

**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:	Northampton				
Division Contact:	Annette Gray				
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):	757-678-5151 (2003)		Fax:	757-678-7267	
Email of Division Contact:	agray@ncpsk12.com				
Name of School	Occohannock Elementary	2012-2013 Grade Span	PK-6	Projected School Membership	554
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	74.5%	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	18.5%	Current Percent Limited English Proficient
					7%
Name of Principal	Ron Yorko				
Telephone of Principal	757-5151 (8100)				
Email of Principal	ryorko@ncpsk12.com				

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 climate has changed a great deal this year, due in part to the expectations of the SIG grant and in part to a change in division leadership. As teachers have become more accustomed to the new and increased expectations, the climate has somewhat relaxed. At this point, the climate is still somewhat tense and uneasy, but a period of stability and positive interactions between all stakeholders may alleviate the feelings of concern.

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?

We typically hold LTM meetings twice a month. All members are encouraged to participate during the discussions and minutes are disseminated for grade level/team discussion and review. They carry discussions to their teams and provide grade level/team feedback to the School Improvement Team. In addition, various team members are charged with monitoring pieces of the SIP. Decisions made at Leadership Team meetings are then shared with the entire staff at biweekly faculty meetings.

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

New strategies and practices at each grade level are monitored throughout the year at team level data meetings. If they appear not to be effective, we typically look at three data points before making a change, to give the practice or strategy time to work. If it is a schoolwide practice or strategy, we first have the discussion / data gathering and feedback at grade level meetings, then bring the topic to the School Leadership Team for discussion and revision of practice/strategy.

C. Instruction

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

Teachers differentiate learning in a variety of ways. At the onset, students complete learning style and interest inventories to assist students in taking ownership for their learning. This year, teachers used the learning styles inventory to adjust their small group instruction based upon the needs of their struggling learners in each group. Teachers then use pre- and post-test data to determine focus of instruction and areas of remediation. Based upon this data, teachers determine whether small group or whole class remediation or instruction is required. In addition, teachers use benchmark data to identify those students not meeting proficiency for additional support through Corrective Instruction Plans, which are broken down by assessed SOL bullets and student achievement in each tested area. Further, students are identified as needing support in reading and math through our fall, winter, and spring universal screening. Through universal screening, all students are assessed in math (from number identification to computational fluency) and in reading (from letter identification to comprehension) based on their grade and readiness levels. Tiered interventions are implemented as needed based upon those results.

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.)

Teachers, with assistance from VDOE-recommended facilitators, wrote math and reading curriculum in the summer of 2010. The VDOE Blueprints and Curriculum Framework have been used heavily in the development. The teachers have been told these are working documents. This curriculum has been revised on an on-going basis, with teachers having significant input in the revisions. Teachers have made notes and suggestions in the guides and the revisions occur in the summer.

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?

Parents are involved in the improvement process in a limited manner. We hold family reading nights to help parents internalize the importance of reading. In addition, we hold our Title I night, ELL family nights and grade level back-to-school nights. To further involve parents in our reading improvement, we have initiated a home reading log on which parents verify reading time at home. In the initial letter sent to parents, we addressed our improvement status and reiterated the importance of reading at home.

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?

We have become much better at putting the right people in the right places through our examination of student performance data. By looking at longitudinal data (both student and teacher), we make staffing decisions with a focus on instructional matching.

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

I can only address the Occohannock Elementary relationship with our division liaison. While this was our first year under her guidance, her assistance has been invaluable. She has been able to view our school dynamics through a different lens. As such, she has been able to provide us with strong support and insight, with concrete examples and strategies

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?

There is a strong focus on data during all discussions. Division representatives are present at all Leadership Team meetings and the representatives provide input and suggestions. Decisions made at Leadership Team meetings are then shared with the entire staff at biweekly faculty meetings.

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 school day was extended this year to allow for more uninterrupted instructional time.

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).

There is a restructured top down process that has worked to help the school focus this year. A variety of suggestions were provided that allowed the flexibility to do our jobs.

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.

The governance was not collaborative. It was a top down process and as a result, we did as we were instructed. As a result of the top down directives the school has experienced improvements. There needs to be some recognition of our individual differences and our individual gifts and suggestions. We do not want to be a carbon copy of another division.

G. Phase Out

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

There will be many services that will not continue. The funding has provided additional physical resources that our budget will not be able to accommodate.

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

The division will look to pick up the funding for summer school and professional development. We will look at our Title grants to determine if the additional tutors can be supported. Although, this is highly doubtful.

