

APPROVED

Virginia Department of Education
Office of Program Administration and Accountability and Office of School Improvement
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, Virginia 23218-2120

1003(a)

Application for Schools in YEAR ONE of Title I School Improvement

Under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, PL 107-110

Due: June 14, 2010

Cover Page

DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name: Greene County Public Schools
Mailing Address: PO Box 1140, Stanardsville, VA 22973
Division Contact: Jennifer Richter
Telephone (include extension if applicable): (434) 985-1429 Fax: (434) 985-4686
E-mail: jrichter@greencountyschools.com

SCHOOL INFORMATION

Provide information for each year one Title I School Improvement school within the division that will receive support through the 1003(a) funds. Copy as many blocks as needed.

School Name: Greene County Primary School
Mailing Address: 64 Monroe Drive, Stanardsville, VA 22973
School Contact: Mike Coiner, Principal
Telephone (include extension if applicable): (434) 985-5279 Fax: (434) 985-1321
E-mail: mcoiner@greencountyschools.com

School Name: Nathanael Greene Elementary School

Mailing Address: __8094 Spotswood Trail, Stanardsville, VA 22973_____
School Contact: __Peter Stern, Principal_____
Telephone (include extension if applicable): __(434) 985-5275_____ Fax: __ (434) 985-5287_____
E-mail: __pstern@greencountyschools.com_____

COVER PAGE CONTINUED

Assurances*: The local educational agency assures that School Improvement 1003(a) 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).

***SPECIAL DIVISION ASSURANCE, IF ANY,
DISCUSSED WITH THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT MUST BE ATTACHED.**

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

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

The division will submit one application packet.

PART I: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Complete the requested information for the schools identified for your division in pink. See Appendix A-a

Name of School	Grade Span	Targeted Assisted School (Check)	Schoolwide Program School (Check)	School Membership	Percent Identified as Disadvantaged	Percent Students with Disabilities	Percent Limited English Proficient
Greene County Primary	PK-2	√		502	42%	19%	4%
Nathanael Greene Elementary	3-5	√		405	40%	16%	3%

PART II: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The LEA must provide the following information for each of the year one Title I School Improvement schools to be served with 1003(a) funds.

- a. Student achievement data for the past two years (2007-2008, 2008-2009) in reading/language arts and mathematics:

by school for the “all students” category and for each AYP subgroup; and by grade level in the “all students” category and for each AYP subgroup;

- b. Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement;
- c. Information about the demographics of the student population to include attendance rate, total number of students, and totals by the following categories: 1) gender; 2) race or ethnicity; 3) disability status; 4) limited English proficient status; 5) migrant status; 6) homeless status; and 7) economically disadvantaged status; and
- d. Annual goals for student achievement on the state’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

Response:

	Required Information	Nathanael Greene Elementary School		
a.	Student achievement data for the past two years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) in reading/language arts and mathematics: by school for the “all students” category and for each AYP subgroup	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09
	Reading Scores:	All Students	85.36	80.41
		Black	74.19	73.80
		Econ. Diadvan.	66.66	72.99
		Hispanic	71.42	66.66
		LEP	75.80	72.72
		Stud. w/ Disab.	48.71	63.33
		White	86.70	82.26
	Mathematics Scores:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
		All Students	84.05	79.63
		Black	77.41	74.41
		Econ. Diadvan.	75.00	68.61
		Hispanic	85.71	66.66
		LEP	73.38	63.63
		Stud. w/ Disab.	51.28	63.33
		White	84.54	80.67
	Second request is “by grade level” in the “all students” category and for each subgroup	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09

3rd Grade Reading:	All Students	78.00	73.85
	Black	78.57	64.70
	Econ. Diadvan.	66.66	59.18
	Hispanic	66.66	50.00
	LEP	66.00	60.00
	Stud. w/ Disab.	52.80	55.00
	White	77.97	78.64
3rd Grade Mathematics:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
	All Students	84.40	85.38
	Black	85.71	76.47
	Econ. Diadvan.	70.00	75.51
	Hispanic	83.33	50.00
	LEP	100.00	40.00
	Stud. w/ Disab.	47.62	75.00
	White	83.90	89.32
4th Grade Reading:	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09
	All Students	87.83	78.83
	Black	70.00	78.57
	Econ. Diadvan.	78.57	76.60
	Hispanic	66.66	75.00
	LEP	50.00	75.00
	Stud. w/ Disab.	57.89	61.90
	White	90.00	78.63
4th Grade Mathematics:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
	All Students	77.39	70.07
	Black	60.00	64.29
	Econ. Diadvan.	61.90	57.45
	Hispanic	66.66	75.00
	LEP	50.00	75.00
	Stud. w/ Disab.	57.89	33.33
	White	79.00	70.09
5th Grade Reading:	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09
	All Students	87.29	86.67
	Black	62.50	75.00
	Econ. Diadvan.	81.08	83.33

		Hispanic	50.00	100.00
		LEP	71.43	100.00
		Stud. w/ Disab.	20.00	66.66
		White	90.10	87.62
	5th Grade Mathematics:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
		All Students	85.71	81.20
		Black	75.00	81.81
		Econ. Diadvan.	85.71	71.43
		Hispanic	50.00	100.00
		LEP	86.49	100.00
		Stud. w/ Disab.	40.00	57.89
		White	87.25	80.58
b.	Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement.	<p>From the overall reading data from both 07-08 and 08-09 it is evident that instruction needs to improve for all students, especially the non-white subgroups. Overall, none of the subgroups met the AMO for the 2008-2009 school year. When analyzed by grade level, it is evident that 3rd and 4th grades must pay attention to the needs of the non-white subgroups. While the 4th grade Hispanic and LEP subgroup scores increased during the 08-09 school year, it is still below the AMO for AYP and is not acceptable. This subgroup is also very small, so one or two students can shift the pass rate. Fifth grade pass rates are higher in 08-09 for every subgroup; however, considerable work is still needed for the “Black” and “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroups.</p> <p>In math, NGES has much room for improvement. Overall, the “All Students,” “Hispanic,” and “White” subgroups met the AMO during the 07-08 school year. However, in 08-09 none of the groups met the AMO; in fact the pass rate for all subgroups except “Students with Disabilities” decreased. When examining the grade level data, considerable improvement needs to be made in all of the non-white subgroups for 3rd and 4th grades.</p>		

