
Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants ST. LUCIE

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:

1. 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;
2. applicable regulations of other Federal agencies; and
3. 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

Return to: 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	A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant: ST. LUCIE 4204 OKEECHOBEE RD FORT PIERCE, FL 34947	<u>DOE USE ONLY</u> Date Received
B) Applicant Contact Information:		
Contact Name: First Name: Mary MI: Last Name: Krause	Mailing Address: 4204 Okeechobee Road Ft. Pierce, FL 34947	
*Telephone Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx): 772-429-5530 Ext:		
Fax Number (xxx-xxx-xxxx): 772-429-5531	E-mail Address: krausem@stlucie.k12.fl.us	
C) ProgramName (1) 2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]	C) ProgramName (1) 2008-2009 Title I School Improvement Fund [1003(g)]	
Project Number: (DOE Assigned)	Project Number: (DOE Assigned)	
D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: \$301467.38	D) Total Funds Requested: Allocation: \$418154.27	
Total Approved Funds: (DOE USE ONLY) \$	Total Approved Funds: (DOE USE ONLY) \$	

CERTIFICATION

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

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

E) _____
Signature of Agency Head

DOE 100B

Revised 12/07



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

School Achievement Data

1. School: **CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 91.13

CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
TOTAL	53.00	45.00	47.00	53.00	NA	44.00	30.00	44.00	50.00	NA	93.00	95.00	95.00	90.00	NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK	48.00	42.00	40.00	46.00	NA	32.00	21.00	31.00	38.00	NA	95.00	94.00	95.00	95.00	NA
HISPANIC	50.00	50.00	54.00	59.00	NA	45.00	38.00	62.00	66.00	NA	94.00				NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	50.00	44.00	48.00	54.00	NA	40.00	29.00	44.00	50.00	NA	92.00	94.00	94.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	48.00	37.00	43.00	48.00	NA	47.00	26.00	53.00	58.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES		26.00	24.00	32.00	NA		26.00	41.00	47.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	60.00	43.00	52.00	58.00	NA	51.00	29.00	48.00	53.00	NA					
4	51.00	43.00	42.00	49.00	NA	47.00	38.00	48.00	53.00	NA					
5	46.00	56.00	45.00	51.00	NA	30.00	21.00	34.00	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: **DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR** **DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 80.23

DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
TOTAL	21.00	8.00	9.00	20.00	NA	8.00	0.00	21.00	31.00	NA					NA
WHITE					NA					NA					NA
BLACK					NA					NA					NA
HISPANIC					NA					NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	21.00	6.00			NA	9.00	0.00	23.00	31.00	NA					NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	21.00	8.00	9.00	20.00	NA	8.00	0.00	21.00	31.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3					NA					NA					
4					NA					NA					
5					NA					NA					
6					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: **LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 76.93

LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
TOTAL	59.00	53.00	59.00	65.00	NA	49.00	47.00	60.00	68.00	NA	84.00	92.00	93.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	64.00	61.00	60.00	65.00	NA	58.00	55.00	63.00	68.00	NA	93.00	92.00	93.00	93.00	NA
BLACK	48.00	47.00	64.00	65.00	NA	37.00	39.00	57.00	68.00	NA	88.00				NA
HISPANIC	63.00	44.00	51.00	65.00	NA	52.00	42.00	60.00	68.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	53.00	46.00	58.00	65.00	NA	43.00	42.00	57.00	68.00	NA	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	54.00	43.00	45.00	65.00	NA	52.00	40.00	50.00	68.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES			30.00	65.00	NA			35.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	69.00	55.00	63.00	65.00	NA	64.00	60.00	73.00	74.00	NA					
4	56.00	53.00	54.00	65.00	NA	53.00	51.00	52.00	68.00	NA					
5	52.00	51.00	60.00	65.00	NA	32.00	30.00	53.00	68.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					

10	NA	NA
11	NA	NA
12	NA	NA

School Achievement Data

1. School: **LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 79.82

LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-	2006-	2007-	2008-	2008-	2005-	2006-	2007-	2008-	2008-	2005-	2006-	2007-	2008-	2008-
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
TOTAL	62.00	65.00	61.00	65.00	NA	60.00	64.00	62.00	67.00	NA	91.00	96.00	94.00	95.00	NA
WHITE	75.00	78.00	80.00	82.00	NA	71.00	72.00	75.00	76.00	NA	94.00				NA
BLACK	47.00	52.00	49.00	55.00	NA	44.00	51.00	55.00	60.00	NA		90.00	90.00	90.00	NA
HISPANIC	66.00	66.00	58.00	62.00	NA	66.00	69.00	59.00	63.00	NA	93.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	55.00	60.00	56.00	60.00	NA	54.00	60.00	59.00	63.00	NA	96.00	93.00	94.00	94.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	29.00	35.00	25.00	33.00	NA	33.00	29.00	34.00	41.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	72.00	69.00	61.00	65.00	NA	65.00	76.00	66.00	68.00	NA					
4	67.00	61.00	62.00	65.00	NA	76.00	59.00	68.00	68.00	NA					
5	49.00	66.00	58.00	62.00	NA	40.00	54.00	47.00	54.00	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: **ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 86.10

ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
TOTAL	66.00	48.00	54.00	59.00	NA	58.00	42.00	55.00	60.00	NA	83.00	87.00	93.00	94.00	NA
WHITE	70.00	63.00	62.00	65.00	NA	66.00	50.00	58.00	62.00	NA					NA
BLACK	59.00	37.00	45.00	51.00	NA	39.00	32.00	45.00	51.00	NA		92.00	93.00		NA
HISPANIC	60.00	49.00	57.00	61.00	NA	56.00	49.00	63.00	67.00	NA		93.00	93.00	94.00	NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	58.00	43.00	53.00	58.00	NA	51.00	38.00	54.00	59.00	NA		88.00	93.00	94.00	NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	51.00	45.00	43.00	49.00	NA	50.00	47.00	61.00	65.00	NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	17.00	15.00	27.00	34.00	NA	18.00	17.00	38.00	44.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	76.00	45.00	56.00	61.00	NA	74.00	45.00	63.00	67.00	NA					
4	56.00	50.00	53.00	58.00	NA	51.00	51.00	53.00	58.00	NA					
5	63.00	49.00	52.00	57.00	NA	46.00	29.00	46.00	52.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					

