

**Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants DADE**

## 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> DADE 1450 NE 2ND AVE # 912 MIAMI, FL 33132	<b>DOE USE ONLY</b>  Date Received
---	---	--

<b>B) Applicant Contact Information:</b>	
<b>Contact Name:</b> First Name: Magaly MI:C Last Name: Abrahante	<b>Mailing Address:</b> 1450 N.E. 2nd Ave., Suite 500 Miami, FL 33132
*Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):305-995-1253 Ext:	
Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx):305-995-2882	E-mail Address:abrahante@dadeschools.net

<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: \$2022575.89	<b>D) Total Funds Requested:</b> Allocation: \$4360751.69
Total Approved Funds: <b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b> \$	Total Approved Funds: <b>(DOE USE ONLY)</b> \$

<b>CERTIFICATION</b>
<p>I <b>Alberto Carvalho</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: **ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.02

ARCOLA LAKE 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	47.00	52.00	57.00	NA	49.00	55.00	46.00	51.00	NA	89.00	89.00	90.00	91.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	56.00	46.00	50.00	55.00	NA	47.00	53.00	43.00	48.00	NA		92.00	92.00	93.00	NA
HISPANIC	50.00	51.00	59.00	64.00	NA	62.00	64.00	59.00	64.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	54.00	47.00	52.00	57.00	NA	49.00	55.00	47.00	52.00	NA		89.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	26.00	21.00	49.00	54.00	NA	38.00	35.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	60.00	55.00	41.00	46.00	NA	57.00	76.00	45.00	50.00	NA					
4	46.00	42.00	58.00	63.00	NA	43.00	49.00	61.00	66.00	NA					
5	58.00	44.00	55.00	60.00	NA	46.00	40.00	34.00	39.00	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: **ASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER SCHOOLASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER SCHOOLASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **97.92**

ASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER 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	41.00	47.00	47.00	52.00	NA	38.00	44.00	46.00	51.00	NA	93.00	96.00	97.00	98.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	43.00	55.00	52.00	57.00	NA	39.00	53.00	48.00	53.00	NA	94.00		100.00	100.00	NA
HISPANIC	39.00	42.00	43.00	48.00	NA	37.00	39.00	44.00	49.00	NA	92.00	96.00	94.00	95.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	40.00	47.00	46.00	51.00	NA	38.00	45.00	46.00	51.00	NA	94.00	96.00	97.00	98.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	42.00	51.00	46.00	51.00	NA	47.00	35.00	33.00	38.00	NA					
7	51.00	50.00	53.00	58.00	NA	38.00	49.00	55.00	60.00	NA					
8	28.00	40.00	41.00	46.00	NA	30.00	49.00	58.00	63.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **88.31**

ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP 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	56.00	57.00	48.00	53.00	NA	51.00	49.00	41.00	46.00	NA	96.00	99.00	99.00	100.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	46.00	60.00	50.00	55.00	NA	49.00	49.00	41.00	46.00	NA	98.00	97.00	100.00	100.00	NA
HISPANIC	63.00	51.00	44.00	49.00	NA	50.00	50.00	38.00	43.00	NA		100.00	98.00	99.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	55.00	55.00	47.00	52.00	NA	49.00	47.00	40.00	45.00	NA	95.00	99.00	99.00	100.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS			17.00	22.00	NA			30.00	35.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	63.00	63.00	42.00	47.00	NA	52.00	47.00	23.00	28.00	NA					
7	69.00	63.00	55.00	60.00	NA	45.00	46.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
8	36.00	46.00	48.00	53.00	NA	56.00	56.00	62.00	67.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **BEL-AIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BEL-AIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BEL-AIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 91.04

BEL-AIRE 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	62.00	57.00	44.00	49.00	NA	59.00	57.00	53.00	58.00	NA	86.00	87.00	85.00	86.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	57.00	46.00	38.00	43.00	NA	50.00	48.00	44.00	49.00	NA	83.00	85.00	86.00	86.00	NA
HISPANIC	65.00	61.00	49.00	54.00	NA	65.00	66.00	60.00	65.00	NA	92.00				NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	63.00	57.00	43.00	48.00	NA	60.00	57.00	52.00	57.00	NA	89.00	84.00	85.00	85.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES			23.00	28.00	NA			46.00	51.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	71.00	52.00	38.00	43.00	NA	73.00	66.00	61.00	66.00	NA					NA
4	55.00	58.00	45.00	50.00	NA	61.00	47.00	53.00	58.00	NA					NA
5	57.00	62.00	50.00	55.00	NA	43.00	59.00	43.00	48.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 92.03

<b>BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	54.00	43.00	54.00	59.00	NA	58.00	39.00	56.00	61.00	NA	87.00	96.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	53.00	42.00	53.00	58.00	NA	57.00	38.00	55.00	60.00	NA		98.00	89.00	90.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	53.00	42.00	52.00	57.00	NA	58.00	39.00	56.00	61.00	NA		96.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	41.00	36.00	45.00	50.00	NA	45.00	35.00	58.00	63.00	NA		92.00	86.00	87.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	57.00	36.00	58.00	63.00	NA	64.00	34.00	72.00	77.00	NA					NA
4	47.00	53.00	49.00	54.00	NA	51.00	61.00	60.00	65.00	NA					NA
5	56.00	42.00	54.00	59.00	NA	56.00	25.00	36.00	41.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **82.26**

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH															
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	10.00	11.00	14.00	19.00	NA	34.00	36.00	37.00	42.00	NA	80.00	83.00	82.00	83.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	7.00	9.00	9.00	14.00	NA	26.00	28.00	32.00	37.00	NA	83.00	83.00	84.00	84.00	NA
HISPANIC	13.00	13.00	18.00	23.00	NA	41.00	45.00	43.00	48.00	NA	83.00	81.00	82.00	82.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	11.00	11.00	14.00	19.00	NA	34.00	37.00	37.00	42.00	NA	85.00	83.00	84.00	84.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	8.00	2.00	13.00	18.00	NA	11.00	8.00	20.00	25.00	NA	59.00	69.00	70.00	70.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9	12.00	13.00	14.00	19.00	NA	32.00	35.00	36.00	41.00	NA					NA
10	8.00	9.00	13.00	18.00	NA	35.00	36.00	38.00	43.00	NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **BROADMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BROADMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BROADMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.82

BROADMOOR 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	49.00	42.00	46.00	51.00	NA	56.00	52.00	55.00	60.00	NA	86.00	88.00	98.00	99.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	50.00	39.00	44.00	49.00	NA	53.00	55.00	60.00	65.00	NA		87.00			NA
HISPANIC	46.00	44.00	48.00	53.00	NA	59.00	50.00	52.00	57.00	NA		89.00	97.00	98.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	47.00	42.00	44.00	49.00	NA	54.00	51.00	53.00	58.00	NA		88.00	98.00	99.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	44.00	32.00	37.00	42.00	NA	51.00	48.00	48.00	53.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	48.00	40.00	46.00	51.00	NA	53.00	60.00	65.00	70.00	NA					NA
4	48.00	40.00	59.00	64.00	NA	59.00	60.00	68.00	73.00	NA					NA
5	51.00	46.00	35.00	40.00	NA	56.00	37.00	31.00	36.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **88.77**

<b>BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	28.00	28.00	32.00	37.00	NA	26.00	25.00	32.00	37.00	NA	89.00	92.00	95.00	96.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	29.00	29.00	33.00	38.00	NA	26.00	25.00	33.00	38.00	NA	88.00	93.00	98.00	99.00	NA
HISPANIC	26.00	26.00	30.00	35.00	NA	26.00	25.00	32.00	37.00	NA	92.00	89.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	28.00	28.00	32.00	37.00	NA	27.00	25.00	32.00	37.00	NA	89.00	92.00	95.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	7.00	11.00	19.00	24.00	NA	7.00	7.00	28.00	33.00	NA	64.00	64.00	88.00	89.00	NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	37.00	31.00	33.00	38.00	NA	31.00	18.00	25.00	30.00	NA					
7	34.00	35.00	35.00	40.00	NA	26.00	25.00	36.00	41.00	NA					
8	18.00	21.00	28.00	33.00	NA	24.00	31.00	35.00	40.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **85.46**

<b>CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	25.00	27.00	33.00	38.00	NA	23.00	27.00	31.00	36.00	NA	87.00	84.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	20.00	21.00	26.00	31.00	NA	17.00	22.00	21.00	26.00	NA	84.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
HISPANIC	29.00	29.00	38.00	43.00	NA	29.00	30.00	37.00	42.00	NA	84.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	23.00	26.00	33.00	38.00	NA	23.00	27.00	30.00	35.00	NA	84.00	92.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	16.00	8.00	13.00	18.00	NA	18.00	17.00	18.00	23.00	NA	71.00	84.00	85.00	85.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	13.00	8.00	24.00	29.00	NA	13.00	8.00	23.00	28.00	NA	63.00	70.00	71.00	71.00	NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	40.00	27.00	31.00	36.00	NA	25.00	19.00	21.00	26.00	NA					
7	22.00	36.00	41.00	46.00	NA	21.00	34.00	29.00	34.00	NA					
8	20.00	18.00	28.00	33.00	NA	25.00	30.00	43.00	48.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **CARIBBEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CARIBBEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CARIBBEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 92.03

CARIBBEAN 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	42.00	47.00	50.00	55.00	NA	37.00	43.00	44.00	49.00	NA	82.00	91.00	90.00	91.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	30.00	36.00	42.00	47.00	NA	26.00	31.00	30.00	35.00	NA	90.00	90.00	91.00	91.00	NA
HISPANIC	50.00	55.00	55.00	60.00	NA	46.00	53.00	52.00	57.00	NA	90.00	92.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	41.00	45.00	48.00	53.00	NA	36.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	NA	90.00	92.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	41.00	39.00	36.00	41.00	NA	43.00	50.00	47.00	52.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	53.00	50.00	48.00	53.00	NA	58.00	53.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
4	33.00	44.00	53.00	58.00	NA	37.00	53.00	43.00	48.00	NA					NA
5	39.00	45.00	51.00	56.00	NA	16.00	24.00	34.00	39.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **80.53**

CENTENNIAL 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	39.00	39.00	42.00	47.00	NA	35.00	37.00	39.00	44.00	NA	91.00	93.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	24.00	30.00	32.00	37.00	NA	23.00	24.00	26.00	31.00	NA	89.00	88.00	96.00	97.00	NA
HISPANIC	45.00	41.00	46.00	51.00	NA	40.00	42.00	46.00	51.00	NA	91.00	95.00	91.00	92.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	37.00	37.00	38.00	43.00	NA	33.00	35.00	36.00	41.00	NA	91.00	92.00	92.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	20.00	25.00	25.00	30.00	NA	14.00	21.00	20.00	25.00	NA	71.00	81.00	86.00	87.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	51.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	NA	34.00	23.00	28.00	33.00	NA					NA
7	43.00	49.00	46.00	51.00	NA	37.00	43.00	40.00	45.00	NA					NA
8	28.00	31.00	36.00	41.00	NA	34.00	46.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.16