		<p>In 5th grade, the “Economically Disadvantaged” and “Students with Disabilities” groups need additional attention. While the 5th grade “Hispanic” and “LEP” subgroups improved, the population of students tested was so small that they still warrant additional attention until a positive trend is established.</p> <p>The data for NGES is very disappointing and has caused great concern for both NGES and GCPS.</p>	
c.	Information about the demographics of the student population to include:	Attendance Rate:	93%
		Total Number of Students:	405
		Gender:	232 Males 173 Females
		Race/Ethnicity:	1 American Indian 4 Asian 49 Black 15 Hispanic 336 White
		Disability Status:	66 Students
		LEP Status:	11 Students
		Migrant Status:	0 Students
		Homeless Status:	11 Students
		Econ. Disadv. Status:	160 Students
d.	Annual goals for student achievement on the state’s assessments in both reading and mathematics.	<p>The goal of NGES for the state assessment is to meet the AMO’s established by NCLB and meet the pass rates required for accreditation. While NGES has met the accreditation requirements, major changes must occur for NGES to accomplish this goal with or without the assistance of “safe harbor.” Through the use of Indistar and through school improvement webinars, both during the 09-10 school year and in the upcoming year, NGES plans to continue to implement changes needed to improve instruction for each individual child. The focus has begun to shift to the individual needs of students and must continue in this vein for NGES</p>	

	to successfully meet this goal.
--	---------------------------------

Required Information		Greene County Primary School		
a.	Student achievement data for the past two years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) in reading/language arts and mathematics: by school for the “all students” category and for each AYP subgroup	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09
	Reading Scores:	All Students	85.36	80.41
		Black	74.19	73.80
		Econ. Diadvan.	66.66	72.99
		Hispanic	71.42	66.66
		LEP	75.8	72.72
		Stud. w/ Disab.	48.71	63.33
		White	86.70	82.26
	Mathematics Scores:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
		All Students	84.05	79.63
		Black	77.41	74.41
		Econ. Diadvan.	75.00	68.61
		Hispanic	85.71	66.66
		LEP	73.38	63.63
		Stud. w/ Disab.	51.28	63.33
		White	84.54	80.67
	Second request is “by grade level” in the “all students” category and for each subgroup	Subgroups	Reading 07-08	Reading 08-09
	3rd Grade Reading:	All Students	78.00	73.85
		Black	78.57	64.70
		Econ. Diadvan.	66.66	59.18
		Hispanic	66.66	50.00
		LEP	66.00	60.00
		Stud. w/ Disab.	52.80	55.00
		White	77.97	78.64
	3rd Grade Mathematics:	Subgroups	Math 07-08	Math 08-09
		All Students	84.40	85.38
		Black	85.71	76.47

		Econ. Diadvan.	70.00	75.51
		Hispanic	83.33	50.00
		LEP	100.00	40.00
		Stud. w/ Disab.	47.62	75.00
		White	83.90	89.32
b.	Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement.	<p>Greene County Primary School educates students in grades PK-2. While they do not administer SOL tests to their students, they are measured by the performance of the 3rd-5th grade students at Nathanael Greene Elementary School. The GCPS teachers have spent much time this year examining the data for 3rd grade.</p> <p>In the overall results for reading, all subgroups except “All Students” and “White” did not meet the AMO in 07-08 and none of the groups met the AMO in 08-09. This shows that there are considerable deficiencies in instruction and much attention is needed not only to the students in the subgroups, but to all students. GCPS must give additional attention to the educational foundation provided during grades K-2 to ensure deficiencies are caught early and intervention occurs until each student masters the material.</p> <p>The need to focus on this early intervention and building a strong educational foundation is evident through the 3rd grade results. This grade did not meet any of the AMOs for either year. While the “Black” students outperformed all other subgroups, their pass rate is still a concern. Much attention is needed to address the problems in reading.</p> <p>In the overall results for math, the “All Students” group as well as the “White” and “Hispanic” subgroups met the AMO in 07-08; however, none of the groups met the AMO in 08-09. In fact, every</p>		

		<p>subgroup with the exception of “Students with Disabilities” experienced a decrease in the pass rate. This is alarming and is cause for great attention. When examining the 3rd grade math results alone the pass rates are higher for every group in 07-08 except “Student with Disabilities.” In 08-09, the pass rates are higher for all subgroups except “Hispanic” and “LEP” students. While the 3rd grade outperformed the other grades in math, considerable work in the primary grades is still needed.</p>	
c.	Information about the demographics of the student population to include:	Attendance Rate:	94%
		Total Number of Students:	502
		Gender:	266 Males 236 Females
		Race/Ethnicity:	0 American Indian 4 Asian 52 Black 26 Hispanic 420 White
		Disability Status:	94 Students
		LEP Status:	11 Students
		Migrant Status:	0 Students
		Homeless Status:	8 Students
		Econ. Disadv. Status:	212 Students
d.	Annual goals for student achievement on the state’s assessments in both reading and mathematics.	<p>The goal of GCPS is to provide a stronger foundation necessary for the students to meet the AMO requirements set by NCLB and the accreditation requirements. While the students are not assessed through SOLs during their time at GCPS, the scores they earn on their 3rd grade SOLs and beyond are indicators of the strengths and weaknesses of the foundation that was laid during the primary grades. It is the goal of GCPS for all of the students to earn passing scores on</p>	

	their SOLs regardless of the subgroup in which they fall.
--	---

PART III. DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT THE INTERVENTION FOR EACH SCHOOL

The LEA will need to have detailed plans in place to demonstrate how the intervention (State Transformation Model) will be implemented. Listed below are the factors that will be considered to assess the LEA’s commitment to implementing the model.

Describe the following:

- The LEA has a plan in place to implement the model beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.
- The LEA has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward implementing the model.
- The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of the model.
- The LEA can demonstrate adequate capacity to implement the model.

