

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(g)

Application for School Improvement Funds

[Complete this application if any of the school's three-year allocation is from 1003(g).]

Under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, PL 107-110 and the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, PL 111-5

Due June 14, 2010

COVER PAGE

DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name: Craig County Public Schools

Mailing Address: 25239 Craig Creek Road, New Castle, Va. 24127

Division Contact: Scott H. Critzer

Telephone (include extension if applicable): 540-8648437

Fax: 540-8645636

E-mail: scritzer@craig.k12.va.us

SCHOOL INFORMATION

Provide information for each school within the division that will receive support through the 1003(g) funds. Copy as many blocks as needed.

School Name: McCleary Elementary

Mailing Address: 25236 Craig Creek Road, New Castle, Va. 24127

School Contact: Carla Williams
Telephone (include extension if applicable): 5408645173
_____ Fax: 5408643686

E-mail: cwilliams@craig.k12.va.us

--

COVER PAGE CONTINUED

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) and the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (ARRA), if funds have been received under both statutes. **Additionally, the local educational agency agrees by signing below to implement program specific assurances located in Section D. Assurances of this application.**

***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: This has already been done (faxed to DOE)

Superintendent's Name: Ron C. Gordon

Date: 6-4-2010

The division will submit one application packet.

SECTION A: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Divisions are aware of the ‘tier’ identification of schools that are eligible for 1003(g) funding. This information is also included in Appendix A-g. Complete the ‘Intervention’ request by placing under the heading Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation the name of the ‘vendor’ your division will employ.

1. Tier I and Tier II School Information

School Name	NCES ID #	Check Tier I	Check Tier II	Intervention			
				Turnaround	Restart	Transformation	Closure
N/A							
				LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	
				LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	
				LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	
				LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	

As a reminder, for implementation requirements of each of the federal reform models see Appendix B-g.

2a. Tier III School Information

Identify each Tier III school that will be implementing the State Transformation model, and provide the information requested.

School Name	NCES ID #
McCleary Elementary	510102000372

2b. Tier III School Information

If applicable, identify each Tier III school that will, by choice, implement one of the four federal reform models, and provide the name of the Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP).

School Name	NCES ID #	Intervention			
		Turnaround	Restart	Transformation	Closure
N/A		LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	

		LTP:	LTP:	LTP:	

As a reminder, for implementation requirements of each of the federal reform models see Appendix B-g.

SECTION B: REQUIRED ELEMENTS

Part 1. Student Achievement and Demographic Data - Applicable to Tier I, II, and III Schools

The LEA must provide the following information for each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that will be served.
Special Note: An LEA with Tier I schools must serve all of its Tier I schools before serving any eligible Tier III 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; 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; please provide additional analysis based on data to be provided in B.1.a. above.
- c. Number and percentage of highly qualified teachers and teachers with less than three years experience by grade or subject;
- d. Number of years each instructional staff member has been employed at the school;
- e. Information about the graduation rate of the school in the aggregate and by AYP subgroup for all secondary schools;
- f. 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;
- g. Information about the physical plant of the school facility to include: 1) date built; 2) number of classrooms; 3) description of the library media center; 4) description of cafeteria; and 5) description of areas for physical education and/or recess;
- h. Total number of minutes in the school year that all students were required to attend school and any increased learning time (e.g., before- or after-school, Saturday school, summer school);
- i. Total number of days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of teacher working days;
- j. Information about the types of technology that are available to students and instructional staff;
- k. Annual goals for student achievement on the state’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that received school improvement funds and services that the Tier III, category 1 school will receive or the activities the school will implement; and
- l. Goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools implementing the State Transformation Model.

Response:

B.1.b. Analysis. Our preliminary results for this past year indicate that we have implemented programs and practices that are working. Even concern, we had more than a 5 percent increase in student performance. This subject/grade level will be one of our top priorities for the upcoming

We have no ethnic diversity, so that is not an issue. Specific performance data by subgroup for grades 3,4, and 5 math are included in the report.

During the upcoming year we will be using the Flanagan TFHS, the new formative assessments, and Rocket Math, along with targeted remediation.