CHARLES R. DREW 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	31.00	36.00	NA	29.00	32.00	32.00	37.00	NA	95.00	97.00	97.00	98.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	31.00	33.00	30.00	35.00	NA	29.00	32.00	32.00	37.00	NA	95.00	97.00	97.00	98.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	31.00	34.00	30.00	35.00	NA	28.00	32.00	31.00	36.00	NA	95.00	97.00	97.00	98.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	38.00	27.00	27.00	32.00	NA	23.00	20.00	22.00	27.00	NA					
7	41.00	48.00	35.00	40.00	NA	29.00	37.00	32.00	37.00	NA					
8	18.00	27.00	30.00	35.00	NA	32.00	38.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **88.34**

<b>CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	33.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	NA	34.00	32.00	34.00	39.00	NA	88.00	87.00	85.00	86.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	34.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	NA	33.00	32.00	34.00	39.00	NA	87.00	85.00	86.00	86.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	33.00	30.00	34.00	39.00	NA	34.00	33.00	33.00	38.00	NA	87.00	83.00	84.00	84.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	13.00	9.00	16.00	21.00	NA	18.00	15.00	17.00	22.00	NA	72.00	60.00	61.00	61.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	23.00	12.00	27.00	32.00	NA	20.00	8.00	28.00	33.00	NA	50.00	60.00	61.00	61.00	NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	40.00	31.00	33.00	38.00	NA	25.00	22.00	20.00	25.00	NA					
7	40.00	37.00	40.00	45.00	NA	32.00	36.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
8	23.00	24.00	29.00	34.00	NA	41.00	36.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.62

COMSTOCK 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	50.00	51.00	52.00	57.00	NA	56.00	57.00	54.00	59.00	NA	87.00	86.00	78.00	79.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	50.00	53.00	52.00	57.00	NA	60.00	60.00	56.00	61.00	NA	87.00	80.00	81.00	81.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	48.00	50.00	51.00	56.00	NA	56.00	56.00	54.00	59.00	NA	86.00	77.00	78.00	78.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	43.00	42.00	45.00	50.00	NA	53.00	53.00	51.00	56.00	NA	80.00	85.00	75.00	76.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	23.00	26.00	38.00	43.00	NA	43.00	30.00	31.00	36.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	62.00	47.00	59.00	64.00	NA	66.00	58.00	71.00	76.00	NA					NA
4	47.00	48.00	46.00	51.00	NA	65.00	70.00	48.00	53.00	NA					NA
5	39.00	59.00	50.00	55.00	NA	38.00	42.00	39.00	44.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.48

DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	42.00	40.00	41.00	45.00	NA	35.00	42.00	46.00	51.00	NA	77.00	88.00	86.00	87.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	41.00	40.00	39.00	44.00	NA	36.00	42.00	43.00	48.00	NA		85.00	84.00	85.00	NA
HISPANIC	45.00	40.00	47.00	52.00	NA	32.00	43.00	53.00	58.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	41.00	39.00	41.00	46.00	NA	35.00	42.00	46.00	51.00	NA		87.00	86.00	87.00	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	41.00	32.00	47.00	52.00	NA	36.00	36.00	68.00	73.00	NA					
4	52.00	39.00	36.00	41.00	NA	35.00	40.00	34.00	39.00	NA					
5	30.00	44.00	44.00	49.00	NA	36.00	46.00	38.00	43.00	NA					
6	47.00	47.00	38.00	43.00	NA	30.00	52.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

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

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.45

EDISON 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	48.00	49.00	47.00	52.00	NA	42.00	47.00	51.00	56.00	NA	91.00	87.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	47.00	50.00	47.00	52.00	NA	42.00	47.00	51.00	56.00	NA		86.00	89.00	90.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	48.00	49.00	47.00	52.00	NA	42.00	47.00	50.00	55.00	NA		86.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	43.00		38.00	43.00	NA	38.00		44.00	49.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES			44.00	49.00	NA			51.00	56.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	56.00	48.00	51.00	56.00	NA	60.00	63.00	56.00	61.00	NA					NA
4	52.00	46.00	53.00	58.00	NA	46.00	48.00	65.00	70.00	NA					NA
5	29.00	55.00	39.00	44.00	NA	12.00	30.00	33.00	38.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.41

FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	55.00	54.00	51.00	56.00	NA	47.00	52.00	66.00	71.00	NA	69.00	81.00	80.00	81.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	45.00	44.00	39.00	44.00	NA	36.00	48.00	54.00	59.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	58.00	62.00	57.00	62.00	NA	50.00	54.00	71.00	76.00	NA	82.00	83.00	84.00		NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	56.00	53.00	49.00	54.00	NA	47.00	52.00	64.00	69.00	NA	81.00	79.00	80.00		NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	48.00	53.00	39.00	44.00	NA	43.00	48.00	69.00	74.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	33.00	24.00	25.00	30.00	NA	17.00	30.00	33.00	38.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	68.00	54.00	44.00	49.00	NA	67.00	57.00	68.00	73.00	NA					
4	40.00	56.00	62.00	67.00	NA	35.00	54.00	67.00	72.00	NA					
5	54.00	51.00	49.00	54.00	NA	32.00	41.00	62.00	67.00	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: **FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM. FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM. FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM.**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.94

FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM.															
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	41.00	40.00	36.00	41.00	NA	34.00	42.00	45.00	50.00	NA	82.00	85.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	34.00	32.00	35.00	40.00	NA	30.00	31.00	37.00	42.00	NA	85.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	NA
HISPANIC	48.00	48.00	36.00	41.00	NA	40.00	52.00	52.00	57.00	NA	83.00				NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	42.00	41.00	36.00	41.00	NA	35.00	43.00	45.00	50.00	NA	85.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	45.00	39.00	33.00	38.00	NA	35.00	46.00	50.00	55.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	53.00	33.00	40.00	45.00	NA	36.00	45.00	58.00	63.00	NA					NA
4	38.00	47.00	28.00	33.00	NA	38.00	52.00	45.00	50.00	NA					NA
5	29.00	41.00	35.00	40.00	NA	27.00	27.00	24.00	29.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.70

GRATIGNY 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	58.00	51.00	55.00	60.00	NA	55.00	55.00	54.00	59.00	NA	87.00	93.00	88.00	89.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	58.00	51.00	53.00	58.00	NA	54.00	53.00	53.00	58.00	NA		93.00	88.00	89.00	NA
HISPANIC			64.00	69.00	NA			63.00	68.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	57.00	50.00	53.00	58.00	NA	54.00	55.00	54.00	59.00	NA		92.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	39.00	38.00	34.00	39.00	NA	43.00	43.00	37.00	42.00	NA		94.00			NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	54.00	54.00	56.00	61.00	NA	53.00	61.00	66.00	71.00	NA					NA
4	58.00	50.00	61.00	66.00	NA	62.00	59.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
5	58.00	51.00	47.00	52.00	NA	51.00	42.00	51.00	56.00	NA					NA
6	68.00	50.00	59.00	64.00	NA	54.00	60.00	45.00	50.00	NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 99.17

HOLMES 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	35.00	32.00	29.00	34.00	NA	45.00	55.00	53.00	58.00	NA	80.00	95.00	95.00	96.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	35.00	30.00	29.00	34.00	NA	44.00	54.00	53.00	58.00	NA		95.00	94.00	95.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	33.00	33.00	29.00	34.00	NA	44.00	55.00	53.00	58.00	NA		95.00	95.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	14.00	15.00	16.00	21.00	NA	40.00	59.00	28.00	33.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	47.00	27.00	32.00	37.00	NA	65.00	73.00	69.00	74.00	NA					
4	23.00	34.00	22.00	27.00	NA	28.00	68.00	53.00	58.00	NA					
5	31.00	35.00	31.00	36.00	NA	34.00	22.00	36.00	41.00	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: **HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **76.76**

HOMESTEAD SENIOR 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	13.00	14.00	17.00	22.00	NA	28.00	29.00	39.00	44.00	NA	81.00	84.00	80.00	81.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	8.00	11.00	14.00	19.00	NA	17.00	19.00	31.00	36.00	NA	84.00	77.00	78.00	78.00	NA
HISPANIC	15.00	15.00	19.00	24.00	NA	34.00	35.00	43.00	48.00	NA	84.00	81.00	82.00	82.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	12.00	13.00	17.00	22.00	NA	27.00	28.00	37.00	42.00	NA	83.00	80.00	81.00	81.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	1.00	2.00	19.00	24.00	NA	11.00	17.00	19.00	24.00	NA	58.00	55.00	56.00	56.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	4.00	10.00	19.00	24.00	NA	5.00	12.00	25.00	30.00	NA	64.00	53.00	54.00	54.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9	14.00	15.00	21.00	26.00	NA	24.00	25.00	40.00	45.00	NA					
10	13.00	12.00	14.00	19.00	NA	34.00	33.00	38.00	43.00	NA					
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **87.98**

<b>HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	38.00	36.00	42.00	47.00	NA	34.00	36.00	39.00	44.00	NA	88.00	95.00	92.00	93.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	36.00	34.00	41.00	46.00	NA	31.00	34.00	38.00	43.00	NA	87.00	94.00	93.00	94.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	37.00	34.00	41.00	46.00	NA	34.00	34.00	39.00	44.00	NA	88.00	94.00	92.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	41.00	37.00	42.00	47.00	NA	24.00	25.00	29.00	34.00	NA					NA
7	44.00	47.00	45.00	46.00	NA	34.00	38.00	44.00	49.00	NA					NA
8	31.00	28.00	37.00	42.00	NA	39.00	42.00	45.00	50.00	NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.65

JOSE DE DIEGO 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	25.00	24.00	27.00	32.00	NA	25.00	28.00	29.00	34.00	NA	85.00	87.00	90.00	91.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	23.00	23.00	31.00	36.00	NA	21.00	24.00	26.00	31.00	NA	86.00	85.00	90.00	91.00	NA
HISPANIC	26.00	25.00	23.00	28.00	NA	27.00	30.00	31.00	36.00	NA	85.00	89.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	25.00	25.00	27.00	28.00	NA	25.00	28.00	29.00	34.00	NA	85.00	88.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	6.00	10.00	9.00	14.00	NA	13.00	13.00	19.00	24.00	NA	66.00	84.00	75.00	76.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	6.00	8.00	17.00	22.00	NA	5.00	10.00	13.00	18.00	NA	62.00	54.00			NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	28.00	26.00	25.00	30.00	NA	20.00	17.00	17.00	22.00	NA					NA
7	28.00	33.00	32.00	37.00	NA	25.00	35.00	27.00	32.00	NA					NA
8	20.00	16.00	23.00	28.00	NA	28.00	30.00	42.00	47.00	NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **94.25**