Response:

1. The LEA has a plan to implement the model at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

During the 2009-2010 school year, the division and each school formed a school improvement leadership team. This team surveyed staff, examined student data, implemented new research-based programs, attended VDOE webinars, and utilized the Indistar tool. All of these components of school improvement will continue for the 2010-2011 school year; however, unlike this past year we can start the year with these components in place. This summer groups from the division and each school will attend the Summer Institute and receive additional training and guidance that will assist us with increasing the intensity of changes toward school improvement. After the July training, we will all meet together to map out the approach we will take to get every staff member involved in school improvement beginning with the pre-service week. During this planning time, we will analyze data, examine the school schedules, and develop a plan for the 2010-2011 school year. The addition of School Improvement Coaches in each school will be key to the activities we plan for the teachers prior to the start of school. It will be the focus of the division to ensure that school improvement and focusing on the needs of individual students remains the focus of each school and that the division is providing the level of support needed for the schools to be successful. The division committee will work throughout the summer to set goals with all schools and examine division-wide practices to ensure necessary changes are made. The division improvement team will also work closely with the new principals in these two schools to ensure all requirements are being met.

2. The LEA has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward implementing the model.

While parents are members of each school improvement team, we plan on improving in this area during the 2010-2011 school year. Each school will make this a standing agenda item on their PTA meeting agendas. At each meeting, the parent representative on the committee will update the attendees and when needed gather parent input and take it back to the school improvement committee for consideration. In addition to the increased efforts at the school level, the division will create a quarterly newsletter celebrating the school improvement successes the division and the schools are experiencing and outlining additional efforts that are underway. The Superintendent will also gather input from the parents that serve on the Superintendent's advisory committee and keep them updated as well.

During the 2010-2011 school year, Greene County Schools will also be revamping the division Strategic Plan. Parents will be heavily involved in this process through committees and will be kept abreast of the school improvement efforts underway.

3. The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of the model.

The school and division improvement teams will meet a minimum of two times a month to evaluate new indicators, set tasks for the indicators that have been selected, and monitor progress toward accomplishing the indicators. 1003a funding will be used to fund the School Improvement Coach, purchase materials needed to accomplish the indicators and positively impact student learning, and provide training needed for teachers to improve instruction and meet the needs of individual students. Time and resources will also be dedicated to collecting and analyzing data, as well as training teachers to use this data to modify instruction to meet the students' needs. The ongoing collection and analysis of data will assist the school improvement teams when selecting a research-based programs to adopt. The division is dedicated to allocating time and resources to ensure that intervention time is offered to students both within and outside of the regular school day. This is critical and must occur so students can grasp concepts and build a foundation for future learning.

4. The LEA can demonstrate adequate capacity to implement the model.

Personnel have been allocated to ensure that proper implementation of the model occurs. Each school will also have a new principal next year. This is to ensure that each school has an instructional leader capable of leading the changes necessary for school improvement. Meeting the requirements of accreditation and AYP are a top priority of the School Board and the

Superintendent. We have hired Intervention Specialists to work with the School Improvement Coaches, and they will make certain that students are getting the extra support they need to be successful.

PART IV: MODIFY PRACTICES AND/OR POLICIES, IF NECESSARY, TO ENABLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL

FULLY AND EFFECTIVELY

The LEA will provide evidence that a review of division and school policies have been completed to ensure alignment with the State Transformation Model. Evidence will include copies of division meeting agenda and accompanying notes. If changes are needed to existing policies and/or procedures, additional documentation will be requested such as revisions to policy manuals, local board of education meeting minutes, and/or other appropriate division communication.

Response: Note: Documents included as attachments must be scanned and attached to this application.
The division improvement team met and examined the requirements of the Transformation Model to ensure that it did not conflict with any School Board policies or regulations. No changes to existing policies or regulations were needed. The School Board received an update at the board meeting; however, it was informational and no action was needed.

PART V. SUSTAIN THE REFORM EFFORT AFTER THE FUNDING PERIOD ENDS

The LEA will provide a narrative identifying resources, financial and otherwise, to demonstrate how the reform effort will be sustained after the funding period ends. The LEA's ability to sustain the reform effort after the funding period ends will be evaluated by considering the following:

Describe the following:

- Use of the Indistar™ tool by the division and school improvement teams to inform, coach, sustain, track, and report school improvement activities;
 - Division plan and budget for sustaining the reform effort.
1. Use of Indistar: At the division level, we will be ramping up our use of this tool. Last year we became acquainted with its features, but did not enter all of our division information into the tool; instead, we focused on assisting the schools with this process. This information will be entered over the summer and this tool will be fully utilized during the 2010-2011 school year.

We will enter our test scores, select indicators to evaluate, create tasks to accomplish the indicators, track our progress in accomplishing these tasks, and use this tool to report the progress we are making. A critical piece of the tool is the pre-planning component. We will use this to plan our meetings and record our minutes. The schools are well acquainted with the Indistar tool and have shown the division-level team the power it has. They too feel they still have a lot to learn, but are vocal about the value it has added to the school improvement process.

Once funding ends for these schools, we will continue to use this tool, provided by the commonwealth, to maintain the improvements made and continue to examine and monitor additional indicators in order to continue to improving and meeting the needs of each student. The division is considering training the other schools to use this tool so consistent, high expectations are set for the entire division.

2. Division plan and budget for sustaining the reform effort: The School Board and employees are committed to sustaining any improvements made in the division, especially those directly involving students. For this reason, the division has hired intervention specialists for all three of our elementary schools and for our middle school. The intervention specialists for GCPS and NGES will work with the school improvement coaches to ensure student needs are being met. Once funding ends, the School Board is committed to keeping all of these positions. During the past year we did not receive money to accomplish new initiatives. Due to this, we were forced to examine how federal, state, and local dollars were being spent. This has led to a much more efficient system for budgeting and the schools are now being held accountable for ensuring their spending is based on research-based programs that will meet the needs of their students. The division and school teams would like to use this money to purchase materials and focus on professional development, so when the funding ends we are left with the tools we need to continue improving.