We would first like to share that our only Title I school (McCleary Elementary) has met the AYP benchmarks for the 2009-2010 school year with the following preliminary Pass Rates: Reading- 91% , Writing- 95% , Math- 88%, Science- 92%, and History- 83%.

Grade 3 was a top priority grade level and their results were outstanding, with several classes/subjects achieving 100% with a high percentage of Pass Advance and Perfect scores.

Other requested data:

Student Achievement and demographic data McCleary Elementary

PART I. SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-2010

Part I. A: School Demographic Information

K-5 Grade Range 343 School Membership Title I Schoolwide Program or X Title I Targeted Assistance School

Male- 51.2% Female- 48.8%

4 Number and 1.2% Percentage of Minority Students 2 Number and Less than 1% Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students

26 Number and 7.7 % Percentage of Students with Disabilities 153 Number and 45.4% Percentage of Students Identified as Disadvantaged

173 Total Minority Students, Limited English Proficient Students, Students with Disabilities, Disadvantaged

Attendance rate- 96.3%

We do not have any migrant or homeless students

Part I. B: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status

School's 2009-2010 NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status Based on 2008-2009 Assessments

- Made AYP (2008-2009 Benchmarks: Reading 81%; Mathematics 79%) Did Not Make AYP
 Check also if AYP was made through Safe Harbor.
 This school is in Title I School Improvement. Year 1 2 3

Part I. C: Standards of Accreditation Warned Status

- This school is currently warned based on 2008-2009 Standards of Learning assessments in the following subject area(s):
 English/Reading Mathematics Science History
- This school was warned based on 2007-2008 Standards of Learning assessments in the following subject area(s):
 English/Reading Mathematics Science History
- This school was warned based on 2006-2007 Standards of Learning assessments in the following subject area(s):
 English/Reading Mathematics Science History

PART II: THREE-YEAR TREND DATA

Part II. A. IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

[Copy attached](#)

Standards of Learning Test Results:
(VGLA and VAAP reported separately)

Number Passing (P) / Number Tested (T) / Percent Passing (P) (WITHOUT Remediation Recovery)

Grade 3	School Year	3 rd Grade Reading	3 rd Grade Math	3 rd Grade Science	3 rd Grade History
	2006-2007	72.9%	85.4%	87.5%	95.8%
	2007-2008	78.2%	89.1%	90.9%	90.9%
	2008-2009	71.2%	86.3%	91%	80.3%

Grade 4

School Year	4 th Grade Reading	4 th Grade Math	4 th Grade if applicable
2006-2007	81.3%	60.4%	83%
2007-2008	80%	68.3%	79.2%
2008-2009	83.3%	68.8%	89.6%

Grade	School Year	5 th Grade English/Reading	5 th Grade English/Writing	5 th Grade Math	5 th Grade History	5 th Grade Science
	2006-2007	80.8%	88.2%	76.9%	NT	84.6%
	2007-2008	86%	87.8%	82%	NT	70%
	2008-2009	87.5%	75.5%	70.8%	NT	75%

5

Virg
Virgini

Results

Number Passing (P) / Number Tested (T) / Percent Passing (P) (WITHOUT Remediation Reco

[Include English Language Learners (ELL) Students]

Grade 3	School Year	3rd Grade Reading	3rd Grade Math	3rd Grade Science	3rd Grade History
	2006-2007	None	None	None	None
	2007-2008	None	None	None	None
Grade 4	2008-2009	None	None	None	None
	School Year	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	4th Grade History (if applicable)	
Grade 5	2006-2007	None	None	None	
	2007-2008	1 VAAP /1/100%	1 VAAP /1/100%	1 VAAP /1/100%	
	2008-2009	1 VGLA/0/0%	1 VGLA/0/0%	1 VGLA/0/0%	
	School Year	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	5th Grade Reading	5th Grade Math

School Year	5th Grade English/Reading	5th Grade English/Writing	5th Grade Math	5th Grade
2006-2007	None	None	None	No
2007-2008	None	None	None	No
2008-2009	1 VAAP /1/100%	1 VAAP /1/100%	1 VAAP /1/100%	1VAAP/1/100%

Recovery Data

Number Coded Recovery (R) / Number Passing Coded Recovery (P) / Percent Passing (P)