<b>KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	47.00	43.00	39.00	44.00	NA	35.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	NA	93.00	93.00	67.00	68.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	44.00	37.00	39.00	44.00	NA	31.00	38.00	37.00	42.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	51.00	51.00	38.00	43.00	NA	39.00	44.00	54.00	59.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	47.00	40.00	38.00	43.00	NA	34.00	40.00	43.00	48.00	NA	94.00	66.00	67.00		NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	57.00	44.00	36.00	41.00	NA	50.00	44.00	58.00	63.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES			12.00	17.00	NA			26.00	31.00	NA					NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	60.00	39.00	42.00	47.00	NA	47.00	57.00	50.00	55.00	NA					
4	43.00	51.00	25.00	30.00	NA	36.00	30.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
5	39.00	38.00	52.00	57.00	NA	21.00	29.00	35.00	40.00	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: **KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 82.94

KINLOCH PARK 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	42.00	39.00	39.00	44.00	NA	38.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	NA	90.00	91.00	87.00	88.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	42.00	38.00	38.00	43.00	NA	38.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	NA	90.00	91.00	86.00	87.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	40.00	36.00	35.00	40.00	NA	38.00	39.00	41.00	46.00	NA	89.00	91.00	86.00	87.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	19.00	15.00	13.00	18.00	NA	22.00	24.00	23.00	28.00	NA	72.00	75.00	63.00	64.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	11.00	15.00	17.00	22.00	NA	10.00	14.00	15.00	20.00	NA	72.00	80.00			NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	51.00	42.00	35.00	40.00	NA	33.00	28.00	22.00	27.00	NA					
7	47.00	45.00	46.00	51.00	NA	41.00	41.00	51.00	56.00	NA					
8	31.00	31.00	34.00	39.00	NA	40.00	53.00	52.00	57.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 97.28

LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	45.00	44.00	45.00	50.00	NA	58.00	55.00	58.00	63.00	NA	83.00	94.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	46.00	43.00	47.00	52.00	NA	56.00	51.00	55.00	60.00	NA	90.00	96.00	97.00	97.00	NA
HISPANIC	45.00	46.00	43.00	48.00	NA	61.00	59.00	60.00	65.00	NA	98.00	90.00	91.00	91.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	44.00	44.00	44.00	49.00	NA	57.00	55.00	57.00	62.00	NA	94.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	34.00	39.00	36.00	41.00	NA	47.00	53.00	62.00	67.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	50.00	49.00	43.00	48.00	NA	74.00	63.00	61.00	66.00	NA					NA
4	42.00	41.00	52.00	57.00	NA	56.00	62.00	61.00	66.00	NA					NA
5	41.00	43.00	41.00	46.00	NA	42.00	39.00	48.00	53.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

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

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **94.72**

LIBERTY 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	41.00	41.00	33.00	38.00	NA	32.00	45.00	28.00	33.00	NA	70.00	97.00	85.00	86.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	41.00	39.00	32.00	37.00	NA	33.00	45.00	28.00	33.00	NA		97.00			NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	39.00	40.00	33.00	38.00	NA	32.00	44.00	28.00	33.00	NA		97.00			NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	51.00	30.00	31.00	36.00	NA	47.00	68.00	41.00	45.00	NA					NA
4	35.00	62.00	32.00	37.00	NA	32.00	62.00	36.00	41.00	NA					NA
5	45.00	44.00	38.00	43.00	NA	18.00	13.00	25.00	30.00	NA					NA
6	24.00	21.00	29.00	34.00	NA	19.00	25.00	13.00	18.00	NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 97.14

LITTLE RIVER 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	41.00	42.00	35.00	40.00	NA	40.00	44.00	44.00	49.00	NA	84.00	94.00	96.00	97.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	42.00	44.00	33.00	38.00	NA	38.00	46.00	42.00	47.00	NA		94.00	95.00	96.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	41.00	42.00	36.00	41.00	NA	41.00	45.00	45.00	50.00	NA		94.00	95.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	32.00	35.00	22.00	27.00	NA	34.00	34.00	34.00	39.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	47.00	39.00	29.00	34.00	NA	40.00	49.00	54.00	59.00	NA					
4	40.00	43.00	33.00	38.00	NA	50.00	54.00	44.00	49.00	NA					
5	34.00	44.00	43.00	48.00	NA	28.00	30.00	33.00	38.00	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: **MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 96.89

MARTIN LUTHER KING 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	35.00	32.00	29.00	34.00	NA	45.00	55.00	53.00	58.00	NA	80.00	95.00	0.00	96.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	35.00	30.00	29.00	34.00	NA	44.00	54.00	53.00	58.00	NA		95.00	94.00	95.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	33.00	33.00	29.00	34.00	NA	44.00	55.00	53.00	58.00	NA		95.00	0.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	14.00	15.00	16.00	21.00	NA	40.00	59.00	28.00	33.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MAYA ANGELOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MAYA ANGELOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MAYA ANGELOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 94.27

MAYA ANGELOU 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	63.00	61.00	52.00	57.00	NA	51.00	68.00	63.00	68.00	NA	94.00	93.00	74.00	75.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	64.00	63.00	53.00	58.00	NA	53.00	70.00	65.00	70.00	NA	93.00	72.00	73.00	73.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	63.00	61.00	52.00	57.00	NA	50.00	66.00	63.00	68.00	NA	93.00	73.00	74.00	74.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	58.00	50.00	43.00	48.00	NA	46.00	63.00	62.00	67.00	NA		67.00	68.00	68.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	64.00	57.00	56.00	61.00	NA	59.00	65.00	75.00	80.00	NA					NA
4	75.00	57.00	42.00	47.00	NA	66.00	71.00	57.00	62.00	NA					NA
5	50.00	73.00	58.00	63.00	NA	31.00	69.00	56.00	61.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **87.87**

<b>MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing					
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	34.00	31.00	36.00	41.00	NA	35.00	32.00	36.00	41.00	NA	94.00	93.00	92.00	93.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	30.00	27.00	33.00	38.00	NA	29.00	27.00	31.00	36.00	NA	97.00	92.00	95.00	96.00	NA
HISPANIC	39.00	33.00	38.00	43.00	NA	39.00	37.00	41.00	46.00	NA	90.00	93.00	88.00	89.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	34.00	30.00	34.00	39.00	NA	33.00	32.00	34.00	39.00	NA	94.00	92.00	92.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	7.00	5.00	18.00	23.00	NA	8.00	4.00	12.00	17.00	NA	87.00	70.00			NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	39.00	33.00	35.00	40.00	NA	27.00	20.00	25.00	30.00	NA					
7	38.00	38.00	38.00	43.00	NA	31.00	44.00	36.00	41.00	NA					
8	27.00	24.00	36.00	41.00	NA	43.00	38.00	50.00	55.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 93.36

MELROSE 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		48.00	53.00	NA	45.00		51.00	56.00	NA	89.00	95.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	52.00		38.00	43.00	NA	40.00		36.00	41.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	61.00		51.00	56.00	NA	46.00		55.00	60.00	NA	93.00	91.00		92.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	59.00		48.00	53.00	NA	44.00		50.00	55.00	NA	96.00	92.00		93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	59.00		43.00	48.00	NA	51.00		50.00	55.00	NA	92.00				NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	69.00	0.00	42.00	47.00	NA	54.00	0.00	57.00	62.00	NA					
4	45.00	0.00	63.00	68.00	NA	45.00	0.00	59.00	64.00	NA					
5	61.00	0.00	44.00	49.00	NA	31.00	0.00	38.00	43.00	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: **MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **75.07**

MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH 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	10.00	10.00	12.00	17.00	NA	29.00	27.00	33.00	38.00	NA	73.00	79.00	79.00	80.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	9.00	9.00	12.00	17.00	NA	28.00	26.00	32.00	37.00	NA	80.00	80.00	81.00	81.00	NA
HISPANIC	14.00	9.00	13.00	18.00	NA	31.00	27.00	35.00	40.00	NA	74.00	76.00	77.00	77.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	10.00	10.00	13.00	18.00	NA	29.00	27.00	34.00	39.00	NA	79.00	81.00	82.00	82.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	2.00	1.00	2.00	7.00	NA	20.00	10.00	19.00	24.00	NA	53.00	49.00	50.00	50.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	5.00	4.00	12.00	17.00	NA	8.00	5.00	21.00	25.00	NA	46.00	57.00	58.00	58.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9	11.00	12.00	12.00	17.00	NA	22.00	25.00	29.00	34.00	NA					NA
10	9.00	8.00	12.00	17.00	NA	35.00	28.00	38.00	43.00	NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.98

MIAMI EDISON 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	24.00	26.00	35.00	40.00	NA	23.00	24.00	26.00	31.00	NA	88.00	20.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	24.00	26.00	34.00	39.00	NA	22.00	25.00	26.00	31.00	NA	88.00		93.00	94.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	24.00	26.00	35.00	40.00	NA	23.00	24.00	26.00	31.00	NA	87.00		90.00	91.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	11.00	9.00	22.00	27.00	NA	10.00	11.00	12.00	17.00	NA	76.00				NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	17.00	16.00	34.00	39.00	NA	12.00	8.00	27.00	32.00	NA	48.00				NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	30.00	28.00	40.00	45.00	NA	15.00	13.00	22.00	27.00	NA					
7	29.00	31.00	40.00	45.00	NA	29.00	21.00	28.00	33.00	NA					
8	15.00	21.00	23.00	28.00	NA	21.00	36.00	28.00	33.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 74.34

MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH 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	6.00	9.00	14.00	19.00	NA	25.00	28.00	41.00	46.00	NA	73.00	83.00	92.00	93.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	6.00	10.00	13.00	18.00	NA	25.00	28.00	41.00	46.00	NA	85.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	7.00	10.00	13.00	18.00	NA	26.00	28.00	41.00	46.00	NA	84.00	94.00	95.00	95.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	0.00	1.00	3.00	8.00	NA	24.00	24.00	35.00	40.00	NA	68.00	81.00	82.00	82.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9	7.00	15.00	16.00	21.00	NA	24.00	31.00	40.00	45.00	NA					NA
10	5.00	4.00	11.00	16.00	NA	26.00	26.00	43.00	48.00	NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHL MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 74.98

MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH 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	9.00	12.00	13.00	18.00	NA	24.00	30.00	39.00	44.00	NA	71.00	81.00	88.00	89.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	9.00	13.00	14.00	19.00	NA	20.00	29.00	36.00	41.00	NA		85.00	95.00	96.00	NA
HISPANIC	10.00	11.00	13.00	18.00	NA	26.00	30.00	41.00	46.00	NA		77.00	84.00	85.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	10.00	11.00	13.00	18.00	NA	23.00	31.00	37.00	42.00	NA		81.00	88.00	89.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	1.00	3.00	3.00	8.00	NA	15.00	11.00	30.00	35.00	NA		45.00	54.00	55.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	1.00	9.00	6.00	11.00	NA	3.00	9.00	15.00	20.00	NA		52.00	78.00	79.00	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					NA					NA					
9	13.00	15.00	13.00	18.00	NA	23.00	34.00	37.00	42.00	NA					
10	6.00	8.00	13.00	18.00	NA	25.00	27.00	40.00	45.00	NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 80.93

