

**Tier III FY2009 Schools
Application for Year 3 Continued Funding**

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Due: July 9, 2012

APPROVED 8-23-12 SF

Please complete this application for each school.

PART I: DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name:		Amherst County Public Schools			
Division Contact:		Dr. Julie Rogers			
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):		434-946-9387	Fax:	434-946-9346	
Email of Division Contact:		jrogers@amherst.k12.va.us			
Name of School	Central Elementary School	2012-2013 Grade Span	PreK-5	Projected School Membership	260
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	70	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	11	Current Percent Limited English Proficient
Name of Principal		Kathleen M. Pierce			
Telephone of Principal		434-946-9700			
Email of Principal		kpierce@amherst.k12.va.us			

PART II: PROCESSES IN PLACE

Complete responses for each question. This summary of processes the division and school have implemented and description of reform efforts will guide the identification of 2012-2013 goals in Part III: Goal Setting.

A. School Climate

- How has the general school climate (i.e. the feel of the building when you walk in) changed since the implementation of the SIG grant? Is it where you want it to be? If not, what can you do to make further changes?

Many parents and community members have commented on the positive feeling in the building, and the close, encouraging attention staff members give to our students. The school has a reputation among those who attend, for being a positive, encouraging place but the change includes the incorporation of higher expectations for all students' success as an element of the climate.

B. Process Steps/Atmosphere of Change

- How are all members of the Leadership Team / Improvement Team encouraged to contribute? How are their opinions considered and incorporated? How are responsibilities divided amongst the team members?

Collaborative work and consistent expectations for high student achievement have become the norm as Improvement Team members bring information to their grade levels, analyze data, and make recommendations for improvement. After faculty data analysis, grade level discussions, and mixed-grade discussions, recommendations are made at the end of the year. During the summer, school improvement team members select the indicators for the school improvement plan as well as the tasks and timelines, based on the data and on faculty input from year-end recommendations. During the development, implementation, and results analysis phases of the school improvement plan process, sub-committees within the school improvement team focus on indicators and tasks selected by them at the start of the year, so that the same team members track and report on progress for each indicator, all year. The subdivision of tasks facilitates careful monitoring and as sub-committees report to the school

improvement team, all team members are invited to make recommendations for revision as needed.

2. How are new strategies or practices monitored throughout the year? What happens if they don't seem to be working?

During monthly SIT meetings, data and progress for indicators are monitored by sub-committees. When things are not working, tasks are eliminated, changed, or added, with input from stakeholders within the committee and from the faculty via SIT member representation.

C. Instruction

1. How do teachers differentiate learning for students? How are students identified as needing additional support in core content areas?

Small group reading instruction is an essential element in the school-wide instructional plan, with quarterly measures of reading levels and Word Study used to group students for daily instruction. Each unit of instruction includes plans for formative assessment. Teams monitor student progress and group students for intervention based on formative data. Students who failed an SOL in the previous year and those who do not meet PALS benchmarks are monitored via team meetings with the principal and data tracking forms.

2. Provide data that demonstrate that the curriculum is aligned with the SOL and is aligned within the school and across grade levels? If not aligned, what is the process for doing this? (i.e. SOL proficiency rates demonstrate that the taught is not aligned to the tested and written curriculum. Division staff, school staff and principal will develop a lesson plan review system and check system to ensure that teachers are teaching to the written and tested curriculum.)

Current reading achievement on the SOLs and PALS assessments demonstrates alignment in reading. Preliminary SOL results include a 93% pass rate for grade 5 reading, 75% for grade 4 reading; and 82% for grade 3 (up from 67% in 2011). The math curriculum pacing guide has undergone additional revisions at the division level to reflect improved alignment.

D. Parental Involvement

1. How are parents supporting the improvement effort? In what ways are parents involved in the school and their children's education? In what other ways could parents be more involved?

Nearly every child in the school submitted weekly reading logs signed by parents to verify time spent reading at home. In addition, parent volunteers help to tabulate reading logs for individual, class, grade, and school totals; and parents are actively involved in attendance at quarterly concerts, awards assemblies, and periodic events such as Back to School Night, evening Book Fairs, the Science Fair, and the fall and spring carnivals. At each of the events, there is information sharing regarding aspects of school improvement

E. Staffing and Relationships

1. How are teachers given positions, classes & grades? Is this process getting the most skilled teachers in front of the right group of students? If not, how can the process be changed?

