

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

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Due: July 9, 2012

APPROVED 9-21-12 SF

Please complete this application for each school.

PART I: DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name:		Essex County					
Division Contact:		Stephanie Bassett					
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):			804-443-4366		Fax:	804-443-4498	
Email of Division Contact:		sbassett@essex.k12.va.us					
Name of School		Essex Intermediate		2012-2013 Grade Span	5-8	Projected School Membership	486
		Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	67%	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	12%	Current Percent Limited English Proficient	Less than 1%
Name of Principal		Angela Gross					
Telephone of Principal		804-443-3040					
Email of Principal		agross@essex.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

1. 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?

The general climate at Essex Intermediate has improved towards the academic focus. Teachers are utilizing more data to drive their instruction. As a result, teachers are more aware of which students require additional support and which objectives require more time. Teachers have embraced the UVA Literacy Consultant and her expertise. The UVA consultant has led on-going literacy professional developments, modeled lessons, and provided individual support when needed. The Algebra Intervention teacher has been also able to serve students in need. The additional resources are creating a shift in thinking. Because this is a shift in the teachers thought processes, additional time is needed to continue working with teachers to develop this transformation.

B. Process Steps/Atmosphere of Change

1. 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?

At Essex Intermediate, the school improvement team is comprised of a member from each content area. The team meets monthly to discuss and review the school's improvement plan, student achievement data, parental involvement activities, and school climate. All members are active and willing participants of the team. Many team meetings end with an assignment which requires a consensus thus prompting each representative to gain the input of all content team members before a consensus can be reached. During the next meeting, each representative is able to share the suggestions from their respective content team with the school improvement committee. Once all comments are shared, the improvement team must then reach a consensus.

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

Practices and strategies are monitored through observations by the principals, literacy coaches, and math coaches. In addition to observations, teachers, administrators, and coaches meet weekly to discuss and review student achievement, attendance and discipline data. Intervention strategies are discussed and remediation plans developed. Teachers discuss the progress of a student's achievement both in class and during remediation. Conversations are continued during PLC meetings which are held monthly. During PLC meetings, instructional practices are examined along with implemented formative assessment strategies. After allowing sufficient time for interventions to work and examining all data, the next tier of interventions are implemented; this would include additional personnel, lessons, resources and supports. Implementing the next level of intervention signals a strategy may not be working. Should interventions continue to be unsuccessful; the various points of data and interventions will lead to a potential child student referral.

C. Instruction

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

When creating lessons, teachers create lesson plans for students performing on-grade level, above-grade level, and below-grade level. Using common assessment, benchmark, and formative assessment data, teachers place students in small groups with opportunities for small group teacher directed instruction. In these small groups, teachers can implement differentiated instructional activities based on student ability levels.

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.)

The following overall SOL data demonstrates that the curriculum is aligned with the SOL in the indicated core content areas:

Grade 5 English:	72%
English	86%
History:	81%
Science:	91%

The area which may reflect the instructional practice is not aligned is mathematics where the overall SOL proficiency rate was

67%. In the area of math and all other content areas, teachers will continue to work on alignment of the curriculum over the summer. The math coaches, literacy coaches, UVA literacy consultant and a history consultant will continue to provide training to teachers and professional development to teachers.

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?

In addition to parent-teacher conferences which are held twice a year, parents are involved in supporting the improvement process through attending literacy, math, and SOL Nights. During our literacy night, parents had an opportunity to come in and participate in various literacy activities which reflected what parents could do at home to support reading strategies and skills learned at school. Parents were also able to watch teachers who modeled lesson which could be simulated at home. The SOL Nights provided parents with opportunities to not only hear presentations about the SOL's, but actively participate in learning test taking strategies and ask questions about testing. The PTO sponsored activities which allowed parents and teachers to interact in a non-threatening manner. A parent representative also sits on the school improvement team. All of these activities provide parents with opportunities to support the improvement effort.

To determine additional ways in which parents could become more involved, data from the Title I parent involvement survey will be utilized.

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?

Each year, principals review student achievement data, discipline data, walkthrough and observation data, evaluation data and other key information to determine which teachers are the most skilled for a grade level. Discussions are held with central office administration and principals make the final decisions after reviewing all available data. Prior to making changes, discussions are also held with teachers. Presently, this process allows the most skilled teachers to provide instruction to students.

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

The state-assigned division liaison has been an asset. The division, liaison, and school administration have worked very closely to ensure technical policies and procedures have been followed as they relate to school improvement. The liaison has also worked to provide suggestions on programs, practices and interventions which are taking place within the division and at the building level to ensure student success. As the school year has progressed, the relationship with the state-assigned liaison has grown. The liaison attended leadership meetings in addition to school and division improvement meetings which allowed him to view how the division's mission encompassed the goal of school improvement. Potentially, keeping the same liaison will allow the opportunity to continue moving forward without a new liaison having to learn the division, school, students and parents.

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?