MIAMI SENIOR 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	23.00	20.00	24.00	29.00	NA	51.00	47.00	56.00	61.00	NA	84.00	86.00	87.00	88.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	22.00	19.00	24.00	29.00	NA	51.00	46.00	56.00	61.00	NA	85.00	86.00	87.00	87.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	23.00	19.00	23.00	28.00	NA	51.00	47.00	56.00	61.00	NA	85.00	87.00	87.00	88.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	5.00	3.00	5.00	10.00	NA	41.00	35.00	44.00	49.00	NA	54.00	55.00	56.00	56.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	6.00	7.00	12.00	17.00	NA	10.00	9.00	24.00	29.00	NA	60.00	72.00	72.00	73.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9	26.00	22.00	29.00	34.00	NA	46.00	43.00	56.00	61.00	NA					NA
10	20.00	18.00	20.00	25.00	NA	57.00	50.00	56.00	61.00	NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MIAMI SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL MIAMI SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL MIAMI SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 73.66

MIAMI SPRINGS 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	49.00	48.00	50.00	55.00	NA	45.00	44.00	45.00	50.00	NA	92.00	91.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	42.00	40.00	49.00	54.00	NA	30.00	32.00	33.00	38.00	NA	89.00	94.00	98.00	99.00	NA
HISPANIC	49.00	48.00	49.00	54.00	NA	45.00	45.00	45.00	50.00	NA	92.00	90.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	43.00	42.00	46.00	51.00	NA	40.00	39.00	40.00	45.00	NA	90.00	90.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	16.00	16.00	18.00	23.00	NA	21.00	21.00	21.00	26.00	NA	71.00	71.00	58.00	59.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	13.00	17.00	18.00	23.00	NA	10.00	19.00	18.00	23.00	NA	82.00	76.00			NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6	60.00	52.00	57.00	62.00	NA	42.00	39.00	43.00	48.00	NA					
7	50.00	51.00	50.00	55.00	NA	42.00	44.00	40.00	45.00	NA					
8	39.00	40.00	41.00	46.00	NA	49.00	50.00	53.00	58.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 92.09

MORNINGSIDE 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	57.00	54.00	52.00	57.00	NA	42.00	45.00	58.00	63.00	NA	85.00	88.00	81.00	82.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	56.00	54.00	51.00	56.00	NA	41.00	44.00	57.00	62.00	NA	87.00	92.00	86.00	87.00	NA
HISPANIC	58.00	47.00	51.00	56.00	NA	38.00	42.00	61.00	66.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	56.00	52.00	51.00	56.00	NA	41.00	45.00	58.00	63.00	NA	83.00	87.00	83.00	84.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	52.00	39.00	44.00	49.00	NA	48.00	53.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	26.00	33.00	30.00	35.00	NA	21.00	28.00	33.00	38.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	63.00	50.00	56.00	61.00	NA	61.00	63.00	70.00	75.00	NA					
4	53.00	49.00	52.00	57.00	NA	36.00	42.00	59.00	64.00	NA					
5	55.00	64.00	47.00	52.00	NA	28.00	26.00	45.00	50.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

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

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **86.50**

MYRTLE GROVE 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	50.00	41.00	45.00	50.00	NA	38.00	43.00	49.00	54.00	NA	91.00	95.00	100.00	100.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	51.00	41.00	46.00	51.00	NA	39.00	43.00	49.00	54.00	NA	92.00	95.00	100.00	100.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	46.00	38.00	44.00	49.00	NA	37.00	41.00	49.00	54.00	NA	90.00	96.00	100.00	100.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	62.00	37.00	49.00	54.00	NA	49.00	35.00	66.00	71.00	NA					NA
4	44.00	43.00	47.00	52.00	NA	32.00	58.00	40.00	45.00	NA					NA
5	39.00	42.00	41.00	46.00	NA	27.00	34.00	39.00	44.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **NARANJA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NARANJA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NARANJA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **87.77**

NARANJA 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	39.00	35.00	38.00	43.00	NA	33.00	28.00	48.00	53.00	NA	69.00	90.00	86.00	87.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	35.00	33.00	38.00	43.00	NA	28.00	23.00	45.00	50.00	NA		86.00	88.00	89.00	NA
HISPANIC	44.00	35.00	36.00	41.00	NA	42.00	33.00	52.00	57.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	39.00	35.00	38.00	43.00	NA	33.00	29.00	47.00	52.00	NA		90.00	86.00	87.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	28.00	24.00	33.00	38.00	NA	33.00	34.00	51.00	56.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	8.00	10.00	20.00	25.00	NA	12.00	12.00	24.00	29.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	35.00	31.00	43.00	48.00	NA	26.00	40.00	54.00	59.00	NA					
4	45.00	38.00	26.00	31.00	NA	39.00	31.00	59.00	64.00	NA					
5	38.00	37.00	43.00	48.00	NA	34.00	13.00	27.00	32.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHL NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHL NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **89.57**

NATURAL BRIDGE 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	56.00	51.00	49.00	54.00	NA	56.00	52.00	54.00	59.00	NA	92.00	90.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	55.00	48.00	44.00	49.00	NA	53.00	49.00	51.00	56.00	NA		88.00	90.00	91.00	NA
HISPANIC	57.00	63.00	67.00	72.00	NA	61.00	66.00	58.00	63.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	56.00	50.00	48.00	53.00	NA	56.00	52.00	54.00	59.00	NA		89.00	88.00	89.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	43.00	34.00	34.00	39.00	NA	47.00	43.00	42.00	47.00	NA	90.00	80.00	78.00	79.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	59.00	48.00	52.00	57.00	NA	62.00	59.00	63.00	68.00	NA					NA
4	55.00	50.00	54.00	59.00	NA	64.00	61.00	57.00	62.00	NA					NA
5	54.00	57.00	39.00	44.00	NA	41.00	36.00	41.00	46.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **90.86**

NORTH COUNTY 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	49.00	54.00	NA	43.00	52.00	53.00	58.00	NA	95.00	84.00	84.00	85.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	44.00	48.00	51.00	56.00	NA	42.00	52.00	55.00	60.00	NA	95.00	83.00	82.00	83.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	42.00	48.00	49.00	54.00	NA	42.00	53.00	53.00	58.00	NA	95.00	85.00	88.00	89.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	27.00	42.00	43.00	48.00	NA	32.00	47.00	31.00	36.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	55.00	48.00	61.00	66.00	NA	41.00	63.00	68.00	73.00	NA					
4	33.00	57.00	40.00	45.00	NA	47.00	55.00	63.00	68.00	NA					
5	41.00	39.00	47.00	52.00	NA	41.00	38.00	30.00	35.00	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: **NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **87.00**

NORTH MIAMI 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	33.00	29.00	36.00	41.00	NA	34.00	33.00	35.00	40.00	NA	90.00	90.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	31.00	28.00	36.00	41.00	NA	32.00	31.00	34.00	39.00	NA	90.00	90.00	88.00	89.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	32.00	29.00	35.00	40.00	NA	33.00	33.00	35.00	40.00	NA	90.00	90.00	89.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	11.00	10.00	7.00	12.00	NA	13.00	13.00	13.00	18.00	NA	76.00	74.00	52.00	53.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	43.00	29.00	42.00	47.00	NA	31.00	22.00	23.00	28.00	NA					
7	38.00	46.00	38.00	43.00	NA	37.00	40.00	35.00	40.00	NA					
8	23.00	18.00	29.00	34.00	NA	33.00	34.00	44.00	49.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **ORCHARD VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHL ORCHARD VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHL ORCHARD VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 95.06

ORCHARD VILLA 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	51.00	48.00	54.00	59.00	NA	42.00	38.00	47.00	52.00	NA	74.00	88.00	85.00	86.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	51.00	47.00	53.00	58.00	NA	41.00	37.00	46.00	51.00	NA		89.00	85.00	86.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	50.00	48.00	54.00	59.00	NA	41.00	38.00	47.00	52.00	NA		88.00	85.00	86.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	30.00	31.00	45.00	50.00	NA	30.00	23.00	39.00	44.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	62.00	55.00	69.00	74.00	NA	46.00	44.00	62.00	67.00	NA					NA
4	37.00	45.00	45.00	50.00	NA	40.00	38.00	51.00	56.00	NA					NA
5	53.00	42.00	45.00	50.00	NA	39.00	32.00	27.00	32.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 76.81

PALM SPRINGS 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	49.00	47.00	50.00	55.00	NA	50.00	53.00	51.00	56.00	NA	89.00	93.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	49.00	47.00	50.00	55.00	NA	50.00	53.00	51.00	56.00	NA	93.00	93.00	94.00	NA	
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	47.00	44.00	47.00	52.00	NA	47.00	50.00	47.00	52.00	NA	92.00	92.00	93.00	NA	
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	19.00	19.00	16.00	21.00	NA	26.00	31.00	26.00	31.00	NA	74.00	76.00	77.00	NA	
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	13.00	18.00	24.00	29.00	NA	9.00	14.00	21.00	25.00	NA	78.00	67.00	68.00	NA	
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	64.00	54.00	51.00	56.00	NA	51.00	47.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
7	50.00	56.00	57.00	62.00	NA	50.00	53.00	53.00	58.00	NA					
8	38.00	35.00	43.00	48.00	NA	49.00	57.00	57.00	62.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 99.27

PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	43.00	34.00	40.00	45.00	NA	35.00	39.00	48.00	53.00	NA	78.00	91.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	41.00	34.00	40.00	45.00	NA	33.00	36.00	46.00	51.00	NA		88.00	92.00	93.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	44.00	35.00	40.00	45.00	NA	37.00	39.00	49.00	54.00	NA		90.00	93.00	94.00	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	54.00	37.00	39.00	44.00	NA	47.00	58.00	54.00	59.00	NA					
4	29.00	36.00	45.00	50.00	NA	32.00	38.00	55.00	60.00	NA					
5	35.00	33.00	35.00	40.00	NA	19.00	26.00	32.00	37.00	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: **PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **86.77**

<b>PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	48.00	47.00	47.00	52.00	NA	38.00	37.00	50.00	55.00	NA	74.00	91.00	85.00	86.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	45.00	40.00	39.00	54.00	NA	33.00	32.00	41.00	46.00	NA		90.00			NA
HISPANIC	50.00	55.00	58.00	63.00	NA	43.00	42.00	58.00	63.00	NA		91.00			NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	46.00	45.00	44.00	49.00	NA	36.00	35.00	48.00	53.00	NA		92.00	85.00	86.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	44.00	44.00	38.00	43.00	NA	43.00	40.00	43.00	48.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	23.00	17.00	23.00	28.00	NA	20.00	24.00	21.00	26.00	NA					NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	54.00	49.00	46.00	51.00	NA	48.00	54.00	52.00	57.00	NA					
4	34.00	47.00	48.00	53.00	NA	36.00	43.00	60.00	65.00	NA					
5	56.00	47.00	48.00	53.00	NA	29.00	19.00	40.00	45.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.99