2006-2007	3/2/66.6%	4/2/50%	4/2/50%	3/1/33.3%
2007-2008	5/3/60%	6/3/50%	3/2/66.6%	5/3/60%

Adequate Yearly Progress and Accreditation Three-Year History

School Year	AYP Status	Accreditation Status
2006-2007	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made AYP <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Make AYP ____ This school is in what year of improvement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accredited <input type="checkbox"/> Warned
2007-2008	<input type="checkbox"/> Made AYP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Did Not Make AYP <u>1</u> This school is in what year of improvement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accredited <input type="checkbox"/> Warned <input type="checkbox"/> Conditionally Accredited <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Denied
2008-2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Made AYP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Did Not Make AYP <u>2</u> This school is in what year of improvement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accredited <input type="checkbox"/> Warned <input type="checkbox"/> Conditionally Accredited <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Denied

	Subgroup	3 rd	4 th	5 th								
	General Education	54	60	41								
	Special Ed/504 Plan	9	2	8								

Number and percentage of HQ teachers with less than 3 years experience by grade level:

3rd - 4 teachers (100%) 4th- 1 teacher (33%) 5th - 2 teachers (66%)

10 Highly Qualified (4 in grade 3, 3 in grade 4, 3 in grade 5).

[See list below for years of experience by grade level](#)

Number of years that each instructional employee has been at the school:

K- has 3 teachers. All have been at the school and grade level for more than 5 years. One for more than 10 years.

1st has 3 teachers. All have been at the school and grade level for more than 8 years. 2 for more than 20 years.

2nd has 3 teachers. 1 has been at the grade level for more than 20 years. 2 for two (2) years each.

3rd. has 4 teachers. 1 has been at the school for more than 15 years, but this was her first year at this grade level. 1 has been at the school for 4 years and at this grade level for 2 years. 2 have been at the school and grade level for 2 years each.

4th- has 3 teachers. One has been at the school and grade level for more than 18years. One has been at the school and grade level for 3 years. One has been at the school and grade level for 1 year.

5th. has 3 teachers. One has been at the school and grade level for 5 years. One has been at the school and grade level for 2 years. One has been at the school and grade level for 1 year.

There are 2 Sp Ed teachers. One has been at the school and in her present assignment for 20 years, The other has been at the school and in her present assignment for 4 years.

The Title I teacher has been at the school for more than 30 years and in her present assignment for 6 years.

McCleary elementary is a little over 40 years old, and is in generally good shape. All instructional areas are air conditioned. There are 19 grade level classrooms, 2 Sp Ed small group instructional areas, and a newly renovated Title I classroom. The Media Center size is adequate for the needs of the school, with 6 computers and an increasing number of books. We share cafeteria and gym space with the middle and high schools. These facilities are fairly new (about 5 years) and are adequate for the needs of the school. There is also a well equipped playground adjoining the elementary school.

Instructional minutes for the year- 70,520. (SES, after school remediation in Reading and Math, and Summer School are also provided).

Total days worked by teachers as a percentage of the total number of days worked is 88.9%

We did not keep this data for the year.

The school has a full computer lab with 28 computers. Each classroom has an average of 3 student computers plus a dedicated teacher computer. There are also 3 Smartboards and several overhead projectors. All classes have full wireless internet access. Teacher's grades and attendance are done on PowerSchool. Many teachers also do online lesson plans. Parent Portal for grades 3-5 will be operational in the 2010-2011 school year.

School year 2009-2010 areas that needed to be improved were Grade 3 Reading and Grade 4 Math.

Preliminary SOL results from spring 2010

McCleary Elementary

Reading - pass rate 91%

Math - pass rate 88%

Science – pass rate 92%

History – pass rate 83%

Writing- pass rate 95.8%

Based on preliminary grade 3 Reading results at 88.4% our goal for 2010-2011 will be to increase that to 90% or better.

We have identified grade 4 Math as an ongoing area of concern. Next year (2010-2011) there will be 2 new teachers and 1 experienced teacher in 4th grade. Based on preliminary grade 4 Math results for spring 2010 at 75.8% our goal is to meet or exceed the AYP benchmark for 2010-2011.

