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:	Pittsylvania County Schools				
Division Contact:	B. Teresa Petty, Director of Instructional Support Programs				
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):	434-432-2761 x 5017		Fax:	434-432-9560	
Email of Division Contact:	teresa.petty@pcs.k12.va.us				
Name of School	Kentuck Elementary School	2012-2013 Grade Span	PreK-5	Projected School Membership	600
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	57%	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	11%	Current Percent Limited English Proficient	2%
Name of Principal	Pamela Fields				
Telephone of Principal	434-822-5944				
Email of Principal	pamela.fields@pcs.k12.va.us				

PART II: PROCESSES IN PLACE

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

A. School Climate

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

The school climate is very good since the implementation of the SIG grant. The implementation of required monthly Leadership Team and weekly grade level team meetings increased collegiality and collaboration among staff. Required agendas and minutes helped to maintain an instructional focus during the meetings. In addition, the faculty's use of technology to support instruction has increased as a result. Funds have been used to add a computer lab which allows for more students to have access to computers on a weekly basis for remediation and practice with test navigation features to help prepare for the SOL tests. Funds have also been used to purchase laptop computers to assist Leadership Team members with classroom observations and overall monitoring of the School Improvement Process. While these funds have increased the use of technology to support classroom instruction, staff is still exploring research based methods to improve student performance in reading and math.

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?

The Leadership Team is given an agenda prior to each meeting. Each member is asked to contribute agenda items and to provide input when the meetings occur. The team consists of four core liaisons and grade level chairpersons. All groups, including SPED, Title I and a parent represented at the meetings. Communications related to the four core areas are presented by the core liaison representatives. Grade level chairpersons are responsible for sharing the Leadership Team meeting minutes and discussions with

their grade level during their weekly common planning block.

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

The administrators monitor classroom instruction, lesson plans which include differentiation, and common assessments. The school is fortunate to have a School Board Office division liaison who also monitors this information. During the weekly common planning blocks, this data, along with remediation efforts, differentiation / tiered assignments, and research-based instructional strategies are discussed. These discussions allow the grade levels to adjust instruction and provide intervention as data indicates.

C. Instruction

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

SOL, Word Study, PALS, formative, and 9, 18, and 27 week benchmark assessments provide ongoing information on student progress. Literacy groups are formed to address the needs of students at various skill levels. The staff works closely with, and communicates often about specific skills needing attention. Further differentiation and remediation are provided during the I/E (Intervention /Enrichment) time according to assessment data. At this time, teachers "tier" lessons to focus assistance on specific skills.

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

The school division provides a yearly review of the division's Pacing Guide which incorporates the SOL with emphasis on skills tested according to the SOL Blueprint. In addition, the school began developing "Units of Instruction" in Reading and Math. The division also provides benchmark assessments aligned with the pacing guides. In addition, the division has focused a system-wide approach to lesson implementation following the Madeline Hunter model. Using this model, stated SOL objectives are written into each teacher's lesson plans. Lesson plans are reviewed during weekly common planning blocks.

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?

Title I, School Improvement Grant (SIG), and local funds are used to involve parents in several events. The following events were included during the 2011-2012 school year: PTO, Saturday Breakfast, Special Reading Nights, First, Second, Third, and Fourth grade Reading Nights, "Build a Book" night, Third grade SOL night, SOL Pep Rally, Multicultural night, and Academic Awards Days. Expectations were discussed about the Reading program, grading, and long range goals for students. The Book Buddies Coordinator has had success in securing a few parents and grandparents to volunteer 45 minutes twice a week to provide reading intervention to weak readers. Parents could be more involved by volunteering time in the school and by assisting at home with the reading and math. The Book Buddies Coordinator would like to increase the number of parent volunteers who are available to participate in this one-on-one reading intervention program.

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?

Administrators review SOL test scores, previous classroom observations, teacher strengths and weaknesses, as well as the needs of students in selecting effective teacher placement. This process is revisited each year and changes are made as indicated. One primary goal is to place the strongest teachers with the weakest students in order to help increase student progress.

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

The school has maintained a positive relationship with Mr. David Wymer, state/division liaison, throughout the process of School Improvement at Kentuck Elementary. Mr. Wymer's monitoring and effective feedback have helped guide the school to improve instruction for all students. Mr. Wymer's knowledge of the School Improvement process has aided Kentuck in planning and implementing effective remediation for targeted at-risk students.

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's School Improvement Plan supports each school's School Improvement Plan. The division level liaison, Nancy Towler, is part of the school's instructional team and provides input, support, and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan. This process helps the school to focus on implementation of the plan with fidelity. The school's SIG funds, and how they are used, are reviewed with the division liaison prior to encumbering these funds.

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

Pittsylvania County Schools implemented an Instructional Framework for Excellence, division-wide, as well as clearly defined expectations for lesson plans, collaboration, use of formative assessments, and data analysis.

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).

The major concern is how to maintain the current level of staffing and tutoring once School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds are depleted. Local budgetary constraints provide no solution to this concern at this time.

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 division academic review team, along with the state liaison for school improvement, are constantly monitoring and reviewing building level data and needs. The division liaison, Nancy Towler, was insightful to the school's needs as they were discussed in weekly common planning blocks instructional team meetings. Guidance and feedback were given to the administrators and teachers throughout the school year.

G. Phase Out

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

Based on the data of student performance, the administrators and the school's Leadership Team will set priorities and utilize local available funds to provide needed services. Systems and processes are now in place that will help to sustain the school improvement efforts.

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 administrators and Leadership Team, along with the division's Leadership Team, have established systems and processes that are now in place that will help to sustain the school improvement efforts. The school's division liaison will facilitate communication of school needs and concerns to the division level. The administrators, school's Leadership Team, and the division liaison will work collaboratively throughout the 2012-2013 school year to make sure that there is a viable school improvement plan in place to support instructional goals once SIG funds are depleted.