<b>PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	44.00	42.00	40.00	45.00	NA	40.00	32.00	41.00	46.00	NA	73.00	87.00	76.00	77.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	39.00	41.00	35.00	40.00	NA	37.00	29.00	35.00	40.00	NA		88.00	70.00	71.00	NA
HISPANIC	55.00	42.00	51.00	56.00	NA	45.00	35.00	57.00	62.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	41.00	41.00	39.00	44.00	NA	39.00	31.00	42.00	47.00	NA		86.00	78.00	79.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	13.00	29.00	12.00	17.00	NA	9.00	8.00	12.00	17.00	NA					NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	54.00	44.00	48.00	53.00	NA	47.00	37.00	54.00	59.00	NA					NA
4	34.00	44.00	31.00	36.00	NA	39.00	42.00	35.00	40.00	NA					NA
5	43.00	39.00	38.00	43.00	NA	34.00	16.00	30.00	35.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 78.01

REDLAND 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	40.00	34.00	36.00	41.00	NA	36.00	32.00	34.00	39.00	NA	92.00	96.00	96.00	97.00	NA
WHITE	63.00	54.00	57.00	62.00	NA	57.00	47.00	57.00	62.00	NA		100.00	94.00	95.00	NA
BLACK	26.00	21.00	24.00	29.00	NA	20.00	19.00	20.00	25.00	NA	92.00	95.00	98.00	99.00	NA
HISPANIC	41.00	35.00	38.00	43.00	NA	39.00	35.00	38.00	43.00	NA	91.00	95.00	95.00	96.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	36.00	31.00	33.00	38.00	NA	32.00	29.00	30.00	35.00	NA	92.00	95.00	95.00	96.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	20.00	15.00	14.00	19.00	NA	19.00	17.00	12.00	17.00	NA	71.00	83.00	86.00	87.00	NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	48.00	37.00	28.00	33.00	NA	33.00	21.00	21.00	26.00	NA					NA
7	41.00	44.00	41.00	46.00	NA	33.00	35.00	36.00	41.00	NA					NA
8	33.00	24.00	38.00	43.00	NA	41.00	39.00	46.00	51.00	NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **SHENANDOAH MIDDLE SCHOOL SHENANDOAH MIDDLE SCHOOL SHENANDOAH MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 83.12

SHENANDOAH 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	43.00	41.00	49.00	54.00	NA	34.00	38.00	43.00	48.00	NA	87.00	90.00	88.00	89.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC	43.00	41.00	48.00	53.00	NA	34.00	37.00	43.00	48.00	NA	86.00	90.00	88.00	89.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	42.00	40.00	49.00	54.00	NA	33.00	37.00	42.00	47.00	NA	85.00	89.00	86.00	87.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	16.00	19.00	26.00	31.00	NA	16.00	21.00	26.00	31.00	NA	52.00	63.00	56.00	57.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	52.00	46.00	53.00	58.00	NA	32.00	35.00	40.00	45.00	NA					
7	51.00	49.00	55.00	60.00	NA	36.00	33.00	42.00	47.00	NA					
8	32.00	30.00	38.00	43.00	NA	35.00	45.00	46.00	51.00	NA					
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 79.09

THOMAS JEFFERSON 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	26.00	22.00	34.00	39.00	NA	39.00	45.00	47.00	52.00	NA	87.00	89.00	81.00	82.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	24.00	21.00	34.00	39.00	NA	39.00	44.00	46.00	51.00	NA		89.00	80.00	81.00	NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	27.00	24.00	34.00	39.00	NA	40.00	45.00	46.00	51.00	NA		88.00	79.00	80.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	31.00		46.00	51.00	NA	18.00		47.00	52.00	NA		66.00			NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	0.00	0.00	37.00	42.00	NA	0.00	0.00	29.00	34.00	NA					NA
7	40.00	46.00	47.00	52.00	NA	41.00	54.00	48.00	53.00	NA					NA
8	20.00	14.00	29.00	34.00	NA	34.00	43.00	47.00	52.00	NA					NA
9	17.00	14.00	25.00	30.00	NA	41.00	40.00	55.00	60.00	NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 90.27

<b>W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	61.00	55.00	50.00	55.00	NA	48.00	47.00	49.00	54.00	NA	88.00	95.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	56.00	52.00	47.00	52.00	NA	41.00	40.00	45.00	50.00	NA	95.00	91.00	92.00	92.00	NA
HISPANIC	70.00	59.00	56.00	61.00	NA	63.00	60.00	58.00	63.00	NA	94.00				NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	59.00	56.00	49.00	54.00	NA	48.00	46.00	48.00	53.00	NA	95.00	92.00	93.00	93.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	52.00	39.00	36.00	41.00	NA	42.00	36.00	39.00	44.00	NA	94.00				NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES					NA					NA					NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3	67.00	53.00	60.00	65.00	NA	56.00	53.00	63.00	68.00	NA					NA
4	57.00	48.00	50.00	55.00	NA	52.00	48.00	46.00	51.00	NA					NA
5	55.00	67.00	39.00	44.00	NA	35.00	37.00	38.00	43.00	NA					NA
6					NA					NA					NA
7					NA					NA					NA
8					NA					NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: **88.99**

<b>WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>															
Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading				Percent Proficient in Mathematics						Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009 Targets	2008-2009 Outcomes
TOTAL	24.00	29.00	31.00	36.00	NA	21.00	27.00	32.00	37.00	NA	87.00	91.00	94.00	95.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	23.00	27.00	29.00	34.00	NA	19.00	25.00	31.00	36.00	NA	92.00	94.00	95.00	95.00	NA
HISPANIC	31.00	33.00	35.00	40.00	NA	26.00	33.00	40.00	45.00	NA	86.00				NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	24.00	28.00	30.00	35.00	NA	20.00	26.00	31.00	36.00	NA	90.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	11.00		13.00	18.00	NA	10.00				NA	60.00				NA
<b>Grade Level Data</b>															
K					NA					NA					NA
1					NA					NA					NA
2					NA					NA					NA
3					NA					NA					NA
4					NA					NA					NA
5					NA					NA					NA
6	34.00	38.00	30.00	35.00	NA	26.00	28.00	19.00	24.00	NA					NA
7	29.00	38.00	38.00	43.00	NA	19.00	35.00	37.00	42.00	NA					NA
8	14.00	17.00	22.00	27.00	NA	20.00	21.00	41.00	46.00	NA					NA
9					NA					NA					NA
10					NA					NA					NA
11					NA					NA					NA
12					NA					NA					NA

### School Achievement Data

1. School: **WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. SCHL WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. SCHL WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. SCHL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 96.02

WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. 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	37.00	41.00	44.00	49.00	NA	41.00	50.00	58.00	63.00	NA	90.00	91.00	91.00	92.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	36.00	32.00	43.00	48.00	NA	36.00	41.00	52.00	57.00	NA	91.00	92.00	84.00	85.00	NA
HISPANIC	38.00	48.00	45.00	50.00	NA	46.00	56.00	62.00	67.00	NA	91.00	89.00	96.00	97.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	38.00	41.00	45.00	50.00	NA	42.00	49.00	59.00	64.00	NA	90.00	90.00	90.00	91.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	29.00	38.00	28.00	33.00	NA	40.00	51.00	59.00	64.00	NA		91.00	97.00	98.00	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	16.00	29.00	23.00	28.00	NA	12.00	31.00	29.00	34.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	47.00	48.00	48.00	53.00	NA	40.00	57.00	73.00	78.00	NA					
4	36.00	36.00	44.00	49.00	NA	46.00	53.00	58.00	63.00	NA					
5	29.00	39.00	41.00	46.00	NA	39.00	37.00	44.00	49.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					
10					NA					NA					
11					NA					NA					
12					NA					NA					

## 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: 1

1. Over the past three school years, Intervene/Correct schools have had poorer ATTENDANCE than non-Title I schools.

2. 2005-06 87% of Intervene/Correct II schools below the non-Title I median (50%)

2006-07 88% (same)

2007-08 93% (same)

3. Target for 2008-09: 85% (same)

School-wide student attendance is a variable that is often overlooked as an interesting but meaningless statistic, however, the positive impact of good school attendance on academic achievement may be greater than historically thought (Roby, 2004, Johnston, 2000, Lamdin, 1996). High attendance rates are indicators of effective schools. There are two obvious and interrelated reasons why students may not do well in their courses- either they are not prepared for the academic work required or they are not coming to class and expending sufficient effort to do the requisite work. Given their low achievement, these are the students who most need to come to school, and they tend to attend the least often. There are likely additional reasons that absences and failures are so strongly related, for example, teachers' grading practices may incorporate absences or may be affected by them. Strictness or reward in assessing performance may go hand in hand with good or bad attendance. Additionally, student absences are caused by illnesses, personal or family problems, the need to work, etc., which are many of the variables prevalent in schools with high concentrations of students from low-income families. Students have better attendance records when parents are involved in homework and school. It is critical that students and their families perceive a school climate that demonstrates high levels of caring, attention, and of support of students as well as trust between teachers and students. The students frequently absent from school and their parents need interventions. It is proposed that in addition to the deployment of intervention and support teams to the schools that will assist to strengthen and align the curriculum and intensive tutorial programs, Social Workers, hired on a part-time basis, will conduct home visits to supplement the school's parental engagement efforts of Community Involvement Specialists and other school personnel to deliver appropriate counseling and social service intervention referrals. Services will focus on family-wide support and parental accountability to address truancy.

## Root Cause Analysis

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

For each Root Cause identified, provide the following:

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

### Root Cause: 1

The district has identified the infrequent use of disaggregated data as a root cause for low academic achievement. School accountability points are regressing as evidenced by students low achievement data. Resources from this grant will be used to hire an outside expert to provide staff professional development regarding how to read data and use it to target the specific core academic deficits of individual schools, classrooms, and students. The district's office of Professional Development and Educational Services will also provide professional development to guide teachers and administrators in the evaluation of student data and decision making to adjust instruction when necessary, based on the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and it's eight-step process. Substitute funds for FCIM training; and teacher stipends for data disaggregation and analysis trainings are included in this grant. The disaggregation of data by school, by classroom, by subject, by sub-group and by student will increase student improve instructional delivery which will increase student achievement by an anticipated 5% in Reading and Math; and 1% in Writing.

