

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

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Due: July 9, 2012

Please complete this application for each school.

PART I: DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name:		Fluvanna County Public Schools			
Division Contact:		Margaret Crawford			
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):		434-589-8208	Fax:	434-589-2248	
Email of Division Contact:		mcrawford@apps.fluco.org			
Name of School	Cunningham	2012-2013 Grade Span	K-2	Projected School Membership	190
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	48	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	27	Current Percent Limited English Proficient
					1
Name of Principal		Sue Davies			
Telephone of Principal		434-842-3197			
Email of Principal		sdavies@apps.fluco.org			

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 school climate has progressed with the focus of our SIP indicators. Student ownership of learning and team goals have significantly helped the faculty focus on student learning. Teachers conversations about student learning have been facilitated through Professional Learning Community meetings. Collaboration has been fostered in order for the teachers to work together.

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?

Team leaders have met bimonthly to discuss our school-wide indicator task progress and focus on analysis of student data. All team leaders know that they are an integral part of the school improvement process. Team leaders from each grade level, Specials and resource staff are represented.

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

The Team Leaders monitor data and progress through a watch list and examining bottom and top quartiles in the common assessments. Students that are not making progress are discussed amongst the grade level teams and if strategies tried are not working the student needs are discussed at an RTI meeting to ensure specific progress is targeted and systematically monitored through weekly probes.

C. Instruction

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

Student learning is discussed at PLC meetings assessment data is shared and discussed to ensure differentiation is implemented and students with varying abilities have their needs met. Data discussed may require students be regrouped according to progress made. Students that are noted as needing support are discussed in the grade level meetings.

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.)

Division-wide Curriculum Maps are being utilized in grade level planning meetings. This document has recently been revised this spring/ summer to ensure total alignment with updated SOL

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?

The division has developed a strategic plan for the next 5 years that included input from each parent organization at each school. The connection with the community and parents has been recognized in an indicator from Cunningham's SIP plan.

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?

The teachers that are strongest are given the students with the greatest need.

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

Our state liaison is knowledgeable and he communicates well when needs arise. More time in face to face conversations would facilitate further knowledge of our specific division requirements and constraints.

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 is supportive of the school improvement efforts. The division SIP plan has connected the needs for the schools to implement their individual plans and the work that the division has required in order to build a systematic continuous improvement focus.

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

The division has required the schools to restructure staff to maximize instructional strengths in deliberate teacher assignments across the division in core areas.

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).

Budget constraints have impacted desired implementation in programing/ Data Warehousing, technology and assessment and staffing to support students 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.

Quarterly reports and accountability in continuous improvement provides shared governance to ensure appropriate progress is made within the indicators noted in the SIP plan.

G. Phase Out

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

Student achievement and data will determine the necessary services after the phase out of SIG funds. Great concern is indicated based on the current budgetary shortfalls from within our division, then coupled with the reduction in funds from SIG monies. Careful examination of student achievement scores, impact on the increase of student achievement and services will have to be examined to ensure the appropriate support of our students and their instructional needs.

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?

Quarterly assessment data and the building of capacity through professional development activities will be determined by both division and school-based personnel. The budgetary shortfalls experienced from both state and local funding, compounded with the phase out of SIG funds, will result in extremely difficult decisions from the division level. Our budget constraints and cuts will impact the continuance of the current staffing and resources. Careful consideration of successful support benefiting our students will need to be addressed. The Division and the school will need to analyze what exactly is needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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

Examples of phase out planning from other divisions would be helpful also sharing creative ways to adopt the services currently in place from local funds.

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

Examples of phase out planning from other divisions would be helpful also sharing creative ways to adopt the services from local funds and continuance of state funding for an additional year would ensure systematic success of current staffing and services for our students.

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	<p>Continued work on monitoring MAP scores and emphasizing the need for continuous growth, particularly with the students in the bottom and top quartiles. <i>VC03 Staff members provide students with feedback that clearly communicates where they are going, where they are now (relative to the learning goal or target), and what they can do to close the gap.</i></p>
---	---