Essex County Public Schools is a small division, a division representative attends school improvement meetings and building administrators are a part of division improvement meetings; comments and suggestions shared at one meeting are reported in the other. At both meetings input is given by all team members and decisions are based on consensus.

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

In addition to two half-day teacher work days, a full day of professional development was added to the division's calendar. This provided an opportunity for division-wide professional development in all content areas and special education. Many times, trainings which take place after school may conflict with building level trainings or other content planning. With the division-wide focus, all content areas and special education teachers had the ability to collaborate together. Second, an Algebra Intervention and Reading Intervention class was added to the schedule. This course took the place of a student elective and parents were notified when their child was struggling and in need of addition remedial support. This course lasted for a semester. Third, to prepare for the changes within the Standards of Learning, curriculum development occurred over the summer.

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).

Currently, there are no barriers that truly exist which prevent the school from obtaining what it needs.

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.

Shared governance and accountability between the division and the school leadership team is achieved through collaboration on the development of the school improvement plan. The tasks associated with each indicator are determined at the division or school improvement meeting with the input from all members of the committee. Goals are established with measureable outcomes and the person responsible is assigned. During the improvement meetings, updates are provided on the progress of each task.

G. Phase Out

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

Three year trend data will be used to start conversations about which programs and additional resources are working effectively and having the greatest impact. These conversations will be held at both school and division improvement meetings. Programs which have had the greatest impact will be maintained through Title I, local and other funds.

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?

As the conversations occur which were referenced in the previous response, teachers, administrators, coaches, and specialists will evaluate the programs and resources currently in use. The division and school improvement teams will determine based on student achievement data which programs should be continued. The Director of Finance will also be included to answer funding questions.

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

Webinars which will include opportunities for divisions to share how they are preparing for the phase out and VDOE expectations. Additional training in Indistar.

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

Continued support in the form of trainings, professional developments, and opportunities to collaborate with other divisions.

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	Based on preliminary data, the overall pass rate for English/Reading decreased from 88% to 86%. This reflects an decrease of two percentage points. Essex Intermediate will continue utilize the UVA Literacy Consultant and a full-time literacy coach for support to teachers in grades 5-8. Teachers will also continue to receive targeted instructional strategy training. Benchmark data will be used to target students for small group intervention and formative assessment strategies will be used to guided instruction.
2	Based on preliminary data, the overall pass rate for Math decreased from 85% to 59%. This reflects a decrease of twenty-six percentage points. For the 2011-2012 school year, the division contracted a part-time math coach for the elementary school. Consideration will be made as to whether the coach's time should be increased. The afterschool program was re-structured to target individual needs and provide small group instruction. Coaches, specialist, and teachers will review the alignment of the math curriculum with the state standards and review assessments for alignment and rigor.
3	
4	
5	

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 fo 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, English SOL scores will decrease the failure rate by 10%. Progress monitoring will take place through i-Station with Datacation, benchmarks and common assessments data also being utilized to determine areas where remediation services will be necessary. (IID08—Task: Instructional teams will use student learning data from benchmark testing, formative assessments, and SPBQs (Student Performance by Question) from last year's SOLs tests to determine areas that require instructional improvement.
2	By June 2013, Mathematics SOL scores will decrease the failure rate by 10%. The division will acquire a research based

	program (software) that will aide in the progress monitoring and remediation of math instruction. However, Datacation along with common assessments and formative assessment strategies currently utilized will provide teachers with the necessary data establish students requiring remediation services. IIB08—Task: Instructional teams will use student learning data from benchmark testing, formative assessments, and SPBQs (Student Performance by Question) from last year's SOLs tests to determine areas that require instructional improvement.
3	By June 2013, parental involvement will increase by 20%. Currently, Essex Intermediate holds one Family Literacy Night, SOL Writing Night, and SOL Night. For the 2012-2013 school year, Essex Intermediate will add an additional literacy night, incorporate a family math activity, schedule quarterly "coffee with the principal" and continue collaborations with the Title I office and PTO. Essex Intermediate will include an indicator and tasks to address parental involvement.
4	By June 2013, all faculty members will have participated in at least five on-going professional development opportunities based on data summary of strengths and weaknesses identified by classroom observations and student achievement. IF08—Task: As a result of these classroom observations, professional development that relates to indicators of effective teaching and classroom management and assessments of strengths and areas in need of improvement will be provided to individual teachers as well as for the whole faculty.
5	By June 2013, the school improvement committee will assist in the evaluation of all programs currently funded through SIG funds. The committee will develop a rubric and guidelines set for each program evaluation. Results will be shared with school and division improvement committees.