10	NA	NA
11	NA	NA
12	NA	NA

School Achievement Data

1. School: **WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 89.06

WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Academic Indicators	Percent Proficient in Reading					Percent Proficient in Mathematics					Percent Proficient in Writing				
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes	Targets				Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009
TOTAL	66.00	47.00	48.00	65.00	NA	52.00	38.00	48.00	68.00	NA	80.00	71.00	89.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	70.00	53.00	59.00	65.00	NA	62.00	48.00	62.00	68.00	NA	74.00				NA
BLACK	55.00	38.00	43.00	65.00	NA	32.00	22.00	37.00	68.00	NA			92.00	93.00	NA
HISPANIC		40.00	42.00	65.00	NA		33.00	56.00	68.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	60.00	40.00	45.00	65.00	NA	47.00	30.00	45.00	68.00	NA	64.00	90.00	90.00		NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS					NA					NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	32.00	16.00	25.00	65.00	NA	32.00	17.00	41.00	68.00	NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	66.00	42.00	49.00	54.00	NA	53.00	38.00	61.00	67.00	NA					
4	74.00	43.00	51.00	56.00	NA	69.00	39.00	44.00	49.00	NA					
5	60.00	56.00	43.00	47.00	NA	37.00	36.00	36.00	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: **WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
2. Percent poverty of school as shown on the 2008-2009 Project Application's Public School Eligibility Survey: 84.74

WHITE 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	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
					Targets Outcomes					Targets Outcomes					Targets Outcomes
	2006	2007	2008	2009		2006	2007	2008	2009		2006	2007	2008	2009	
TOTAL	62.00	50.00	52.00	57.00	NA	64.00	48.00	47.00	53.00	NA	78.00	81.00	85.00	90.00	NA
WHITE	75.00	63.00	80.00	81.00	NA	77.00	73.00	65.00	69.00	NA					NA
BLACK	38.00	34.00	38.00	42.00	NA	35.00	27.00	35.00	42.00	NA					NA
HISPANIC	54.00	48.00	47.00	53.00	NA	58.00	40.00	47.00	53.00	NA					NA
ASIAN					NA					NA					NA
AMERICAN INDIAN					NA					NA					NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	52.00	44.00	47.00	51.00	NA	52.00	40.00	45.00	51.00	NA	78.00	83.00	90.00		NA
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS			23.00	44.00	NA		39.00	44.00		NA					NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	11.00	17.00	39.00		NA	15.00	23.00	31.00		NA					NA
Grade Level Data															
K					NA					NA					
1					NA					NA					
2					NA					NA					
3	71.00	42.00	52.00	68.00	NA	74.00	42.00	58.00	65.00	NA					
4	59.00	46.00	50.00	68.00	NA	72.00	54.00	45.00	65.00	NA					
5	57.00	63.00	54.00	68.00	NA	48.00	49.00	37.00	65.00	NA					
6					NA					NA					
7					NA					NA					
8					NA					NA					
9					NA					NA					

10	NA	NA
11	NA	NA
12	NA	NA

Optional Performance Indicators

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

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

Indicator: 0

Root Cause Analysis

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

For each Root Cause identified, provide the following:

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

Root Cause: 1

Each of the schools targeted for assistance by this grant have very high numbers of students from low socio-economic backgrounds. The percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch at these schools ranges from a low of 77% to a high of 92%. The percentage of minority students at these schools ranges from a low of 62% to a high of 94%. Research has shown that students from deprived backgrounds have underdeveloped vocabularies, lack fluency in reading and struggle with comprehension. According to an article by Douglas N. Harris published in the American Journal of Education (2007), Vol. 113, n. 3, pp. 367-394: "In debates about accountability, advocates often point to individual "high flying" schools that achieve high test scores despite serving disadvantaged populations. Using a near-census of U.S. public schools, this new analysis considers the likelihood that schools become high flyers. The results suggest that of the more than 60,000 schools considered, low-poverty schools are 22 times more likely to reach consistently high academic achievement compared with high-poverty schools. Schools serving student populations that are both low-poverty and low-minority are 89 times more likely to be consistently high performing compared with high-poverty, high-minority schools." Low performing students from disadvantaged backgrounds are at increased risk of falling behind due to the amount of learning gains required for them to achieve proficiency as compared to subgroups that already meet AYP targets. Increased instructional time is supported in research as an effective strategy that affords opportunity for intensive interventions for increased academic success. Each of the targeted schools will offer additional tutorial time in order to produce high yield results for the identified AYP groups. Providing more instructional time in the form of after-school intensive tutorials will increase student achievement by an anticipated 5-10%.

Root Cause: 2

Lack of transportation for students attending after-school, Saturday, or summer school programs is another root cause. Often the very students who need additional instructional support are the same students who can not participate due to transportation issues. Therefore, transportation will be provided at those schools in need of it in order to maximize participation in the after-school, Saturday, or summer school programs offered. This will enhance the additional instructional time root cause strategy and therefore support increased student achievement. Providing transportation for after-school intensive tutorials will increase student achievement by an anticipated 5-10%.

Root Cause: 3

A third root cause is insufficient time for professional development and instructional planning. Teachers often do not have the skills to differentiate instruction for subgroups of students in order to be supportive of their specific learning needs. If schools are to maximize the academic progress of students from low socio-economic backgrounds, then all teachers of these students need to be accomplished in

implementing effective instructional strategies for this subgroup. Providing teachers with substitutes and/or stipends for additional after school hours so that they can participate in targeted professional development, joint planning of lessons, developing common assessments, and reviewing data to determine effective instruction will address this root cause and increase student achievement in this subgroup by an anticipated 5-10%.

