FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROJECT APPLICATION

TAPS: 1. 11A006

Please return to:	A) Name and Address of Eligible Applicant:	DOE USE ONLY
Florida Department of Education Office of Grants Management Room 332, Turlington Building 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400 Telephone: (850) 245-0496	Clay County District School Board 900 WALNUT ST GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FL 32043	Date Received

B) Applicant Contact Information

Contact Name: Dewitt Lewis, Jr.	Telephone Number: 904-529-4927
Mailing Address: 900 Walnut Street Green Cove Springs, FL	Fax Number: 904-529-4825
E-mail Address: dlewis@mail.clay.k12.fl.us	

Programs

C) Program Name:	Project Number: (DOE Assigned):	D) Total Funds Requested:	Total Approved Funds (DOE USE ONLY):
1. Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]	100-2261A-1CS01	$246,750.00	

CERTIFICATION

I, Mr. Benjamin Wortham 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 100

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET DESCRIPTION FORM -
Title I School Improvement Initiative [1003(a)]

A) NAME OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT: **Clay County District School Board**
B) Project Number (DOE USE ONLY): **100-2261A-1CS01**

E) TAPS Number 11A006

count	Activity	Function	Object	Account Title and Description	FTE	Amount
1	Provide for extended targeted instructional time. Saturday, before school a...	5100	120	Classroom Teachers SALARIES for extended day teachers(Strategy 1)	1.540	$78,045.00
2	Provide for extended targeted instructional time Strategy 1	5100	150	Aides SALARIES for extended day and computer lab aides. (Strategy 1)...	0.160	$3,648.00
3	Provide for extended targeted instructional time Strategy 1	5100	210	Retirement Retirement benefits for extended targeted instructional t...	0.000	$8,798.34
4	Provide for extended targeted instructional time Strategy 1	5100	220	Social Security Social Security benefits for extended targeted instr...	0.000	$6,249.51
5	Provide printing for extended targeted instructional time Strategy 1	5100	390	Other Purchased Services Printing of materials to support (Strategy ...	0.000	$2,035.68
6	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	510	Supplies Consumable items such as paper back books, paper, pencils, ...	0.000	$15,575.45
7	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	612	Library Books for Existing Libraries Library books for differentiate...	0.000	$1,952.15
8	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	643	Computer Hardware Capitalized Computer hardware to support (Strategy...	0.000	$6,000.00
9	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	644	Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized Computer hardware to support (Stra...	0.000	$1,550.00
10	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	691	Computer Software Capitalized Computer software to support (Strategy...	0.000	$78,646.04
11	Provide differentiated instruction utilizing enhanced technology, suppleme...	5100	692	Computer Software Non-Capitalized Computer software to support (Stra...	0.000	$1,100.00
12	Provide Professional Staff Development for writing (Strategy 3)	6400	140	Substitute Teachers Substitute teachers hired to allow teachers to p...	0.260	$6,264.00

13	Provide for printed material for Professional Staff development in writing ...	6400	390	Other Purchased Services Printing for training materials for 6+1 Tra...	0.000	$3,518.00
14	Provide supplies and material for Professional Staff development activities...	6400	510	Supplies Supplies for training materials for 6+1 Traits of writing P...	0.000	$9,136.00
15	District indirect cost	7200	790	Miscellaneous Expenses Recovery of district charges for indirect cos...	0.000	$5,150.32
16	Provide Administrative suppervision and monitoring during extended instruct...	7300	110	Administrators SALARIES for exteded day. Administrative support duri...	0.125	$6,020.00
17	Provide Administrative suppervision and monitoring during extended instruct...	7300	210	Retirement Retirement benefits for extended targeted instructional t...	0.000	$648.36
18	Provide Administrative suppervision and monitoring during extended instruct...	7300	220	Social Security Social security benefits for extended targeted instr...	0.000	$460.54
19	Provide for transportation to support extended targeted instructional time....	7800	390	Other Purchased Services Provide for transportation to support exten...	0.000	$11,953.00
Totals:					2.085	$246,750.39

DOE 101

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

Title I, Part A School Improvement Grants CLAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

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.

✓ Spends funds quickly, consistent with NCLB's reporting and accountability requirements, to help drive the nation's economic recovery.

✓ Improve student achievement through school improvement and reform and help close the achievement gap by: 1) making progress toward rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments; 2) establishing pre-K to college and career data systems that track progress and foster continuous improvement; 3) improving teacher effectiveness and the equitable distribution of qualified teachers; and 4) providing intensive support and effective interventions for the lowest-performing schools.

✓ Ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability to accurately measure and track funds and publicly report on how funds are used.

School Information

School #	School	% Poverty	Differentiated Accountability Category	SINI	Allocation 1003(a) Regular
0071	CHARLES E. BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	72.90	PREVENT II	2	34590.36
0232	GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	67.86	CORRECT II	7	34625.23
0241	W E CHERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	68.06	PREVENT I	2	33856.40
0331	S BRYAN JENNINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	69.37	PREVENT I	2	33066.46
0411	CLAY HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	60.78	PREVENT I	2	33029.14
0491	J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL	70.95	CORRECT I	7	36285.97
0511	MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	60.50	PREVENT I	3	33228.18

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 deliver the data analysis professional development?

   Response: The district office will provide professional development and supportive leadership for data analysis to school based leadership teams during the 2010 – 2011 school year. School leadership teams and administrators will then conduct data reviews and data chats throughout the school year. The district's "Dash Board" system, a tool available district wide, will be utilized to retrieve and analyze student data, along with information from FCAT Star, and the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN).

   Each school's leadership team will learn to identify trends and patterns within the test data which identify strengths and weaknesses in student learning or gaps in instruction. Data analysis will be conducted at a minimum once per month at the school level for Prevent I and Prevent II schools. Correct I and Correct II schools will review and analyze data at a minimum of twice per month. Schools will utilize instructional leadership team meetings and grade level data chats to analyze data.

   The District Instruction Leadership Team (DILT) will review summary reports of school based assessments. Schools will be encouraged to establish and maintain a data room for charting, and posting student test results. After each meeting teachers will adjust their instructions as needed to meet the needs of their students.

2. How many times during the 2010-2011 school year will data analysis take place at SINI schools identified as Prevent I, Prevent II, Correct I, Correct II, and/or Intervene schools? Provide the format for the data analysis (professional learning communities, data chats, etc).

   Response: Data analysis will be conducted at a minimum once per month at the school level for Prevent I and Prevent II schools. Correct I and Correct II schools will review and analyze data at a minimum of twice per month. Schools will utilize instructional leadership team meetings and grade level data chats to analyze data.

3. How will the information based on data analysis be used?

   Response: The District Instruction Leadership Team (DILT) will review summary reports of school based assessments. Schools will be encouraged to establish and maintain a data room for charting, and posting student test results. After each meeting teachers will adjust their instructions as needed to meet the needs of their students.

LEA Support Teams

Describe how the LEA will provide technical and program assistance to Prevent I, Prevent II, Correct I, Correct II, and/or Intervene schools. For each activity the LEA shall include: the frequency of the activity and duration of the activity.

Response: 1.The District Instructional Leadership Team (DILT) will meet weekly for the purpose of reviewing school and classroom data to determine appropriate professional development and evaluate the success of district programs and their implementation. Additionally, representatives of the DILT will visit P1, P2, C1, and C2 schools quarterly to review data, provide support in the form of classroom-walkthroughs and/or participation in school data meetings.

2.The Superintendent will meet with each school principal at the beginning and end of the school year to conduct a data chat. The School Improvement Plan goals, strategies and outcomes will also be review during these meetings. The Superintendent and members of his senior staff will schedule visits to schools sites quarterly to monitor progress towards improvement.

3.Based on the strategies implemented, each school will Pre & Post test the students impacted by that strategy. Schools will use data sources to identify areas of weakness.

4.District provided 14 Response to Intervention (RTI) Coaches that are assigned to three (3) school sites. RTI coaches will provide on-going professional development in data analysis, side-by-side coaching, and model lessons. District Curriculum Specialists assist with data analysis and provide grade level and individual professional development based upon identified trends. RTI Coaches and District Curriculum Specialists will assist schools in the development of professional learning communities.

5.Members of the DILT will convene a Success Maker High Stakes Management meeting for P1, P2, C1, and C2 schools, four (4) times per year. During these meetings a comprehensive review of test data via the Success Maker Program, will compare reports of hours of usage for each group, class, and grade level in reading and math. The data will also provide information on how each group has progressed toward their benchmark. The reports will show growth, predict students' likelihood of achieving a level 3 or higher on FCAT, and prescribe instruction to meet the identified benchmark.

Strategies to Be Implemented

1. Provide the identified needs, strategies, purpose, and the research on their effectiveness, root cause, targeted population, and current capacity. Provide the following in your response:

1a. Identify the Need: **Increase student proficiency in reading, math and writing for W, B, SWD, and students from ED**

1b. Provide the Data Source(s) and the Actual Outcome(s) as the basis for the identified Need.
Response: The 2009-10 FCAT Score Reports indicate Schools failed to meet AYP goals in Reading, Writing or Math

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

- CHARLES E. BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1d. Name of strategy

Response: Strategy #1 Extended Targeted Instructional Time

1e. Provide the purpose, description of research of effectiveness, and how each strategy will support the implementation of Differentiated Accountability.

Response: (Purpose): Extended instructional time provided to low performing student groups is a key component to closing the achievement gap for targeted low performing students. Experts agree that school-age children, who are engaged in meaningful organized learning before school, after school and over the summer, are more likely to make significant gains in core curriculum areas. The benefits of additional time spent on computer assisted instruction, tutoring, extended school library time, and/or small group instruction, all play a major role in turning around low academic achievement. This strategy is listed in the differentiated accountability section of the DA regulations as it relates to curriculum alignment and pacing section. Each of these schools have a DA designation assigned to them, and shall be guided in part by the DA and FCIM practices.

Research: Studies suggest that poor and minority students, in particular, benefit more from extended time, especially if they go to summer school, according to Silva's report. Education Sector in the News: As Push for Longer Hours Forms, Intriguing Models Arise in D.C. Published February 5, 2007

Extended day tutorial increases mastery of academic skills (Miller, Kohler, Ezell, Hoe1, & Strain, 1993; Kalkowski, 1995; Martino, 1993;Topping, 1988).

Tutorial provided via extended day programs improves self-esteem and self-confidence (Rekrut, 1994; Kalkowski, 1995; Gaustad, 1992). Improves students' attitudes toward school: reduces dropout rates, truancies, and tardiness (Kalkowski, 1995; Cotton, 1989;

Martino, 1993). Breaks down social barriers and creates new friendships

(Miller et al., 1993; Kalkowski, 1995; Cotton, 1989). Provides emotional support and positive role models (Martino, 1993).

1f. Identify the Root Cause(s) each strategy will address to remove barriers to low academic achievement.

Response: Response: The district has identified limited instructional time as a root cause for low

performing subgroups. Schools lack time in the instructional day to provide additional assistance in reading, writing and math. Increasing instructional time beyond the regular school day and year, will aid students in receiving a double dose of instruction in the identified weak areas. Before school, after school, and/or summer school will be structured to deliver explicit interventions in math, writing, and reading.

1g. Identify the targeted population(s) for this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

Response: Response: Underperforming students across most counted subgroups failed to meet proficiency levels.

Charles E. Bennett Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Writing, Reading & Math

(White, Black, Economically Disadvantage, Students with disabilities)

Grove Park Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Writing, Reading & Math

(White, Black, Hispanics, Economically Disadvantage, Students with disabilities)

W.E. Cherry: sub groups not making AYP in Reading and Math

(Black Students)

S. Bryan Jennings Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Reading and Math

(Blacks, Hispanics, Economically Disadvantage, Student with disabilities)

Clay Hill Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Reading and Math

(Students with disabilities)

J.L. Wilkinson Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Writing, Reading & Math

(Whites, Economically disadvantage, & Students with disabilities)

McRae Ele: sub groups not making AYP in Reading and Math

(Whites, Economically disadvantage, & Students with disabilities)

1h. Describe the Current Capacity to implement the above strategy. If this is a new strategy, indicate in this response "New Strategy."

Response: Response: This strategy is a continuing practice from the 2009-2010 school year. The district currently extends the students' day using funds from the NCLB Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program. The SES program targets only students on free or reduced lunch. Using grant funds students not participating in SES would receive targeted reading, math, and writing instruction through the extended day programs. Funds from this grant would provide opportunities for Saturday school, Summer school, before and after school small group instruction and intensive computer-assisted instruction in identified low performing areas.

1i. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)

Response: Response: Before and after school tutoring, and Saturday School will be offered 2-3 days per week,60-90 minutes per day, for 5 weeks begining as early as October 2010.

Educational summer camps will run 2-3 days per week, 120 minutes per day, in alignment with the limited district summer school program for a total of 16 days, beginning the week of June 20 2011.

2. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy?

Response: The school based administrator will monitor the daily implementation of this strategy.

The Title I Director of Instructional Projects and Title I Curriculum specialist will monitor and provide technical assistance monthly and/or as needed. Representatives of the DILT will conduct focus walks to observe fidelity to the goals and objectives identified for this strategy.

3. What progress monitoring tool will be used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.

Response: Response: Title I schools may utilize assessments tools as follows:

•Exam View created assessments (math & reading)

•FAIR – Ongoing Progress Monitoring

•FCAT Explorer grades 3-6

•Success-Maker progress reports in reading and math, K-6

•The Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR) for grades K-6

•Go Math – in program assessment tools K-5

•Big Ideas Math – in program assessment 6grade only

•Macmillan (Treasures) – in program assessments

•Teacher developed writing prompts

•Discovery Education Assessment tools (reading, math, & science)

4. Provide the frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Each grade level will assess reading, writing, and math twice a month. The schools have access to the following assessments.

•FCAT Explorer which is an on-line assessment and progress monitoring tool in reading, and math.

•Success-maker is a computer based skills and assessment tool which will render assessment data.

•The Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR) for grades k-6 will be administered three times a year

•Treasures reading series assessment.

•Writing assessments/prompts

•Go Math program assessments.

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

Response: Response: Close monitoring by the Title I staff will be on-going to ensure that this strategy does not interfere or violate the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Supplemental Educational Services program. Additionally, this program will support those students not eligible for SES.

6. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **1.1**

7. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading, mathematics, and/or science initiative.

Reading
Mathematics

Strategies to Be Implemented

1. Provide the identified needs, strategies, purpose, and the research on their effectiveness, root cause, targeted population, and current capacity. Provide the following in your response:

1a. Identify the Need: **Increase student achievement in reading, math, science and writing.**

1b. Provide the Data Source(s) and the Actual Outcome(s) as the basis for the identified Need.
Response: 2009-2010 FCAT;Failed to meet AYP goals, in the area of Reading, Math, Science and Writing

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

- CHARLES E. BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- W E CHERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- S BRYAN JENNINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- CLAY HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL
- MCRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1d. Name of strategy

Response: Strategy #2 Differentiated Instruction using enhanced technology,supplemental materials,and supplies

1e. Provide the purpose, description of research of effectiveness, and how each strategy will support the implementation of Differentiated Accountability.

Response: Through the careful selection and acquisition of enhanced technology equipment, additional supplemental instructional materials, and supplies, teachers will provide a varied and differentiated approach to student academic needs. With the latest updated Pearson Successmaker software license, I-response systems, upgraded computers equipment and systems, and various other select new and/or updated technology, supplies and materials, teachers will increase their opportunities to help students master identified weak skill areas.

Research shows that computer assisted instruction can provide effective supplemental practice for students if it is carefully monitored and delivered with enough regularity and frequency. (Dr. Joseph Torgesen, Director Florida Center for Reading Research)

"Reading instruction effectiveness lies not with a single program or method but, rather, with a teacher who thoughtfully and analytically integrates various program, materials, and methods as the situation demands." (Duffy & Hoffman)

The new materials and updated equipment would be utilized to reinforce deficit skills and assist in closing the achievement gaps of low performing students.

All equipment, materials, and supplies would meet the No Child Left Behind requirement of being scientifically proven and/or tested for its effectiveness. A review of local data reveals that science and writing supplemental instructional materials, supplies, and/or technology are of greatest need. The district Title I Director of Instructional Projects and Title I Curriculum Specialist will monitor this strategy to ensure purchases are above and beyond the district's allocation for technology, materials, and supplies.

This strategy is expected to support the implementation of Differentiated Accountability by

ensuring students are properly placed in rigorous coursework (DA plan- curriculum aligned and paced section) and providing a comprehensive strategy under FCIM)(DA plan- FCIM section).

1f. Identify the Root Cause(s) each strategy will address to remove barriers to low academic achievement.

Response: Response: Performance scores by subgroups reveal deficit scores across a broad range of subtest areas, in reading, math, writing and science. In order to address these deficits teachers need a variety of instructional tools and technology to differentiate their approach to the needs of all subgroups. The challenge of accomplishing this task with limited planning time is to make available to teachers these materials, supplies and technology, which is generally outside of the schools' basic materials and supply allocation. Barriers to teaching from a differentiated approach include a lack of technology, supplies, and materials in place and ready for use with students. The table below indicates the percent of students in each school scoring below the proficiency level in reading, math, science, and writing by school, percent of Students Not meeting High Standards in Writing (W), Below proficiency in Reading (R), Below proficiency in Math (M), and Below proficiency in Science (S).

Charles E. Bennett Ele. 40W 34R 37M 65S

Grove Park Ele. 42W 41R 46M 40S

W.E. Cherry Ele. 23W 21R 18M 46S

S. Bryan Jennings Ele. 21W 25R 21M 50S

Clay Hill Ele. 18W 22R 21M 58S

J. L. Wilkinson Ele. 44W 33R 32M 50S

McRae Ele. School 12W 30R 33M 61S

1g. Identify the targeted population(s) for this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

Response: Students in all subgroups will benefit from differentiated instruction using technology, materials, and supplies in reading, math, writing, and science.

1h. Describe the Current Capacity to implement the above strategy. If this is a new strategy, indicate in this response "New Strategy."

Response: This "new strategy" will allow schools to purchase web based reading, math, writing, and science program from a wide range of materials not currently available with district funds. These funds would be used to purchase needed materials, supplies, and technology to address the wide range of student needs that currently exist among students in reading, math, writing, and science.

1i. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)

Response: Response: Supplemental materials, supplies and technology equipment will be purchased based on data after various district assessment tests are reviewed by school leadership teams. All materials will be tied to results from FCAT data, as well as district in-house assessments. These resources will be used to differentiate instructions based on groups that may be organized for intensive remediation in the various content areas as identified by the data above. All purchased items will be used during computer assisted instruction 2-3 days per week, 16 days during the summer, 5 weeks weeks during the school year begining in November.

Purchases will be on-going throughout the school year targeting weak academic areas, and areas where students are under performing.

2. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy?

Response: The Title I department will monitor invoices of purchased materials, supplies and technology. All purchasing requests will have to be tied to improvement goals and/or objectives, and must be an enhancement beyond what is usually supplied by the school district. Each school leadership team will keep data notebooks of the results and effects of the newly purchased equipment, materials and supplies on student performance used in the differentiated classroom instruction.

3. What progress monitoring tool will be used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.

Response: Response: Data reports from the FAIR assessment test, school based testing tools, and results from the Pearson Success Maker program will be closely scrutinized to determine the success of these tools as implemented within the daily academic program. The district Title I director and purchasing office will monitor all purchases to assure materials are appropriate and meet NCLB guidelines.

4. Provide the frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Response: Title I will track all purchases and survey schools on the use and effectiveness of the tools each semester. Also monthly reviews will be conducted to evaluate the use of technology, materials and supplies and how they are being utilized. Data chats will be on-going with school leadership teams to track performance changes.

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

Response: Response: The Title I office will require schools to expend all LEA dollar prior to expending Title I funds for supplemental materials, supplies and technology. The Title one office will ensure that all materials purchased are above and beyond their regular district purchases. All purchase orders will be reviewed for compliance with NCLB requirements

6. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **1.1**

7. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading, mathematics, and/or science initiative.

Reading
Mathematics
Science

Strategies to Be Implemented

1. Provide the identified needs, strategies, purpose, and the research on their effectiveness, root cause, targeted population, and current capacity. Provide the following in your response:

1a. Identify the Need: **Increase student achievement in the area of writing.**

1b. Provide the Data Source(s) and the Actual Outcome(s) as the basis for the identified Need.
Response: FCAT 2009-2010; Failed to meet AYP goals, and low performance in the area of writing

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

- CHARLES E. BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
- J.L. WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHL

1d. Name of strategy

Response: Strategy # 3 6+1 Traits of Writing (A systematic approach to writing instruction & assessment)

1e. Provide the purpose, description of research of effectiveness, and how each strategy will support the implementation of Differentiated Accountability.

Response: Response: A review of FCAT data reveals that three (3) of the seven (7) Title I schools did not make AYP as a result of gaps in writing instructions throughout the school year. It has been determined that a systematic approach to writing instruction is needed across all grade levels. There is also a need to provide professional development for all teachers on the 6 + 1 Traits of Writing. These strategies are supported by the differentiated accountability plan related to districts providing individual professional development for teachers of targeted subgroups who did not make AYP.

The notion is widespread that children must learn to read before they can write. However, Bissex (1980), Chomsky (1971) and Graves (1983) found that young children begin writing as or even before they learn to read, because they have a need to communicate ideas and concepts that have been discovered by experience rather than in books. This communication serves not only to share thoughts, but also to help organize them into coherent categories.

Research has confirmed the importance of process in writing, and that what writers do as they write is at least as important as the products they produce (Tompkins 1993). Britton (1970), Emig (1971) and Graves (1975) investigated the thinking processes that young writers used as they wrote. They found that the process consisted of three basic activities: conception or prewriting, incubation or composing, and production or postwriting. Flowers and Heyes (1977, 1981) found these same basic stages, and added that the process is recursive, with writers moving between steps in the process freely. Sommers (1980, 1982) described writing as a revision process in which ideas are developed, and pointed to the limitations placed on student thinking when teachers focus on mechanics rather than content.

Early research into the process of writing was brought to a head in 1972 with the Bay Area Writing Project that later became the National Writing Project. But while the writing process developed by the Project provided teachers with a framework within which to work, it did not give the detailed description of what makes good writing. Paul Diederich's work at the Educational Testing Service remained the only description of writing quality criteria until 1984 when Beaverton School District in Oregon began a study that eventually led to the development of the

Six Traits of Writing.

Diederich, French and Carlton (1961) in a paper presented to the National Council of Teachers of English described a factor-analytic study of the reasons teachers gave for their grades on written compositions, along with a set of eight scales developed from the study by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Their scales were named: ideas, organization, wording, flavor, usage, punctuation, spelling, and handwriting.

This paper along with his later article titled "How to Measure Growth in Writing Ability" (1966), are the earliest systematic attempts to move the educational community away from holistic writing scoring towards and analytic, trait-baised model.

1f. Identify the Root Cause(s) each strategy will address to remove barriers to low academic achievement.

Response: Response: Performance scores by subgroups indicate deficit scores in writing. To address these underperforming students, teachers need more training on effective, systematic approaches to writing. Currently, there is not an established, uniform approach from grade level to grade level in the area of writing. The table below denotes the percent of 4th grade students who are not meeting high standards in writing % of Students Not meeting High Standards in Writing

Charles E. Bennett Ele. 40

Grove Park Ele. 42

J. L. Wilkinson Ele. 44

1g. Identify the targeted population(s) for this strategy (identify specific subgroups, teachers, parents, etc.)

Response: Students in all subgroups will benefit from utilizing the 6+1 Traits of Writing. Teachers of these subgroups will increase their knowledge of how to implement an effective writing program.

1h. Describe the Current Capacity to implement the above strategy. If this is a new strategy, indicate in this response "New Strategy."

Response: Response: The 6 + 1 Traits of writing will be split into small training components, thereby allowing time for schools to implement phases of the writing practices as they are being trained on the new methods. Writing specialist will be utilized to train teachers along with the support of district curriculum staff. The professional development will be ongoing throughout the academic year. The school district currently meets with groups of teacher on a regular basis to provide these types of trainings.

1i. Frequency and duration of this strategy (For example: three days per week after school for nine weeks starting the week of January 7th.)

Response: Response: The application of the 6 + 1 Traits of Writing will be on-going beginning November 2010. Teachers will immediately implement strategies after each segment of professional development, with students putting these newly developed strategies to use on a daily basis. The professional development for teachers will be scheduled on a monthly basis with best practices for writing implemented daily, throughout the 2010-2011 school year.

2. Who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the strategy?

Response: Response: Each school's leadership team will engage in data chats and keep data

notebooks of the results and effects of the new writing practices. Teacher professional learning communities will be used to enhance practices and to share ideas, as well as examine any potential barriers that may impede progress.