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:

- targeted group; intervention description;
- intervention provider;
- frequency and amount of time for each tier; and,
- 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	Students receive small group differentiated instruction from the classroom teacher 5 times per week for 30 minutes; i-Station comprehensive online intervention program 30 minutes 2-3 times per week. Students will be progress monitored through formative assessments, common assessments, and i-Station Indicators of Progress. Data will be analyzed weekly by the teacher and discussed bi-weekly at data meetings with the building administration, classroom teacher, reading specialist and literacy coach. Students targeted for remediation will be those not meeting mastery on formative assessments and scoring between 79%-70% on common assessments and benchmarks.
Tier 3	Students receive small group differentiated instruction from the classroom teacher 5 times per week for 30 minutes; reading specialist provides small group differentiated instruction 4-5 times per week for 30 minutes (pull-out); paraprofessionals provide push-in support during literacy centers 4-5 times per week for 30 minutes; reading intervention staff provides intervention 5 times per week for 30 minutes during non-instructional time; i-Station comprehensive online intervention program 4-5 times per week for 30 minutes; students are targeted for afterschool tutoring which meets 2 days per week for 28 weeks. Progress is monitored through Datacation, formative assessments, common assessments, and i-Station's Indicators of Progress which are analyzed weekly by the teacher and discussed bi-weekly at data meetings with the building administration, classroom teacher, reading specialist and literacy coach. Students targeted for Tier 3 remediation will be those not meeting mastery on formative assessments and scoring 69% and below on common assessments and benchmarks.

Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL

Tier 2	Students receive small group differentiated instruction from the classroom teacher 5 times per week for 30 minutes; intervention 2-3 times per week by the math remediation teacher. Math coaches also provide support and assistance with small group intervention, modeling best instructional practices and supporting teachers in the creation of hands-on lessons 2-3 times per week. Progress is monitored through Datacation, ARDT, formative assessments and common assessments which are analyzed weekly by the teacher and discussed bi-weekly at data meetings with the building administration, classroom teacher and math coach. Students targeted for remediation will be those not meeting mastery on formative assessments and those scoring between 79%-70% on common assessments and benchmarks.
Tier 3	Students receive small group differentiated instruction from the classroom teacher 5 times per week for 30 minutes; math remediation teacher provides intervention 4-5 times per week for 30 minutes during non-instructional time; students are targeted for afterschool tutoring which meets 2 days per week for 28 weeks. Math coaches also provide support and assistance with small group intervention, modeling best instructional practices and supporting teachers in the creation of hands-on lessons 2-3 times per week. Progress is monitored through Datacation, ARDT, formative assessments and common assessments which are analyzed weekly by the teacher and discussed bi-weekly at data meetings with the building administration, classroom teacher and math coach. Students targeted for Tier 3 remediation will be those not meeting mastery on formative assessments and those scoring 69% and below on common assessments and benchmarks.

Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable

Tier 2	
Tier 3	

Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above

Tier 2	
Tier 3	

Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified

above	
Tier 2	
Tier 3	

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: Essex Intermediate			
Year 3: 2012-2013			
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$17950	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$60,745
	School Expenses \$54320	School Expenses \$	
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$1374	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$5,262
	School Expenses \$12279	School Expenses \$	
3000 – Purchased Services	Division Expenses \$72791	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$18000	School Expenses \$	
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses \$1000	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$2658.17
	School Expenses \$14000	School Expenses \$	
8000 – Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	
Total	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	
			Total Division Expenses \$93115
			Total School Expenses \$98599
			TOTAL (Do not include "Other") \$191,714

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: Essex Intermediate
<p>1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) Editure/TeachFirst Leader Stipends (\$9,000); Reading and Math remediation specialists (\$3,000); Algebra Intervention Teacher (\$13,800); Part-time Reading Support Coach (\$10, 000); Benchmark/Data Assistant (\$6,950); substitutes for full day planning each quarter (\$8,520); Staff for targeted Afterschool/Early Bird targeted assistance and Saturday Academy (\$10,000) Other Funding: 2 Full time literacy coaches (K-3 and 3-8)—Title I, 1 additional math coach and math remediation teacher and reading tutor</p>
<p>2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.) FICA, VRS, Health and Retiree Health Other Funding: Title I funding will be utilized for 2 literacy coaches, math coach and math remediation teacher</p>
<p>3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.) UVA Outside Consultant (\$37, 500); Contracted Remediation Services in Reading and Math (\$18,000); Math Software for remediation and progress monitoring (\$7,000); Focus/Priority Coach (\$16,791); i-Station Diagnostic Licenses (\$6,500); Professional development to gain instructional best practices in math and reading (\$5,000) Other funding: Title IIA will be utilized for professional development and consultants</p>
4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)
<p>5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.) Travel to DOE Initiatives/Training (\$1000)</p>
<p>6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.) Algebra/Math Manipulative (\$3,000); Printing Benchmarks (\$3,000); Literacy/Math Center Development and curriculum resources (\$6,000) Title I funding will also be used for reading and math manipulatives, resources and supplemental instructional materials.</p>
8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay (Use as much space as necessary.)

**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	\$	\$	\$
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$	\$	\$
3000 - Purchased Services	\$	\$	\$
4000 - Internal Services	\$	\$	\$
5000 - Other Charges	\$	\$	\$
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$	\$	\$
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$	\$	\$
			TOTAL SIG and ARRA Funds \$

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:	
Superintendent’s Name:	
Date:	
Principal’s Signature Read # 9 above	
Date:	

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	Occohannock 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