### Root Cause: 2

The district has identified the need to implement with fidelity a comprehensive instructional timeline as a root cause for low academic achievement. The lack of fidelity to the instructional timeline is evidenced by the students' movement of high achievement scores to low achievement scores. In order to address this root cause the district will implement a Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the elementary and secondary levels. At the elementary level the district will deploy Student Teacher Support Teams (ST2) at each school which will be composed of curriculum support specialists, psychologists, subject area coaches and teachers with expertise in core academic subjects; and will use the Rtl strategies at the secondary level. The ST2 Team is a problem-solving, data-driven leadership group that has been implemented to build support for identifying student needs quickly and making decisions based on that data, as well as delivering school site, job-embedded professional development. In addition to applying Rtl to academics, these strategies also address social/emotional and behavioral issues using data collection and data analysis. They will be used to ensure the delivery of the instructional timeline, interventions, instructional alignment and follow-up, at these school sites.

The ST2 teams in this grant, are composed of curriculum support specialists and teachers in the areas of reading, writing and math/science. Funds from this grant will be used to support and/or supplement an administrator, Rtl secondary instructors, and curriculum support specialists that will participate in the ST2 teams at the elementary level. The administrator will coordinate the reading, writing, mathematics and science, instructional alignment and delivery at the schools. This will support student achievement, through targeted instructional service, based on the analysis of data with the goal of improving achievement in Reading and Math by 5%; in Writing by 1%.

### Root Cause: 3

The district has identified the need to deliver greater focused benchmark lessons and administer mini-assessments of benchmarks as a root cause for low academic achievement. This is evidenced by the students movement from high achievement scores to low achievement scores. The ST2 Teams/Rtl instructors will implement the Instructional Focus Calendar, including strategies to address the weakest to the strongest benchmarks. The focused benchmark lessons will be meshed in instructional materials and delivered in the

classrooms. A streamlined, District-wide assessment program will provide regular progress monitoring of struggling students in grades K-12. Mini-assessments that are tied to the focused benchmark lessons and instructional materials will be delivered to determine mastery. This will support student achievement, through targeted benchmarks and assessments, thereby increasing the anticipated Reading, Math and Science scores by 5%; and Writing by 1%.

**Root Cause: 4**

The district has identified the need to enhance strategically focused, tutorials and enrichments for mastery and non-mastery students as a root cause for low academic achievement. This is evidenced by the students' movement from high achievement scores to low achievement scores, resulting in a regression of school accountability points. Based on the mini-assessments, mastery and non-mastery students will be provided strategically focused tutorials and enrichment experiences designed as part of the instructional materials program to improve academic achievement. Teachers will be provided professional development to improve their use of disaggregated data to support the effective delivery of strategically focused tutorials and enrichments. This will support student achievement, through targeted tutorials and enrichment, thereby increasing the anticipated Reading and Math scores by 5%; and Writing by 1%.

**Root Cause: 5**

The district has identified the need to elevate the monitoring of instructional delivery as a root cause for low academic achievement. This is evidenced by the students' movement from high achievement scores to low achievement scores, thus school accountability points are regressing.

The instructional leader of the school will constantly monitor the instructional delivery at the school through the implementation of the FCIM. The instructional leader of the school will be supported by ten district deployed Curriculum Support Teams (CST) each composed of three highly skilled, highly effective, curriculum specialists in the area of reading, writing, and mathematics/science. The CST will assist with the organization of professional learning communities (PLC) and will ensure their alignment with focused delivery models and teachers of targeted subgroups into lesson study groups (LSG). The CST's will also assist with the development and implementation of the instructional time line. Additionally, the district will implement a streamlined monitoring program of the instructional delivery. Through this grant the district's ST2 (Rtl model) for elementary schools; and using RTI strategies for secondary schools, will implement strategies that will focus on examining the schoolwide program by targeting the following areas: Data analysis; Literacy Block (Elementary Schools only); Intensive Reading Block (Secondary only); Intensive Reading Plus Block (Secondary only); Extended Learning Services; and Third Grade (Elementary only). Principals and schools will be monitored to determine how well they are meeting the requirements of the K-12 Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan, inclusive of the Sunshine State Standards and Benchmarks.

On-going progress monitoring through the implementation of the School Improvement Plans will be provided. This will support student achievement, through targeted monitoring of instructional delivery resulting in an increase of student achievement by 5% in Reading and Math; and by 1% in Writing.

**Root Cause: 6**

The district has identified the failure to implement with fidelity the FCIM as a root cause for low academic achievement. This is evidenced by the lack of curricular experiences among the leaders at the schools with these demographics, and the students' movement from high achievement scores to low achievement scores. Funds from this grant will support the delivery of the CIM training to all schools and staff by the district's office of Professional Development and Educational Services, thus ensuring FCIM's: Plan, Do, Check, and Act (PDCA), within the PDCA cycle. This will support student achievement, through delivery, by the anticipated 5% in Reading and Math; and 1% in Writing.

## 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 will provide professional development to all teachers and school level administrators in data analysis during the 2008-2009 school year as a means to ensure that the school leadership's team and school staff are engaged in the vital task of using data to drive instruction. Professional development activities will focus on the use of the Disaggregate, Assess, Review and Target (DART), 2007 model (9th Edition). The study of FCAT data through this tool will allow school staff to design, guide and focus on activities that will improve student achievement. School leadership teams will also acquire greater skill in comparing performance of student subgroups as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The comparative charts provided in the DART, 2007 model will be used to ensure that the school leadership team has a clear picture as to the academic performance of each subgroup and is prepared to implement immediate instructional changes and interventions for the identified subgroup.

Professional development will be provided by an outside expert from the state-approved listing to all schools regarding data disaggregation and analysis. Additional professional development activities will be offered by the district and FLDOE South Regional Center staff. The district and FLDOE South Regional Staff will coordinate these activities with the instructional program reviews in reading and mathematics that will be conducted three (3) times during the school year to ensure fidelity with implementation of the Comprehensive Researched-base Reading Plan and Comprehensive Math Plan. These reviews will be scheduled prior to the administration of the FCAT, with a focus on subgroups not meeting NCLB targets.

In addition, the district and FLDOE South Regional Staff will conduct training and oversee the implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), which is a quality-based approach that tracks student performance based on research, helps close the achievement gap between all racial and socioeconomic subgroups, and is performance driven. Implemented at all levels, the CIM approach treats students individually by assessing how much they are learning at regular intervals. Based on these assessments, students who have achieved the mastery level receive enrichment to challenge them further, while others receive remediation to bring their skills up to accepted standards.

The District will develop a strategic plan to deliver and sustain the FCIM training to all schools supported to this project. Information based on data analysis will be used to modify instruction and identify further professional development needs.

## 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	Deputy Supt., Operations, Mr. George Nunez	23 years experience: teacher; elem, middle, senior asst principal; elem principal; Regional Supt, temporary Deputy Supt.; Masters of Education in Ed Leadership
2	Regional Center Supts., Ms. Millie Fornell, Ms. Janet Hupp, Dr. Marcos Moran, Dr. Essie Pace	Masters Degree and certification in Ed Administration/Supervision. Progressively responsible administrative experiences that have included minimum of 3 years of school based, regional, or district administrative assignments.
3	Asst. Supt., Title I Administration, Dr. Magaly C. Abrahante	25 years experience: secondary teacher, secondary counselor, asst principal, Student Advocacy Supv, assistant principal; Civil Rights Officer; School Choice Administrator, Chief Personnel Officer. Doctor of Education in Ed Leadership
4	Asst. Supt., Curriculum and Instruction, Ms. Valtena Brown	21 years experience: teacher, counselor, middle asst principal, elem principal, Administrative Director, Instructional Support, Regional Adm Director, Curriculum & Instruction and Early Childhood Assistant Supt. Master of Science Psychology
5	Asst. Supt., Curriculum and Instruction, TBA	Master's degree in Education or related field, with certification in supervision and administration or educational leadership, or school principal.
6	Asst. Supt., Professional Development and Educational Services, Ms. Ava Byrne	30 years experience: teacher, Chief, Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention, FLDOE. Associate Supt, Professional Development, supervising special education and student services, M-DCPS. Master of Science in Early Childhood Education.
7	Adm. Dir., Assessment, Research and Data Analysis, Ms. Gisela Feild	25 yrs experience: data management, data analysis, assessment and research. Master of Science in Computer Science.
8	Student Teacher Support (ST2) Teams, TBA	Bachelors degree and certification in either elem ed, language arts, reading, english, math or science. Minimum 2 years exp with curriculum writing, professional development and/or leadership roles. Familiarity with major trends in instruction.
9	Curriculum Support Team, TBA ( hourly)	Bachelors degree and certification in either elem ed, language arts, reading, english, math or science. Minimum 2 years exp with curriculum writing, professional development and/or leadership roles. Familiarity with major trends in instruction.
10	Response to Intervention (Rtl) instructors	Bachelors degree and certification in either elem ed, language arts, reading, english, math or science. Minimum 2 years exp with curriculum writing, professional development and/or leadership roles. Familiarity with major trends in instruction.
11	Social Workers, TBA (hourly)	Masters degree in Social Work (preferred), and certification in school social work.
12	Teachers, TBA (hourly)	Highly qualified teachers
13	Interventionst linstructors, TBA (hourly)	Bachelors degree and certification in either elem ed, language arts, reading, english, math or science. Minimum 2 years exp with curriculum writing, professional development and/or leadership roles. Familiarity with major trends in instruction.
14	Adm. Secretary, TBA	Passed the M-DCPS Data test: filing, mathematics, memorandum format, 60 wpm, and 7 managerial inservice courses offered by the District
15	Clerical, TBA, (hourly)	Passed the M-DCPS Data test: accounting, 45 wpm
16	State Regional Director, State Riginal Center 5, FLDOE, Mr. Jeffrey Hernandez	Educator with proven track records of improving low performing schools.

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 District Support Team (DSP) will collaborate with the Office of Professional Development and Educational Services in order to design and deliver required training(s) that address deficiencies that caused individual project schools to be identified as “in need of improvement.” The DSP will monitor the delivery of the professional development activities in order to ensure alignment between the professional development activities and the individual schools’ School Improvement Plan. The DSP will provide support to administrators and teachers at all levels by ensuring school based professional development planning and implementation.

The District Support Team will collaborate with the district office of Accountability and Systemwide Performance, Office of School Quality Improvement, and Office of Professional Development in order to provide technical assistance to schools identified as Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI). The technical assistance activities to be provided will be aligned with the reasons each impacted school did not make AYP and will address the needs of the lowest performing students.

The District Support Team will conduct an analysis based on district-wide disaggregated student achievement data results (FCAT test data, SAT for students in grade 2, DIBELS, FLKRS, Grade 3 Student Reading Portfolio, CELLA, MAT7, IEP, Section 504 Plans and ELLP) to pinpoint instructional needs, identify skill gaps and deficiencies, establish school improvement plans, and determine professional development needs for schools.