PART VI: SELECTION OF COACH

The State Transformation Model, which year one schools are implementing, requires schools to use funding to hire a coach that will work with the school in the area(s) that caused the school to enter school improvement. Responsibilities of a coach may include, but are not limited to the following:

Assisting the School Improvement Team in:

- Using appropriate data to:
 - drive decision-making in developing, selecting, and evaluating instructional programs and practices
 - select appropriate strategies to individualize classroom instruction
 - establish goals for all students with a focus on subgroup performance
- Developing and evaluating a highly effective school improvement plan via online planning

<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant
School 4: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	School 5: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	School 6: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant

PART VII: BUDGET

Note: Budget Summaries (one for the division and one for each year one school). 1003(a) funding may be expended on any 1003(a) Condition of Award. See Attachment B-a. 1003(a) funding may also be expended for the purchase of educational vendor/company services to support the implementation of the selected reform model. See Attachment C-a.

Note: Part 2: Budget Narrative: The detailed budget summary the LEA submits as part of the grant application will provide evidence of how 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 support 1003(a) initiatives. Additionally, the LEA will provide a budget narrative in its application that will provide a description of how other resources will be used, such as personnel, materials, and services to support school improvement activities.

Division Budget Summary

Division Name: Greene County Schools

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

Note 1

Divisions must ensure that 1003(a), year one School Improvement, applicant schools participating in Strand III (TeachFirst Formative Assessment) of the July 19-22, 2010, institute include the purchase of the TeachFirst Formative Assessment platform in their budgets. The total expenditures from all Strand III schools must be included in the division summary budget. Cost: \$1,950 per school

Yes No: Does the division have schools participating in Strand III (TeachFirst Formative Assessment) of the July 19-22 institute?

If yes, check here to indicate that the division has included the purchase of the TeachFirst Formative Assessment platform in its budget for each school.

Expenditure Codes	School Year 2010-2011		
	ESEA 1003(a) Funds [Funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011.]	Other Funds	Total Across Object Codes (Do not include "other" funds.)
1000 - Personnel	\$83,653	n/a	\$83,653.00
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$27,907	n/a	\$27,907.00
3000 - Purchased	\$72,400	Title I (not including SES): \$19,039.35	\$72,400

Services		Title II A: \$6,109.70 Title III: \$5,451.50 Local: \$35,000	
4000 - Internal Services	\$0	n/a	\$0
5000 - Other Charges	\$10,000	Title III: \$522.90 Local: \$10,000	\$10,000
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$157,256	Title III: \$3,223.28 Local:\$87,500	\$157,256
8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay	\$0		\$0
Total	\$351,216		(Must Equal Division Allocation)

School Budget Summary

School Name: Greene County Primary School

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

Yes No: Is this school a participant in Strand III (TeachFirst Formative Assessment) of the July 19-22 institute?

If yes, check here to indicate that the school has included the purchase of the TeachFirst Formative Assessment platform in its budget.

	School Year 2010-2011		
Expenditure Codes	ESEA 1003(a) Funds [Funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011.]	Other Funds	Total Across Object Codes (Do not include "other" funds.)
1000 -	\$42,014	n/a	\$42,014

Personnel			
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$13,986	n/a	\$13,986
3000 - Purchased Services	\$36,200	Title I: \$10,016.69 Title II: \$3,214.34 Title III: \$2,868.06 Local \$ 17,500	\$36,200
4000 - Internal Services	\$0	n/a	\$0
5000 - Other Charges	\$5,000	Title III: \$275.10	\$5,000
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$78,408	Title III: \$1,695.79 Local: \$47,000	\$78,408
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay	\$0	n/a	\$0
Total	<i>\$175,608</i>		(Must Equal School Allocation)

School Budget Summary

School Name: Nathanael Greene Elementary School

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

Yes No: Is this school a participant in Strand III (TeachFirst Formative Assessment) of the July 19-22 institute?

If yes, check here to indicate that the school has included the purchase of the TeachFirst Formative Assessment platform in its budget.

	School Year 2010-2011		
Expenditure Codes	ESEA 1003(a) Funds	Other Funds	Total Across Object Codes

	[Funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011.]		(Do not include "other" funds.)
1000 - Personnel	\$41,639	n/a	\$41,639
2000 - Employee Benefits	\$13,921	n/a	\$13,921
3000 - Purchased Services	\$36,200	Title I: \$9,022.66 Title II: \$2,895.36 Title III: \$2,583.44 Local \$ 17,500	\$36,200
4000 - Internal Services	\$0	n/a	\$0
5000 - Other Charges	\$5,000	Title III: \$247.80	\$5,000
6000 - Materials and Supplies	\$78,848	Title III: \$1527.49 Local: \$40,500	\$78,848
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay	\$0	n/a	\$0
Total	\$175,608		(Must Equal School Allocation)

Part 2. Budget Narrative: Describe in detail by expenditure codes how the school improvement 1003(a) funds as well as other funding sources will be used to support school improvement activities.

Division Name: Greene County Schools

1. Personal Services (1000)

The salaries of the School Improvement Coaches, as required in the Transformation Model, will be covered using 1003a funds. The amount of \$83,653 covers the salaries of two coaches and is in line with the School Board approved salary scale.

Their contracts are for 10.5 months. If additional time is needed, the School Board will cover the additional expenses through a stipend.

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

The amount of \$27,907 covers the benefits of the two Coaches. These benefits include: FICA, VRS, and health insurance.