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

The continued support of the state liaison, Mr. David Wymer, is most important as this will provide guidance on phasing out funds. Mr. Wymer's perspective on phasing out SIG support will be crucial.

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

As long as schools are designated as priority or focus in the school improvement process, it would be quite helpful if grant funding is continued at some level.

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	The instructional team monitored SOL, Word Study, PALS, formative, and division benchmark assessments to provide ongoing information on student progress. Literacy groups were formed to address the needs of students at various skill levels.
2	Administrators established a new daily schedule to include remediation and enrichment periods. The development of a 90 minute planning block for teachers on a 7 day rotation allowed teachers to disaggregate data, continue to plan "Units of Instruction" in reading, and discuss strategies to use with "tiered" students.
3	During instructional team meetings and vertical articulation meetings, the staff discussed the specific skills needing attention in reading and math. Further differentiation was provided during the I/E (Intervention /Enrichment) remedial time. At that time, teachers "tiered" lessons to focus attention on specific skills. Reading specialists and special education teachers were present during the meetings to provide input regarding how to address the needs of targeted students.
4	Teachers developed "Units of Instruction" in reading which included pre/post test in grades K-3. The pretests helped teachers differentiate instruction in reading.
5	Staff participated in intensive and sustained staff development training conducted by district and school staff, private providers, and T-TAC in core content areas, co-teaching, data analysis and interpretation, differentiation of instruction, formative assessment, word study, and working with students of poverty.

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 June 2013, SOL reading scores will increase by 5% and SOL mathematics scores will increase by 10% in Grades 3, 4, 5 by continuing a clear focus of monitoring math/reading instructional strategies and remediation services through the use of common assessments, Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9, 18, and 27-week benchmark assessments.

	Student progress will be reviewed weekly during grade level meetings to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. IID06- Yearly learning goals will be set for the school by the Leadership Team, utilizing student learning data. • The Instructional Team will review reading and math test data on a monthly basis during planned instructional meetings. • Teachers will review reading and math test data on a weekly basis during common planning blocks and adjust instruction. • A tracking system will be put in place at the beginning of the school year to monitor student progress in reading and math to identify at risk students. This Indicator aligns with NCLB Crosswalk component 5 of the ten required components.
2	In order to meet the 5% increase in reading and 10% increase in math in grades 3-5 by June 2013, the administrative team will effectively monitor and encourage curriculum implementation and quality instructional practices. These efforts will improve teaching and student learning in the classroom. Providing specific and timely feedback will give teachers opportunities for reflection and growth. These observations and follow-up conferences will be documented on Kentuck's Quarterly Data Analysis Reports. IIE07- The principal will monitor curriculum and classroom instruction regularly. • The principal will spend at least 50% of her day working directly with teachers to improve instruction and student growth. • The principal or her designee will monitor all extended grade level instructional meetings. • The principal will prepare grade level agendas and require grade level teams to maintain official minutes of meetings. This Indicator aligns with NCLB Crosswalk component 2 of the ten required components.
3	In order to meet the 5% increase in reading and 10% increase in math in grades 3-5 by June 2013, teachers will incorporate a variety of research-based instructional practices as a means to accommodate student differences in learning. Data collected from benchmarks, pre and post tests, and observations will be used, along with other sources of data in order to identify and accommodate student's learning needs. "Units of Instruction" will help foster the use of differentiation in the classrooms. The goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to "personalize" learning. IIA07- All teachers will differentiate assignments (individualize instruction) in response to individual student performance on pre-tests and other methods of assessment. • "Units of Instruction" will be developed in math for grades K-3. These "Units of Instruction" will incorporate pre and post testing to identify students' academic needs. • "Units of Instruction" will continue to be revised in reading in grades K-3. These "Units of Instruction" will include tiered lesson plans that will incorporate pre and post testing. • Teachers will provide daily remediation to targeted students based on pre and post test results. This Indicator aligns with NCLB Crosswalk component 1 of the ten required components.
4	In order to meet our goal of 5% increase in reading and 10% increase in math in grades 3-5 by June 2013, Kentuck recognizes that collaboration is essential in the development of quality teachers. Collaboration in the form of peer mentoring and/or coaching can be support for a teacher new to education or to a new grade level or content area. Teachers will have the opportunity to observe colleagues, plan vertically, and come together to collaborate during common planning blocks and other various times. Grade level minutes and schedules will document these efforts.

	IF10- The principal will plan opportunities for teachers to share their strengths with other teachers. • The principal will develop a schedule for teachers to observe colleagues during the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year. (Tasks will be added second semester to the School Improvement Plan to reflect this as an ongoing process) • A vertical planning schedule will be developed to allow math and language arts teachers to meet during the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year. (Tasks will be added second semester to the School Improvement Plan to reflect this as an ongoing process) • Teachers will be given the opportunity to provide peer coaching during common planning blocks and other various meeting times. This Indicator aligns with NCLB Crosswalk components 4 and 10 of the ten required components.
5	In order to meet our 5% increase in reading and 10% increase in math in grades 3-5 by June 2013 Kentuck recognizes the need for parent participation in student's learning. Teachers will notify parents of student progress using interim reports, report cards, Parent Conference Nights, and individual conferences by phone, email, and letters. These conferences will be reported on Kentuck's Quarterly Reports. Parents will also be involved in Title I activities and other school events throughout the 2012-2013 school year to foster parent involvement. IIB01- All teachers will maintain a file of communication with parents. • Teachers will systematically report to parents the students' academic progress throughout the school year. • Teachers will continue to maintain a parent log of visits and communications which will be monitored the first quarter of the 2012-2013 school year. (Tasks will be added each quarter to the School Improvement Plan to reflect this as an ongoing process). • The School will host activities to enhance school climate, community relations, and parental involvement throughout the year. This Indicator aligns with NCLB Crosswalk component 8 of the ten required components.

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.