	<p>Effective feedback helps maintain a supportive environment for student learning. Cunningham teachers will focus on providing students with feedback that is goal referenced, actionable, specific, personalized, timely, ongoing and consistent to improve students' achievement and to assist them in meeting their personal goals. Professional development will be provided for teachers to improve their skills in providing feedback.</p>
2	<p>Continue working on students' ownership of learning by MAP goal setting meetings and teaching students how to monitor their own progress in the classroom through the use of charts and graphs. Monitoring and scheduling testing environment for students as well as monitoring accommodations for students with disabilities in order to provide optimum testing conditions for all students.</p> <p><i>VA08 Staff members plan ways to involve students in assessing their own progress.</i></p>
3	<p>Continue focus on addressing teachers' instructional weaknesses and monitoring progress on goals through Teacher Performance Evaluation System.</p> <p><i>IE07 The principal monitors curriculum and classroom instruction regularly.</i></p>
4	<p>Focus on Formative Assessment: Checking for Understanding/Misconceptions through informative writing and reading through the content areas.</p> <p><i>VB04 Staff members use a variety of techniques to check students understanding through writing across the curriculum (such as RAFT, Interactive writing, quick writes).</i></p> <p><i>VB02 Staff members check students' understanding through purposeful questioning (such as formulating higher order questions).</i></p> <p>Bloom's Taxonomy provides a framework for teachers to use to focus on higher order questioning. In using this framework, teachers at Cunningham Elementary will craft questions for conferring with students and providing feedback on students' understanding.</p>
5	<p>Focus on team building and school culture as well as using data to inform instruction through PLC meetings and SIP team meetings.</p> <p><i>IID06 Yearly learning goals are set for the school by the Leadership Team, utilizing student learning data. (This was extremely effective last year and the SIP team wanted to use this indicator again with our new staff).</i></p> <p><i>IF04 Professional development for teachers includes observations by peers related to indicators of effective teaching and classroom management.</i></p> <p>Effective learning involves planning and goal-setting, monitoring progress, and adapting instruction as needed. With a clear goal in mind, teachers are more likely to try to reach a learning target and improve student learning. The School Improvement Team will analyze student data to generate learning goals for Cunningham School as well as grade level teams and for students.</p>

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:

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.)	
1	Decrease the percentage of students identified by PALs from the Fall to the Spring (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
2	Increase the top quartile of MAP student performance in each grade level (proficient and above) by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
3	Decrease the bottom quartile of MAP student performance in each grade level (below proficiency level) by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
4	Increase the students achieving Rigby Benchmark by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
5	Increase overall IA quarterly assessment pass rate by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).

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	
Tier 3	
Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	
Tier 3	
Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable	
Tier 2	K-2 Students who failed PALS will be identified as Title-One. Specific skills related to grade level skills will be targeted for weekly interventions from the Title-one teacher in collaboration with the classroom teacher.
Tier 3	Students that have failed PALS for more than one school year will be put on an individualized RTI plan that will target specific skills to be "probed" and assessed weekly to monitor progress. The resource teacher will instruct the students and administer the assessments and provide weekly updates to the classroom teacher and the administration.
Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	N/A Our students are K-2 intervention will take place at the new 3 rd and 4 th grade school
Tier 3	
Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	N/A Our students are K-2 intervention will take place at the new 3 rd and 4 th grade school
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 Cunningham			
Year 3: 2012-2013			
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$21,913.38	School Expenses \$	
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$6,942.97	School Expenses \$	
3000 – Purchased Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$6,932.03	School Expenses \$	
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$692.53	School Expenses	\$		
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$13,284.56	School Expenses	\$		
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$	School Expenses	\$		
Total	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$49,765.47	School Expenses	\$		
					Total Division Expenses \$	
					Total School Expenses \$49,765.47	
					TOTAL (Do not include "Other") \$	

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:
<p>1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) .3 FTE instructional coach (estimated salary of \$14,412.03). .15 FTE assessment coach (estimated salary of \$7,501.35) to focus on consistent use of student data in order to inform instruction. Other funding sources/ Local: .05 FTE Director of elementary education/Division contact for school improvement (estimated salary of \$3,200.00), .5 FTE Principal (salary of \$40,810.00). Other funding sources/ Title I, Part A: .25 Instructional Coordinator for all elementary schools (School Improvement Professional development) estimated cost of \$5,000.00 Total of projected salaries from other sources: \$47,210.00.</p>
<p>2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.) .3 FTE instructional coach and .15 FTE assessment coach (estimated FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment of \$6,942.97). Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are projected at \$14,163.00.</p>
<p>3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.) Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) and/or literacy and math support as needed. Purchased services to support the cost of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth, Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments, and/or other software. Total estimated costs equal \$6,932.03. Total estimated costs equal \$4,265. Other funding sources/local: May include purchase of services for Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Interactive Achievement for Cunningham Elementary School estimated at \$5,122 and professional development/conferences as needed. Total of other funding sources/local: \$4,265.</p>
<p>4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>

5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.)

Travel to school improvement related trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an estimated cost of \$692.53.

6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.)

Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs, and literacy/math instructional support materials at an estimated cost of \$13,284.56 from 1003(g) funding. Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an estimated cost of **\$11,035**

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.

- Please see Carysbrook Elementary School SIG Continuation application for the division-level budget summary.

	<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:	Ms. Gena C. Keller
Date:	09/04/12
Principal’s Signature Read # 9 above	Ms. Sue Davies
Date:	09/04/12

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

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

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Due: July 9, 2012

Please complete this application for each school.