Goals for the school on state assessments for 2010-2011

Reading- 90% or better

Math- 90% or better

Personnel and Programs that will be maintained :

Fulltime Instructional Coach

PD 360 for professional development

Second round of training in the 4 Block instructional method

Formative Assessment Program,

Flanagan/ROS Test for Higher Standards

Waterford Early Learning Program,

I-Station

Rocket Math

SOAR to SUCCESS Reading program

Student personal response systems to be put on mobile carts for use in several grade levels.

Part 2. Design and Implement the Intervention for Each School - Applicable to Tier I, II, and III Schools

The LEA will need to have detailed plans in place to demonstrate how the interventions will be designed as well as the plan for implementation. Listed below are the factors that will be considered to assess the LEA's commitment to designing interventions consistent with the factors below from the USED Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants as amended January 2010.

Describe the following:

- The LEA has a plan in place to implement the intervention by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

- The LEA has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward the design and implementation of the interventions and to give them opportunity to provide input.

McCleary elementary will expand its web page, add Parent Portals to provide easy access to student progress information, do fall and spring student/parent surveys, and strive to increase the frequency of teacher contact with parent by phone, email, or conference.

- The LEA has adequate resources to research and design the selected intervention as intended.
- The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.

The school division and school have allocated all the resources necessary to provide the personnel and purchase the programs needed to fully implement the program of school improvement created by the school improvement committee.

- The LEA, with Tier I and Tier II schools, has attended the SEA sponsored strategic planning session on April 7, 2010, conducted by Dr. Lauren Morando Rhim representing the Center for Innovation and Improvement.
- The LEA has demonstrated adequate capacity to implement the selected intervention models.

Response:

The LEA has provided full support (both financial and policy) for continued employment of a fulltime instructional coach, continuation of a strong program of professional development for all personnel, and acquisition and implementation of all identified programs and instructional strategies.

- If the LEA lacks sufficient capacity to serve all of its Tier I schools provide the following information:
 - a. What steps have been taken to secure the support of the local school board for the reform model selected?
 - b. What steps have been taken to secure the support of the parents for the reform model selected?
 - c. If the LEA does not have sufficient staff to implement the selected reform model fully and effectively, has the LEA considered use of the School Improvement Grant funds to hire necessary staff?
 - d. What steps have been taken to secure assistance from the state or other entity in determining how to ensure sufficient capacity exists to implement the model?
 - e. Has the SEA provided other technical assistance through a Memorandum of Understanding?

Response:

NA, if applicable

--

Part 3. Recruit, Screen, and Select External Providers - Applicable to Tier I and II Schools

To assist school divisions with recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers, if applicable, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) conducted a Request for Proposals for Lead Turnaround Partners (LTPs). Awarded were four independent contractors: Cambridge Education; Edison Learning, Inc; John Hopkins University; and Pearson Education. School divisions may select a LTP from the competitively awarded contract list or they may choose to initiate their own competitive process. The benefit of selecting a provider from the VDOE contract list is that the competition has already taken place and a school division will not have to delay the implementation of the work with the LTP by awaiting results from its own competitive process. Specific information such as contract number and pricing about each awarded contractor is publically posted on the VDOE Web site. This link <https://vendor.epro.cgipdc.com/webapp/VSSAPPX/Advantage> provides the background information regarding the selection of the LTPs.

Below are the factors that will be considered to assess the LEA’s commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, consistent with the USED Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants as amended in January 2010. Describe the following:

- Reasonable and timely steps taken to recruit, screen, and select providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year that may include, but are not limited to:
 - Analyzing the LEA’s operational needs;
 - Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school;
 - Contacting other LEA’s currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience;
 - Engaging parents and community members to assist in the selection process; and
 - Delineating the responsibilities and expectations to be carried out by the external provider as well as those to be carried out by the LEA.

<input type="checkbox"/> Mark NA here if the LEA selected a LTP from the state’s list.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark NA here if the selected model does not require a LTP.

- Detailed and relevant criteria for selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I and/or Tier II schools to be served by external providers. These criteria may include, but are not limited to:
 - A proven track record of success in working with a particular population or type of school;
 - Alignment between external provider services and needs of the LEA;
 - Capacity to and documented success in improving student achievement; and
 - Capacity to serve the identified school or schools with the selected intervention model.

Mark NA here if the LEA selected a LTP from the state's list.
 Mark NA here if the selected model does not require a LTP.

Part 4: Modify Practices and/or Policies, If Necessary, to Enable Implementation of the Intervention Fully and Effectively-Applicable to Tier I, II, and III Schools

The LEA will provide evidence that a review of division and school policies have been completed to ensure alignment with the selected interventions. 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:
The Superintendent and School Board have reviewed and approved the School Improvement plan and provided full funding support to implement the plan. No policy changes were required this year. During the 2008-2009 the Board reviewed the elementary retention policy and adopted a new Summer School policy and Targeted Remediation policy for implementation during the regular school day.

Part 5. Sustain the Reform Effort After the Funding Period Ends - Applicable to Tier I, II, and III Schools

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;
- Implementation of contract with external provider, if applicable; and
- Division plan and budget for sustaining the reform effort.

Response:

Implementing the CII (Indistar) reporting system was somewhat difficult at first, but once we learned how to use it we found it to be a generally useful tool.

The school division (school board) has allocated sufficient funds to support all programs identified by the School Improvement committee and Leadership Team as being critical to the present and future success of the school. These include class reduction, a strong commitment to both onsite professional development through the use of the PD 360 program and course offering as well as off-site training as needed. 4 Block training began last year with the Principal, Instructional Coach, and 6 teachers attending as 4 day training session. This year there will be 13 more teachers attending this training. We will also be emphasizing training in effective classroom management, RTI, and differentiation of instruction.

In addition to the new Formative Assessment Program, McCleary is using the Flanagan/ROS Test for Higher Standards, the Waterford Early Learning Program, I-Station, Rocket Math, SOAR to SUCCESS Reading program, and PD 360 professional development program. We will also be acquiring several of the student personal response systems to be put on mobile carts for use in several grade levels.

Once McCleary is no longer in school improvement the Title I money that is currently required for SES set aside will be available for maintaining many of the programs and strategies. The Superintendent and School Board have also demonstrated a strong commitment to maintaining the instructional coach position once the three year grant period has ended.

SECTION C: SELECTION OF COACH FOR TIER III SCHOOLS: STATE TRANSFORMATION MODEL - Tier III Schools Only

The State Transformation Model 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. **Coaches must be employed by June 28, 2010, the last day to register for the summer institute.** 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

- Protecting instructional time
- Monitoring student progress and sharing findings
- Promoting a collegial relationship between school administrators, staff, and coach

In the box below, please respond to the following questions:

Describe the process that was used or will be used to select each school’s Tier III coach. (Use as much space as needed.)

Our instructional coach was selected based on:

- Her more than 27 years of experience as an elementary teacher.
- Her demonstrated ability to work well with faculty, staff, and school administration.
- Her success as a classroom teacher. She incorporated many instructional best practices in her instruction, which resulted in student success on SOLs
- Her willingness to learn and embrace best practices and new instructional methodologies.
- Her experience as a mentor teacher and supervising teacher for student teachers.

Check the expertise of the coach or prospective coach. Check all that apply.

School 1 McCleary Elementary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input checked="" 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	School 2: _____ <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	School 3: _____ <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)
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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	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 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)

SECTION D: BUDGET - Applicable to Tier I, II, and III Schools

Part 1. Budget Summary (one for the division and one for each school). Description of expenditure codes can be found at the end of

Section C. 1003(g) and 1003(a) funding may be expended on any Condition of Award. See Attachment C-g. 1003(g) and 1003(a) funds may also be expended for the purchase of educational vendor/company services to support the implementation of the selected reform model. See Attachment D-g.

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(g) 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 the selected intervention model.

Division Budget Summary

Division Name: Craig County Public Schools

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

Note 1

Divisions must ensure that 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

Note 2

Divisions must ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools include in their budgets the purchase of I Station and ARDT.

I Station Cost: \$6,500

ARDT Cost: \$4.00 per student per school.