<u>SAMPLE RESPONSE</u>

Students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	5th 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	5th 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	Targeted at-risk students will be identified by administrators and grade three – grade five teachers and placed on a Reading Hot List. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Hot List students are identified by using the following information: PALS scores, SOL test scores from the previous year (Tier 2 -350-412), 9, 18, and 27 week assessments and common assessments. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Tier 3	Targeted at-risk students will be identified by administrators and grade three – grade five teachers and placed on a Reading Hot List. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Hot List students are identified by using the following information: PALS scores, SOL test scores from the previous year (Tier 3- below 350), 9, 18, and 27 week assessments and common assessments. Additional tutoring by a grade three – grade five teacher will be provided for these targeted students, plus small group remediation with a reading teacher or certified tutor during the school day. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	Targeted at-risk students will be identified by administrators and grade three – grade five teachers and placed on a Math Hot List. . Identified students will receive additional math remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Hot List students are identified by using the following information: SOL test scores from the previous year (Tier 2 -350-412), 9, 18, and 27 week assessments and common assessments. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Tier 3	Targeted at-risk students will be identified by administrators and grade three – grade five teachers and placed on a Math Hot List to receive additional remediation provided by the teachers and other intervention staff. Hot List students are identified by using the following information: SOL test scores from the previous year (Tier 3- below 350), 9, 18, and 27 week assessments and common assessments. Additional tutoring grade three – grade five teacher will be provided for targeted students, plus small group remediation with a math teacher or certified tutor during the school day. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable	
Tier 2	Targeted students will receive additional remediation by a trained PALS tutor for two and a half hours a week in addition to the regular 1 ½ hour reading block. PALS data will be monitored by administrators and teachers in weekly grade level meetings by reviewing PALS reports and tutoring time sheets.
Tier 3	In addition to the regular 1 ½ hour daily classroom instruction and two and a half hour weekly PALS tutoring,

	students will participate in Book Buddies (one-on-one targeted intervention) at least twice a week. The Book Buddies Program will be monitored by the Book Buddies Coordinator.
Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	Targeted students will be placed on the Hot List to be monitored and provided with additional resources as needed according to the data. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Tier 3	Targeted students will be placed on the Hot List to be monitored and provided with additional resources as needed according to the data. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings. Additional tutoring by a grade three – grade five teacher will be provided for these targeted students, plus small group remediation with a reading teacher or certified tutor during the school day. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings
Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	Targeted students will be placed on the Hot List to be monitored and provided with additional resources as needed according to the data. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings.
Tier 3	Targeted students will be placed on the Hot List to be monitored and provided with additional resources as needed according to the data. Identified students will receive additional remediation by grade three – grade five teachers and certified tutors during scheduled daily remediation. Remediation is scheduled for at least twenty minutes per day five days a week. Administrators and teachers will review intervention data in weekly grade level meetings. In addition, students will be tracked through Study Island. The data will be reviewed in weekly grade level meetings to determine specific skill progress. The Title 1 Math teacher will tutor, monitor and share student progress.

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: Kentuck Elementary School			
	Year 3: 2012-2013		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds (N/A)	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Remediation Tutoring $13,005.50 EIRI $33,390.45 Title I, Part A $130,800.00
	School Expenses $119,538.00	School Expenses $	Other Personnel Total: $177,195.95
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Remediation Benefits $994.50 EIRI Benefits $2,372.85 Title I, Part A Benefits $41,516.88
	School Expenses $25,125.00	School Expenses $	Other Benefits Total: $44,884.23
3000 – *Purchased Services*	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Training $1,000.00 Title I, Part A $648.40
	School Expenses $6,900.00	School Expenses $	Other Purchased Services Total: $1,648.40
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: $0
	School Expenses $0	School Expenses $	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Training $1,880.00
	School Expenses $8,602.00	School Expenses $	
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: Local Instructional Funds $17,000.00
	School Expenses $19,002.00	School Expenses $	
8000 – Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: $0
	School Expenses $0	School Expenses $	
Total	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $0	Other: $242,608.58
	School Expenses $179,167.00	School Expenses $0	
			Total Division Expenses $0
			Total School Expenses $179,167.00
			TOTAL (Do not include "Other") $179,167.00

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.

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: Kentuck Elementary School
1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) School Improvement Coach ($50,800.00) One new teacher ($38,178.00) Remediation Tutors (3 persons-100 days @ 4hrs per day ($23.00) = ($29,000.00) 26 Substitute Teachers for Teachers attending Professional Development in Code 5000 below ($1,560.00) 3 or more SOL Remediation Tutors @ $20 hr. ($13,005.50); 3 or more EIRI Tutors @ 20 hr. ($33,390.45); Title I Part A/ 2 Reading & 1 Math Teacher ($130,800.00)
2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.) Retirement, FICA, etc. for Coach ($13,009.78) Retirement, FICA, etc. for teacher ($9,777.38) Remediation Tutor Benefits @7.65% FICA ($2,218.50) 26 Substitute Teachers FICA @7.65% ($119.34) SOL Remediation Tutor Benefits @7.65% FICA ($994.50); EIRI Tutor Benefits @7.65% FICA ($2,372.85); Total Benefits Package for 3 Teachers ($41,516.88)
3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.) VDOE- Assigned State Contractor Fee ($4,500.00) Editure Formative Assessment Training ($1,900.00) Virginia Dashboard – ($500.00) SOL Training/Professional Development/Presenters ($1,000.00); Title I, Part A / Elementary School's Portion (1 of 10 Elementary Schools) Division-wide Differentiation Training with Jim Grant ($648.40)

4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)
5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.) Professional development that supports the following (including Registration, Mileage, Lodging, & Meals) Math: Building Number Sense with Ready-to-Use Singapore Math Strategies (K-6) in Charlottesville, VA, December 6, 2012, 6 Teachers = $2,132, and Guided Math-Practical Strategies to Differentiate Your Math Instruction Using Small Groups, Math Learning Centers and Whole Group Instruction (Grades 3-6) in Roanoke, VA, December 12, 2012, 6 teachers= $1,828; Reading: Advanced Guided Reading Strategies – New Ideas to Take Your Guided Reading Instruction to Another Level (Grades 1-3) in Roanoke, VA, November 9, 2012, 8 Teachers = $2,254; and Strengthen Your Instruction Using iPad Technology and iPad Apps to Increase Student Learning (K-6) in Richmond, VA, October 29, 2012, 6 Teachers = $2,388 Total: $8,602.00 Other: SOL Training / Professional Development Travel to Relevant Instructional Workshops & Conferences ($1,880.00)
6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.) Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Reading Series and/or other comparable research-based -Tier 3 materials ($2,100.00) Study Island- web based program designed as a supplemental educational tool ($2,402.26) Reading Eggs- web based program designed as a supplemental educational tool ($1,500.00) Leveled Readers to support our Leveled Reader Room ($4,500.00) Singapore Math Book Bundle ($500) U / Horseshoe Shape Tables with Chairs to Support Small Group Guided Reading ($7,999.74) Other: Local Regular Instructional Funds / Research-based Core Area Materials & Instructional Supplies ($17,000)
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.
*Combined Budget Summary is Located after Dan River Middle School's Budget Narrative

	Year 3: 2012-2013		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds (N/A)	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:	*Signature on Original
Superintendent's Name:	Mr. James E. McDaniel
Date:	07-09-2012
Principal's Signature Read # 9 above	Pamela Fields, Principal of Kentuck Elementary School (Signature on Original)
Date:	07-03-2012

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 (NA)

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.

Please complete this application for each school.

PART I: DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name:	PITTSYLVANIA COUNTY					
Division Contact:	B. Teresa Petty					
Telephone of Division Contact (include extension if applicable):		(434) 432-2761 Ext. 5017		Fax:	(434) 432-9560	
Email of Division Contact:	teresa.petty@pcs.k12.va.us					
Name of School	DAN RIVER MIDDLE SCHOOL		2012-2013 Grade Span	6-8	Projected School Membership	528
	Current Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	54%	Current Percent Students with Disabilities	18.3%	Current Percent Limited English Proficient	<1%
Name of Principal	Emily S. Reynolds					
Telephone of Principal	(434) 822-6027					
Email of Principal	emily.reynolds@pcs.k12.va.us					

PART II: PROCESSES IN PLACE

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

A. School Climate

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

Dan River Middle School's climate has changed dramatically as a result of the processes put into place since the implementation of the SIG grant. There is a clear sense of urgency and the need to ensure that every effort is made for each child to be academically successful. The staff fully understands the need for, and has implemented key instructional changes that center around formative assessment and differentiation of instruction. With the implementation of weekly team meetings that have a clear focus on student achievement, teachers are able to clearly identify students who are in need of immediate remediation or acceleration. Dan River Middle School still has room to grow and change as a staff; however, the overall climate is one of positive change and collaboration as a whole.

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?

Each member of Dan River Middle School's Leadership Team serves as a Focus Team chairperson or co-chairperson. These individuals serve as a liaison from the administrative team to the faculty as a whole and serve as representatives of the faculty as a whole. In the 2011-12 school year, modifications were made to the processes used for the Leadership Team. These processes include additional support staff (i.e. ITRT, division liaison) who became members of the Leadership Team. Each Leadership Team meeting had a more clear and concise focus and followed a prescribed agenda. Additionally, the membership on the focus team was adjusted to ensure the key staff members in the building were a part of the process. There was a clear collaborative climate to the Leadership Team 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 are monitored through the Leadership Team and Focus Teams. Dan River Middle School has created a climate of honest self-reflection. The staff members feel comfortable sharing strengths and weaknesses of the processes that are in place. There is a clear understanding of "why" many things are done and there is always a clear rationale of the reasoning behind decisions that are made. When processes do not work, the leadership team brainstorms ideas of ways to make the process better.

C. Instruction

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

Teachers use a variety of ways to differentiate learning within the classroom. Dan River Middle School has moved to a full inclusion model, which has increased the need of new ways to approach instruction and differentiate learning as well. In January 2012, 14 teachers participated in a one-day Jim Grant workshop on differentiation. These teachers were key instructors within the building who conducted in-service training for staff members over several days to relay the information taught. Additionally, DRMS has introduced 20 new SMART Boards to core area classrooms to help with differentiation efforts. Teachers are required to use research-based instructional strategies to ensure all levels of learners are addressed. Students in need of additional support are identified through data analysis by core area teachers, the school improvement coach, and administration. Data meetings are held quarterly to discuss benchmark assessments and identify students who need remediation in the math remediation lab and the Read 180 remediation lab. These placements are a fluid process, allowing students to move in and out based on achievement. Additionally, all students participate in a dedicated in-school remediation period each day to address and remediate weaknesses as soon as they are identified.

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.)

Dan River Middle School's SOL proficiency rates indicate that the curriculum alignment process is working; however, there are clear weaknesses that are present and will be addressed. DRMS made significant gains in the area of Math 6; however, it is clear that attention and focus needs to be given to pre-algebra in Grades 7 and 8 to ensure the percentage of students meeting the proficiency level increases. Division staff, school staff, and the principal will work to ensure that best practices are being used in all pre-algebra classrooms to allow these pass rates to increase. DRMS is in the process of creating a clear monitoring system to use for all math and reading classrooms, with the aide of the school improvement coach. Additionally, DRMS is implementing an effective school-wide discipline model for the 2012-13 school year to aide in reducing the number of classroom disruptions to protect as much instructional time as possible.

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?

While there are a high number of parents who are involved and supportive of the school improvement efforts, there clearly needs to be a greater focus on parental involvement at Dan River Middle School. It is difficult, many times, to have parents come into the school for meetings to discuss their child's academic progress. DRMS has low attendance at PTO meetings; however, with the implementation of new PTO efforts during the 2011-12 school year and a new PTO board for the 2012-13 school year, DRMS has seen a marked increase in the number of parents who volunteered during faculty lunches, etc.

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?

At the beginning of the 2011-12 school year, Dan River Middle School made a number of key staffing changes to ensure that the strongest teachers were working with the weakest students. This plan proved to be quite successful, especially in 6th grade reading and math. Teachers are placed on teams, and grade levels based on teaching style, past success, and personality. When there were areas of concern with specific teachers, the principal and assistant principal worked together with the teacher to ensure supports were put into place to aide their success in the classroom. The administrators feel confident that they have the best teachers in the best placements at this time.

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

Dan River Middle School and Pittsylvania County Schools' Division School Improvement Team have a positive working relationship with Mr. David Wymer, state/division liaison. Mr. Wymer has provided constructive feedback and given major support to school-wide processes and changes that needed to take place at Dan River Middle School. Under his guidance, Dan River Middle School's staff has grown significantly in its ability to reach struggling learners. He has given us tools to analyze data and implement processes with fidelity.

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?

Dan River Middle School works to ensure all staff members have a voice in the improvement process; however, the principal and division staff have final say of changes that need to be made. The principal, in collaboration with the district team, work to ensure that the processes put into place and decisions that are made are instructionally sound and in the best interest of the students of Dan River Middle School. Decisions are data driven to ensure there is a documented need for the decision.

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

Pittsylvania County implemented an Instructional Framework for Excellence division-wide, as well as clear expectations for lesson plans, collaboration, use of formative assessments, data analysis, etc.

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).

Staffing concerns once grant funds are depleted are a concern for Dan River Middle School. Dan River Middle School has used grant funds to ensure student/teacher ratios remain at a manageable level. While this concern is paramount, due to budgetary constraints, there are no foreseeable resolutions to this concern.

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.

There is a team focus between Dan River Middle School and the division staff. Our division liaison, Teresa Petty, has been an integral part of our faculty for the 2011-12 school year. She attended team meetings, focus team meetings, faculty meetings, was a member of our Leadership Team, and provided sound guidance and constructive feedback to the administration and faculty throughout the year. She ensured that our decisions were sound based on data and the identified needs of the school. This created a sense of teamwork, not only for the administration and school improvement coach, but also for the faculty as a whole. Not only was Ms. Petty an excellent colleague and advisor, but the entire division staff were present within our building throughout the school year in classrooms and at meetings to ensure that processes were in place and being carried out with fidelity.

G. Phase Out

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

Dan River Middle School and the division staff feel that the processes that have been put into place will remain so because they have a clear focus on school improvement. The staff of DRMS has embraced the "whatever it takes" mentality and strives to ensure that school improvement processes are approached with a team effort. Staff believes that all of the current initiatives that are in place are key to the success of DRMS and hopes to remain in effect, even after grant funds are depleted.

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?

Dan River Middle School has centered all of its efforts for school improvement around the continuation of the school improvement process after grant funds are depleted. Dan River Middle School will spend the entire 2012-13 school

year ensuring that processes are in place for the continuation of school improvement after the services of the school improvement coach are no longer available. During the 2011-12 school year, numerous processes were put into place including mandatory weekly team meetings, specific lesson plan templates, and an instructional framework that served as a catalyst for rigor in the classroom. All of these are not dependent on grant funding, which will allow for their continuation without the need for additional funding. Dan River Middle School's principal, school improvement coach, and leadership team have worked closely to identify key areas of need as the school prepares to phase out grant funds. These areas include services such as Study Island and Gizmos, as well as professional development and material purchases. In working with the Instructional and Title I Department of Pittsylvania County Schools, the principal will ensure that sound instructional decisions are made for the continuation of DRMS' school improvement.

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

It would be most beneficial to have the continued support of David Wymer as State Liasion. His guidance and support to the school and division have helped to move Dan River forward in the school improvement process.

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

As long as schools are designated as priority or focus in the school improvement process, it would be quite helpful if grant funding is continued at some level.

PART III: GOAL SETTING

H. 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	Scores continued to improve in the area of English. While math scores were not as successful, Dan River Middle School did show significant growth in the area of Math 6, an area that was identified as the weakest for the 2010-11 school year. Much of this success stems from a climate shift, and a total buy-in by staff members.
2	Dan River Middle School modified the Leadership Team model for the 2011-12 school year, allowing for a much more successful experience for the school as a whole. The Leadership Team members worked together to create a climate of professionalism on the team, allowing for open discussions of the needs of the school based on data and research.
3	Key staffing changes were made for the 2011-12 school year to move highly successful staff members into areas of weakness. This proved to be successful both academically and from a behavioral perspective. Student scores were successful in many of the areas and the school was able to reduce the number of referrals to the office by more than 35%. Additionally, the administration worked to secure teachers with a high success rate for new positions.
4	Highly successful teachers were moved into the math and reading lab positions for the 2011-12 school year. These teachers made significant revisions to the programs to ensure success for the students. Through data analysis, students were evaluated on a 6-week basis and moved in and out of the remediation labs based on ability levels and success throughout the year.
5	The principal and school improvement coach instituted data meetings with all core teachers following each benchmark testing phase to discuss test results. These meetings followed a prescribed format which addressed areas of needed improvement based on the SOL, strategies to overcome these deficits, students who were in need of immediate remediation, and ways that the principal and school improvement coach could aide teachers in achieving the goals that were set during the meeting. These meetings allowed for open and honest communication and evaluation of classroom

	practices and created a team approach to improvement.

I. 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 June 2013 SOL mathematics scores will increase by 9% in Grade 6 mathematics, 38% in Grade 8 mathematics, and will remain at 96% for Algebra I to meet the state benchmark by continuing a clear focus of monitoring math instructional strategies and remediation services through the use of ARDT, Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments. Student progress will be reviewed during each post-benchmark assessment meeting to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. IIB04 – Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others ☐ Departments will meet and discuss the most effective approach to use formative assessments in the classroom ☐ The principal and school improvement coach will meet with teachers to discuss 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessment results with all teachers and implement a plan to ensure student success on the SOL test in May, 2013. ☐ Math teachers will receive a watch list spreadsheet to track their students' progress throughout the school year. IIC01 – Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. ☐ Differentiated instruction training and formative assessment training will be provided to new staff members to ensure they are aligned with current staff members. Additionally, an emphasis will be placed on rigor in the classroom with all staff members. Additional training in DI and formative assessments will be required of staff members who are observed as being weak in these instructional strategies. ☐ Math teachers will continue to share various instructional strategies in Math Focus Team meetings. The math coach will meet with individual teachers to discuss their creation and implementation of a "Math SOL Success" sheet. These sheets will contain important notes for students to review. IID08 – Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. ☐ The math focus team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress according to current testing data. The data will be used to determine if students are in need of remediation in a tutoring environment. IID09 – Instructional teams use student learning data to plan instruction ☐ Employ in-school tutors for assistance with in-school remediation ☐ The school improvement coach and retired teachers will provide in-school remediation at all grade levels. These individual will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure more individualized instruction for students in jeopardy of failing based upon student learning data. ☐ All core teachers will utilize the computer lab during Expo remediation to practice ePAT for online testing, as well as to use Study Island, which allows teachers to choose specific, targeted areas of focus for individual students. ☐ Grade level instructional teams meet weekly with administration to discuss student progress and develop

	remediation plans for students who are in need of remediation.
2	By June 2013 SOL English scores will increase by 7% in Grade 6, 7, and 8 language arts to meet the state benchmark by continuing a clear focus of monitoring English instructional strategies and remediation services through the use of Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments. Student progress will be reviewed during each post-benchmark assessment meeting to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. IIB04 – Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others ☐ Departments will meet and discuss the most effective approach to use formative assessments in the classroom ☐ The principal and school improvement coach will meet with teachers to discuss 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessment results with all teachers and implement a plan to ensure student success on the SOL test in May, 2013. ☐ English teachers will receive a watch list spreadsheet to track their students' progress throughout the school year. IIC01 – Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. ☐ Differentiated instruction training and formative assessment training will be provided to new staff members to ensure they are aligned with current staff members. Additionally, an emphasis will be placed on rigor in the classroom with all staff members. Additional training in DI and formative assessments will be required of staff members who are observed as being weak in these instructional strategies. ☐ English teachers will continue to share various instructional strategies in English Focus Team meetings. IID08 – Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. ☐ The English Focus Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress according to current testing data. The data will be used to determine if students are in need of remediation in a tutoring environment. IID09 – Instructional teams use student learning data to plan instruction ☐ Employ in-school tutors for assistance with in-school remediation. ☐ The school improvement coach and retired teachers will provide in-school remediation at all grade levels. These individual will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure more individualized instruction for students in jeopardy of failing based upon student learning data. ☐ All core teachers will utilize the computer lab during Expo to use Study Island. This program allows teachers to choose specific, targeted areas of focus for individual students. ☐ Grade level instructional teams meet weekly with administration to discuss student progress and develop remediation plans for students who are in need of remediation.
3	By June 2013 SOL mathematics scores for students with disabilities will increase by 20% in Grade 6 mathematics, 25% in Grade 8 mathematics, and will meet the requirements for AYP for Algebra I (first year of testing a large number of students with disabilities in Algebra I) to meet the state benchmark by continuing a clear focus of monitoring math instructional strategies and remediation services for special education students through the use of a full inclusion model, and monitoring processes such as ARDT, Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments. Student progress for students with disabilities will be reviewed during each post-benchmark assessment meeting to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. The administration and school improvement coach will work closely with inclusion teams to ensure the sound instructional practices are being implemented within the classroom, and that all classroom accommodations are being met for each student. IIB04 – Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others ☐ Departments will meet and discuss the most effective approach to use formative assessments in the classroom ☐ The principal and school improvement coach will meet with teachers to discuss 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessment results with all teachers and implement a plan to ensure student success on the SOL test in May, 2013.

	☐ Math teachers will receive a watch list spreadsheet to track their students' progress throughout the school year. IIC01 – Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. ☐ Differentiated instruction training and formative assessment training will be provided to new staff members to ensure they are aligned with current staff members. Additionally, an emphasis will be placed on rigor in the classroom with all staff members. Additional training in DI and formative assessments will be required of staff members who are observed as being weak in these instructional strategies. ☐ Math teachers will continue to share various instructional strategies in Math Focus Team meetings. The math coach will meet with individual teachers to discuss their creation and implementation of a "Math SOL Success" sheet. These sheets will contain important notes for students to review. IID08 – Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. ☐ The math Focus Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress according to current testing data. The data will be used to determine if students are in need of remediation in a tutoring environment. IID09 – Instructional teams use student learning data to plan instruction ☐ Employ in-school tutors for assistance with in-school remediation. ☐ The school improvement coach and retired teachers will provide in-school remediation at all grade levels. These individual will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure more individualized instruction for students in jeopardy of failing based upon student learning data. ☐ All core teachers will utilize the computer lab during Expo remediation to practice ePAT for online testing, as well as to use Study Island, which allows teachers to choose specific, targeted areas of focus for individual students. ☐ Grade level instructional teams meet weekly with administration to discuss student progress and develop remediation plans for students who are in need of remediation.
4	By June 2013 SOL English scores for students with disabilities will increase by 15% in Grade 6 and 7 English, and 20% in Grade 8 English to meet the state benchmark by continuing a clear focus of monitoring English instructional strategies and remediation services for special education students through the use of a full inclusion model, and monitoring processes such as Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments. Student progress for students with disabilities will be reviewed during each post-benchmark assessment meeting to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. The administration and school improvement coach will work closely with inclusion teams to ensure the sound instructional practices are being implemented within the classroom, and that all classroom accommodations are being met for each student. IIB04 – Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others ☐ Departments will meet and discuss the most effective approach to use formative assessments in the classroom ☐ The principal and school improvement coach will meet with teachers to discuss 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessment results with all teachers and implement a plan to ensure student success on the SOL test in May, 2013. ☐ English teachers will receive a watch list spreadsheet to track their students' progress throughout the school year. IIC01 – Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. ☐ Differentiated instruction training and formative assessment training will be provided to new staff members to ensure they are aligned with current staff members. Additionally, an emphasis will be placed on rigor in the classroom with all staff members. Additional training in DI and formative assessments will be required of staff members who are observed as being weak in these instructional strategies. ☐ English teachers will continue to share various instructional strategies in English Focus Team meetings. IID08 – Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. ☐ The English Focus Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress according to current testing data. The data will be used to determine if students are in need of remediation in a tutoring environment.

	IID09 – Instructional teams use student learning data to plan instruction ☐ Employ in-school tutors for assistance with in-school remediation. ☐ The school improvement coach and retired teachers will provide in-school remediation at all grade levels. These individual will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure more individualized instruction for students in jeopardy of failing based upon student learning data. ☐ All core teachers will utilize the computer lab during Expo remediation to practice ePAT for online testing, as well as to use Study Island, which allows teachers to choose specific, targeted areas of focus for individual students. ☐ Grade level instructional teams meet weekly with administration to discuss student progress and develop remediation plans for students who are in need of remediation.
5	By June 2013 SOL mathematics scores for low socioeconomic students will increase by 12% in Grade 6 mathematics, 16% in Math 8 (Grades 7 and 8) to meet the state benchmark by continuing a clear focus of monitoring math instructional strategies and remediation services for special education students through the use of a full inclusion model, and monitoring processes such as ARDT, Study Island, Tests for Higher Standards, as well as 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments. Student progress for students with disabilities will be reviewed during each post-benchmark assessment meeting to ensure a remediation plan is in place for each child in the areas of identified need by SOL. The administration and school improvement coach will work closely with inclusion teams to ensure the sound instructional practices are being implemented within the classroom, and that all classroom accommodations are being met for each student. IIB04 – Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others ☐ Departments will meet and discuss the most effective approach to use formative assessments in the classroom ☐ The principal and school improvement coach will meet with teachers to discuss 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessment results with all teachers and implement a plan to ensure student success on the SOL test in May, 2013. ☐ Math teachers will receive a watch list spreadsheet to track their students' progress throughout the school year. IIC01 – Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. ☐ Differentiated instruction training and formative assessment training will be provided to new staff members to ensure they are aligned with current staff members. Additionally, an emphasis will be placed on rigor in the classroom with all staff members. Additional training in DI and formative assessments will be required of staff members who are observed as being weak in these instructional strategies. ☐ Math teachers will continue to share various instructional strategies in Math Focus Team meetings. The math coach will meet with individual teachers to discuss their creation and implementation of a "Math SOL Success" sheet. These sheets will contain important notes for students to review. IID08 – Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. ☐ The math Focus Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress according to current testing data. The data will be used to determine if students are in need of remediation in a tutoring environment. IID09 – Instructional teams use student learning data to plan instruction ☐ Employ in-school tutors for assistance with in-school remediation ☐ The school improvement coach and retired teachers will provide in-school remediation at all grade levels. These individual will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure more individualized instruction for students in jeopardy of failing based upon student learning data. ☐ All core teachers will utilize the computer lab during Expo remediation to practice ePAT for online testing, as well as to use Study Island, which allows teachers to choose specific, targeted areas of focus for individual students. Grade level instructional teams meet weekly with administration to discuss student progress and develop remediation plans for students who are in need of remediation.

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	5th 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	5th grade math teachers will work collaboratively with the 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	English teachers will work collaboratively to develop a list of lessons on Study Island for the highly qualified in-school tutors to use with the students identified by grades C-D, low weekly formative assessment performance and scoring 60-75% on 9-weeks assessment during 45-minute Expo remediation period daily. Teachers will review results from Study Island reports weekly to determine student progress.
Tier 3	English teachers will work collaboratively with the school improvement coach to analyze 9-week benchmark data for all students. Any student scoring under 65% on the benchmark test with a grade of C or below will be reviewed in-depth and recommended to the Reading Remediation Lab where Read 180 software is used. The highly qualified Reading Lab specialist will develop child-specific lesson plans and instructional strategies based on areas of weakness. The Reading Lab specialist will address specific skills for the student 5 days/week for 45 minutes daily. The Reading Lab specialist and classroom teacher will review reports from the Read 180 program weekly.
Part IV (b): Interventions for students who are at-risk of failing a mathematics SOL	
Tier 2	Math teachers will work collaboratively to develop a list of lessons on Study Island for the highly qualified in-school tutors to use with the students identified by grades C-D, low weekly formative assessment performance and scoring 60-75% on 9-weeks assessment during 45-minute Expo remediation period daily. Teachers will review results from Study Island reports weekly to determine student progress.