PART I: DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name:		Fluvanna County Public Schools			
Division Contact:		Margaret Crawford			
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):		434-589-8208		Fax:	434-589-2248
Email of Division Contact:	mcrawford@apps.fluco.org				
Name of School	Columbia	2012-2013 Grade Span	K-2	Projected School Membership	120
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	39	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	12	Current Percent Limited English Proficient
Name of Principal	Sue Davies				
Telephone of Principal	434-842-3197				
Email of Principal	sdavies@apps.fluco.org				

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.

H. School Climate

2. 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 school climate has progressed with the focus of our SIP indicators. Student ownership of learning and team goals have significantly helped the faculty focus on student learning. Teachers' conversations about student learning have been facilitated through Professional Learning Community meetings. Collaboration has been fostered in order for the teachers to work together.

I. Process Steps/Atmosphere of Change

3. 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?

Team leaders have met bimonthly to discuss our school-wide indicator task progress and focus on analysis of student data. All team leaders know that they are an integral part of the school improvement process. Team leaders from each grade level, Specials and resource staff are represented.

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

The Team Leaders monitor data and progress through a watch list and examining bottom and top quartiles in the common assessments. Students that are not making progress are discussed amongst the grade level teams and if strategies tried are not

working the student needs are discussed at an RTI meeting to ensure specific progress is targeted and systematically monitored through weekly probes.

J. Instruction

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

Student learning is discussed at PLC meetings assessment data is shared and discussed to ensure differentiation is implemented and students with varying abilities have their needs met. Data discussed may require students be regrouped according to progress made. Students that are noted as needing support are discussed in the grade level meetings.

4. 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.)

Division-wide Curriculum Maps are being utilized in grade level planning meetings. This document has recently been revised this spring/ summer to ensure total alignment with updated SOL

K. Parental Involvement

2. 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?

The division has developed a strategic plan for the next 5 years that included input from each parent organization at each school. The connection with the community and parents has been recognized in an indicator from Columbia's SIP plan.

L. Staffing and Relationships

3. 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?

The teachers that are strongest are given the students with the greatest need.

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

Our state liaison is knowledgeable and he communicates well when needs arise. More time in face to face conversations would facilitate further knowledge of our specific division requirements and constraints.

M. Decision-making Process and Autonomy

5. 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 is supportive of the school improvement efforts. The division SIP plan has connected the needs for the schools to implement their individual plans and the work that the division has required in order to build a systematic continuous improvement focus.

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

The division has required the schools to restructure staff to maximize instructional strengths in deliberate teacher assignments across the division in core areas.

7. 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).

Budget constraints have impacted desired implementation in programing/ Data Warehousing, technology and assessment and staffing to support students needs

8. 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.

Quarterly reports and accountability in continuous improvement provides shared governance to ensure appropriate progress is made within the indicators noted in the SIP plan.

N. Phase Out

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

Student achievement and data will determine the necessary services after the phase out of SIG funds. Great concern is indicated based on the current budgetary shortfalls from within our division, then coupled with the reduction in funds from SIG monies. Careful examination of student achievement scores, impact on the increase of student achievement and services will have to be examined to ensure the appropriate support of our students and their instructional needs.

6. 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?

Quarterly assessment data and the building of capacity through professional development activities will be determined by both division and school-based personnel. The budgetary shortfalls experienced from both state and local funding, compounded with the phase out of SIG funds, will result in extremely difficult decisions from the division level. Our budget constraints and cuts will impact the continuance of the current staffing and resources. Careful consideration of successful support benefiting our students will need to be addressed. The Division and the school will need to analyze what exactly is needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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

Examples of phase out planning from other divisions would be helpful also sharing creative ways to adopt the services currently in place from local funds.

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

Examples of phase out planning from other divisions would be helpful also sharing creative ways to adopt the services from local funds and continuance of state funding for an additional year would ensure systematic success of current staffing and services for our students.

PART III: GOAL SETTING

C. 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	<p><i>IID06 Yearly learning goals are set for the school by the Leadership Team, utilizing student learning data.</i> Effective learning involves planning and goal-setting, monitoring progress, and adapting instruction as needed. With a clear goal in mind, teachers are more likely to try to reach a learning target and improve student learning. The School Improvement Team will analyze</p>
---	--

	student data to generate learning goals for Columbia School as well as grade level teams and for students.
2	<i>VB02 Staff members check students' understanding through purposeful questioning (such as formulating higher order questions). The staff would like to expand on the effective work done last year with this indicator).</i> Bloom's Taxonomy provides a framework for teachers to use to focus on higher order questioning. In using this framework, teachers at Columbia Elementary will craft questions for conferring with students and providing feedback on students' understanding.
3	<i>VC03 Staff members provide students with feedback that clearly communicates where they are going, where they are now (relative to the learning goal or target), and what they can do to close the gap.</i> Effective feedback helps maintain a supportive environment for student learning. Columbia teachers will focus on providing students with feedback that is goal referenced, actionable, specific, personalized, timely, ongoing and consistent to improve students' achievement and to assist them in meeting their personal goals. Professional development will be provided for teachers to improve their skills in providing feedback.
4	<i>IE07 The principal monitors curriculum and classroom instruction regularly.</i> Continue focus on addressing teachers' instructional weaknesses and monitoring progress on goals through Teacher Performance Evaluation System.
5	