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

Continued support from Annie Harman. She is a straight forward, matter of fact resource who provides practical examples for implementation.

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

Continue support from Annie Harman.

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	Improved reading scores at all tested grade levels
2	Improved teacher accountability for and of their students' learning through the use of data
3	Students are more knowledgeable of and accountable for their learning based on formative assessment practices
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:

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	By the end of June 2013, SOL Writing scores will increase by 5% in order to exceed state benchmark standards. This will be done by monitoring/evaluating instructional practices on the unified writing process (prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, final copy), ensure that teachers are modeling effective writing, using data in order to remediate deficient areas, and student kept writing folders in order to determine growth. Indicators Addressed: IE06, IE07, IE09, IIB03, IIIA02, IIIA01, IIIA11
2	By the end of June 2013, SOL US History I scores will increase by 8.6% in order to achieve the state benchmark of 70%. This will occur by data analysis of benchmark scores to provide target based remediation, increase in teacher observations to ensure that appropriate instructional practices are occurring, and lesson plan evaluation to ensure that instruction aligns with both curriculum and pacing. Indicators Addressed: IE06, IE07, IE09, IIIA07, IIIA02, IIIA01
3	By the end of June 2013, SOL Math scores will increase by 10% in 3 rd grade, 8% in 4 th grade, 10% in 5 th grade,

	and 10% in 6 th . This will occur by curriculum analysis, increase observations to ensure proper instruction, lesson plan analysis to ensure that the instructional delivery matches the curriculum strand, and data analysis to ensure proper remediation of students is occurring. Indicators Addressed: IE06, IE07, IE09, IIIA07, IIIA02, IIIA01
4	By the end of June 2013, SOL Reading scores will increase by 6% in 4 th grade in order to reach 5% above the 70 % mark. This will be done through increase observations and specific administrative feedback towards instructional practices, target –based instruction based on benchmark data, peer observations in order to build repertoire of effective pedagogy, and lesson plan evaluation to ensure that instructional delivery aligns with curriculum and pacing guide. Indicators Addressed: IE06, IE07, IE09, IIIA07, IIIA02, IIIA01
5	By the end of June 2013, 85% of students entering 1 st grade will know and understand the concept of word. This is a 5% gain from the 2011-2012 school year. This will occur by providing reading remediation based off of areas of concern/deficient areas as identified in PALS testing, more rigorous, differentiating instruction based off of students needs, increase in evaluations to ensure effective instructional practices are occurring, and data coach modeling effective reading strategies. Indicators Addressed: IE07, IE09, IIIA02, IIIA01

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 an extra 45-minute reading block of instruction in small groups using Walpole McKenna's direct instruction for small groups (5-10 students); small group remediation based on information on from the non-mastery list from quarterly benchmark assessments, students in grades 4-5 identified by AIMSweb screenings as being above 25% in reading fluency but below the 25% in comprehension were placed in READ 180 intervention groups
Tier 3	Students in Tier 3 have utilized an alternate core reading program in the form of Corrective Reading with an additional 45 minutes of Corrective Reading during Power Up in groups of 2 -6 . Small group remediation is based on information from the non-mastery list from quarterly benchmark assessments; students in grades 4-5 identified by AIMSweb screenings as being above 25% in reading fluency but below the 25% in comprehension were placed in READ 180 intervention groups

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

Tier 2	Students complete daily computational fluency practice. Students are progress monitored every 2 weeks for computational fluency, with small group remediation based on information derived from the non-mastery list from quarterly benchmark assessments. Students participate in small group instruction with teachers based on the data.
Tier 3	Students complete daily computational fluency practice. Students are progress monitored every 2 weeks for computational fluency, with small group remediation based on information derived from the non-mastery list from quarterly benchmark assessments. Students participate in small group instruction with math tutors.

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

Tier 2	In kindergarten, students have 20 – 45 minutes of supplemental reading instruction through the use of Foundations & Early Success. In grades 1,2 and 3, students have 45 minutes of supplemental reading instruction during Power Up using Walpole McKenna Direct Phonics instruction.
Tier 3	In kindergarten students use Reading Mastery as a reading alternate core. First grade students use Foundations or Reading Mastery as the alternate core, depending upon the reading level of the student. Second and third grade students use Walpole McKenna Direct Phonics instruction in small group of 2-3 students.