Tier 3	Math teachers will work collaboratively with the school improvement coach to analyze 9-week benchmark data for all students. Any student scoring under 65% on the benchmark test with a grade of C or below will be reviewed in-depth and recommended to the Math Remediation Lab where a variety of instructional software is used. The highly qualified Math Lab specialist will develop child-specific lesson plans and instructional strategies based on areas of weakness. The Math Lab specialist will address specific skills for the student 5 days/week for 45 minutes daily. The Math Lab specialist and classroom teacher will review student progress on a weekly basis.
Part IV (c): Interventions for students who are identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable	
Tier 2	N/A
Tier 3	N/A
Part IV (d): Interventions for students who failed the SOL reading assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	English teachers will work collaboratively to develop a list of resources and SMART Board activities to use during the in-school remediation period (Expo) for 45 minutes daily. Students identified as "watch list" will be placed in an English Expo class to ensure that identified areas of need (based on the SPBQ from the previous SOL) are addressed. Teachers will review student progress with administration each 9-week period and will track progress on the Watch List tracking sheets for English.
Tier 3	English teachers will work with the School Improvement Coach to devise intervention plans for students who did not pass the Reading SOL in the previous year and are not meeting benchmark standards on the 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments (below 65% proficiency). These students will be recommended to the Reading Remediation lab to work with the Reading Lab Specialist on areas of weakness 45 minutes per day. Students will use the Read 180 software during their remediation time in the lab. Teachers will work with the Reading Lab Specialist to review student progress in the Read 180 program, as well as progress on classroom formative assessments. Student intervention plans will be reviewed and modified every two weeks by the classroom teacher and Reading Lab Specialist with the assistance of the School Improvement Coach.
Part IV (e): Interventions for students who failed the SOL mathematics assessment in the previous year not identified above	
Tier 2	Math teachers will work collaboratively to develop a list of resources and SMART Board activities to use during the in-school remediation period (Expo) for 45 minutes daily. Students identified as "watch list" will be placed in a math Expo class to ensure that identified areas of need (based on the SPBQ from the previous SOL) are addressed. Teachers will review student progress with administration each 9-week period and will track progress on the Watch List tracking sheets for math.
Tier 3	Math teachers will work with the School Improvement Coach to devise intervention plans for students who did not pass the Math SOL in the previous year and are not meeting benchmark standards on the 9-, 18-, and 27-week benchmark assessments (below 65% proficiency). These students will be recommended to the Math Remediation lab to work with the Math Lab Specialist on areas of weakness 45 minutes per day. Students will use a variety of math software and ARDT during their remediation time in the lab. Teachers will work with the Math Lab Specialist to review student progress on the ARDT strand tests, as well as progress on classroom formative assessments. Student intervention plans will be reviewed and modified every two weeks by the classroom teacher and Math Lab Specialist with the assistance of the School Improvement Coach.

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: Dan River Middle School			
	Year 3: 2012-2013		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds /NA	Other Funds
1000 – Personnel	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Remediation $11,147.00 Title I, Part A $123,800.00
	School Expenses $101,368.50.	School Expenses $	Total Personnel: $134,947.00
2000 – Personnel	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Remediation Benefits $852.75 Title I, Part A Benefits $40,126.68
	School Expenses $26,059.70.	School Expenses $	Total Personnel Benefits: $40,979.43
3000 – *Purchased Services*	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Training $1,000.00 Title I, Part A $553.90
	School Expenses $17,916.00	School Expenses $	Total Purchased Services: $1,553.90
4000 - Internal Services	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: $0
	School Expenses $0	School Expenses $	

5000 - Other Charges	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: SOL Training Funds $1,445.00
	School Expenses $0	School Expenses $	
6000 - Materials and Supplies	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: Local Instructional Funds $14,000.00
	School Expenses $33,822.80	School Expenses $	
8000 – Equipment/ Capital Outlay	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $	Other: $0
	School Expenses $0	School Expenses $	
Total	Division Expenses $0	Division Expenses $0	Other: $192,925.33
	School Expenses $179,167.00	School Expenses $0	
			Total Division Expenses $0
			Total School Expenses $179,167.00
			TOTAL (Do not include "Other") $179,167.00

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.

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: DAN RIVER MIDDLE SCHOOL
1000 – Personnel (Use as much space as necessary.) School Improvement Coach – Part Time ($25,012.50); Math Teacher ($38,178.00); Reading Teacher ($38,178.00) 3 or More SOL Remediation Tutors ($11,147.00) Title I, Part A / 2 Reading Teachers & 1 Math Teacher ($123,800.00)
2000 -Employee Benefits (Use as much space as necessary.) School Improvement Coach FICA and Benefits ($6,504.94); Math Teacher FICA and Benefits ($9,777.38); Reading Teacher FICA and Benefits ($9,777.38) 3 or More SOL Remediation Tutors ($852.75) Title I, Part A / Total Benefits Package for 2 Reading Teachers & 1 Math Teacher ($40,126.68)
3000 - Purchased Services (Use as much space as necessary.) Editure ($1,900.00); Virginia Dashboard ($500.00); SMART Goals Training ($4,365.00); Professional Development: SMARTBoard Training = $4,797.00 & Differentiation Training $1,854.00 = ($6,651.00) /State Liaison Support ($4,500.00) SOL Training / Professional Development Presenters ($1,000.00) Title I, Part A / Middle School's Portion (1 of 10 Middle and High Schools) Division-wide Differentiation / "Tiering" Instruction Training with Betty Hollas ($553.90)
4000 - Internal Services (Use as much space as necessary.)"
5000 - Other Charges (Use as much space as necessary.) SOL Training / Professional Development Travel to Relevant Instructional Workshops and Conferences ($1,445.00)

6000 - Materials and Supplies (Use as much space as necessary.) Gizmos ($3,126.80); Study Island – 3 year subscription ($9,267.00); SMART Boards – 8 Boards ($16,800); Instructional Materials and Supplies ($4,629.00) Local Regular Instructional Funds / Research-based Materials and Instructional Supplies ($14,000.00)
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.
*Kentuck Elementary School and Dan River Middle School

	Year 3: 2012-2013		
Expenditure Codes	SIG Funds	ARRA Funds: N/A	Other Funds
1000 - Personnel	$220,906.50	$	$312,142.95
2000 - Employee Benefits	$51,184.70	$	$85,863.66
3000 - Purchased Services	$24,816.00	$	$3,202.30
4000 - Internal Services	$0	$	$0
5000 - Other Charges	$8,602.00	$	$3,325.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies	$52,824.80	$	$31,000.00
8000 – Equipment/ Capital Outlay	$0	$	$0
Total	$358,334.00	$0	$435,533.91
			TOTAL SIG and ARRA Funds $358,334.00

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:	*Signature on Original
Superintendent's Name:	Mr. James E. McDaniel
Date:	07/09/2012
Principal's Signature Read # 9 above	Emily S. Reynolds, Principal of Dan River Middle School (Signature on Original)
Date:	07/03/2012

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 (NA)

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 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