The District will conduct an analysis of its performance based on the State’s Adequate Yearly Progress Report, State’s School Public Accountability Report (SPAR), State Individual School Report Cards, District FCAT Reports, District Accountability Report, cluster analysis of student standardized test data and district-

wide disaggregated student achievement data results (FCAT test data, SAT for students in grade 2, DIBELS, FLKRS, Grade 3 Student Reading Portfolio, CELLA, MAT7, IEP, Section 504 Plans and ELLP) to pinpoint instructional needs, identify skill gaps and deficiencies, establish District Assistance and Intervention Plans, and determine professional development needs for the District. The District Support Team will assist Educational Excellence School Advisory Committees (ESSAC) with analysis of student data.

The District Support Team will ensure that the core academic program is being implemented with fidelity by monitoring instruction at the school. The District Support Team will assist schools in their efforts to engage all stakeholders in efforts to ensure adequate yearly progress; and thereby leading to improved student achievement.

Members of the LEA Support Team identified in lines 1-7 and line 16 will meet as frequently as necessary, but not less than monthly, for a two-hour session. The other members of the LEA Support Team will be involved in the provision of direct services to students and will meet on an ongoing basis 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 District's Division of Language Arts/Reading works closely with schools in order to provide them with research-based instructional resources and strategies. The staff collaborates with the Professional Development office in order to design and deliver required training(s) pertaining to new instructional programs and research-based instructional practices to language arts, reading, and content area teachers, as well as school-site administrators.

The core reading program will consist of uninterrupted 90 minute blocks of instruction daily throughout the 180 day school year. Tutoring programs (before-school, after-school, and extended year) will occur weekly throughout the school year and provide an additional 30-60 minutes of intensive remedial instruction.

For all grades and reading levels, the District implements research-based instructional strategies that support the essential components of reading to increase student literacy. These strategies focus on strengthening students' phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and reading comprehension. Reading instructors are expected to follow the instructional framework that is a part of the Just Read, Florida Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan (CRRP) that recommends a systematic, explicit instructional delivery, emphasizing continuous scaffolding of learning opportunities for students. It is believed that the prescribed strategies will increase students' background knowledge prior to reading, promote active engagement with text during the reading process, and foster students' meta-cognitive skills.

The activities supported by this grant will enhance the District's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in reading by providing for an additional cadre of people with proven-effective expertise in the areas of reading and school improvement to assist school level leadership teams and teachers with the use of data analysis and targeted interventions. These individuals will also provide training on best practices in reading instruction to address the needs of the subpopulations of students who did not meet State proficiency target in reading.

Professional development for coaches, third and fourth grade teachers, are paid from the K-12 funds and provided by district or regional staff. Our collaborative partners include: Reading First Professional Developers (RFPD) from the University of Central Florida, providing on-site support and professional development to teachers and reading coaches in 88 Reading First Elementary schools; Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence (FLaRE) providing support and professional development to teachers and reading coaches in secondary schools; and Support is provided to elementary and secondary teachers from vendors of core reading programs including Houghton Mifflin, Voyager, Jamestown Reading Navigator, Hampton Brown Edge, and Language! by Sopris West.

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 District's Division of Mathematics and Science Education provides curriculum leadership and instructional support for the development of scientific and mathematical literacy to impact student achievement and to promote lifelong learning. Strategic goals are to:

- Improve the teaching and learning of mathematics so that all students are ensured an equitable standards-based education;
- Implement for every teacher of mathematics, a variety of professional development opportunities which are designed to enhance performance and produce systemic reform; and
- Promote parental involvement and community awareness of the district's comprehensive mathematics plan in order to assist with students' mathematics academia.

Curriculum and Instruction will target specific professional learning to develop school site mathematics learning communities.

The activities supported by this grant will enhance the District's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in mathematics by providing for an additional cadre of people with proven-effective expertise in the areas of mathematics and school improvement to assist school level leadership teams and teachers with the use of data analysis and targeted interventions. These individuals will also provide training on best practices in mathematics instruction to address the needs of the subpopulations of students who did not meet State proficiency target in mathematics.

Mathematics is part of the Florida Promise grant which does not specifically target these schools, but the teachers in these schools are benefitting from grant funded standards training. Also, some principals are attending the leadership training. There are no other state funded math programs.

Collaborative: Compass learning is providing its program in 14 middle schools as well as at Bunche Park and Comstock Elementary. Selected secondary schools have Carnegie Learning's cognitive tutor (algebra). All schools have access to Riverdeep and FCAT explorer. Carol City Middle is using Algebraic thinking.

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 District provides teachers and students with strategies that build students' writing skills, and include those which deal with promoting all stages of the writing process, including pre-writing, revising, drafting, and culminating in the publishing stage. Students are asked to write in multiple formats and for various purposes, while integrating creative writing instructional strategies such as Role, Audience, Format, and Topic (RAFT), which is a Creating Independence Through Student-Owned Strategies writing strategy. The RAFT strategy is utilized by students to understand the multifaceted role of the writer, who must always consider his/her audience, the format of the work, and the expected product. In addition to this, model papers are presented for students to emulate, while technology is often integrated into the writing process.

The district also trains teachers and students in the use of key instructional strategies that also include the use of cooperative learning and differentiated instruction as a means of addressing varying students' needs and levels.

The activities supported through this grant will enhance the district's current capacity to assist Title I students not achieving proficiency in writing by providing for an additional cadre of people with proven-effective expertise in the areas of writing and school improvement to assist school level leadership teams and teachers with the use of data analysis and targeted interventions. These individuals will also provide training on best practices in writing instruction to address the needs of the subpopulations of students who did not meet the State proficiency target in writing.

All writing activities including professional development for coaches, third and fourth grade teachers, are paid from the K-12 funds and provided by district or regional staff. Our collaborative partners include: Reading First Professional Developers (RFPD) from the University of Central Florida, providing on-site support and professional development to teachers and reading coaches in 88 Reading First Elementary schools; Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence (FLaRE) providing support and professional development to teachers and reading coaches in secondary schools; and Support is provided to elementary and secondary teachers from

vendors of core reading programs including Houghton Mifflin, Voyager, Jamestown Reading Navigator, Hampton Brown Edge, and Language! by Sopris West.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- BEL-AIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL
- BROADMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CARIBBEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY
- EDISON PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL
- FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM.
- GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL
- LIBERTY CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MAYA ANGELOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MYRTLE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ORCHARD VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHL
- PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL
- PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY
- WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. SCHL

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

- Indicator 1

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 3
- Root Cause 4
- Root Cause 5
- Root Cause 6

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** Response to Intervention (Fuchs and Fuchs, 1998; Gresham, 2002) has been proposed as a framework for prevention and early identification of learning disabilities that utilizes screening and progress monitoring of reading achievement to guide instruction and intervention. Evidence indicates significant gains in reading achievement and reductions in referrals of students to special education based on Rtl implementation (Canter, 2004; Ikeda et al., 1996; Marsten, Canter, Lau, & Muyskens, 2002). According to Batsche et al. (2005), "Rtl is an integrated approach to service delivery that encompasses general and special education." The multi-tiered system of service delivery inherent in Rtl relies on quality, research based reading instruction at Tier One and a seamless process of movement between tiers based on the analysis of student achievement data. Since Rtl has received the most attention in the special education literature, it is imperative that regular education personnel fully understand Rtl, as student movement between service delivery tiers requires efficient regular and special education collaboration. High quality professional development is critical to the successful implementation of Rtl (Batsche et al., 2005) and must include theory, demonstration, practice and feedback (Showers, 1984). Specific skills necessary to implement Rtl include connecting student achievement to Rtl data, and the use of technology in the collection and analysis of that data (Batsche et al., 2005). Furthermore, bringing Rtl to scale requires the commitment and collaboration of general education, professional development, school psychology and special education (Denton, Vaughn, & Fletcher, 2003). This is consistent with Miami-Dade's ST2 program which is a modified Rtl model in that it adds the job-embedded professional development component not usually inherent in the usual Rtl model; thus, combining intervention process strategies with a job-embedded response mechanism.

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:** A ST2 Team will provide services to each elementary school on a weekly basis for the duration of the 2008-2009 school year.

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

**Response:** The Deputy Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, Regional Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents listed in this grant will monitor implementation of the strategy and student progress. Additionally, administrative and support staff will monitor academic progress through school site visitations to evaluate the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The ST2 team will assist teachers with data collection; progress monitoring, appropriate interventions, and timely, targeted, job-embedded professional development.

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

**Response:** Utilizing the Continuous Improvement Model, the district will administer baseline benchmark assessments to measure students' initial level of achievement on the state's SSS in reading, mathematics, writing and science. The baseline assessments will immediately identify students' strengths and weaknesses in order to customize curricular programs to address students' specific needs.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Each school's leadership team will meet weekly through the end of the 2008-2009 school year, via grade level groups and subject area teams to review student performance patterns through progress monitoring of ongoing assessments and as needed to adjust the instructional program as required. Particular attention will be provided to progress monitoring results of subgroups as identified by the NCLB Act of 2001 and the targeted population of this grant. The actual schedule for progress monitoring assessments will be determined at each school.

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

**Response:** 1. The district will ensure services supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement Project grant expenditures as well as Title I Part A and local expenditures.

School Improvement Project funds will be placed in a separate program for the monitoring and documentation purposes. The DST will monitor the focus of services to ensure that the specific subgroups not making AYP receive supplemental services delineated in this project application.

2. Funds from the School Improvement Project grant will be used to train teachers in data analysis and best instructional practices. They will not be utilized for highly qualified teacher training, nor to assist in meeting teacher minimum qualification requirements in the core academic subjects. The district will ensure that the training of teachers supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement funds, Title I Part A, and local expenditures.

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

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

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

**Response:** The targeted population of this strategy are students scoring below proficiency in reading, mathematics, or writing on the Florida Comprehensive Test (FCAT) in Title I schools identified in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructurions.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- ASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER SCHOOL
- ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL
- BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH
- BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
- HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL
- JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL
- KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
- MIAMI SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL
- NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL
- REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL
- SHENANDOAH MIDDLE SCHOOL
- THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL
- WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 1

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 3
- Root Cause 4
- Root Cause 5
- Root Cause 6

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** Response to Intervention (Fuchs and Fuchs, 1998; Gresham, 2002) has been proposed as a framework for prevention and early identification of learning disabilities that utilizes screening and progress monitoring of reading achievement to guide instruction and intervention. Evidence indicates significant gains in reading achievement and reductions in referrals of students to special education based on RtI

implementation (Canter, 2004; Ikeda et al., 1996; Marsten, Canter, Lau, & Muyskens, 2002). According to Batsche et al. (2005), "Rtl is an integrated approach to service delivery that encompasses general and special education." The multi-tiered system of service delivery inherent in Rtl relies on quality, research based reading instruction at Tier One and a seamless process of movement between tiers based on the analysis of student achievement data. Since Rtl has received the most attention in the special education literature, it is imperative that regular education personnel fully understand Rtl, as student movement between service delivery tiers requires efficient regular and special education collaboration. High quality professional development is critical to the successful implementation of Rtl (Batsche et al., 2005) and must include theory, demonstration, practice and feedback (Showers, 1984). Specific skills necessary to implement Rtl include connecting student achievement to Rtl data, and the use of technology in the collection and analysis of that data (Batsche et al., 2005). Furthermore, bringing Rtl to scale requires the commitment and collaboration of general education, professional development, school psychology and special education (Denton, Vaughn, & Fletcher, 2003). This is consistent with Miami-Dade's ST2 program which is a modified Rtl model in that it adds the job-embedded professional development component not usually inherent in the usual Rtl model; thus, combining intervention process strategies with a job-embedded response mechanism.