3. What progress monitoring tool will be used to track effectiveness of this strategy as measured by student progress.

Response: Response: Data reports from the "Clay Writes" assessment will be utilized to measure growth and change in students' writing performance. Additionally, 6 +1 writing components have embedded writing prompts which will be administered routinely. Ultimately, the FCAT test will offer results of the success of the hard work by students and teachers.

4. Provide the frequency of progress monitoring of this strategy.

Response: Response: The Title I Department and each school's leadership team will chart related data on changes in student's writing scores from month to month as writing assessments are administered. Weekly focus walks by the school leadership team will be conducted throughout the year to ensure fidelity of the program implementation strategies.

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

Response: Response: The 6 + 1 Traits of Writing is relatively new to the district and will provide the structure for supplementing what currently exist in the writing program at the various Title I schools. Teachers may use this program to strengthen their current practices and to build upon existing strategies in writing.

6. Strategic Imperative this strategy addresses: **1.1**

7. If applicable, indicate if strategy is a reading, mathematics, and/or science initiative.

Dissemination/Marketing and Reporting Student Outcomes

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

1. Provide the method(s) of dissemination/marketing of this application

   Response: Response: The district and school websites will be the host sites where this grant will be posted. Once approved, the grant will be available for review by staff, parents, and community stakeholders for the entire funding period of the grant. In Clay County parents may access the web from their homes, public libraries and media centers. Student outcomes will also be reported in each individual school newsletter. Our targeted population is the community and parents of identified schools.

2. Provide the method(s) for reporting student outcomes

   Response: Schools that receive funds under this grant will summarized the grant and student outcomes in monthly school newsletters. This information will be shared with all school personnel and parents of each Title I school.

3. Provide the population each method will address

   Response: The target population is school personnel and parents of the Title I school.

4. Provide the frequency and duration of each method used

   Response: Each school will summarize the grant and student outcomes in monthly school newletters. The LEA will also provide an overview of the the final grant after all stake holders have provided feedback on the grant's design and content during PAC meetings.

5. Provide the language(s) each method will be made available

   Response: A hard copy of the approved application will be available at the school their child attends and at the district office. This notification will be available in English and Spanish as needed. Assistance will be available as needed for individuals requiring help. Interpreters are readily available at all times in most applicable language.

Evaluation of Previous Year's Title I School Improvement

1. Describe the process for evaluating the outcomes of student academic achievement as a result of implementing strategies described in your previous year's application.

Response: The District Instructional Leadership Team along with curriculum specialist reviewed data from a variety of available data sources to determine the impact of the strategies implemented during the 2009-2010 school year. The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, Pearson Successmaker, local Math and Reading benchmark assessment tests, and the Waterford curriculum progress report, were used to identify strength and weaknesses of tested areas. Six out of seven Title I schools all managed to maintain or improve their school performance grade. Data meeting were held routinely at targeted schools as a means for monitoring intervention strategies implemented via the SIP grant. The district maintains a data aggregation system (Data Star) on-line to assist schools in managing and accessing various data.

2. What contributed to your success or failure in meeting proposed outcomes?

Response: Data recorded via the Successmaker computer assisted program showed skills to be sustained to improved overall in reading and math areas in many of our targeted schools. The use of the extended day provided the necessary practice time for teachers to examine and drill deep into students' conceptual skill development. The professional development activities will need to be on-going so that over time teachers can more fully develop their strategies for reaching subgroups not making AYP. Teachers need more training and time to build their skill set for providing differentiated instruction.

3. Based on your evaluation, what worked when you implemented your program?

Response: The data indicated that the sustained regimen of direct instruction, computer assisted educational activities, and extended instructional time showed the most improvement in student performance among students who regularly participated in the program. Two schools were close to making AYP on the FCAT test.

4. Based on your evaluation, what did not work when you implemented your program?

Response: The initial feedback from the Saturday Scholar's program was that the program design was not defined and/or specific enough in its format to yield the desired outcomes expected. There was also a lack of dependable pre-test and post-test data collected to fully determine the growth of student skills. Additionally, this program was not monitored on a Saturday as effectively as it should have been monitored.

5. Based on your evaluation, what contributed to your success or failure in program implementation?

Response: The computer assisted instruction and extended day programs seemed to yield an overall increased in student performance. Schools that monitor these programs closely made growth in many of the underperforming areas. More work is needed with professional development in an effort to raise the teacher's skill level in providing more targeted skill

development during extended day and/or Saturday programs.