Teachers are assigned based on certifications, and on providing the "best fit" in terms of experience and content knowledge at each grade level. Our master schedule was revised for 2011-2012, to increase the time reading specialists can "push in" at each grade level, in addition to the daily intervention these highly trained reading specialists provide for students who struggle most.

2. How do you define the relationship between the division and state-assigned division liaison? How can it be improved?

The relationship between the division and state-assigned liaison is positive. There is good communication and resource/recommendations are pertinent to school and division needs.

F. Decision-making Process and Autonomy

1. What is the school and division level decision-making process for anything related to the school improvement effort, overall strategic vision, or anything that impacts the improvement plan?

The division team reviews the school improvement plan and relevant data, provides feedback, and revises the division plan to support the school.

2. What division policies were changed this year? (i.e. priority in filling teacher vacancies, exemptions from division PD sessions, school year/day adjustments)

none

3. What policy barriers still exist to truly getting the school what it needs to succeed? What is the process to remove those barriers? Please note where the policies originate (i.e. state code or division policy).

Division-wide budget limitations have reduced the number of support personnel in all schools. A part-time secretary to monitor bus radios in the afternoons and a full-time teacher assistant who provided computerized instruction are two positions that were cut in the budget process over the past two years, impacting the overall schedule and pressure in the main office to handle managerial tasks with limited personnel.

4. How is shared governance and accountability between the division and the school leadership implemented in this division and with this school? This must be included in the division and school improvement plan.

Monthly and quarterly meetings among the teams, and principals, and quarterly meetings between the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and the school principal provide ongoing support, monitoring and feedback processes.

G. Phase Out

1. How will the division and school decide what services should be maintained after SIG funds and supports end in 2013?

Decisions will be made based on what has worked and on available local funds if no further grant monies are awarded. The division has applied for 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant.

2. How will the district and school prepare for the phase out of funds, supports, and services? Who will be involved and what will be their role?

The Reading Coach and Instructional Coach positions will be reviewed to determine how these supports can be provided by other means. The division team will conduct the review and make recommendations to the Superintendent during the budget planning process.

3. What supports from the state would be the most helpful during year 3?

Continued support in the form of quarterly meetings, data review, and guidance via the division liaison would be most helpful.

4. What supports from the state would be the most helpful after SIG funding ends?

Additional funding to continue to provide at least one coach and the division liaison would be most helpful.

PART III: GOAL SETTING

A. Outcomes: Based on the school's 2011-2012 improvement plan, list the outcomes resulting from the reform efforts implemented under 1003(g) SIG funding during the 2011-2012 term.

Please describe in detail the 2011-2012 outcomes below.

1	Preliminary Grade 3 reading SOL pass rates increased from 67% in 2011 to 82% in 2012.
2	Preliminary Grade 4 reading SOL pass rates were 75%, as compared to 80% in 2011.
3	Preliminary Grade 5 reading SOL pass rates were 93% as compared to 82% in 2011.

4	Preliminary Math SOL pass rates were down in 2012 compared to 2011.
5	Parent involvement in the student reading program increased as a result of implementation of the "Reading Millionaire" program.

B. Goals for 2012-2103: Use the current 2011-12 data from Quarterly Reports, Interventions, Datacation, etc. and other data sources collected to respond to the following questions for continued FY2009 1003(g) grant funding.

Please list 5 (SMART) goals for the upcoming school year:

<p>Example: By June 2013 SOL mathematics scores will increase by 15% in grade 7 and by 5% in grade 6, 8 to exceed the state benchmark by 5% by establishing a laser-like focus on the monitoring of math remediation services using the ARDT as a screening tool for all students to identify area of student need, design remediation content, establish a timeline for remediation services, and record strand assessments results. (Indicate the Indistar indicator(s) that will be addressed in the School Improvement plan and bullet the associated tasks that will be implemented under each indicator to accomplish each goal.)</p>	
1	By June, 2013 SOL reading scores for grade 3 will increase by 10%. IE06, Tasks 1-9; IF08, Tasks 1, 2, 3, 5; IIC01, Task 2; IIC03, Task 3; IIIB02, all 7 tasks
2	By June, 2013 SOL reading scores for grade 4 will increase by 10%. IE06, Tasks 1-9; IF08, Tasks 1, 2, 3, 5; IIC01, Task 2; IIC03, Task 3; IIIB02, all 7 tasks
3	By June, 2013 SOL reading scores for grade 5 will increase by 2%. IE06, Tasks 1-9; IF08, Tasks 1, 2, 3, 5; IIC01, Task 2; IIC03, Task 3; IIIB02, all 7 tasks
4	By June, 2013 SOL writing scores for grade 5 will be 80% or higher. IE06, Tasks 1, 4-9; IF08, Tasks 1, 2, 5, 6; IIC01, Task 1
5	By June, 2013 SOL math scores will increase by 15% in grades 3 through 5. IE06, Tasks 1, 4-9; IF08, Tasks 1, 2, 4, 5; IIC03, Tasks 1, 2