Root Cause: 4

Lack of formal evaluation of district programs may foster continuation of ineffective programs which contribute to low student achievement. Many different initiatives have been implemented in the district over the years, but very few have been thoroughly evaluated. Identifying the cause of low academic achievement is vital to developing an action plan to address it. To continue to implement programs without valid evaluation is contrary to the principals of data-driven instruction and may result in funneling scarce resources into ineffective programs instead of utilizing district dollars to support programs with proven results that have been verified by formal evaluation.

District FCAT scores in math were analyzed and determined to be well below acceptable standards. To address this, a new math program was implemented as part of the Title I restructuring plan during school year 2007-2008. Teachers received professional development to support this initiative during spring and summer of 2008. They are participating in ongoing professional development via Math Coaches and consultants during school year 2008-2009 as they implement this new initiative. A formal evaluation of this math initiative will inform district administration as to its effectiveness in raising student achievement.

Data Analysis during Project Period

Describe the process the district will have in place during the project period to analyze student achievement and program outcome data.

Your response must include the following:

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

Response: The district provided these schools with Data Flow training from Pearson Solutions during school year 2007-2008. A consultant with the Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education, Mark Rolewski, has been hired for the 2008-2009 school year to work with the leadership teams of the identified schools on a monthly basis. This monthly training, along with site visits will increase the knowledge of the leadership teams regarding data analysis and teacher use of data. The St. Lucie County School District also provides data analysis training to assistant principals on a monthly basis through the Accountability and Assessment Department.

The district administers quarterly Benchmark tests to all students in grades 3-10. This data is input into a district electronic data base that can be accessed by all teachers at their desktop. The data can be drilled down to individual students, and teachers have received training on how to use this data to differentiate instruction. Schools have also developed mini-assessments that are used weekly to track progress. Utilizing the information gathered from assessments, data can be analyzed daily, weekly and quarterly to provide teachers with the information needed to drive their instruction. Schools in corrective action, restructuring and school improvement have their data analyzed by the district on a quarterly basis. The data analysis drives instruction, drills down to the needs of the individual student, and provides a road map for instruction for teachers. St. Lucie County has been administering the Benchmark tests for four years.

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	Mary Krause, Executive Director of School Renewal: Title I, Title III and Migrant	34 years experience in education; B.S. degree from Univ. of LA; Masters in Ed. Leadership, FAU. Experience: Director of Sch. Improvement; Exe. Director of Teaching and Learning; and Exe. Director of School Renewal, Title I, Title III and Migrant.
2	Owen Roberts, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Accountability, and Assessment	29 years experience in education; B.S. Northern Caribbean Univ.; M.A. Andrews University.; M.S. Nova Southeast University; Ph.D, University of Miami; Exe. Dir. of Accountability & Assessment; Asst. Supt. of Curriculum, Accountability, and Assessment
3	Christine Kerstyn, Director of Accountability and Assessment	34 years experience in education; B.A. from Northeastern Illinois University; M.S. from University of South Florida; Ph.D from University of South Florida; Director of Accountability and Assessment
4	Karlheinz Haas, Director of Curriculum/School Improvement	27 years experience in education; M.S. in Secondary Education/Science University of Heidelberg, Germany; M. S. in Physics, University of Heidelberg, Germany; Director of Curriculum/School Improvement
5	Genelle Yost, Area Assistant Superintendent supervising Title I Schools	33 years experience in education; B.S. Ed from Univ. of FL; M.A. Ed from Florida Atlantic Univ.; administrative experience includes: Asst. ESE Director; Principal of an ESE Center, Magnet School and Title I middle school; and Area Asst. Supt.

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 St. Lucie County support team will meet monthly to review school progress toward reform model implementation. Schools will be visited monthly by team members and classroom walkthroughs will be used to document observations. Interviews will be conducted by support team members and the consultants who are hired to work with the schools' leadership team and teachers. School visits will be random and on a varied schedule so that team members may make observations and conduct interviews throughout the day.

Check list will include:

- School leader is highly visible in classrooms daily
- Formative student assessment data is being used to drive instruction weekly
- Summative student assessment data is being used to make curriculum decisions quarterly
- Priority areas have been identified for instructional focus in restructuring plans
- Professional development is targeted to teacher need as reflected in Individual Professional Development Plans yearly
- Professional development is targeted to subject areas identified for instructional improvement and teachers of subgroup populations which would include reading, writing and mathematics.
- Curriculum alignment with state standards has been done
- Students are engaged in the learning process
- Project-based activities are taking place
- Instruction is being differentiated
- Reviews of attendance data monthly
- Reviews of discipline data monthly
- Reading Coach /Math Coach are being used only for professional development and modeling in the classroom weekly

As part of the process described above, the LEA Support Team will specifically monitor tutorials in the following way:

1. The Curriculum Director along with his writing specialist will do site visits and monitor the implementation of the writing program. They will visit on a weekly basis and do fidelity checks.
2. The Director of Assessment will provide district writing prompts and the student data will be analyzed to determine the progress of the students from the pre prompt to the final prompt.
3. The Title I Director will monitor teacher quality, attendance, budget and overall implementation of the tutorials.
4. Reports will be made to the District Advisory Council at their monthly meetings by the schools on student progress.

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 has provided Reading Coaches at every school who support teachers in the classroom with coaching, modeling, and strategies to improve instruction. The district has provided needed professional development during the summer with follow up continuous support throughout the year. Benchmark testing is done on a quarterly basis with results being available to the desktop of the classroom teacher. Training in data analysis has enabled teachers to use data to identify specific needs of individual students and to drive instruction accordingly.

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 has revised the mathematics curriculum to align with the new Florida Math Standards. Training in a new math program took place twice during the summer with follow up professional development days in September, October and November. Math Coaches are provided to do modeling, coaching and planning strategies to improve student achievement in math.

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: A new writing scope and sequence has been developed, and training on this scope and sequence took place in July, 2008. A district writing specialist provides continual training and on-site visits to school to help teachers understand how to teach the writing process as well as how to utilize rubrics and scoring with rubrics to improve student writing. Schools have hired consultants who have also provided support for writing in the schools. The district developed writing prompts (pre, quarterly and post) for schools to utilize to measure their progress.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Foundations includes the essential components of reading instruction and is incorporated into Reading First grants as a supplemental or early intervention program. The Florida Center for Reading Research, one of three federally-funded Reading First technical centers, conducted a review of Foundations and its effectiveness. The analysis confirmed the alignment with reading research and noted no weaknesses in the program.

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

Response: Tutoring will occur 5 days per week for 1 hour daily after school starting the week of January 7, 2009 and continuing through May 30, 2009.

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

Response: The Assistant Principal, Tamyra DiFruscio will be in charge of monitoring for fidelity of implementation.

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

Response: DIEBELS, SRI, and the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams will be the tools used to measure student progress.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will occur at the end of each nine week marking period.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

The district does not provide afterschool transportation. However, some Title I schools utilize part of their Title I allocation for existing after school programs. The afterschool tutorials described in this application are new programs.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted population is the lowest 25% of K-3 students enrolled at the school.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Wilson Foundations includes the essential components of reading instruction and is incorporated into Reading First grants as a supplemental or early intervention program. The Florida Center for Reading Research, one of three federally-funded Reading First technical centers, conducted a review of Foundations and its effectiveness. The analysis confirmed the alignment with reading research and noted no weaknesses in the program.

Kagan Structures transform how content is taught without changing what is taught. Kagan Structures are consistent with a range of educational theories. Schools adopting Kagan Structures demonstrate positive results as measured by teacher testimonials, student statements, and empirical studies. The Kagan Structures align instruction with how the brain best learns implementing the essence of both cooperative learning and multiple intelligences philosophies and methods. Kagan Structures replace an over-reliance on traditional teacher-centered instructional methods with the world's largest array of engaging student-centered instructional strategies.

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: Wilson Reading Foundations - 1 day during the week of January 1, 2009.

Kagan Strategies - 3 days starting the week of January 7, 2009 and ending on or before the week of May 30, 2009

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

Response: The Assistant Principal, Tamyra DiFruscio will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

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

Response: DIEBELS, SRI, and the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams will be the progress monitoring tools.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Monitoring will occur at the end of each nine week marking period.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The Wilson Foundations and Kagan Structures are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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

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

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

Response: Wilson Foundations - Teachers of grades PK-2 and ESE teachers

Kagan Strategies - Teachers of grades PK-5, ESE teachers, and resource teachers

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Soar to Success is a research based K-8 program, recognized by the Florida Center for Reading Research and selected by educators as a highly effective text-based reading intervention. The program provides systematic instruction in reading, introducing letter sounds and decoding strategies for early learners, and includes a rich selection of fiction, nonfiction and other genres to reinforce critical skills.

SuccessMaker is used by educators in over 16,000 schools in the U.S. and 1,500 schools abroad to support classroom instruction and increase student achievement. With strong bases of both underlying and effectiveness research, SuccessMaker provides individualized, targeted instruction to help every student reach their greatest potential. SuccessMaker has been proven to work.

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: Intensive tutorials will take place 2 days per week for 2 hours after school starting January 7, 2009 and ending on or before May 30, 2009.

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

Response: Roseanne Shepherd will be the onsite project coordinator.

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

Response: The progress monitoring tool will be the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will take place bi-monthly and quarterly.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different

times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

The district does not provide afterschool transportation. However, some Title I schools utilize part of their Title I allocation for existing afterschool programs. The after school tutorials described in this application are new programs.

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

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

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

Response: Grade 3-5 students who scored at Level 1 or Level 2 on the FCAT will be the targeted population.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: The Kathryn Robinson WriteMath program is research based and aligned with Florida Sunshine State Standards. Tracking data compiled from open sources of the Florida Dept of Education indicate that schools across Florida using the Kathryn Robinson program have increased writing achievement. Six of those schools (Cypress Creek, Floral Avenue, Oscar J. Pope, Riverside/Anna Woodbury, Gause Riverside, and Wahneta Elementary Schools) are especially significant because they represent the 'toughest' schools to affect change – as measured in all commonly used

categories - demographics, turnover stats, English speakers, family income, and past test scores. All six have used Kathryn Robinson materials for three years or more. All six were rated 'D' or worse in 1999 and preceding years. By 2003 all but one of the six schools - Lewis Anna Woodbury -was rated 'A'. Significant increases in the percentage of students scoring above 3.0 and 4.0 occurred in every school. In 2004, all but one of the schools – Oscar Pope at 86%-continued to attain 90% levels and above of their students achieving high standards in writing. It should also be noted that each of these schools has met and, in most cases, greatly exceeded statewide averages each year. In addition to the preceding, the DOE 2006 published list of the Top 100 Schools with the most improvement in FCAT writing over the 2005 school year, includes 25 schools that utilized the Kathryn Robinson program.

The 6+1 Trait(R) Writing Model of Instruction and Assessment, developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, is research-based and proven effective. It will be used with the 6-8 grade students.

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 intensive tutorials will take place 3 days per week for 1.5 hours each day afterschool beginning January 7, 2009 and continuing until February 26, 2009.

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

Response: Larry Brashear, principal, along with Peggy Martin, classroom teacher, will be in charge of monitoring implementation

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

Response: Student portfolio assessment will be used to measure student progress. Monitoring student progress through portfolio assessment is beneficial in order to provide for differentiation in writing. Portfolios lend themselves well to conferencing with individual students. Students may return to former pieces to revise and edit before publishing. Building on the writing process is essential to developing a comprehensive writing curriculum that meets the needs of a diverse population of students. The portfolio also assists teachers in conferencing with parents in regard to student progress.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will take place weekly by evaluation of student portfolios.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted population will be students who scored in the lowest 25% on the FCAT in Writing.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Thinking Maps in one form or another have been around since the research of Dr. Albert Upton who wrote "Designs for Thinking" in 1941. Extensive research has been done in the last 50 years documenting Thinking Maps as an effective strategy for teaching a common visual language for learning within and across disciplines. David Hyerle is the most recent advocate and published a dissertation in 1994 presenting test results that show that Thinking Maps significantly affect standardized and qualitative measures of student performance.

Data analysis as a tool for instructional planning is a time tested strategy that has significantly increased since the advent of AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. Unfortunately teachers rarely have time during the instructional day to set aside for this activity. Providing substitutes to allow teachers time during the school day will greatly enhance their ability to use data to effectively drive their instruction.

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: Thinking Map training will occur on one day for 6 hours during the month of April, 2009.

Data analysis to drive instructional planning will take place for 2 hours per month for each grade level starting in January, 2009 and continuing through May, 2009. Substitutes will be provided during the school day for teachers to participate in the analysis and planning sessions.

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

Response: The principal, Michael Hitsman will be in charge of monitoring these strategies.

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

Response: St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams will be the tool used to track student progress.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring with Benchmark Exams will be at the end of each nine week marking period. Mini-assessments will be used as needed throughout the year.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The Thinking Map training will be in addition to already scheduled training. The embedded data analysis and instructional training using substitutes to free up teacher time during the school day is not currently being implemented. This grant will provide the funds to pay for substitutes for this purpose.

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

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

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

Response: All teachers at the school site will participate in these activities, as well as guidance counselors and administration.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Wilson Foundations will be used with grades K-2. It includes the essential components of reading instruction and is incorporated into Reading First grants as a supplemental or early intervention program. The Florida Center for Reading Research, one of three federally-funded Reading First technical centers, conducted a review of Foundations and its effectiveness. The analysis confirmed its alignment with reading research and noted no weaknesses in the program.

The National Literacy Coalition Reading Model will be used with grades 3-5. NLC is not a program, but a reading framework for differentiated instruction. The research is in the National Reading Panel Report. According to the "Evidence Base of the National Literacy Coalition Literacy Model 2004" published on the NLC website, an analysis of student achievement in several school systems implementing the National Literacy Coalition system revealed substantial improvements in student reading achievement. Average first-year growth in state assessment achievement levels across these schools was 20% over the baseline year. Eighty-three percent of implementing schools showed achievement improvement in their first year of implementation. These schools also demonstrated substantial movement of students from the lowest performance levels to the next highest level. Students already performing at the proficient levels showed similar rates of improvement in moving to advanced performance levels

LL Teach is a consulting firm hired by our district to re-structure the way math is being taught in our schools. It was chosen based on its track record of success in closing the achievement gap in schools in New Jersey. Its program, Communicator Math, will be used with grades 3-5 in the math component of the tutorial

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: Tutorials will occur 2 days per week for 2 hours each day after school starting January 7, 2009 and ending on or before May 30, 2009.

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

Response: Jackie Lynch, principal, will be in charge of monitoring the implementation of this strategy.

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

Response: The tools used to track student progress will be the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams, DIEBELS, and Fox in the Box.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will occur quarterly for Benchmark Exams. DIEBELS will be given twice yearly and Fox in the Box will also be utilized for more frequent monitoring between administration of DIEBELS.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

The district does not provide afterschool transportation. However, some Title I schools utilize part of their Title I allocation for existing afterschool programs. The afterschool tutorials described in this application are new programs.

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

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

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

Response: The students targeted for this strategy are the ones in K-2 who scored in the intensive range on DIEBELS and grades 3-5 students who are the lowest 35% based on FCAT scores.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Thinking Maps in one form or another have been around since the research of Dr. Albert Upton who wrote "Designs for Thinking" in 1941. David Hyerle is the most recent advocate and published a dissertation in 1994 presenting test results that show that Thinking Maps significantly affect standardized and qualitative measures of student performance.

To enhance student learning, CRISS employs several concepts drawn from cognitive psychology and brain research. First, students need to be taught how they learn. They learn to self-monitor their learning to identify which strategies are the most effective for a given set of learning materials. Second, students are taught to integrate new information with prior knowledge. And third, students learn to be actively involved in their own learning by discussing, writing, and organizing. These behaviors need to be taught by all teachers -- across grade levels and curriculum areas -- to maximize the acquisition of course information.

Kagan Structures transform how content is taught without changing what is taught. They are consistent with a range of educational theories. Schools adopting Kagan Structures demonstrate positive results as measured by teacher testimonials, student statements, and empirical studies. Kagan Structures align instruction with how the brain best learns, implementing the essence of both cooperative learning and multiple intelligences philosophies and methods.

Wilson Foundations includes the essential components of reading instruction and is incorporated into Reading First grants as a supplemental or early intervention program. The Florida Center for Reading Research, one of three federally-funded Reading First technical centers, conducted a review of Foundations and its effectiveness. The analysis confirmed its alignment with reading research and noted no weaknesses in the program.

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

Response: The Foundations training will occur on 1 day in January, 2009. All other trainings are scheduled as a "Summer Institute" which will take place at the end of the school year for 5 days during the week of June 15, 2009.

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

Response: Jackie Lynch, principal, will be in charge of monitoring implementation of this strategy.

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

Response: A variety of progress monitoring tools will be used to track effectiveness of this strategy. They include teacher observation and assessment, student writing samples, FCAT, SAT, and St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Teacher observation and assessment will occur daily. FCAT occurs annually and St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams take place quarterly.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The trainings provided by this grant are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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

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

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

Response: All teachers of grade K-5 will participate in one or more of these trainings.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: The PLC's will utilize the book "Classroom Instruction that Works with English Language Learners" as the basis of their study. This book is a sequel to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's "Classroom Instruction that Works" and describes research-based strategies that can be applied to English Language Learners to boost achievement levels and close the achievement gap.

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 PLC's will meet 1 hour weekly after school beginning March 26, 2009 and ending May 28, 2009.

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

Response: The assistant principal, Jonetha Manness, will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

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

Response: The progress monitoring tool to track effectiveness of this strategy will be weekly logs kept by participants as well as student performance on the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Teacher logs will be reviewed weekly and St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams will occur quarterly.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The Professional Learning Communities provided by this grant are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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: All classroom teachers in grades K-5 will be the targeted population of this strategy.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: The Kathryn Robinson Writing program is research based and aligned with Florida Sunshine State Standards. Tracking data compiled from open sources of the Florida Dept of Education indicate that schools across Florida using the Kathryn Robinson program have increased writing achievement. Six of those schools (Cypress Creek, Floral Avenue, Oscar J. Pope, Riverside/Anna Woodbury, Gause Riverside, and Wahneta Elementary Schools) are especially significant because they represent the 'toughest' schools to affect change – as measured in all commonly used

categories - demographics, turnover stats, English speakers, family income, and past test scores. All six have used Kathryn Robinson materials for three years or more. All six were rated 'D' or worse in 1999 and preceding years. By 2003 all but one of the six schools - Lewis Anna Woodbury -was rated 'A'. Significant increases in the percentage of students scoring above 3.0 and 4.0 occurred in every school. In 2004, all but one of the schools – Oscar Pope at 86%-continued to attain 90% levels and above of their students achieving high standards in writing. It should also be noted that each of these schools has met and, in most cases, greatly exceeded statewide averages each year. In addition to the preceding, the DOE 2006 published list of the Top 100 Schools with the most improvement in FCAT writing over the 2005 school year, includes 25 schools that utilized the Kathryn Robinson program.

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

Response: This tutorial will be implemented 2 days per week for 2 hours each day for 6 weeks starting April 20, 2009 and ending May 27, 2009.

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

Response: The principal, Cindy Cobb, along with the 3rd Grade Chairperson will be in charge of monitoring implementation of this strategy.

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

Response: The FCAT practice prompt and baseline score will be the monitoring tool used to track student progress.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: The final prompt score at the end of the six week tutorial will be the measurement to determine progress.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted population will be 3rd grade students whose performance on quarterly district writing prompts indicates that they are Level 2 or below. The focus is on writing because students who do not pass the FCAT in reading will be eligible for the Summer Reading Program. Also, students must show progress in writing in order for the school to reach Safe Harbor.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1
- Root Cause 2

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: The National Literacy Coalition Reading Model will be used with grades 3-5. It has been used successfully in schools around the country including a school in our district.

After more than a decade of research in association with Vanderbilt University and eight years in schools across the nation, READ 180 is the most thoroughly researched reading intervention program in the world.

Destination Reading offers a proven solution, based on empirical research and practice, that helps identify, prevent, and remediate reading difficulties at all grade levels - from elementary through high school. Featuring sequenced, prescriptive, step-by-step instruction, Destination Math helps students develop fluency in critical skills, math reasoning, conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.

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 tutorials will take place 2 days per week for 2 hours each day for 22 weeks starting January 3, 2009 and ending June 10, 2009.

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

Response: The assistant principal, Lavonne Walker, will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

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

Response: The tools used to track student progress will be: the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams; mini-assessments; SAT-10; and DIBELS.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Progress monitoring will take place every 2 weeks.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

The district does not provide afterschool transportation. However, some Title I schools utilize part of their Title I allocation for existing after school programs. The afterschool tutorials described in this application are new programs.

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

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

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

Response: Read 180 will be targeted to the students who scored in the bottom 25% of the FCAT in Reading. Students targeted for NLC, Destination Math and Reading, and Nancy Prozito's writing strategies will be those who scored in Level 2 and low Level 3 on the FCAT in Reading, Math, and Writing.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Data analysis as a tool for instructional planning is a time tested strategy that has significantly increased since the advent of AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. Providing substitutes to allow teachers time during the school day will greatly enhance their ability to use data to effectively drive their instruction.

Response to Intervention (RTI) is a research based multi-tiered approach to help struggling learners. The essential components of RTI include: a) Universal screening for all students to determine their status against academic and social benchmarks; b) Scientifically based instruction for all students (Tier 1); c) Secondary prevention interventions (Tier 2) for students not responding adequately to Tier 1 instruction; d) Monitoring student progress, and e) Tertiary prevention instruction (Tier 3) for students making insufficient progress in response to Tier 2 instruction.

Extensive research has been done in the last 50 years documenting Thinking Maps as an effective strategy for teaching a common visual language for learning within and across disciplines. David Hyerle is the most recent advocate and published a dissertation in 1994 presenting test results that show that Thinking Maps significantly affect standardized and qualitative measures of student performance.

Kagan Structures transform how content is taught without changing what is taught. They are consistent with a range of educational theories. Schools adopting Kagan Structures demonstrate positive results as measured by teacher testimonials, student statements, and empirical studies. Kagan Structures align instruction with how the brain best learns, implementing the essence of both cooperative learning and multiple intelligences philosophies and methods. They replace an over-reliance on traditional teacher-centered instructional methods with the world's largest array of engaging student-centered instructional strategies.

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: Substitutes will be provided for teachers to participate in professional development and instructional planning which will occur one day per month for each grade level.

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

Response: The principal, Scott Neil, will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

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

Response: A variety of progress monitoring tools will be used to track effectiveness of this strategy. They include Classroom Walkthroughs, St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams, SAT-10 and DIBELS.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Classroom Walkthroughs will occur daily. Benchmark exams are given quarterly, and SAT-10, mini-assessments, and DIBELS as needed.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The trainings provided by this grant are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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

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

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

Response: All teachers are targeted for data analysis training, Thinking Maps, and Kagan Structures. RTI will be targeted to the Student Support Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Assistant Principal, Principal, and Positive Behavior Support Chair.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 1

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Wilson Foundations includes the essential components of reading instruction and is incorporated into Reading First grants as a supplemental or early intervention program. The Florida Center for Reading Research, one of three federally-funded Reading First technical centers, conducted a review of Foundations and its effectiveness. The analysis confirmed its alignment with reading research and noted no weaknesses in the program.

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

Response: The tutorial will take place 5 days per week for 1 hour each day starting the week of January 7, 2009 and ending on May 30, 2009.

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

Response: The principal, Keith Davis, along with Tina Davis, classroom teacher, will be in charge of monitoring the implementation of this strategy.

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

Response: The tools used to track student progress will be DIBELS, SRI, and the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Monitoring will occur at the end of each nine week marking period.

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

Response: The tutorials provided by this grant will be in addition to existing tutorials and SES. These tutorials will be scheduled at different times that will not conflict with existing programs ensuring that they will be supplemental and will not supplant any other program.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted population for this strategy is all students in grades K-2.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: Kagan Structures transform how content is taught without changing what is taught. They are consistent with a range of educational theories. Schools adopting Kagan Structures demonstrate positive results as measured by teacher testimonials, student statements, and empirical studies. Kagan Structures align instruction with how the brain best learns, implementing the essence of both cooperative learning and multiple intelligences philosophies and methods. They replace an over-reliance on traditional teacher-centered instructional methods with the world's largest array of engaging student-centered instructional strategies.

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: 3 days starting the week of January 7, 2009 and ending on or before the week of May 30, 2009.

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

Response: The assistance principal, Pamela Holmes, will be in charge of monitoring implementation.

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

Response: The tools used to track student progress will be DIBELS, SRI, and St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Monitoring will occur at the end of each nine week marking period.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The trainings provided by this grant are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted populations of this strategy are all teachers of grades PK-5, ESE teachers and Resource teachers.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL
- DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR
- LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL
- LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 3

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: The district will organize a Summer Institute to continue the Math Initiative training that began in Summer, 2008. Teachers from all eligible schools will participate. The training will be conducted by LL Teach, Inc. LL Teach, Inc. is a consulting firm hired by the district to re-structure the way math is being taught in its schools. It was chosen based on its track record of success in closing the achievement gap in schools in New Jersey. It's program, Communicator Math, will be used with grades 3-5.

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 Summer Institute will be held for 2 days in June, 2009. The initial professional development took place in spring 2008, continued into summer 2008, and will continue into summer 2009. All teachers receive ongoing professional development during the school year on designated professional development days and through Math Coach modeling. Since this is part of the Title I restructuring plan, provision will be made to train new teachers as needed.

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

Response: Karlheinz Haas, the district Director of Curriculum and School Improvement, will be in charge of monitoring implementation of this strategy.

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

Response: The monitoring tool used to track effectiveness of this strategy will be the St. Lucie County Benchmark Exam for Math.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Student progress will be monitored at the end of each nine week monitoring period. Schools will continue to be monitored

monthly with data analysis and on-site visits from members of the District Restructuring and Monitoring Advisory Board.

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

Response: Professional development utilizing the required 5% set-aside has already been scheduled. The trainings provided by this grant are additional professional development opportunities for teachers at this school.

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

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

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

Response: The targeted population of this strategy will be the teachers of math at all of the eligible schools.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1a. Name of strategy

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

- CHESTER A. MOORE K-7 SCHOOL
- DALE CASSENS EDUCATIONAL CTR
- LAKEWOOD PARK ELEM. SCHOOL
- LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WEATHERBEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

- Indicator 0

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

- Root Cause 4

1e Description of research of effectiveness (or purpose)

Response: District math achievement has historically been low (particularly at Title I schools) and it became clear that existing programs were not addressing the problem. As part of the district Restructuring Plan, a new math model is being implemented at Title I schools. The purpose of this new strategy is to allow teachers in grades K-8 to focus on a smaller number of math concepts and teach them to mastery. The instructional materials to be developed will reflect this focus and not include materials that are outside the scope of the concepts for a particular grade level. Through this initiative the district will align curriculum and instruction based upon the new math standards. This strategy will take a multi-step approach:

- 1) Conduct an evaluation of the math initiative
- 2) Compare results by subgroup, grades, Title I schools and non-Title I schools
- 3) Determine strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps in the implementation of the math initiative
- 4) Conduct a review of the core and supplemental curriculum materials to determine areas in which gaps exist
- 5) Provide staff development to aid teachers in developing and supplementing the curriculum based upon the next generation standards
- 6) Develop and implement changes in the instructional program based upon the review.

This strategy will impact all facets of instruction, such as staff development, classroom management, teacher efficacy, and student

achievement. In a recent article published in Education, "A Systems Approach to School Improvement: Program Evaluation and Organizational Learning" (Thornton, Shepperson, and Canaro; Fall, 2007), the authors stated that one driver of schoolwide change can be program evaluation. An evaluation of the new math model will provide information on curriculum impact. The evaluation will impact achievement by determining if the new math model is effective. If it is, achievement will rise. An outside consultant will conduct the review.

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

Response: This strategy will be implemented throughout the year with planned monthly meetings to discuss formative concerns.

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

Response: A research team will be created under the direction of Dr. Christine Kerstyn, Director of Assessment and Accountability to monitor implementation of this strategy. An outside evaluator who meets the following criteria will be engaged to write the evaluation plan: the candidate will possess an advanced degree; the candidate will possess an understanding of K-20 math curriculum; the candidate will have conducted math studies and/or evaluations of math curriculum; and, the candidate will have a working knowledge of Florida K-12 math standards. At this point we don't yet have a name for the person who is going to serve as the primary investigator as we have not completed our selection.

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

Response: The St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams in Math and the FCAT in Math will be used to measure student progress.

Minutes from monthly evaluation team meetings will be used to monitor progress of the evaluation research. These minutes may include any or all of the following: timelines; developed instruments; appropriate student achievement data; and recommendations/commendations.

5. Frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: St. Lucie County Benchmark Exams take place quarterly and the FCAT in Math is given annually.

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

Response: This strategy will supplement existing services because no district funds have been used previously for this purpose.

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

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

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

Response: Program developers and curriculum managers in St. Lucie County will be the targeted population of this strategy and will gain needed information about the effectiveness of this new math initiative.

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: Data analysis will determine eligible students. Information will then be disseminated through parent meetings, personal phone calls, parent letter in native language sent home, and Connect Ed phone messages in native language. Home languages include Spanish and Creole. Parents will receive quarterly updates until the project ends on June 30, 2009. A copy of the application will be available at the district office for public review.

BudgetA. NAME OF THE NCLB PROGRAM: **Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]**B. NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **St. Lucie**

C. Project Number (DOE USE ONLY):

TAPS Number

09A006

No.	(1) FUNCTION	(2) OBJECT	(3) ACCOUNT TITLE AND NARRATIVE	(4) FTE POSITION	(5) AMOUNT
			Stipends for teachers to participate in Professional Learning		
1	6400	129	Communities and to have additional time for instructional planning - Strategies 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 14	0.0	161358.00
2	6400	220	FICA benefits on teacher stipends - Strategies 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 14	0.0	12343.89
3	6400	750	Substitutes for teachers to attend professional development activities during the school day - Strategies 2, 5, and 11	0.0	14250.00
4	6300	391	Printing of materials necessary for alignment of math curriculum and instruction - Strategy 15	0.0	4000.00
5	6300	360	Online subscription to survey service for purposes of collecting information for review of math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	200.00
6	6300	510	Materials and supplies necessary for conducting review of math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	6648.10
7	6300	644	Computer and printer for outside consultant to work onsite in the district. In order that the consultant have access to our key data systems, the computer they use will have to exist inside of the School District's network and will need special programs installed as well as rights to access these programs. While all of this can be done to a consultant's own personal machine, such an action would pose a security risk and our IT department would not be supportive of such efforts. - Strategy 15	0.0	1600.00
8	6300	691	Software to analyze qualitative data and software to create formulas used in review of math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	3500.00
9	6400	311	Consultants to provide professional development in Kagan strategies, Foundations, CRISS strategies and Thinking Maps at White City Elementary (consultants are Gina Renna for Kagan, Susan Sentell for Foundations, Donna Dorio for CRISS, and Carolyn Wilkins for Thinkging Maps- Strategy 7	0.0	3790.00

10	6400	510	Materials and supplies to be used for professional development (Foundations Learning Kits for teachers in grades K-2 and Wilson Reading Kits for teachers in grades 3-5 at Lawnwood Elementary; instructional materials for Thinking Maps, CRISS and Kagan training at White City Elementary; and, workbooks and manipulatives for Communicator Math in Summer Institute) - Strategies 2,7, and 14	0.0	37574.00
11	7200	790	Indirect cost figured on non-capitalized items at the rate of 2.07%	0.0	6010.39
12	6400	311	Consultants to provide professional development in Wilson Foundations and Kagan Strategies at Lawnwood Elementary School (consultants are Susan Sentell for Foundations and Angela Hunsaker for Kagan) - Strategy 2	0.0	13197.00
13	6400	311	Consultants to provide professional development in Kagan Strategies at C. A. Moore Elementary - (consultant for Kagan is Angela Hunsaker) Strategy 13	0.0	11996.00
14	6400	311	Consultants to provide professional development in Communicator Math during Summer Institute - (consultant for Communicator Math is LL Teach, Inc.)Strategy 14	0.0	25000.00

Total 301467.38

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: **St. Lucie**

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	210	Retirement benefits on additional work for teachers - Strategies 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, and 12	0.0	27303.81
2	5100	220	FICA benefits on additional work for teachers - Strategies 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, and 12	0.0	21205.49
3	5100	510	Instructional supplies for intensive tutorials at Dale Cassens School - Strategy 4 (materials from Kathryn Robinson's WriteMath program to include: Full Primary Writing Special; 3rd Grade Writing Special; 4th-6th Grade Writing Special; and the Trait Tote: Grades 6-8)	0.0	700.00
4	6300	311	Consultant to work onsite to review math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	25000.00
5	6300	510	Materials and supplies necessary for conducting review of math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	4079.93
6	7200	790	Indirect costs on non-capitalized items figured at 2.07%	0.0	7669.04
7	7800	391	Transportation for students attending afterschool tutorials - Strategies 1, 3, 6, and 10	0.0	40000.00
8	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at Lawnwood Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (30 teachers x 5 hours/week x 19 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 1	1.8	65550.00
9	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at Weatherbee Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (19 teachers x 4 hours/week x 19 hours x \$23/hour) Strategy 3	0.9	33212.00
10	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at White City Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (20 teachers X 4 hours/week x 19 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 6	1.0	34960.00
11	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at Dale Cassens School to provide intensive tutorials (3 teachers x 4.5 hours/week x 8 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 4 (FTE .06)	0.0	2484.00

12	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at St. Lucie Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (10 teachers x 4 hours/week x 6 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 9	0.2	5520.00
13	5100	128	Additional hours for teachers at Lakewood Park Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (40 teachers x 4 hours/week x 19 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 10	2.0	69920.00
14	5100	128	Additional hours for teacher at C. A. Moore Elementary to provide intensive tutorials (30 teachers x 5 hours/week x 19 weeks x \$23/hour) Strategy 12	1.8	65550.00
15	6300	312	Consultant to work onsite to review math initiative - Strategy 15	0.0	15000.00

Total 418154.27

DOE 101



Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

[DOE Home](#) | [Commissioner](#) | [Board of Education](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [DOE Paperless](#) | [Open Government](#) | [Site Index](#)

For questions & comments regarding education issues: Commissioner@fldoe.org | For questions & comments regarding this Web site: [E-mail Webmaster](#)

[Accessibility](#) | [Copyright Florida Department of Education ©2005](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Public Records](#)

Free Downloads: [Acrobat Reader](#) | [Excel Viewer 2003](#) | [Word Viewer 97/2000](#) | [PowerPoint Viewer 2003](#)

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public-records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.