently unlock the meaning of the texts and books"(FCRR,2008).Drs.Beck and McKeown's(2002)research validates the rationale and methods for teaching children rich, robust vocabulary words, underscoring the importance of providing repeated opportunities to hear and use new vocabulary words in different contexts like those in Elements of Reading:Vocabulary and Text Talk.Read Naturally develops in readers the skills necessary for fluent/effortless reading:speed, accuracy,proper expression and incorporates fluency levels based on studies of Hasbrouck and Tindal(1991).Incorporating reading and writing with mathematics clarifies students' understanding, improves their ability to analyze, interpret, and communicate mathematical ideas critical to achievement in mathematics(Fennema,1999,Hiebert,1997). Minutes to Math targets fundamental concepts, teaches relevant vocabulary and demonstrates problem-solving solutions. Breakaway Math builds proficiency by moving from fundamental level to on-grade aptitude facilitating learning by reviewing each math skill with hands-on activities in a real-world context, giving all students access to learning with focused and easy-to-read explanations for each concept. Houghton Mifflin Multilevel Intervention, Gourmet Curriculum, Triumph Learning and Do the Math, developed by Marilyn Burns, will supplement the core math curriculum.

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 instructional materials will be utilized as needed in the tutoring sessions that will be provided for students individually or in small groups during the school day for a total of 4 hours per day for a total of 70 days in a structured setting. Tutoring sessions for small groups of 3-5 students will meet for thirty (30)

minutes, and individual tutoring will also meet for thirty (30) minutes. The computre software will also be accessible at home for those students who have internet access.

3. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy or student progress?
Response: Classroom teachers will utilize the data reports provided by the program to customize practice levels and specific skills unique to individual students. The growth reports are an additional progress monitoring tool for assessing a student's achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. The reports will be reviewed at a minimum of bi-weekly. An LEA Support Team member will monitor the acquisition of the instructional materials and review the progress monitoring data.

4. Progress monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.
Response: The progress monitoring assessment, ThinkLink, will be administered three times during the school year to track student achievement in the areas of reading and math. In the area of writing, a district-developed writing assessment will be administered three (3) times during the school year to determine student achievement in that content area. The writing instrument is similar to the format of Florida Writes! Essay and is graded using the Department of Education FCAT Writing Rubrics.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.
Response: The administration windows for ThinkLink and the writing assessment are: September 2008, January 2009 and May 2009. Additionally, teachers have the ability to assess students on a more frequent basis through ThinkLink benchmark-specific probes.

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

Response: The materials purchased with this grant will be in addition to any instructional support provided by other federal programs. Additionally, all material expenditures will be supplemental.

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 district examined Reading and Mathematics data for grades 3, 4, and 5 and Writing data for grade 4 over the past 3 years and determined that the subgroups not making AYP for 2008 (SWD and Black) need additional time focusing on their individual areas of deficit

Dissemination/Marketing

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

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

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

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

Hard copy and/or online newsletters of schools receiving funds: Information about the award will be provided in monthly newsletters after the approval of the application. This notification will address parents, staff, and students. This will be a one-time notification through this method.

School Advisory Councils of schools receiving funds: Information on the application will be provided to SACs to gain their input on how to expend funds to best assist each school. This notification will address parents, staff, students, and the community. This was done in the August 2008 meeting for planning purposes. The SACs will be notified upon approval of the application and will receive updates at every SAC meeting for the remainder of the school year on progress toward meeting student achievement goals.

Columbia County Newspapers

Online and hard copies of the Lake City Reporter: Information about the award will be provided to readers in a one-time notification after the approval of the application. This notification will address students, parents, staff, and community.

Online copies of the Lake City Journal: Information about the award will be provided to readers in a one-time notification after the approval of the application. This notification will address students, parents, staff, and community.

NorthEast Florida Educational Consortium meetings: Upon approval of the application information about the award will be provided to other district members of the Consortium on a quarterly basis. This notification and updating will address the wider community of Northeast Florida.

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

Budget

A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: **Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]**
B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **Columbia**
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	139	Remedial teachers for 6 schools: 13 teachers @ $21.50 per hour for 4 hours per day for 70 days Strategy 1: Tutoring	5.5	78260.00
2	6400	311	Consultant: Professional development on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (4 days to reach 198 teachers) Strategy 2: Professional Development	0.0	6400.00
3	5100	750	Substitutes: To release teachers for professional development - 198 substitutes @ $70.00 each Strategy 2: Professional Development	0.0	13860.00
4	5100	691	Computer software: Practice Planet for reading and math - 5 @ $1,495 each Strategy 3: Acquisition of Research-based Materials	0.0	7475.00
5	6400	510	Books for teachers to use in on-site Learning Communities: 75 books for Teachers in Grades K - 1 Learning Communities @ $23 each. 123 books for Teachers in Grades 2 - 5 Learning Communities @ $28 each. Strategy 2: Professional Development	0.0	5169.00
6	5100	510	Materials and Supplies :Reading materials to include: Elements of ReadingVocabulary, Soar to Success, Renaissance Learning Accelerated Learning Cards, Text Talk, Read Naturally, High Noon Chapter books, and Word Forward; Mathematics: Do the Math, Houghton Mifflin Multilevel Intervention, Breakaway Math, and Minutes to Math Success, Gourmet Curriculum, Triumph Learning; Strategy 3: Acquisition of Research-based Materials	0.0	18737.10
7	5100	220	Social Security benefits for wages paid; Strategy 1: Tutoring; Strategy 2: Professional Development	0.0	10048.98
8	5100	159	Remedial tutors for 6 schools: 13 tutors @ $10.78 per hour for 4 hours per day for 70 days Strategy 1: Tutoring	5.9	39239.20
				Total	179189.28

DOE 101

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner