



Keeping the Promise of Change

Why California’s chronically underperforming schools need bold reforms

Albert Einstein once defined insanity as “doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” If his assertion is true, then the recent history of California’s school-improvement efforts paints a picture of sheer madness.

For more than a decade, California has tossed hundreds of millions of dollars at low-performing schools in a series of unproductive “reform” initiatives. Instead of drilling down to fix the conditions that create a cycle of under-performance, these programs have skimmed the surface of school improvement and produced minimal gains.

Now, California is poised to repeat history. In March 2010, the state revealed its list of 188 persistently underperforming schools. Our analysis finds that over the last six years, 70 percent of these schools have accessed significant state dollars – more than \$265 million – for school improvement efforts. They are now eligible for millions of additional dollars under the federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) program. Unless our state leaders direct these new funds to bold, high-impact reforms, they have virtually guaranteed that the epitaph for these new grants will echo that of past efforts: “No significant impact.”

That’s too bad for California. But it bodes even worse for the nearly 200,000 mostly Latino, African-American, and low-income students – and English-language learners – who are trapped in the 188 persistently underperforming schools. There is, however, a saner approach, which we lay out in this brief.

This approach would reform the teaching and learning conditions that breed under-performance. It would put student and community needs above bureaucratic

processes and adult interests. And, it would charge state officials with providing oversight and accountability to guarantee that the millions in federal school improvement dollars are spent effectively. Instead of yet another school-reform money pit, these changes could turn the dollars into an engine for real improvement for California’s most underserved students.

MONEY FOR NOTHING? THE RECENT HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA’S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Over the past decade, California created four grant programs to help low-performing schools meet state-accountability targets. As Figure 1 shows, these programs include the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP), the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP), the School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) program, and the Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA).

Following in the wake of II/USP, HPSGP resembled its predecessor. Together, the two programs provided roughly \$1.3 billion in funding to approximately 2,500 schools over ten years. Under both programs, schools were deemed “state monitored” if they failed to meet modest growth targets; SAIT offered them further funding and support. In 2006, a lawsuit settlement between the California Teachers Association and the state established QEIA, which promised to pump an additional \$3 billion into low-performing schools over seven years.

In total, these programs would funnel approximately \$4.5 billion to thousands of low-performing schools across the state. Using a variety of reform strategies, the programs have spent their dollars on the same basic recipe for school improvement. First, hire an outside consultant to help develop an “action plan.” Next, analyze school data to figure out what’s not working and set

modest improvement goals. Finally, identify a few strategies designed to achieve those targets without removing ineffective staff or shaking things up too much.

State-approved ingredients for reform have included the ever-popular class-size reductions, a dash of professional development for teachers and principals, and such questionably innovative strategies as cutting student-to-counselor ratios and buying state-approved textbooks. The real question: Has this recipe changed the academic trajectory of California’s underperforming schools?

Let’s be clear: Incremental changes of one Academic Performance Index (API) point per year – which II/USP deemed “significant growth” – or topping the school’s overall annual growth target¹ (a QEIA goal) will not improve the quality of these schools or the lives of their students. Indeed, for this kind of financial investment, Californians should expect rapid, pronounced

improvements in student performance and college and career readiness.

Luckily, a third party has evaluated each of California’s three major school-improvement programs. These evaluations reveal that the payoff for these programs has been negligible at best:

- **II/USP:** The 2003 evaluation of II/USP by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) found no significant effect of II/USP on a school’s likelihood of meeting API growth targets. The 2005 evaluation found cases of small, positive effects that dissipated after II/USP funding ended.²
- **HPSG:** Similarly, AIR’s 2006 and 2007 evaluations of HPSG Cohort 1 found that most participating schools did not gain significantly more than nonparticipating schools. In some cases, HPSG schools showed slight, positive gains in student learning.

FIGURE 1 – STATE AND FEDERAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS SINCE 1999

	Program Years	Targeted Schools	Number of Schools Served	Funding Available	Funding Source
Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP)	1999-00 to 2001-02	Bottom 50% of schools, based on API rankings	430 schools, Cohort 1 430 schools, Cohort 2 430 schools, Cohort 3	\$50,000 in planning funds, plus \$200 per student, per year, for two to three years	State
High Priority Schools Grant (HPSG) Program	2002-03 to 2008-09	Bottom 50% of schools, based on API rankings, with priority given to bottom 10%	662 schools, Cohort 1 508 schools, Cohort 2	\$50,000 in planning funds (planning year is optional), plus \$400 per student, per year, for two to four years*	State
School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) program	2001-02 to current	Schools that did not make an acceptable level of academic progress while in the II/USP or the HPSG program	300**	Cost of SAIT member salaries, plus \$150 per pupil from the state (which the district matches)	Combination of state and district dollars
Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA)	2007-08 to 2013-14	Bottom 20% of schools, based on API rankings	488 schools in 07-08 488 schools in 08-09	\$500 for each K-3 student, \$900 for each student in grades 4-8, and \$1,000 for each student in grades 9-12	State
Federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) Program	2010-11 to 2012-13	Bottom 5% of schools in Program Improvement and/or Title I eligible, based on a combination of factors including API over five years, CST scores over three years, and graduation rates over four years	TBD	\$150,000 to \$6 million over three years	Federal — American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

*There were some variations in funding. In Cohort 1, a fourth year of funding was available to schools meeting targets or making significant growth. Cohort 2 funding was ended after two program years because the program ended. **The California Department of Education website identifies 41 HPSG schools assigned SAITs since November 2006 and 6 II/USP schools that have been targeted for SAIT since November 2007. A February 2007 EdSource report, “Worthy Goals, Limited Success: Intervention Programs in California,” notes that an additional 253 schools had been assigned SAITs as of November 2006.

- **QEIA:** Pending a formal evaluation of QEIA, the CTA has released early data from its own evaluation.³ The CTA finds that 70 percent of QEIA schools met schoolwide API targets,⁴ slightly more than the 61 percent of California’s bottom 20 percent of schools (the pool from which QEIA schools are selected) that met API targets in 2008. In one year, just 2 percent of QEIA schools exited “Program Improvement” status (Title I-funded schools that fail to make annual yearly progress for two consecutive years). And only 1 percent of QEIA schools exceeded the state API goal of 800.

THE USUAL SUSPECTS

In March 2010, California released a list of persistently underperforming schools, as required by federal law. Drawn from a pool of schools eligible for Title I funds, under federal Program Improvement status, or both, the state identified these 188 schools based on several factors. These included state math and reading scores over three years, academic progress on the state’s API, and graduation rates.

Given the disappointing results of California’s past efforts to improve schools, it is no surprise that the list

surfaces many of the usual suspects. In fact, 70 percent of the schools on the list have been on previous school-improvement lists and already have been targeted for II/USP, HPSG, and/or QEIA funds. In total, these schools account for more than \$265 million of state school-improvement grant spending over the last six years. Five of the high schools on the list have received more than \$9 million since 2003. Four middle schools have received more than \$5 million. And seven elementary schools have received more than \$1.5 million.

For example, Manual Arts Senior High School in Los Angeles received \$11.77 million from 2003 to 2009—\$5.02 million through HPSG, \$6.03 million through QEIA, and \$722,000 through SAIT. Others keeping Manual Arts company on the list of top-20 spenders include Belmont Senior High (Los Angeles Unified), Lynwood Middle School (Lynwood Unified), Century High (Santa Ana Unified), Pacific High (San Bernardino Unified), and Los Angeles Senior High (Los Angeles Unified). For a full list of schools and their funding amounts, see the Appendix.

The list comprises disproportionately high-need schools: 78 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals. Meanwhile, 89 percent of the students are Latino or African-American and 38 percent are English-language learners. Common sense and

FIGURE 2 – PREVIOUS CALIFORNIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP)	<p>Schools required to develop an action plan to improve student achievement. At minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze data to identify undeserved subgroups and identify barriers to achievement • Set short-term academic objectives • Improve the involvement of parents and guardians • Improve the effective and efficient allocation of resources and management of the school
High Priority Schools Grant (HPSG) Program	<p>Schools required to develop an action plan that addresses strategies for improving achievement. At minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop high-quality curriculum and instruction aligned with standards • Provide each student with current appropriate instructional materials • Develop a strategy to recruit, retain, and distribute high-quality staff • Increase the number of credentialed teachers • Develop a school-parent compact • Maintain or increase parent and guardian contacts and school-home communications • If necessary, increase the number of bilingual personnel <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers and principals required to participate in state-specified professional development • School required to purchase state-adopted English and math textbooks
School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) Program	<p>Schools required to contract with a SAIT provider. The provider assesses the degree to which the school is implementing the nine SAIT Essential Program Components (EPCs) and helps the school implement a corrective action plan. The provider also monitors the school’s progress three times per year.</p>
Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA)	<p>Schools required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or reduce class size • Reduce high school pupil-to-counselor ratios • Ensure all teachers are highly qualified, as defined in federal law • Ensure no disparity in experience between QEIA and non-QEIA schools

research suggest that closing achievement gaps between these students and their more advantaged peers means investing more resources. Yet the influx of school-improvement funds to these schools has not yielded commensurate increases in student performance. By looking closer at the previous reform strategies used there, we can begin to see why.

RECYCLED REFORMS

The AIR evaluation of HPSG found that schools used these funds in several ways, with varying effectiveness in boosting school performance. Some schools put the HPSG funds into a “coherent program of school improvement.” For example, an elementary school focused on improving reading skills hired literacy coaches to work with each grade level. In contrast, other schools used the funds to backfill budget cuts and buy things they could not otherwise afford. Such items included new administrative positions; computers, software, and instructional materials; fees for teachers to attend conferences; technical assistance; and miscellaneous supplies.

The AIR evaluation found schools that used the funds in a coherent manner were organized and goal focused, while the schools that used HPSGP to fulfill their wish list of needs had “minimal interaction, planning, or collaboration.”

QEIA’s prescriptive nature, on the other hand, makes clear what strategies have been used in the schools it has funded. QEIA calls on schools to reduce class size, improve teacher and principal training, add counselors to high schools, and match the district average for years of teaching experience.

To see how these strategies work, we reviewed Single Plans for Student Achievement (SPSA)—the planning document required of California schools in Program Improvement. In its SPSA, De Anza Senior High School (West Contra Costa Unified) lists a host of school-improvement strategies, including many of those pushed by QEIA—class-size reduction in ninth and tenth grades; professional development for Advanced Placement teachers and the school librarian; and training for teachers on project-based learning, “blackboard configuration,” writing-rubric calibration, and the use of technology in the classroom. The plan also includes some more promising strategies such as extended learning time for tutoring and use of benchmark-assessment data. However, line items such as \$20,000 of QEIA funds for printer cartridges and copy paper may help explain why these funds have

quickly disappeared without yielding student-achievement gains.⁵ In fact, De Anza Senior High School’s API backslid 26 points from 2008 to 2009.

It’s no wonder that after receiving \$2.7 million in HPSG and QEIA funds, De Anza High has shown up once again on California’s list of persistently underperforming schools. Without different strategies and accountability for spending the dollars they may receive from the SIG program, failing schools will just do more of the same.

NEW HOPE FOR CHANGE

President Obama and U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan have put a high priority on turning around persistently underperforming schools. Secretary Duncan has required that states identify such schools and take aggressive action to improve them. The Obama Administration has backed these mandates with money by offering \$3.5 billion for the schools willing to enter the SIG program. The intent is to push states to improve their worst schools and provide them with the money to get the job done.

The administration identified four options for schools applying for SIG funds:

1. **Turnaround model:** Replace the principal and at least 50 percent of the teachers. Adopt a new governance structure, a new instructional program, and strategies for recruiting and retaining effective staff. Grant the principal flexibility in managing such things as the school calendar, staffing, and budgeting.
2. **Restart model:** Convert the school or close and reopen it as a charter school.
3. **School-closure model:** Close the school and transfer the students to a higher achieving school.
4. **Transformation model:** Replace the principal and implement strategies for increasing teacher and leader effectiveness. Start a new instructional program. Increase learning time and expand family and community engagement. Grant the principal flexibility in managing such things as the school calendar, staffing, and budgeting.

The first three options are aggressive interventions that could quickly force needed change, depending on how they are implemented. The fourth is a catch-all option that could differ widely from school to school, depending on its execution. In the best case scenario, the fourth option will lead to substantial school improvement. In the worst—and, sadly, more typical—case, it will allow a

school to duck reform requirements by tinkering on the edges of real change, implementing the same status-quo strategies that were previously tried and failed.

Sadly, the fourth turnaround model will be the overwhelming choice for most of California's chronically low-performing schools. For starters, districts are predisposed to choose the least drastic model for change. Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), for example, districts could use aggressive reform strategies for schools in the later stages of Program Improvement, but few have chosen to do so. An analysis by the Center for Education Policy found that in 2006-07, 90 percent of schools in the restructuring process required by NCLB chose the "other" option⁶ as their primary reform strategy.⁷

In addition, the timing of the federal SIG grant—plus the requirements of state law and local collective-bargaining agreements—has constrained the choice of strategies. Option four is the only one that doesn't require dismissal or movement of staff (except for the principal). Indeed, the state's deadline for issuing layoff notices for the 2010-11 school year was March 15—just days after the low-performing schools list was released.

Federal leaders tried to limit the fourth choice in districts with nine or more schools on the list, permitting them to use this option in no more than 50 percent of their schools. But in California, only three districts (Los Angeles Unified, San Bernardino Unified, and San Francisco Unified) fall into this category.

A BETTER RECIPE FOR REFORM

It is likely that the California Department of Education (CDE) soon will receive a flood of proposals from districts seeking SIG funds for option four, the transformation model. Rather than giving these proposals a cursory review and doling out federal monies by request or formula, state leaders must set the bar higher. That means weeding out proposals that promise more of the same weak ideas that have yielded marginal improvements at best. SIG dollars present an opportunity for real reform—but only if the state demands innovative, promising strategies.

We applaud the strong language to this effect in the Local Education Area (LEA) Request for Applications issued by the CDE. The CDE states that it will "only consider awarding funds to those LEAs that develop and submit a comprehensive and viable application likely to improve student achievement." We challenge the CDE to adhere to this pledge, and we look forward to reviewing

its funding decisions. Ultimate approval rests in the hands of the state board of education, and we challenge the board to hold the CDE accountable if it chooses to fund requests that fail to tackle the root causes of underperformance.

The federal Race to the Top program has demonstrated how this review and approval process can work. By asking states to vie for more than \$4 billion, establishing a panel of expert reviewers, and turning away all but the boldest proposals, the U.S. Department of Education encouraged states to discard the status quo in favor of real change. As CDE prepares to award funds to California's 188 persistently underperforming schools, it should follow a rigorous application-based process. In evaluating proposals, CDE should look for those that do the following:

- **Set ambitious targets for improvement.** To close achievement gaps, chronically underperforming schools must make up substantial ground. For this reason, LEAs should set clear, ambitious targets for schools, even if reaching those targets requires rapid year-to-year growth. Simply achieving the state's modest goals for API growth will not transform schools. Instead, LEAs should create improvement targets rigorous enough to move schools into the ranks of demographically similar high-performing schools over the three-year grant period. In addition, LEAs should set fixed school-performance targets benchmarked against the state goal of 800 API or against the API performance of the state's demographically similar top-performing schools. Because CDE already posts data about "Similar School" performance on its Web site, districts need not build additional data systems to set these goals.
- **Craft an innovative plan for recruiting, evaluating, and retaining the best teachers and leaders—and removing those who are ineffective.** This should include (1) annual evaluations of teachers using multiple measures, including student-growth data as one significant factor; (2) strategies for swiftly removing staff found to be ineffective in improving student outcomes; and (3) flexible compensation and financial incentives to attract teachers to high-need areas and recognize those who boost student outcomes.

- **Present strategies that identify high-risk students and create opportunities for them to excel.** Strong proposals will feature early warning systems that use a mix of student achievement and attendance measures to find students at risk of failure. Such proposals also will provide supports designed to ensure that high-need students, including low-income students, English-language learners, and special-needs students are achieving at grade level and being prepared for college and a career.
- **Recognize that more learning time can translate into increased achievement.** Bold proposals will lengthen the school day and add weekend or summer programs for all students. Although added tutoring time may help some students, true reform will mean structural changes in the school day and year; these may require some exemptions from union contracts.

Although the state will be distributing the funds, districts have a critical role in ensuring the strategies laid out above are successfully implemented. Districts that receive these new SIG funds must provide their schools with consistent support, freedom to innovate, and autonomy to make personnel decisions. AIR's evaluations of II/USP and HPSG found that this was not always the case: Some districts helped, and others hindered school improvement. For example, helpful districts provided student-assessment data, recruited effective staff, and provided professional development.

Districts that request SIG dollars must pledge to change personnel policies that lead to turnover among school leaders and staff; otherwise, reforms are less likely to take root. Districts must ensure that schools can select their staff, remove ineffective employees, avoid an imbalance of novice teachers (unless part of an intentional staffing strategy), and protect high-performing staff members from such practices as bumping, seniority-based layoffs, and "must place" assignments. In addition, districts must ensure that SIG dollars supplement, not supplant, the existing state, local, and federal funding that schools receive.

Once CDE selects the winning proposals, officials should publicly share their scores and comments regarding the actual school and district proposals, as is the case in the Race to the Top competition. In addition, the state should allocate sufficient dollars to a third-party evaluation of the program's effectiveness.

The federal government, too, must obligate states and districts to quickly distribute SIG dollars to schools, so they have adequate time to plan. Students in California's 188 low-performing schools cannot afford to wait for the wheels of state, county, and district bureaucracies to turn before receiving these critical funds. Nor can they afford to become victims, once again, of half-hearted and half-baked reform efforts. Effective change is based on thoughtful preparation and deliberate implementation. We know that the nation's best charter schools take a full year and spend significant dollars to recruit and train the right people, build a strong instructional program, and create a school culture of high expectations—all before opening their doors.

Let's be realistic about the planning and time needed for school improvement, even as we ensure the process moves swiftly. Some reforms will take more time to implement than others, but experience suggests that a short summer of planning is likely to be inadequate.

Finally, we urge the Obama Administration and California's leaders to hold schools to account and take action if a turnaround plan isn't working. If schools select option four, they should be required to meet performance targets by the end of the three-year grant period. If performance hasn't significantly improved by then, any future state or federal turnaround funds and efforts in that school should require the school to choose one of the first three options (or other strategies the grant's evaluation shows to be effective). California's students cannot afford to languish in chronically underperforming schools any longer.

CALIFORNIA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR REAL REFORM

The new School Improvement Grant program presents a singular opportunity. It shines a spotlight on high-need schools and provides them with sizable dollars—so critical in this season of fiscal crisis and budget cuts—that can spur overdue change. Rather than protest their placement on this list, schools, districts, and communities should seize the chance to advocate for meaningful reforms that address the problems that have plagued these schools and their students for too long. Community and district leaders should reject the failed school-improvement strategies of the past. Those strategies required a minimal investment of energy and suggested contentment with the status quo and incremental change.

The four turnaround models set forth by SIG are not silver bullets, and implementing any one of them alone cannot necessarily ensure comprehensive change. Rather, they create the conditions under which reform can happen. With these new SIG dollars, school, community, and district leaders have an opportunity to innovate. We appeal to state leaders to set the bar high. With sufficient courage and creativity, California can offer its highest need students the high-quality schools they deserve.

NOTES

- ¹ California uses the Academic Performance Index (API) to measure school performance and growth based on test scores in grades two through 12. Schools must improve their performance each year by 5 percent of the difference between their API and the statewide target of 800 (out of 1,000), with a minimum target of five points of growth.
- ² The statistically significant effects that were present were very small and arguably educationally insignificant. For example, Cohort One II/USP schools gained an average of seven API points more during the planning years than the comparison schools. The average API target for this group of schools was 14 points.
- ³ Tuss, P. (2009). "Analysis of the Impacts of QEIA on Student Achievement." Sacramento County Office of Education, Center for Student Assessment and Program Accountability.
- ⁴ API subgroup targets: All subgroups must meet the school's growth target of 5 percent of the difference between its API and 800, or a minimum of five points.
- ⁵ De Anza Senior High School Single Plan for Student Achievement.
www.wccusd.net/Documents/studentachievement.aspx.
- ⁶ The school may choose to implement "any other major restructuring of the school governance" that is likely to significantly improve school performance. This includes changes to staffing, curriculum, grade or class-size configuration, and so on.
- ⁷ Center on Education Policy. (2008). "Managing More than a Thousand Remodeling Projects: School Restructuring in California." Washington, D.C.

ABOUT THE EDUCATION TRUST—WEST

The Education Trust promotes high academic achievement for all students at all levels—pre-kindergarten through college. We work alongside parents, educators, and community and business leaders across the country in transforming schools and colleges into institutions that serve all students well. Lessons learned in these efforts, together with unflinching data analyses, shape our state and national policy agendas. Our goal is to close the gaps in opportunity and achievement that consign far too many young people—especially those who are black, Latino, American Indian, or from low-income families—to lives on the margins of the American mainstream.

1814 Franklin St., Suite 220, Oakland, Calif. 94612
T 510/465-6444 F 510/465-0589

APPENDIX: CALIFORNIA'S 188 PERSISTENTLY UNDERPERFORMING SCHOOLS AND PREVIOUS STATE SCHOOL- IMPROVEMENT GRANTS, 2003-09

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
Alameda	Hayward Unified	Burbank Elementary	755	9	79	59	83	\$ -	\$716,663	\$ -	\$716,663
Alameda	Hayward Unified	Longwood Elementary	719	6	77	57	78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Alameda	Hayward Unified	Tennyson High	1581	13	56	31	55	\$312,320	\$ -	\$ -	\$312,320
Alameda	Oakland Unified	Alliance Academy	336	27	68	48	85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Alameda	Oakland Unified	Elmhurst Community Prep	347	30	65	43	88	\$664,320	\$ -	\$ -	\$664,320
Alameda	Oakland Unified	Explore Middle	244	74	17	9	81	\$50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland Unified	ROOTS International Academy	349	28	65	41	85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Alameda	Oakland Unified	United for Success Academy	391	18	69	44	95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Alameda	San Lorenzo Unified	Hillside Elementary	485	32	53	52	77	\$466,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$466,400
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Bel Air Elementary	470	23	59	46	92	\$443,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$443,600
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Glenbrook Middle	587	6	66	35	77	\$589,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$589,600
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Meadow Homes Elementary	876	2	88	79	87	\$754,400	\$878,264	\$ -	\$1,632,664
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Oak Grove Middle	634	5	72	49	83	\$601,200	\$985,491	\$211,200	\$1,797,891
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Rio Vista Elementary	429	12	66	48	85	\$373,760	\$ -	\$ -	\$373,760
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	Shore Acres Elementary	540	3	86	76	91	\$536,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$536,800
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa Unified	De Anza Senior High	952	27	35	22	57	\$978,800	\$1,765,005	\$ -	\$2,743,805
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa Unified	Helms Middle	755	14	76	47	93	\$632,640	\$1,088,528	\$ -	\$1,721,168
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa Unified	Lincoln Elementary	378	15	81	66	100	\$950,880	\$ -	\$ -	\$950,880
Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	Castle Rock	443	0	11	2	55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
El Dorado	Lake Tahoe Unified	Bijou Community	524	1	76	69	90	\$ -	\$513,023	\$ -	\$513,023
Fresno	Fresno Unified	Carver Academy	275	27	41	45	92	\$641,760	\$486,025	\$121,650	\$1,249,435
Fresno	Fresno Unified	Webster Elementary	491	4	78	39	98	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fresno	Fresno Unified	Yosemite Middle	648	5	68	43	96	\$1,359,120	\$1,139,285	\$ -	\$2,498,405
Fresno	Parlier Unified	Martinez (John C.) Elementary	467	0	99	79	81	\$216,000	\$ -	\$69,000	\$285,000
Fresno	Parlier Unified	Parlier Junior High	488	0	99	60	92	\$760,000	\$835,094	\$161,500	\$1,756,594
Humboldt	Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified	Hoopa Valley Elementary	437	0	1	0	88	\$ -	\$543,083	\$ -	\$543,083
Kern	Arvin Union Elementary	Bear Mountain Elementary	884	1	95	80	97	\$1,512,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,512,000
Kern	Arvin Union Elementary	Sierra Vista Elementary	908	1	96	80	96	\$813,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$813,120
Kern	Beardsley Elementary	Beardsley Intermediate	387	2	27	6	92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Kern	Buttonwillow Union Elementary	Buttonwillow Elementary	386	1	88	61	91	\$357,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$357,600
Kern	Fairfax Elementary	Shirley Lane Elementary	699	4	85	46	93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Kern	Kern County Office of Ed.	Kern County Community	1636	15	58	15	33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Kern	Maricopa Unified	Maricopa Elem.	188	1	33	18	91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Kern	McFarland Unified	McFarland High	864	1	95	31	97	\$548,520	\$ -	\$ -	\$548,520
Kern	Semitropic Elementary	Semitropic Elementary	234	1	95	60	88	\$165,760	\$ -	\$114,150	\$279,910
Kern	Wasco Union Elementary	Palm Avenue Elementary	741	4	90	49	87	\$71,680	\$ -	\$ -	\$71,680
Kings	Lakeside Union Elementary	Lakeside Elementary	286	13	75	42	94	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
Kings	Reef-Sunset Unified	Avenal Elementary	757	0	96	74	93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	ABC Unified	Pharis F. Fedde Middle	439	4	87	47	88	\$490,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$490,000
Los Angeles	Antelope Valley Union High	Antelope Valley High	1817	33	49	21	73	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Antelope Valley Union High	Eastside High	2331	33	46	16	69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Antelope Valley Union High	Littlerock High	1839	10	63	29	74	\$1,853,440	\$ -	\$1,055,100	\$2,908,540
Los Angeles	Azusa Unified	Valleydale Elementary	398	3	91	50	87	\$432,000	\$444,940	\$ -	\$876,940
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Centennial High	1396	38	62	35	69	\$659,520	\$ -	\$ -	\$659,520
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Davis Middle	1327	17	82	57	95	\$688,640	\$2,098,235	\$ -	\$2,786,875
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Dominguez High	2668	23	75	40	75	\$2,703,360	\$ -	\$483,400	\$3,186,760
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Martin Luther King Elementary	601	18	81	64	85	\$297,000	\$625,210	\$ -	\$922,210
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Vanguard Learning Center	414	45	54	23	78	\$ -	\$742,190	\$ -	\$742,190
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Walton Middle	575	31	66	44	82	\$366,240	\$877,912	\$ -	\$1,244,152
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Whaley Middle	1039	10	88	58	91	\$ -	\$ -	\$195,000	\$195,000
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Willowbrook Middle	512	40	59	30	92	\$156,960	\$925,900	\$ -	\$1,082,860
Los Angeles	Hacienda la Puente Unified	William Workman High	1171	1	89	24	66	\$1,859,840	\$ -	\$313,300	\$2,173,140
Los Angeles	Inglewood Unified	Crozier (George W.) Middle	1185	26	73	31	68	\$782,080	\$1,795,014	\$ -	\$2,577,094
Los Angeles	Inglewood Unified	Lane (Warren) Elementary	599	82	16	9	68	\$711,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$711,600
Los Angeles	Inglewood Unified	Monroe (Albert F.) Middle	1017	26	72	37	78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Lennox Elementary	Century Academy for Excellence	324	94	6	0	93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Today's Fresh Start Charter	611	62	35	33	91	\$468,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$468,800
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Angeles Mesa Elementary	485	55	43	20	90	\$454,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$454,400
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Audubon Middle	1215	65	33	11	79	\$3,543,120	\$2,086,295	\$ -	\$5,629,415
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Belmont Senior High	1468	3	88	49	85	\$4,421,760	\$7,051,248	\$ -	\$11,473,008
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Carson Senior High	3544	19	46	10	47	\$777,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$777,840
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Charles Drew Middle	2152	15	84	39	83	\$4,025,280	\$3,605,920	\$ -	\$7,631,200
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Crenshaw Senior High	2042	65	33	12	80	\$3,486,720	\$3,596,885	\$571,300	\$7,654,905
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	East Valley Senior High	1309	5	84	29	79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Edwin Markham Middle	1495	27	72	35	82	\$894,240	\$2,416,725	\$ -	\$3,310,965
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Florence Griffith Joyner Elem.	935	32	67	39	93	\$1,369,600	\$ -	\$234,600	\$1,604,200
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Gardena Senior High	3166	33	59	18	62	\$2,323,320	\$ -	\$528,600	\$2,851,920
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	George Washington Carver Middle	1960	7	93	45	89	\$4,010,160	\$3,364,666	\$ -	\$7,374,826
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	George Washington Preparatory High	2383	52	46	21	86	\$4,369,920	\$4,511,640	\$538,300	\$9,419,860
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Henry Clay Middle	1302	49	50	24	88	\$3,079,440	\$2,460,060	\$ -	\$5,539,500
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Henry T. Gage Middle	3150	0	99	32	89	\$2,955,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,955,120

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Hillcrest Drive Elementary	906	51	47	32	92	\$794,240	\$1,003,253	\$ -	\$1,797,493
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	International Studies Learning Center	760	1	98	20	71	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	John Muir Middle	2002	23	76	36	77	\$1,202,560	\$3,332,999	\$ -	\$4,535,559
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Los Angeles Senior High	3163	11	76	40	74	\$7,032,480	\$6,250,263	\$ -	\$13,282,743
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Manual Arts Senior High	3500	18	81	39	76	\$5,015,040	\$6,032,333	\$722,200	\$11,769,573
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Maywood Academy High	1349	0	99	26	91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Miguel Contreras Learning Complex	935	2	93	36	84	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	2092	3	88	42	87	\$3,625,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$3,625,440
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Robert Louis Stevenson Middle	2283	0	99	36	87	\$1,175,040	\$3,758,423	\$ -	\$4,933,463
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Samuel Gompers Middle	1619	29	71	35	76	\$1,618,320	\$2,648,430	\$ -	\$4,266,750
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	San Fernando Senior High	3282	1	97	34	86	\$2,867,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,867,200
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	South East High	2815	1	99	30	80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Sun Valley Middle	1643	2	95	40	90	\$2,566,080	\$3,877,677	\$ -	\$6,443,757
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Sylmar Senior High	3672	2	94	26	68	\$ -	\$5,991,575	\$ -	\$5,991,575
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Thomas Jefferson Senior High	1971	9	90	46	84	\$3,028,080	\$3,344,988	\$763,800	\$7,136,868
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	William Jefferson Clinton Middle	1151	9	91	42	80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Woodcrest Elementary	924	36	63	47	96	\$1,261,680	\$1,052,465	\$ -	\$2,314,145
Los Angeles	Lynwood Unified	Lynwood High	3152	11	88	34	100	\$3,468,360	\$ -	\$ -	\$3,468,360
Los Angeles	Lynwood Unified	Lynwood Middle	1648	10	89	37	100	\$1,839,200	\$2,716,642	\$ -	\$4,555,842
Los Angeles	Palmdale Elementary	Cactus Middle	1064	18	69	30	81	\$462,000	\$ -	\$165,300	\$627,300
Los Angeles	Palmdale Elementary	Tumbleweed Elementary	1004	13	75	42	62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Los Angeles	Pomona Unified	Emerson Middle	831	4	89	44	91	\$286,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$286,800
Los Angeles	Pomona Unified	Fremont Middle	785	4	92	46	92	\$1,863,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,863,120
Los Angeles	Pomona Unified	Pomona Senior High	1839	11	82	39	74	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Monterey	Alisal Union	Bardin Elementary	814	0	98	76	0	\$1,528,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,528,000
Monterey	Alisal Union	Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Elem	522	1	99	83	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Monterey	Chualar Union Elementary	Chualar Elementary	364	0	98	76	100	\$153,600	\$373,659	\$ -	\$527,259
Monterey	Greenfield Union Elementary	Greenfield Elementary	628	1	97	79	96	\$504,840	\$544,613	\$ -	\$1,049,453
Monterey	Greenfield Union Elementary	Vista Verde Middle	782	1	96	50	89	\$351,840	\$1,155,836	\$ -	\$1,507,676
Monterey	King City Joint Union High	Greenfield High	988	1	95	44	67	\$727,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$727,440
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula Unified	Highland Elementary	417	5	84	76	92	\$280,320	\$ -	\$ -	\$280,320
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula Unified	Martin Luther King	728	11	70	46	83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula Unified	Seaside High	1233	14	46	23	52	\$950,400	\$ -	\$505,000	\$1,455,400
Monterey	North Monterey County Unified	Castroville Elementary	619	1	91	58	79	\$504,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$504,800
Monterey	Soledad Unified	Rose Ferrero Elementary	424	0	91	48	92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Century High	2472	0	96	52	80	\$4,583,040	\$4,229,975	\$481,000	\$9,294,015
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Saddleback High	2144	1	94	47	70	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Santa Ana High	3368	1	98	53	82	\$3,083,640	\$ -	\$ -	\$3,083,640
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Sierra Intermediate	875	1	95	67	89	\$1,831,200	\$1,451,743	\$ -	\$3,282,943
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Valley High	2610	1	97	58	77	\$2,452,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,452,800
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Willard Intermediate	1172	0	98	70	92	\$2,246,160	\$2,059,736	\$ -	\$4,305,896
Riverside	Alvord Unified	Norte Vista High	2388	3	82	42	64	\$516,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$516,480
Riverside	Coachella Valley Unified	West Shores High	415	3	84	48	91	\$188,160	\$ -	\$60,900	\$249,060
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	March Mountain High	684	26	60	23	58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Riverside	Palm Springs Unified	Desert Hot Springs High	1952	7	70	24	77	\$1,482,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,482,800
Riverside	Palo Verde Unified	Palo Verde High	936	10	56	8	56	\$ -	\$ -	\$130,800	\$130,800
Riverside	Perris Elementary	Good Hope Elementary	915	3	87	58	87	\$718,000	\$956,998	\$ -	\$1,674,998
Riverside	Perris Union High	Perris High	2692	11	80	19	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Riverside	Riverside County Office of Education	Riverside County Community	1146	13	64	6	55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Oak Ridge Elementary	459	21	46	41	93	\$129,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$129,800
Sacramento	San Juan Unified	Encina Preparatory High	732	23	39	24	82	\$545,280	\$ -	\$ -	\$545,280
Sacramento	Twin Rivers Unified	Highlands Academy of Arts and Design	1,554	15	27	18	70	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Benito	Aromas/San Juan Unified	San Juan	420	2	72	40	64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Bernardino	Fontana Unified	Fontana A. B. Miller High	3006	8	82	32	65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Arroyo Valley High	3022	14	79	34	83	\$1,269,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,269,200
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Barton Elementary	523	26	55	28	89	\$220,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$220,400
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Davidson Elementary	522	17	70	28	86	\$256,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$256,400
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Hunt Elementary	744	20	67	40	95	\$354,000	\$825,127	\$122,550	\$1,301,677
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Marshall Elementary	600	14	73	32	90	\$29,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$29,200
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Pacific High	2243	17	68	27	86	\$648,960	\$3,769,495	\$ -	\$4,418,455
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Rio Vista Elementary	578	29	62	42	94	\$375,760	\$687,484	\$99,150	\$1,162,394
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	San Gorgonio High	3111	16	65	24	76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Serrano Middle	959	19	57	22	83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Shandin Hills Middle	1202	15	70	27	80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	Wilson Elementary	691	13	76	37	93	\$472,320	\$767,222	\$ -	\$1,239,542
San Diego	Escondido Union Elementary	Felicita Elementary	659	1	92	79	78	\$451,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$451,440
San Diego	San Diego Unified	Burbank Elementary	380	2	97	77	97	\$17,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$17,200
San Diego	San Diego Unified	Charter School of San Diego	1912	15	42	10	57	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Diego	San Diego Unified	King/Chavez Arts Academy	131	4	93	82	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Diego	San Diego Unified	San Diego Business	445	13	79	40	90	\$420,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$420,000
San Diego	San Diego Unified	San Diego MVP Arts	487	11	77	35	93	\$460,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$460,000
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Brown, Jr., (Willie L.) Elementary	221	72	3	12	81	\$172,000	\$299,428	\$ -	\$471,428

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Bryant Elementary	230	3	86	70	87	\$231,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$231,200
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Cesar Chavez Elementary	461	2	86	72	78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Everett Middle	427	19	58	51	73	\$861,840	\$760,694	\$222,000	\$1,844,534
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	George Washington Carver Elementary	266	68	5	5	85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Horace Mann Middle	330	15	68	47	77	\$144,000	\$697,419	\$183,750	\$1,025,169
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	John Muir Elementary	243	37	44	41	86	\$ -	\$250,873	\$ -	\$250,873
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	John O'Connell Alternative High	662	11	74	47	62	\$826,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$826,000
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Mission High	854	19	46	47	60	\$419,520	\$1,487,760	\$ -	\$1,907,280
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Paul Revere Elementary	409	20	57	44	71	\$336,000	\$470,524	\$ -	\$806,524
San Joaquin	Lodi Unified	Lawrence Elementary	553	1	82	72	95	\$24,640	\$ -	\$ -	\$24,640
San Joaquin	Lodi Unified	Sutherland Elementary	378	28	35	37	88	\$25,240	\$614,005	\$ -	\$639,245
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Harrison Elementary	681	14	52	29	84	\$555,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$555,600
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	John C. Fremont Elementary	707	6	74	37	92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Nightingale Elem	497	28	58	40	85	\$784,560	\$592,896	\$ -	\$1,377,456
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Richard A. Pittman Elem	726	6	73	55	92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Roosevelt Elem	546	12	70	41	92	\$136,600	\$693,696	\$ -	\$830,296
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Taylor Skills Elementary	578	16	42	39	95	\$228,800	\$ -	\$168,150	\$396,950
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Wilhelmina Henry Elementary	973	3	73	45	88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Mateo	La Honda-Pescadero Unified	Pescadero Elementary and Middle	174	2	77	71	80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
San Mateo	Ravenswood City Elementary	Costano Elementary	339	19	65	60	73	\$50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$50,000
San Mateo	Ravenswood City Elementary	Edison-Ronald McNair Intermediate	501	8	81	63	76	\$895,440	\$ -	\$60,450	\$955,890
San Mateo	Ravenswood City Elementary	Stanford New School	536	17	75	61	81	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara Elementary	Cesar Estrada Chavez Dual Language Immersion	255	1	84	68	68	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria-Bonita	Adam (William Laird) Elementary	793	1	95	72	83	\$597,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$597,600
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria-Bonita	Alvin Elementary	683	1	90	67	81	\$560,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$560,800
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria-Bonita	Calvin C. Oakley Elementary	784	1	93	66	75	\$665,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$665,600
Santa Clara	Alum Rock Union Elementary	Cesar Chavez Elementary	561	1	85	75	100	\$356,640	\$624,056	\$ -	\$980,696
Santa Clara	East Side Union High	Escuela Popular Accelerated Family Learning	311	2	97	94	82	\$50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$50,000
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	Calabasas Elementary	639	0	95	75	92	\$156,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$156,000
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	E. A. Hall Middle	620	0	96	49	82	\$1,505,280	\$984,566	\$ -	\$2,489,846
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	Hall District Elementary	570	0	96	78	90	\$574,560	\$ -	\$ -	\$574,560
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	T.S. MacQuiddy Elementary	662	0	96	76	88	\$241,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$241,600

California's Persistently Underperforming Schools								Previous State School Improvement Grants 2003-09*			
County	District	School	Enrollment	% African American	% Latino	% English Learners	% Free/Reduced Meals	HPSG / II/USP	QEIA	SAIT	Total
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	Watsonville High	2134	0	93	37	75	\$2,701,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,701,440
Solano	Vallejo City Unified	Hogan High	1445	31	28	12	44	\$1,068,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,068,160
Solano	Vallejo City Unified	Vallejo High	1797	34	28	13	51	\$532,320	\$3,070,029	\$ -	\$3,602,349
Sonoma	Bellevue Union Elementary	Kawana Elementary	388	4	77	66	96	\$405,120	\$ -	\$279,000	\$684,120
Stanislaus	Modesto City Elementary	Robertson Road Elementary	390	6	78	58	94	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tulare	Alta Vista Elementary	Alta Vista Elementary	502	0	74	56	100	\$232,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$232,800
Tulare	Farmersville Unified	Farmersville High	687	0	91	28	85	\$868,560	\$ -	\$ -	\$868,560
Tulare	Farmersville Unified	George L. Snowden Elem	412	0	91	67	90	\$858,480	\$316,259	\$ -	\$1,174,739
Tulare	Lindsay Unified	Jefferson Elementary	708	0	89	63	83	\$324,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$324,000
Tulare	Lindsay Unified	Lindsay Senior High	1108	0	89	40	71	\$470,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$470,400
Tulare	Visalia Unified	Highland Elementary	511	3	80	56	98	\$787,920	\$ -	\$ -	\$787,920
Tulare	Waukena Joint Union Elem	Waukena Joint Union Elementary	222	0	74	43	77	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Yuba	Marysville Joint Unified	Ella Elementary	528	1	52	49	90	\$328,320	\$ -	\$ -	\$328,320
188 Schools			197,500	14	75	38	78	\$145,816,840	\$113,246,434	\$8,561,150	\$267,624,424

Sources: HPSG Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 data provided by the California Department of Education. These data include II/USP funds for HPSG grantees. All other data obtained from California Department of Education Web site. www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/.

*Notes: SAIT funding only reflects grants from 2005-06 to 2008-09. Data on previous state school-improvement grants may be incomplete and/or may or may not reflect HPSG, II/USP, QEIA, and SAIT funding levels actually received by individual schools. In addition, it does not capture total participation; a number of schools on this list may have been eligible for but did not draw down funds.