PART IV: SCHOOL PLAN TO MONITOR INTERVENTIONS AT THE SCHOOL-LEVEL

Based on the analysis of the school's academic achievement and intervention data collected during the 2011-12 school year, provide a detailed tiered approach to interventions to support student achievement that will be implemented in the school improvement plan as it is developed. Describe specific interventions being put in place as a result of the data analysis.

The description of the intervention for each group should include the following elements:

- a. targeted group; intervention description;
- b. intervention provider;
- c. frequency and amount of time for each tier; and,
- d. description of how the intervention will be monitored.

See the sample provided.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

Students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	5 th grade math teachers will work collaboratively to develop a list of activities on the math remediation software (intervention description) for the highly qualified paraprofessional (intervention provider) to use with the students identified by grades C-D, low weekly formative assessment performance and scoring 70-80% on 9-weeks assessment (targeted group) during the first 9 weeks in lieu of specials 3 days per week for 40 minutes (frequency and time). Teachers will review results from remediation software reports bi-weekly (monitoring).
Tier 3	5 th grade math teachers will work collaboratively with math specialist to analyze lesson plans and instructional strategies used during instruction of Measurement and Geometry to develop hands-on activities for daily intervention small group pull-out (intervention description). The licensed Title I teacher (intervention provider) will address specific skills identified in the strand for the targeted population 5 days/week for 40 minutes (frequency and time). Teachers will review results of ARDT strand tests as they are completed in accordance with student's remediation timeline (4 weeks at minimum) (monitoring).

Part IV (a): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a reading SOL	
Tier 2	Classroom teachers and Title I reading specialists will lead guided reading groups in grades 1-5 as the reading specialists "push-in" during daily reading classes, according to plans developed in collaboration among grade level teachers and the reading specialists. Word Study will be incorporated in small group instruction for students struggling with phonics and word recognition, as appropriate.
Tier 3	Title I reading specialists and classroom teachers will work with small groups of students to support word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, based on students' identified needs from individual reading inventories, fluency measures, and assessments of vocabulary and comprehension. Assessment will occur at least quarterly and intervention groups will be formed twice or more per quarter, depending on student needs and current unit work. This intervention will be provided during the daily thirty-minute intervention period.

Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	Grades 2-5 math teachers will work with the instructional coach to plan specific lessons for intervention to be provided by the coach and the teachers to use with students identified with low weekly formative assessment performance and/or scoring 70-80% on 9-week assessments during small group differentiated math time in the daily math schedule.
Tier 3	Grades 2-5 math teachers will work with the instructional coach to plan specific lessons for intervention to be provided by the coach to use with students identified as having failed the previous year's math SOL <u>AND</u> scoring less than 70% on 9-week assessments during the first nine weeks in lieu of specials 3 days per week for 40 minutes. Each four weeks teachers will assess individual student progress to determine mastery or need for further assistance.

Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable	
Tier 2	Title I reading specialists will "push in" to classes for thirty minutes per group during daily reading instruction to provide instruction for students who are below grade level in reading, according to running records. They will also incorporate Word Study instruction, where appropriate, in their small group support. This support will occur throughout the year.
Tier 3	Title I reading specialists and PALS tutors will provide daily small group reading practice in a pull-out program, during the thirty-minute daily intervention period.

Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	All were included above;
Tier 3	All were included above;

Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	All were included above;
Tier 3	All were included above;

Part V: BUDGET (DIVISION/SCHOOL)

Budget Summary

School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds may be expended on any allowable expense as described in the Guidelines for School Improvement Grant Application document. School Improvement Grant funds may also be expended for the purchase of educational vendor/company services to support the implementation of the selected intervention model(s). The LEA must submit the following:

- a. For the school served with SIG funds, a budget summary detailing expenditures designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) or, if applicable, other school improvement strategies.
- b. For the school served with SIG funds, a detailed narrative describing the use of SIG funds and other sources such as Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III, Part A; Title VI, Part B; state and/or local resources supporting the SIG initiatives.