3. Purchased Services (3000)

- Data disaggregator: \$16,000. In addition to the SOL test scores for NGES, the division has been using locally developed benchmark tests to assess students in math and reading at the end of each nine weeks. Each year, we have noticed that the benchmark results are not good indicators of how our students will perform on SOL tests. The benchmark scores are inflated in comparison to the SOL test scores. This past year the division improvement team focused on identifying a reliable and valid assessment tool. The assessment program we have selected has benchmark tests that were created from released SOL items, a test bank for formative assessments, and it easily disaggregates the results by student, subgroup, class, grade, and school. At the division level, we need a tool that provides valid results. At the school level, they not only need a valid method for assessing students, they need a great deal of training on how to use the data to drive their instruction (Indicators- Division: IA11, IB02; GCPS: IE06, IID06, IIIB06; NGES: ID07, IID11).
- Professional development: \$30,000. The need for professional development is two-fold. As referenced in the preceding bullet and supported by both the low SOL scores across the board and division survey results, 62% of the teachers at GCPS and 84% of the teachers at NGES stated they need in depth training in understanding data, using data to drive instruction, and selecting the proper teaching methods to meet the students' needs. To meet these needs, we plan on hiring a consultant and sending teacher leaders to workshops for training (a train-the-trainer approach). The Principal and Coach will be expected to monitor each teacher, identify their needs and with the leadership team develop the professional development plan that will lead to school improvement. The second need is to provide a user-friendly method for teachers to receive targeted professional development to assist them with their weaknesses in other areas. The division has been examining tools to assist with this and will be adopting an online tool with research-based videos and reflection questions. In addition to the professional development provided for the entire school, each teacher will set individual professional development goals and use this tool to work toward meeting their

goals (Indicators- Division: IA14; GCPS: IE06, IF10, IIIA27; NGES: IIIA35).

- Intervention: \$26,400. Examining SOL scores, benchmark scores, formative assessments and walk through data show that students are not receiving the instruction they need. It is evident by the walk through data alone that instruction is more teacher-centered than student-centered. This data also show that GCPS and NGES need additional levels of intervention. While classroom interventions occur in some classrooms, Title I reading and pull out intervention during the school day are the only consistent methods for providing individualized instruction. The schools need to offer after school programs that flexibly group and focus on the needs of each student, and the traditional one-size-fits-all summer school program needs to be abandoned for a program that targets the deficiencies of individual students. These funds would be used to pay teachers to stay after school and during the summer to provide intense, individualized, targeted instruction (Indicators- Division: IA12, IA14; GCPS: IE06; NGES: IID11).

4. Internal Services (4000)

N/A

5. Other Charges (5000)

All travel will be associated with the Summer Institute in Williamsburg and other professional development workshops the school improvement teams determine are needed. Travel expenses will not exceed \$10,000. It is the hope of the division committee that travel expenses will not come close to this amount; however, we do not want to limit the school improvement teams if the professional development is research-based and fits the needs of the school.

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

The total amount for materials and supplies is \$157,256. While this amount is large, the division feels providing funding for professional development and the necessary materials and supplies to implement effective instructional methods are two important components of school improvement. Over the past several years, the budget has been tight and schools have lost 20% of their material and supply money due to hold backs. Due to this there is a need to purchase math manipulatives, leveled readers, tutorial software for reading and math (for a small population of students), after school and summer intervention resources to meet individual student needs, and the purchase of technology and training needed to properly implement it in order to engage students in their learning and foster 21st century skills. The best data to support this need is budgetary. In 08-09, **the total material and supply budget** for these two schools was \$130,000, but only

\$104,000 was released to the schools to spend; in 09-10 the budget was \$120,000, but only \$96,000 was released for them to spend; and for the 10-11 school year the total budget for GCPS and NGES is \$87,500 and we anticipate a 20% hold back will be applied next year as well.

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

n/a

School Name: Greene County Primary School

1. Personal Services (1000)

The salary of the School Improvement Coach, as required in the Transformation Model, will be covered using 1003a funds. The amount of \$42,014 is in line with the School Board approved salary scale. Her contract is for 10.5 months. If additional time is needed, the School Board will cover the additional expenses through a stipend.

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

The amount of \$13,986 covers the Coach's benefits which include: FICA, VRS, and health insurance.

3. Purchased Services (3000)

- Data disaggregator: \$8,000. As mentioned above, the division has been using locally developed benchmarks and has noticed that the data is not a good predictor of student success on the SOLs. While none of the students at the primary school take SOL tests, the school improvement team uses benchmarks to predict which subsumed concepts need additional attention. While the other schools have had their students record their answers on scantrons, this has not been an option for grades K and 1. Therefore, teachers had to disaggregate the data themselves, with little training, and try to identify each student's needs. With the addition of the new data disaggregator, kindergarten and 1st grade students will be able to participate in benchmark testing and their data will be disaggregated for the teachers.

Likewise, the 2nd grade will benefit from this as well. GCPS uses additional tests to monitor student progress; however, many of these are locally developed. One standard measurement tool used by the school is the Rigby reading program. This tool is used to identify reading deficiencies in students. While this tool has been effective, additional evaluation tools are needed (Data in intervention section below) (Indicators- GCPS: IE06, IID06, IIIB06).

- Professional development: \$15,000. The need for professional development is two-fold. As referenced in the division section, 62% of the teachers need additional training in the area of data. GCPS collects and analyzes data; however, only a few are proficient at taking the results and modifying their day-to-day instruction to meet the needs of the students. Attention is given to individual students in intervention; however, teachers mainly use the results to regroup students for instruction. There is also a need for professional development in differentiation of instruction. Walk through data show that differentiation of instruction only occurs about 20% of the time in the regular classroom. While it is positive that they regroup students based on data, training is needed to ensure teachers are differentiating within the groups of students. (GCPS: IE06, IF10, IIIA27)
- Intervention: \$13,200. During the 2004-2005 school year, GCPS school under the leadership of a previous principal tackled the issues they were experiencing with reading. That year they determined that 58% of 1st graders and 57% of 2nd graders were reading on grade level. This principal and a core group of teachers developed the skeleton of an intervention program. Over the past several years it has grown and the addition of an intervention specialist has made a big difference. During the 2008-2009 school year 81% of 1st graders and 82% of 2nd graders were reading on grade level. While great progress has been made in reading, nearly 20% of the students are still not reading on grade level. Also, the addition of math intervention is greatly needed as well. It is the intention of the school to use this money to restructure the program to include math and continue to improve the program so that the students who are still trailing behind are able to read on grade level. Likewise, the traditional summer school has had a minimal impact on increasing student achievement, as measured by Rigby and no after school remediation opportunities have been provided. While student participation in an afterschool program may not be as high as the school would like, every avenue to have additional time to teach students should be offered. Likewise, summer school needs to be restructured to look like intervention. Due to the small class sizes we can offer through both after school and summer opportunities, the potential to reach these students greatly increases. (Indicators- GCPS: IE06)

4. Internal Services (4000)

n/a

5. Other Charges (5000)

All travel will be associated with the Summer Institute in Williamsburg and other professional development workshops the school improvement teams determine are needed. Travel expenses will not exceed \$5,000. Travel expenses will be minimized when possible.

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Materials and Supplies: \$78,408. This money is needed to purchase math manipulatives, leveled readers, tutorial software for reading and math (for a small population of students), after school and summer intervention resources to meet individual student needs, and the purchase of technology and training needed to properly implement its use in order to engage students in their learning and foster 21st century skills. The school improvement team under the leadership of the principal and school improvement coach will identify school-wide needs to create continuity between classrooms. The team will work to identify research-based programs that will provide resources to both the classroom and intervention teachers. Diagnostic programs will also be examined to improve the quality of data collected and used to determine student needs. RIBGY and PALS are the only two tools currently being used to identify reading needs and math benchmarks are the primary means for determining the students' needs in math.

It is the intent of the school improvement committee to spend this money wisely. Over the past three years, the funding for materials and supplies has decreased from \$69,810 in 08-09 to \$46,987.50 in 2010-2011 (These amounts are prior to the 20% hold back experienced each year). It is critical that this money be used on research-based strategies that will assist the teachers in meeting the needs of individual students (Indicators: GCPS- IE06, IF10).

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

n/a

School Name: Nathanael Greene Elementary School

1. Personal Services (1000)

The salary of the School Improvement Coach, as required in the Transformation Model, will be covered using 1003a funds. The amount of \$41,639 is in line with the School Board approved salary scale. Her contract is for 10.5 months. If additional time is needed, the School Board will cover the additional expenses through a stipend.

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

The amount of \$13,921 covers the Coach's benefits which include: FICA, VRS, and health insurance.

3. Purchased Services (3000)

- Data disaggregator: \$8,000. As mentioned above, the division has been using locally developed benchmarks and has noticed that the data is not a good predictor of student success on the SOLs. Currently, the benchmarks are the main avenue for measuring student progress in both math and reading. Since our system is flawed, teachers do not have confidence in the results. During the 3rd nine weeks the students were given a released SOL to determine the standards that the students have not mastered. The system identified by the school division will allow teachers to administer valid tests and disaggregate the data in many different ways to allow the teachers to identify every student's needs (Indicators- NGES: ID07, IID11).
- Professional development: \$15,000. The need for professional development is two-fold. As referenced in the division section, 84% of the teachers reported the need for extensive training in the area of data. Walk through data shows that only 22% of students are actively engaged in their learning, teachers use higher order questioning techniques 15% of the time, and differentiation rarely occurs. It is not enough to assess the students and look at the data for a class or grade level. The teachers at NGES must be trained to analyze the data and know what to look for. They also need extensive training when it comes to using the data to modify instruction. Much attention must be given to improving instructional strategies and keeping a focus on meeting the needs of every student. (Indicators- NGES: IIA35)
- Intervention: \$13,200. During the 09-10 school year, NGES started offering a pull out intervention program. Still in its infancy, 117 students (29%) grades 3-5 participated in math intervention. Preliminary SOL results show that 80 of these students passed the 2010 SOL tests. In reading, 112 students (28%) grades 3-5 attended intervention. Fifty of these students passed this year's SOL according to preliminary results. While much improvement is still needed, this data demonstrates the need for intervention. In addition to improving intervention during the school day, after school and summer intervention must also be offered to students. NGES wants to provide every opportunity possible to their students to ensure academic success (Indicators- NGES: IID11).

--

4. Internal Services (4000)

--

5. Other Charges (5000)

All travel will be associated with the Summer Institute in Williamsburg and other professional development workshops the school improvement teams determine are needed. Travel expenses will not exceed \$5,000. Travel expenses will be minimized when possible.

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Materials and Supplies: \$78,848. This money is needed to purchase math manipulatives, leveled readers, tutorial software for reading and math (for a small population of students), after school and summer intervention resources to meet individual student needs, and the purchase of technology and training needed to properly implement its use in order to engage students in their learning and foster 21st century skills. The school improvement team under the leadership of the principal and school improvement coach will identify school-wide needs and will work to identify research-based programs that will provide resources to both the classroom and intervention teachers. Diagnostic programs will also be examined to improve the quality of data collected and used to determine student needs. Benchmarks, PALS, and QRIs are the current methods for collecting data. AIMS web, MAP testing, and other tools need to be examined to determine the best methods for monitoring student progress and providing support for students and teachers.

It is the intent of the school improvement committee to spend this money wisely. Over the past three years, our funding for materials and supplies has decreased from \$60,190 in 08-09 to \$40,512.50 in 2010-2011 (These amounts are prior to the 20% hold back experienced each year). It is critical that this money be used on research-based strategies that will assist the teachers in meeting the needs of individual students (Indicators: NGES- IID11, IIIA35).

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)



These accounts 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.

Expenditure Code Definitions

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 intragovernmental 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.

Strand I
(Mentor Coaching Training and Special Education Training)

The **New* 1003g Coach**, the **New Building Principal**, a **Special Education Teacher**, and a **New Division Contact Person** must register for this strand of the summer institute.

For divisions marked with an asterisk (*): Division contact registers for Strand II.

Accomack County	Nandua MS	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Accomack County	Arcadia MS	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Accomack County	Kegotank ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Accomack County	Metompkin ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Washington MS	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Washington MS 2	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Hammond MS	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Hammond MS 2	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Hammond MS 3	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City*	Ramsay ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Brunswick County	Red Oak-Sturgeon ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Campbell County	Altavista ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Charles City County	Charles City County ES	Tier III – 1003g
Franklin City	Franklin HS	Tier III – 1003g
Fredericksburg City	Walker-Grant MS	Year 1 of Title I School Improvement
Greene County	Nathaniel Greene ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Greene County	Greene County Primary	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Greensville County	Greensville ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Hampton City	Mallory ES	Tier III – 1003g
Henrico County	Highland Springs ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Henrico County	Adams ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Lynchburg City	Perrymont ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Middlesex County	Middlesex ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Newport News City	L.F. Palmer ES	Tier III – 1003g
Roanoke City	Hurt Park ES	Tier III – 1003g
Roanoke City	William Fleming HS	Tier III – 1003g
Shenandoah County	Sandy Hook ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Smyth County	Marion Intermediate	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Smyth County	Marion Primary	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Staunton City	Ware ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Suffolk City	Benn Jr. ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Suffolk City	Mount Zion ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Warren County	Wilson Morrison ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement

**Strand II
(Division Leadership Support Training)**

The **Title I Director** or **Director of Instruction of Returning* Divisions** must register for this strand of the summer institute.