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

Tier 2	The majority of students failing the SOL assessment for reading were identified as tier 2 or 3 during our RtI universal screenings in the fall. All of these students received tier 2 & 3 interventions during a daily 45 minute remediation/enrichment period. The remaining students failing receive test taking strategy-instruction.
Tier 3	The majority of students failing the SOL assessment for reading were identified as tier 2 or 3 during our RtI universal screenings in the fall. All of these students received tier 2 & 3 interventions during a daily 45 minute remediation/enrichment period. The remaining students failing receive test taking strategy-instruction.

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

Tier 2	After each benchmark, teachers completed Corrective Intervention Plans based on the Interactive Achievement non-mastery lists. These plans grouped the students according to specific SOL bullets not mastered on the benchmark. The CIP included specific strategies for remediating the skills and documentation of remediation & mastery had to be provided with the CIP plan at the end of each quarter.
--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Tier 3	After each benchmark, teachers completed Corrective Intervention Plans based on the Interactive Achievement non-mastery lists. These plans grouped the students according to specific SOL bullets not mastered on the benchmark. The CIP included specific strategies for remediating the skills and documentation of remediation & mastery had to be provided with the CIP plan at the end of each quarter.
--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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: Occohannock Elementary School			
Year 3: 2012-2013			
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds	Other Funds
1000 - Personnel	Division Expenses	Division Expenses	Other: Title 1 Funds
	\$0	\$0	\$0
	School Expenses	School Expenses	
	\$154,523.95	\$0	
2000 - Personnel	Division Expenses	Division Expenses	Other:
	\$0	\$0	\$0
	School Expenses	School Expenses	
	\$24,642.05	\$0	
3000 - Purchased Services	Division Expenses	Division Expenses	Other:
	\$0	\$0	\$0
	School Expenses	School Expenses	
	\$0	\$0	
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses	Division Expenses	Other:
	\$0	\$0	\$0
	School Expenses	School Expenses	
	\$0	\$0	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses	\$0	Division Expenses	\$0	Other:	\$0	
	School Expenses	\$0	School Expenses	\$0			
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses	\$0	Division Expenses	\$0	Other:	\$0	
	School Expenses	\$0	School Expenses	\$0			
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses	\$0	Division Expenses	\$0	Other:	\$0	
	School Expenses	\$0	School Expenses	\$0			
Total	Division Expenses	\$0	Division Expenses	\$0	Other:	\$0	
	School Expenses	\$179,166.00	School Expenses	\$0			
						Total Division Expenses	\$0
						Total School Expenses	\$179,166.00
						TOTAL (Do not include "Other")	\$179,166.00

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.

<p>SCHOOL NAME: Occohannock Elementary School</p>	
<p>1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Jumpstart Program - \$10,800.00 - Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass their reading and math SOL assessments (4 Teachers – 12 students per grade level -48 students) 4 Teachers x \$25.00 hrs. x 4.5 hours x 20 days = \$9,000.00 / 2 – Bus Drivers x 15.00 hr. x 3 hrs. x 20 days = \$1,800.00 • Data Coach – \$61,823.95 – Will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's weaknesses and areas needing improvement. • Part-time Math Tutors (2) - \$54,600.00 – (6 hrs. x 182 days x \$25.00 x 2 tutors) • Part-time Early Intervention Reading Tutor - \$27,300.00 – 1 Tutor 	<p>2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.)</p> <p>Data Coach - \$17,550.50</p> <p>Jumpstart – \$826.20</p> <p>Tutors - \$6,265.35</p>
<p>3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>	
<p>4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>	
<p>5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>	
<p>6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>	
<p>8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay (Use as much space as necessary.)</p>	

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	\$154,523.95	\$	\$	\$
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$24,642.05	\$	\$	\$
3000 - Purchased Services	\$	\$	\$	\$
4000 - Internal Services	\$	\$	\$	\$
5000 - Other Charges	\$	\$	\$	\$
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$	\$	\$	\$
8000 - Equipment/ Capital Outlay	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$179,166.00	\$	\$	\$
TOTAL SIG and ARRA Funds \$179,166.00				

PART VII: ASSURANCES

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

The LEA must assure that it —

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

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

Superintendent's Signature:	<i>Walter R. Clemmons</i>
Superintendent's Name:	<i>Walter R. Clemmons</i>
Date:	<i>7/10/12</i>
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 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:	Walter R. Clemens
Date:	7/10/12
Principal's Signature Read # 9 above	
Date:	7/10/12

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.