See following pages for budget form(s).

Budget Expenditure Code Definitions

These expenditure codes are for budgeting and recording expenditures of the educational agency for activities under its control. Below are definitions of the major expenditure categories. The descriptions provided are examples only. For further clarification on the proper expenditures of funds, contact your school division budget or finance office, the grant specialist in the Virginia Department of Education, or refer to the appropriate federal act.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1000 | Personal Services - All compensation for the direct labor of persons in the employment of the local government. Salaries and wages paid to employees for full- and part-time work, including overtime, shift differential and similar compensation. Also includes payments for time not worked, including sick leave, vacation, holidays, and other paid absences (jury duty, military pay, etc.), which are earned during the reporting period. |
| 2000 | Employee Benefits - Job related benefits provided employees are part of their total compensation. Fringe benefits include the employer's portion of FICA, pensions, insurance (life, health, disability income, etc.), and employee allowances. |
| 3000 | Purchased Services - Services acquired from outside sources (i.e., private vendors, other governmental entities). Purchase of the service is on a fee basis or fixed time contract basis. Payments for rentals and utilities are not included in this account description. |
| 4000 | Internal Services - Charges from an Internal Service Fund to other functions/activities/elements of the local government for the use of intra-governmental services, such as data processing, automotive/motor pool, central purchasing/central stores, print shop, and risk management. |
| 5000 | Other Charges - Includes expenditures that support the program, including utilities (maintenance and operation of plant), staff/administrative/consultant travel, travel (staff/administration), office phone charges, training, leases/rental, Indirect Cost, and other. |
| 6000 | Materials and Supplies - Includes articles and commodities that are consumed or materially altered when used and minor equipment that is not capitalized. This includes any equipment purchased under \$5,000, unless the LEA has set a lower capitalization threshold. Therefore, computer equipment under \$5,000 would be reported in "materials and supplies." |
| 8000 | Equipment/Capital Outlay - Outlays that result in the acquisition of or additions to capitalized assets. Capital Outlay does not include the purchase of equipment costing less than \$5,000 unless the LEA has set a lower capitalization threshold. |

Part V (a): School Budget Summary

In the chart below, please provide a budget detailing expenditures designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) or, if applicable, other school improvement strategies. Provide the school name and identify the correct cohort. Separate division- and school-level expenses for SIG funds. Division-level expenses are those that occur at the division level to support school improvement activities for the specific school. School-level expenses are those expenses that are incurred for school improvement activities at the school building.

School Name			
	Year 3: 2012-2013		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$109,707.72	School Expenses \$	
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$19,000.00	School Expenses \$	
3000 – Purchased Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$34,083.80	School Expenses \$	
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$4,650.00	School Expenses	\$	Title I Expenses – Title I will provide a workshop for K-1 teachers on Concept of Word through the University of Virginia PAL’s Office. The anticipated cost	\$1,515.46
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$38,809.11	School Expenses	\$		
8000 – Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$	School Expenses	\$		
Total	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$206,250.63*	School Expenses	\$		
*The total includes the Year 3 Allocation of \$179,166.00 and \$37,084.63 of funding carried forward from Year 2.					Total Division Expenses	\$1,515.46
					Total School Expenses	\$206,250.63
					TOTAL (Do not include “Other”)	\$206,250.63

Part V (b): School Budget Narrative

In the chart below, please provide a budget narrative of expenditures for activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) or, if applicable, other school improvement strategies. Include the use of SIG funds and other sources such as Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III, Part A; Title VI, Part B; state and/or local resources supporting the SIG initiatives. Use as much space as needed for each Expenditure Code.