D. 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	Decrease the percentage of students identified by PALs from the Fall to the Spring (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
2	Increase the top quartile of MAP student performance in each grade level (proficient and above) by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
3	Decrease the bottom quartile of MAP student performance in each grade level (below proficiency level) by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
4	Increase the students achieving Rigby Benchmark by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).
5	Increase overall IA quarterly assessment pass rate by 10% (percentage based on the initial data provided by student performance Fall 2013).

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:

- e. targeted group; intervention description;
- f. intervention provider;
- g. frequency and amount of time for each tier; and,
- h. 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	
Tier 3	
Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	
Tier 3	
Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable	
Tier 2	K-2 Students who failed PALS will be identified as Title-One. Specific skills related to grade level skills will be targeted for weekly interventions from the Title-one teacher in collaboration with the classroom teacher.
Tier 3	Students that have failed PALS for more than one school year will be put on an individualized RTI plan that will target specific skills to be "probed" and assessed weekly to monitor progress. The resource teacher will instruct the students and administer the assessments and provide weekly updates to the classroom teacher and the administration.

Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	N/A Our students are K-2 intervention will take place at the new 3 rd and 4 th grade school
Tier 3	
Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	N/A Our students are K-2 intervention will take place at the new 3 rd and 4 th grade school
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:

- c. 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.
- d. 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 Columbia Elementary School			
Year 3: 2012-2013			
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$13,388.30	School Expenses \$	
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$4,241.42	School Expenses \$	
3000 – Purchased Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$4,265.87	School Expenses \$	
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses \$	Division Expenses \$	Other: \$
	School Expenses \$	School Expenses \$	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$426.17	School Expenses	\$		
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$8,175.16	School Expenses	\$		
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$	School Expenses	\$		
Total	Division Expenses	\$	Division Expenses	\$	Other:	\$
	School Expenses	\$30,496.92	School Expenses	\$		
					Total Division Expenses	\$
					Total School Expenses	\$30,496.92
					TOTAL (Do not include "Other")	\$

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
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) 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)
SCHOOL NAME:
1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) .1 FTE instructional coach (estimated salary of \$8,772.54). .05 FTE assessment coach (estimated salary of \$4,615.76) to focus on consistent use of student data in order to inform instruction. Other funding sources/ Local: .05 FTE Director of elementary education/Division contact for school improvement (estimated salary of \$3,200.00), .5 FTE Principal (salary of \$40,810.00). Other funding sources/ Title I, Part A: .25 Instructional Coordinator for all elementary schools (School Improvement Professional development) estimated cost of \$5,000.00 Total of projected salaries from other sources: \$47,210.00.
2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.) .1 FTE instructional coach and .05 FTE assessment coach (estimated FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment of \$4,241.42). Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are projected at \$14,163.00.
3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.) Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) and/or literacy and math support as needed. Purchased services to support the cost of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth, Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments, and/or other software. Total estimated costs equal \$4,265.8 Other funding sources/local: May include purchase of services for Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Interactive Achievement for Columbia Elementary School estimated at \$3,251 and professional development/conferences as needed. Total of other funding sources/local: \$3,251.

4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)

5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.)

Travel to school improvement related trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an estimated cost of \$426.17.

6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.)

Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs, and literacy/math instructional support materials at an estimated cost of \$8,175.16 from 1003(g) funding. Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an estimated cost of **\$6,791**

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.

- Please see Carysbrook Elementary School SIG Continuation application for the division-level budget summary.

	<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 —

10. 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;
11. 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;
12. 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;
13. Attends OSI technical assistance sessions provided for school principals and division staff;
14. Collaborates with assigned VDOE contractor(s) to ensure the division and school maintain the fidelity of implementation necessary for reform;
15. Ensures division improvement plan supports the school-level improvement plan and is monitored monthly; and
16. Reports to the SEA the school-level data required under the final requirements of this SIG grant.
17. The school is a Title I school for the 2012-2013 school year.
18. 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:	Ms. Gena C. Keller
Date:	09/04/12
Principal’s Signature Read # 9 above	Ms. Sue Davies
Date:	09/04/12

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	Columbia 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