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:** Rtl instructors will provide services to each secondary school on a weekly basis for the duration of the 2008-2009 school year.

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

**Response:** The Deputy Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, Regional Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents listed in this grant will monitor implementation of the strategy and student progress. Additionally, administrative and support staff will monitor academic progress through school site visitations to evaluate the implement of the School Improvement Plan. The Rtl model will assist teachers with data collection; progress monitoring, appropriate interventions, and timely, targeted, job-embedded professional development. The goal will be to develop a site-based culture for data analysis that links school staff needs and student achievement data to the application of instructional practices and professional growth.

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

**Response:** Utilizing the Continuous Improvement Model, the district will administer baseline benchmark assessments to measure students' initial level of achievement on the state's SSS in reading, mathematics, writing and science. The baseline assessments will immediately identify students' strengths and weaknesses in order to customize curricular programs to address students' specific needs.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** Each school's leadership team will meet weekly through the end of the 2008-2009 school year, via grade level groups and subject area teams to review student performance patterns through progress monitoring of ongoing assessments and as needed to adjust the instructional program as required. Particular attention will be provided to progress monitoring results of subgroups as identified by the NCLB Act of 2001 and the targeted population of this grant. The actual schedule for progress monitoring assessments will be determined at each school.

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

**Response:** 1. The district will ensure services supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement Project grant expenditures as well as Title I Part A and local expenditures.

School Improvement Project funds will be placed in a separate program for the monitoring and documentation purposes. The DST will monitor the focus of services to ensure that the specific subgroups not making AYP receive supplemental services delineated in this project application.

2. Funds from the School Improvement Project grant will be used to train teachers in data analysis and best

instructional practices. They will not be utilized for highly qualified teacher training, nor to assist in meeting teacher minimum qualification requirements in the core academic subjects. The district will ensure that the training of teachers supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement funds, Title I Part A, and local expenditures.

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

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

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

**Response:** The targeted population of this strategy are students scoring below proficiency in reading, mathematics, or writing on the Florida Comprehensive Test (FCAT) in Title I schools identified in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructurions.

## Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ASPIRA EUGENIO MARIA DE HOSTOS CHARTER SCHOOL
- ASPIRA YOUTH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL
- BEL-AIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEM. SCHOOL
- BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SR HIGH
- BROADMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CARIBBEAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL
- COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY
- EDISON PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEM. SCHOOL
- FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEM.
- GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
- HORACE MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL
- JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL
- KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL
- LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEM. SCHOOL
- LIBERTY CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MAYA ANGELOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MAYS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHL
- MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
- MIAMI SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL
- MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- MYRTLE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHL
- NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL
- ORCHARD VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHL
- PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL
- PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM. SCHOOL
- PINE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL
- SHENANDOAH MIDDLE SCHOOL
- THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL
- W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY

- WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL
- WILLIAM A. CHAPMAN ELEM. SCHL

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

- Indicator 1

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2
- Root Cause 3
- Root Cause 4
- Root Cause 5
- Root Cause 6

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

**Response:** Response to Intervention (Fuchs and Fuchs, 1998; Gresham, 2002) has been proposed as a framework for prevention and early identification of learning disabilities that utilizes screening and progress monitoring of reading achievement to guide instruction and intervention. Evidence indicates significant gains in reading achievement and reductions in referrals of students to special education based on Rtl implementation (Canter, 2004; Ikeda et al., 1996; Marsten, Canter, Lau, & Muyskens, 2002). According to Batsche et al. (2005), "Rtl is an integrated approach to service delivery that encompasses general and special education." The multi-tiered system of service delivery inherent in Rtl relies on quality, research based reading instruction at Tier One and a seamless process of movement between tiers based on the analysis of student achievement data. Since Rtl has received the most attention in the special education literature, it is imperative that regular education personnel fully understand Rtl, as student movement between service delivery tiers requires efficient regular and special education collaboration. High quality professional development is critical to the successful implementation of Rtl (Batsche et al., 2005) and must include theory, demonstration, practice and feedback (Showers, 1984). Specific skills necessary to implement Rtl include connecting student achievement to Rtl data, and the use of technology in the collection and analysis of that data (Batsche et al., 2005). Furthermore, bringing Rtl to scale requires the commitment and collaboration of general education, professional development, school psychology and special education (Denton, Vaughn, & Fletcher, 2003). This is consistent with Miami-Dade's ST2 program which is a modified Rtl model in that it adds the job-embedded professional development component not usually inherent in the usual Rtl model; thus, combining intervention process strategies with a job-embedded response mechanism.

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 CST will provide services to elementary and secondary schools on a weekly basis for the duration of the 2008-2009 school year.

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

**Response:** The Deputy Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, Regional Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents listed in this grant will monitor implementation of the strategy and student progress. Additionally, administrative and support staff will monitor academic progress through school site visitations to evaluate the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The team will assist teachers with data collection; progress monitoring, appropriate interventions, and timely, targeted, job-embedded professional development.

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

**Response:** The CST will provide progress monitoring and data analysis to determine effectiveness of instruction and identify needed resources through Diebels, S-RUSS, SAT 10th Edition. The district will use additional screening and diagnostic assessment such as the DRA.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

**Response:** These district assessments will occur at the end of January 2009 and mid April 2009, with the interim being administered in November 2008.

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

**Response:** 1. The district will ensure services supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement Project grant expenditures as well as Title I Part A and local expenditures.

School Improvement Project funds will be placed in a separate program for the monitoring and documentation purposes. The DST will monitor the focus of services to ensure that the specific subgroups not making AYP receive supplemental services delineated in this project application.

2. Funds from the School Improvement Project grant will be used to train teachers in data analysis and best instructional practices. They will not be utilized for highly qualified teacher training, nor to assist in meeting teacher minimum qualification requirements in the core academic subjects. The district will ensure that the training of teachers supplement existing services through the monitoring of School Improvement funds, Title I Part A, and local expenditures.

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

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

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

**Response:** The targeted population of this strategy are students scoring below proficiency in reading, mathematics, or writing on the Florida Comprehensive Test (FCAT) in Title I schools identified in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructurions.

## Dissemination/Marketing

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

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

**Response:** This application will be disseminated and marketed through staff meetings, parent meetings, Educational Excellence School Advisory Meetings (EESAC), PTA/PTSA Meetings, the M-DCPS parent webpage and will be available at Project schools. Additionally, the quarterly Title I District Advisory Council (DAC) meetings and Title I Regional Center Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings (twice in each of the four Regions in the district), will include information regarding this project on their agendas, and handouts. The Title I Newsletter for Parents, published quarterly, and disseminated to parents in hardcopy and online, is an additional venue for Title I parents and stakeholders to receive information about the activities and services from this grant. Parents are given an opportunity to provide feedback and have comments addressed regarding the schoolwide plans at monthly EESAC Meetings, as well as, PTA Meetings.

Additionally, The District's Office of Assessment, Research and Data Analysis generates and distributes to schools hard copies of the Individual Student Report for FCAT Writing+, FCAT SSS, FCAT NRT, and CELLA (for ELLs). These reports are sent home to parents by the schools. The format and content of the report is generated by the FLDOE. In addition, FCAT SSS results are available to parents via the M-DCPS' Parent Portal.

The District website will provide information about the activities funded through this grant 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.

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

Information about the activities funded through this grant will be provided in the monthly newsletter (at schools that publish them) after the approval of the application. This notification will address parents, staff, and students. This will be a one time notification through this method.

Educational Excellence School Advisory Meetings (EESAC)- Information on the application will be provided to EESACs. The EESACs will be notified upon approval of the application and receive monthly updates for the remainder of the school year on progress toward meeting student achievement goals.

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

## Budget

- A. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: **Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]**
- B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **Dade**
- 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	144	Teacher (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	14.0	656748.00
2	5100	210	Retirement (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	160453.00
3	5100	220	Social Security (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	122014.00
4	5100	240	Workman Compensation (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	44021.00
5	6300	137	Clerk (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	1.0	50000.00
6	6300	210	Retirement (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	5030.00
7	6300	220	Social Security Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	3825.00
8	6300	232	Insurance (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	5885.00
9	6300	240	Workman Compensation (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	1380.00
10	6300	390	Printing & Duplicating (Strategy 1, & 2)	0.0	25000.00
11	6300	510	Supplies (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	10007.89
12	5100	150	Hourly Teacher (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	20.0	855822.00
13	5100	230	Insurance (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	82390.00
Total					2022575.89

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: **Dade**
- 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	136	Teacher Stipends (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	700.0	70000.00
2	5100	149	Temporary Instructors/Subs (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	833.0	99960.00
3	5100	150	Hourly Teacher (Strategy 3)	8.0	373536.00
4	5100	311	P&T FL CIM, Expert; Data analysis (Strategy 1 & 2)	0.0	75000.00
5	5100	510	Supplies (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	225750.69
6	5100	691	Capitalized Software (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	149365.00
7	5100	692	Non-Capitalized Software (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	121078.00
8	6300	114	Asst Supt, Curr & Instr (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.8	127930.00
9	6300	150	Hourly Clerk (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.3	16602.00
10	6140	135	Psychologists (Strategy 3)	2.0	128000.00
11	6300	168	Curriculum Specialists (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	32.0	2048000.00
12	5100	210	Retirement (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	54676.00
13	5100	220	Social Security (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	41578.00
14	5100	240	Workman Compensation (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	15001.00
15	6300	210	Retirement - (\$14,539 Adm.) (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	220569.00
16	6300	220	Social Security - (\$11,056 Adm.) (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	167729.00
17	6300	232	Insurance - (\$5,885 Adm.) (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	194205.00
18	6300	240	Workers Comp- (\$3,989 Adm.) (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	60514.00
19	6140	210	Retirement (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	12877.00
20	6140	220	Social Security (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	9792.00
21	6140	232	Insurance (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	11770.00
22	6140	240	Workman Compensation (Strategy 1, 2, & 3)	0.0	3533.00
23	5100	312	PD FL CIM; Expert; Data analysis (Strategy 1, & 2)	0.0	133286.00
Total					4360751.69

DOE 101



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