SCHOOL NAME: SAMPLE
<p>1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) Math Instructional Coach (\$36,000, SIG); Teacher Stipends (15 K-3 teachers @ \$1000/teacher over 5 days) for summer math curriculum and assessment development (\$15,000, SIG); Reading intervention specialist for morning intervention K-2 (1.5 hrs/3 days/wk @\$75 over 30 weeks) (\$10,125, ARRA)</p> <p>Title I math teacher K-3 (\$42,000; Title I); 2 Title I reading specialist K-2 (\$60,000, Title I and \$26,000 state EIRI and \$15,000 local match)</p>
SCHOOL NAME: Central Elementary School
<p>1000 – Personal (\$109,707.00) Funds in this category will continue to be used to provide a part-time Reading Coach and full-time instructional coach who will focus primarily on math instruction (\$85,000). Funds in this category will also be used to pay for small group and one-to-one tutoring, in reading and math, during intervention in the regular school day and before and after school (\$20,000); and funds will be used to pay teachers providing reading and math instruction in the Leadership Academy (\$4,707). Other division and Title I funds support related forms of remediation and staff development services.</p>
<p>2000 -Employee Benefits (\$19,000) Benefits such as retirement, F.I.C.A, as required, will be paid through this funding source.</p>
<p>3000 - Purchased Services (\$34,083) Funds in this category will be used to provide additional tutoring with the Sylvan Ace It tutoring program and to continue staff development support on differentiated reading and math instruction with a consultant we have used previously, Pam Pierce.</p>
4000 - Internal Services
<p>5000 - Other Charges (\$4,650) The principal anticipates spending for staff to travel to conferences to address math and writing instructional topics of concern, and school improvement. In addition, indirect costs of the program, including temporary clerical assistance to address increased time for bookkeeping, timesheets for tutors, and other clerical duties essential to program operation are beyond the normal work load for the individual school secretary the school division employs for those duties at the school site.</p>
<p>6000 - Materials and Supplies (\$38,809.00) Central Elementary School will continue the use of istation for reading and will also use these funds to purchase books for differentiated reading instruction, math materials, books for the Leadership Academy, materials and supplies for family involvement and literacy, and incentives for the Reading Millionaire program. In addition, we will purchase materials and supplies for staff development, including appropriate professional books to build on our work with book discussions on literacy</p>

assessment, grouping and instruction.
8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay

Part VI: Combined Division-Level Budget Summary for ALL (Tier III) Schools the LEA Commits to Serve
(ONE PER DIVISION, NOT PER SCHOOL)

Although this form is included in each school-level application, complete only one Division-Level Budget Summary for ALL (Tier III) schools in the division.

PART VI

Combined Division-Level Budget Summary for ALL (Tier III) Schools the LEA Commits to Serve (ONE PER DIVISION, NOT PER SCHOOL)

In the chart below, include a budget summary of expenditures for activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) in the LEA's Tier III schools.

	<u>Year 3: 2012-2013</u>		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 - Personnel	\$109,707.72	\$	\$
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$19,000.00	\$	\$
3000 - Purchased Services	\$34,083.80	\$	\$
4000 - Internal Services	\$	\$	\$
5000 - Other Charges	\$4,650.00	\$	\$
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$38,809.11	\$	\$
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$206,250.63	\$	\$
			TOTAL SIG and ARRA Funds \$

PART VII: ASSURANCES

PART VII: ASSURANCES

The local educational agency assures that School Improvement 1003(g) funds will be administered and implemented in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, policies, and program plans under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). The division agrees to these conditions of award:

The LEA must assure that it —

1. Uses its SIG funds to implement school improvement practices fully and effectively in each Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve, consistent with the final SIG requirements;
2. Uses Indistar™, an online school improvement tool, for the following:
 - establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics;
 - collecting meeting minutes, professional development activities, strategies for extending learning opportunities, and parent activities as well as indicators of effective leadership and instructional practice;
 - completing analysis of data points for quarterly reports to ensure strategic, data-driven decisions are made to deploy needed interventions for students who are not meeting expected growth measures and/or who are at risk of failure and dropping out of school; Uses an electronic query system (i.e., Datacation) to provide principals with quarterly data needed to make data driven decisions at the school-level;
3. Uses an electronic query system (i.e., Datacation, or Interactive Achievement's Snapshot Tool) to provide principals with quarterly data needed to make data driven decisions at the school-level;
4. Attends OSI technical assistance sessions provided for school principals and division staff;
5. Collaborates with assigned VDOE contractor(s) to ensure the division and school maintain the fidelity of implementation necessary for reform;
6. Ensures division improvement plan supports the school-level improvement plan and is monitored monthly; and
7. Reports to the SEA the school-level data required under the final requirements of this SIG grant.
8. The school is a Title I school for the 2012-2013 school year.
9. The principal played a significant role in the development of the budget and the development of responses to Part II, Part III, and Part IV of this application.