(*Returning means divisions that did attend last summer's institute.)

Albemarle County	Henrico County	Richmond City
Alexandria City	King George County	Roanoke City
Amherst County	King and Queen County	Rockbridge County
Arlington County	Lancaster County	Shenandoah County
Bedford County	Louisa County	Stafford County
Craig County	Lunenburg County	Suffolk City
Culpeper County	Newport News City	Warren County
Essex County	Norfolk City	Westmoreland County
Fairfax County	Northampton County	Williamsburg-James City Co.
Fauquier County	Orange County	
Fluvanna County	Petersburg City	
Franklin City	Pittsylvania County	
Fredericksburg City	Portsmouth City	
Hampton City	Pulaski County	

**Strand III
(Formative Assessment™ Training)**

The **Returning* Building Principal** and the **Returning 1003g School Coach** must register for this strand of the summer institute.

(*Returning means individuals that did attend last summer's institute.)

Albemarle County	Greer ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City	Mount Vernon ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City	Patrick Henry ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Alexandria City	Cora Kelly Magnet School	Tier III – 1003g
Alexandria City	Jefferson-Houston ES	Tier III – 1003g
Amherst County	Central ES	Tier III – 1003g
Arlington County	Barcroft ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Arlington County	Drew Model ES	Tier III – 1003g
Arlington County	Hoffman-Boston ES	Tier III – 1003g
Arlington County	Randolph ES	Tier III – 1003g
Bedford County	Bedford ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Bedford County	Bedford Primary	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Craig County	McCleary ES	Tier III – 1003g
Culpeper County	Sycamore Park ES	Tier III – 1003g
Culpeper County	Pearl Sample ES	Tier III – 1003g
Essex County	Essex Intermediate	Tier III – 1003g
Essex County	Tappahannock ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fauquier County	Grace Miller ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Fluvanna County	Central ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fluvanna County	Columbia District ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fluvanna County	Cunningham District ES	Tier III – 1003g
Hampton City	Smith ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
King George County	King George ES	Tier III – 1003g

King George County	Potomac ES	Tier III – 1003g
King and Queen County	King and Queen ES	Tier III – 1003g
Lancaster County	Lancaster Primary School	Tier III – 1003g
Louisa County	Trevilians ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Lunenburg County	Victoria ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Newport News City	Sedgefield ES	Tier III – 1003g
Norfolk City	Jacox ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Norfolk City	Lindenwood ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Northampton County	Kiptopeke ES	Tier III – 1003g
Northampton County	Occohannock ES	Tier III – 1003g
Orange County	Orange ES	Tier III – 1003g
Orange County	Lightfoot ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Orange County	Unionville ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Orange County	Gordon Barbour ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Petersburg City	A.P. Hill ES	Tier III – 1003g
Petersburg City	J.E.B. Stuart ES	Tier III – 1003g
Petersburg City	Vernon Johns Junior High	Tier III – 1003g
Pittsylvania County	Dan River MS	Tier III – 1003g
Pittsylvania County	Kentuck ES	Tier III – 1003g
Portsmouth City	Brighton ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Portsmouth City	Churchland Academy ES	Tier III – 1003g
Pulaski County	Dublin ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Pulaski County	Pulaski ES	Tier III – 1003g
Richmond City	Blackwell ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Roanoke City	Addison MS	Tier III – 1003g
Roanoke City	Huff Lane Intermediate	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Roanoke City	Round Hill Montessori	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Rockbridge County	Fairfield ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Shenandoah County	Ashby Lee ES	Tier III – 1003g
Stafford County	Kate Waller Barrett ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Stafford County	Falmouth ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Suffolk City	Elephant’s Fork ES	Tier III – 1003g
Warren County	Warren County MS	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Westmoreland County	Washington District ES	Tier III – 1003g
Williamsburg-James City	Montague ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement

Included for Application Completion Only-UVA Lead Turnaround Program

Fairfax County	Woodlawn ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Fairfax County	Bucknell ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Fairfax County	Beech Tree ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement
Fairfax County	Hollin Meadows ES	Year I of Title I School Improvement

Fairfax County	Dogwood ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fairfax County	Hybla Valley ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fairfax County	Washington Mill ES	Tier III – 1003g
Fairfax County	Mount Vernon Woods ES	Tier III – 1003g

**Strand IV
(Lead Turnaround Partner Training)**

The **Division Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent**, the **Lead Turnaround Partner**, and the **School Principal of Tier I and Tier II Schools** must register for this strand of the summer institute.

	Tier 1 Schools		Tier 2 Schools
Brunswick County	James. S. Russell Middle	Alexandria City	T.C. Williams HS
Grayson	Fries Middle	Buchanan County	Hurley HS*
Norfolk City	Lake Taylor Middle	Colonial Beach	Colonial Beach HS
Norfolk City	Ruffner Middle	Danville City	Langston Focus HS
Petersburg City	Peabody Middle	King and Queen County	Central HS
Richmond City	Fred D. Thompson Middle	Prince Edward County	Prince Edward Co HS
Richmond City	Boushall Middle	Richmond City	Armstrong HS
Roanoke City	Westside Elementary	Richmond City	George Wythe HS*
Sussex County	Chambliss Elementary	Roanoke City	Patrick Henry HS*
Sussex County	Sussex Central Middle		

*These schools have applied for a waiver of identification.

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS OF AWARD

Requirement	A Requirement of 1003(g)	A Requirement of 1003(a)
Requirements for Tier I and Tier II Schools and Divisions (Other Schools As Indicated)		
<u>School Level</u>		
Selection and implementation of a federal reform model (Appendix C)	Yes	No
Continued Submission of the Data Analysis or Restructuring Quarterly Reports	Yes	Yes
Continued School Improvement Planning via Indistar™ (Center on Innovation and Improvement - CII)	Yes	Yes
Online Attendance at Rapid Improvement Indicator-based Webinars (Tailored to summer institute strands as follow-up technical assistance)	Yes	Yes
<p>For the purpose of monitoring struggling students in reading, the Office of School Improvement is requiring Tier I and Tier II schools to purchase <i>ISTATION</i> (K-10). Cost \$6500 per school.</p> <p>For the purpose of monitoring struggling students in mathematics, the Office of School Improvement is requiring Tier I and Tier II schools to purchase the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT). Cost \$4 per student.</p>	Yes	No
Attendance at 1003(g) and 1003(a) summer institute to be held at the Williamsburg Marriott, July 19-22, 2010.	Yes	Yes

Requirement	A Requirement of 1003(g)	A Requirement of 1003(a)
(Division Level) <u>Divisions with Tier I and Tier II Schools</u>		
Continued School Improvement Planning via Indistar™: Division-Level (Center on Innovation and Improvement - CII)	Yes	Yes
Attendance at Summer Institute Training (July 19-22, 2010, Williamsburg's Marriott) - Lead Turnaround Partner Training with Lauren Morando Rhim. (The principal will attend this training with the division contact person.)	Yes	No
Attendance at Lead Turnaround Partner Follow-up Division-level Webinars (Tailored to summer institute strand as follow-up technical assistance)	Yes	No
Summer Institute Training (July 19-22, 2010, Williamsburg's Marriott) - Division Leadership Support (Training Provided by The College of William and Mary)	Yes	No
Four One-Day Division Leadership Workshops (October, December, February, and April)	Yes	No
Site Visits to Schools with the Division Leadership Support Directors	Yes	No
Attendance at Webinars and Video Conferencing via The College of William and Mary	Yes	No
Requirements for Tier III Schools and Divisions		
<u>School Level</u>		
Employment of a School Improvement Coach	Yes	Yes
Continued Submission of the Data Analysis Quarterly Reports	Yes	Yes
Continued School Improvement Planning via Indistar™ (Center on Innovation and Improvement - CII)	Yes	Yes
Summer Institute Training (July 19-22, 2010 – Mentor Coaching and Special Education Training)	Yes, if assigned to Strand I	Yes, if assigned to Strand I

Requirement	A Requirement of 1003(g)	A Requirement of 1003(a)
Online Attendance at Mentor Coach Training Webinars (follow-up to summer training)	Yes, if assigned to Strand I	Yes, if assigned to Strand I
Summer Institute Training (July 19-22, 2010), Formative Assessment Module: Checking for Understanding [Training Provided by TeachFirst] <i>(New to the institute schools will be assigned to the Teacher Leader Training.)</i>	Yes, if assigned to Strand III	Yes, if assigned to Strand III
Online Attendance at Formative Assessment Webinars (follow-up to summer training)	Yes, if assigned to Strand III	Yes, if assigned to Strand III
<u>(Division Level)</u> <u>Divisions with Tier III Schools</u> <u>(Exception: Accomack, Green, Lynchburg, and Staunton)</u>		
Use of a Division-Level Coach Model	Yes	No
Continued School Improvement Planning via Indistar™: Division-Level (Center on Innovation and Improvement – CII)	Yes	Yes
Summer Institute Training (July 19-22, 2010), Williamsburg's Marriott) - Division Leadership Support (Training Provided by The College of William and Mary)	Yes	No
Four One-Day Division Leadership Workshops (October, December, February, and April)	Yes	No
Site Visits to Schools with the Division Leadership Support Directors	Yes	No
Attendance at Webinars and Video Conferencing via The College of William and Mary	Yes	No
<u>Special Requirements for Schools Assigned to Strand III of the Summer Institute</u> Schools assigned to Stand III of the July Institute will be required to purchase the support platform for the implementation of TeachFirst's Formative Assessment Series™. (The cost is \$1,950 per school. For information regarding contracting with TeachFirst, please contact John Mullins at (206) 453-2445.)	Yes	Yes, if assigned to Strand III

ACHIEVE3000

www.Achieve3000.com

Sonya Coleman
Regional Director
301-352-3459

Cambridge Education
Mott MacDonald dba Cambridge Education
Trevor B. Yates, Executive Vice President
717-701-0123

CaseNEX, LLC
<http://www.casenex.com/casenet/index.html>
Griff Fernandez
866- 817- 0726

Classworks
<http://www.classworks.com>
Wayne Brown
804-747-3515

Compass Learning
<http://www.compasslearning.com>
Corey Good
804-651-3508

EdisonLearning, Inc
<http://www.edisonlearning.net/>
Curtiss Stancil, Vice President for Business Development
917-482-4396

Educational Impact
<http://www.educationalimpact.com>
George Elias
215-534-0899

Evans Newton, Inc.
<http://www.evansnewton.com>
Cecily Williams-Blijd
240-695-2479

ISTATION
<http://www.istation.com>
Bob Blevins
866-883-7323

Johns Hopkins University
Kathy Nelson (contact for middle schools only)
410-516-8800

Pearson Digital Learning
www.pearsonschool.com
Matt Robeson
804-836-3906

Pearson Education
<http://www.pearsoned.com/>
Fred Bost, Regional VP
Phone: 877-873-1550, x1617
Pearson Tapestry
www.pearsontapestry.com
Steve Watson
843-538-3834

READ NATURALLY INC
<http://www.readnaturally.com>
Ben Weisner
Director, Sales and Marketing
800-788-4085, ext. 8722 (desk)
612-710-5697 (cell)

Research For Better Teaching
<http://www.rbteach.com>
Cynthia Pennoyer
978-263-9449

TeachFirst
<http://www.teachfirst.com>
John Mullin
206.453.2445

Teachscape
<http://www.teachscope.com>
Veronica Tate
757-289-6192

The Flippen Group
<http://www.flippengroup.com>
Brian Whitehead
865-577-6008

Voyager Learning
<http://www.voyagerlearning.com/about/index.jsp>
Ron Klausner
888-399-1995