Certification: I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct.

Superintendent's Signature:	<i>Julie B. Rogers, Asst. Superintendent (designee)</i>
Superintendent's Name:	<i>Julie B. Rogers</i>
Date:	<i>7/30/12</i>
Principal's Signature Read # 9 above	<i>[Signature]</i>
Date:	<i>7/30/12</i>

Additional assurances may be needed for compliance pending final approval of Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). OSI is certain that if the waiver is approved, the following assurance will apply:

Ensures forty percent of a teacher's evaluation will be based on multiple measures of student academic progress. When data are available and appropriate, teacher performance evaluations incorporate student growth percentiles (SGPs) as one measure of student academic progress.

PART VIII: OPT OUT CLAUSE

If a division is certain that improvement efforts and program implementation during the first two years of the SIG grant have resulted in successful and sustainable improvement, the division may forfeit all remaining unencumbered funds as of September 30, 2012. In doing so, the division and school will be relieved from adherence to school improvement requirements associated with SIG funding as well as the assurances denoted in this application. Submit this page only by SSWS drop box to Janice Garland if the division decides to opt out.

Opt Out Certification: I hereby certify that (division) _____ will relinquish all unencumbered SIG funds for (school) _____ as of September 30, 2012.

Superintendent's Signature:	
Superintendent's Name:	
Date:	

The application must be submitted to the Office of School Improvement via the Virginia Department of Education's Single Sign-On for Web Systems (SSWS) Drop Box to Janice Garland by Friday, July 9, 2012 from the division Superintendent's office. The notification through SSWS will serve as a certification that a signed copy of the application is located in the division's files. This school will be a Title I school next year.

Tier III SIG FY09 School List

DIV #	Division Name	School	Total Award
101	Alexandria City	Cora Kelly Magnet School	\$537,501.00
101	Alexandria City	Jefferson-Houston Elementary School	\$537,501.00
005	Amherst County	Central Elementary School	\$537,500.00
007	Arlington County	Drew Model Elementary School	\$537,500.00
007	Arlington County	Hoffman-Boston Elementary School	\$537,500.00
007	Arlington County	Randolph Elementary School	\$537,500.00
019	Charles City County	Charles City County Elementary School	\$537,500.00
023	Craig County	McCleary Elementary School	\$537,501.00
024	Culpeper County	Pearl Sample Elementary School	\$537,500.00
024	Culpeper County	Sycamore Park Elementary School	\$537,500.00
028	Essex County	Essex Intermediate School	\$537,501.00
028	Essex County	Tappahannock Elementary School	\$537,501.00
029	Fairfax County	Dogwood Elementary School	\$537,500.00
029	Fairfax County	Hybla Valley Elementary School	\$537,500.00
029	Fairfax County	Mount Vernon Woods Elementary School	\$537,500.00
029	Fairfax County	Washington Mill Elementary School	\$537,500.00
032	Fluvanna County	Central Elementary School	\$537,500.00
032	Fluvanna County	Columbia District Elementary School	\$537,500.00
032	Fluvanna County	Cunningham District Elementary School	\$537,500.00
135	Franklin City	Franklin High School	\$537,501.00
049	King and Queen County	King and Queen Elementary School	\$537,501.00
048	King George County	King George Elementary School	\$537,500.00
048	King George County	Potomac Elementary School	\$537,500.00
051	Lancaster County	Lancaster Primary School	\$537,500.00
117	Newport News City	L.F. Palmer Elementary School	\$537,500.00
065	Northampton County	Kiptopeke Elementary School	\$537,500.00
065	Northampton County	Ocochannock Elementary School	\$537,500.00
068	Orange County	Orange Elementary School	\$537,500.00
071	Pittsylvania County	Dan River Middle School	\$537,501.00
071	Pittsylvania County	Kentuck Elementary School	\$537,501.00
121	Portsmouth City	Churchland Academy Elementary School	\$537,500.00
077	Pulaski County	Pulaski Elementary School	\$537,500.00
124	Roanoke City	Addison Aerospace Magnet School	\$537,500.00
124	Roanoke City	Hurt Park Elementary School	\$537,500.00
085	Shenandoah County	Ashby Lee Elementary School	\$537,500.00
127	Suffolk City	Elephant's Fork Elementary School	\$537,500.00
095	Westmoreland County	Washington District Elementary School	\$537,500.00