Division Budget Summary

Division Name: Craig County Public Schools

Complete using all applicable funding sources. The division budget represents all applicant schools.

Expenditure Codes	Year 1 2010-2011				Year 2 2011-2012			Year 3 2012-2013			Total
	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	ESEA (1003a)	Other Funds	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	Add ARRA and All ESEA [1003(g) and 1003(a), if applicable] across Object Codes (Do not include "other funds.")
	Note: Certain 1003(g) schools (green) are receiving 1003(a) funds as their first year allocation. Include division total for these schools. [1003(a) funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011]										
1000 - Personnel		\$95,134				\$95,134			\$95,134		285,402
2000 - Employee Benefits		18,033				18,033			18,033		54,099
3000 - Purchased Services		61,000				61,000			61,000		183,000
4000 - Internal Services											
5000 - Other Charges											
6000 - Materials and Supplies		5,000				5,000			5,000		15,000
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay											
Total		179,167				179,167			179,167		537,501

* If applicable.

School Budget Summary

School Name: McCleary Elementary

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? See Attachment A-g.

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

Yes No: Is this school a Tier I or Tier II school? See attachment A-g.

If yes, check here to indicate that the school has included the purchase of I Station and ARDT in its budget.

School Budget Summary (One Per Applicant School)

Complete using all applicable funding sources.

	Year 1 2010-2011				Year 2 2011-2012			Year 3 2012-2013			Total
	Note: Certain 1003(g) schools (green) are receiving 1003(a) funds as their first year allocation. Include here. [1003(a) funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011]										
Expenditure Codes	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	ESEA (1003a)	Other Funds	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	Add ARRA and All ESEA [1003(g) and 1003(a), if applicable] across Object Codes (Do not include "other funds.")
1000 - Personnel		\$95,134				\$95,134			\$95,134		285,402
2000 - Employee Benefits		18,033				18,033			18,033		54,099
3000 - Purchased Services		61,000				61,000			61,000		183,000
4000 - Internal Services											

5000 - Other Charges										
6000 - Materials and Supplies		5,000				5,000			5,000	15,000
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay										
Total		179,167				179,167			179,167	537,501

Complete a budget form for each school – one for each school.

Part 2. Budget Narrative: Describe in detail by expenditure codes how the school improvement 1003(g) funds as well as other funding sources will be used to implement the selected reform model(s) for the division and each school.

DIVISION NAME: Craig County Public Schools

1. Personal Services (1000)

\$95,134 for instructional coach and instructional assistants

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

\$18,033 for Soc Sec and benefits

3. Purchased Services (3000)

Waterford- \$20,000
 Flanagan/ROS \$7,000
 PD 360 Prof Dev. Program \$3,000
 I Station \$7,500
 SOAR to SUCCESS Reading Program- \$6,000
 Two (2) carts with programmable PRD's (per response devices) \$5,000
 Required Formative Assessment program- \$3,000

Rocket Math Program \$2,000
Professional development including program training \$7,500

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

\$1,500 for materials and supplies
3,5000 required summer training conference, conferences during the year, and travel

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

(SCHOOL NAME: McCleary Elementary)

1. Personal Services (1000)

\$95,134 for instructional coach and instructional assistants

1. Employee Benefits (2000)

\$18,033 for Soc Sec and benefits

2. Purchased Services (3000)

Waterford- \$20,000
Flanaghan/ROS \$7,000
PD 360 Prof Dev. Program \$3,000
I Station \$7,500
SOAR to SUCCESS Reading Program- \$6,000
Two (2) carts with programmable PRD's (per response devices) \$5,000
Required Formative Assessment program- \$3,000
Rocket Math Program \$2,000
Professional development including program training \$7,500

3. Internal Services (4000)

4. Other Charges (5000)

5. Materials and Supplies (6000)

\$1,500 for materials and supplies
3,5000 required summer training conference, conferences during the year, and travel

6. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

Complete a budget narrative for each applicant school.

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.

Section E: Assurances

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section B of this application to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under the final requirements of this SIG grant.

Section F: Waivers **(FOR SCHOOLS ALLOCATED 1003g FUNDS)**

The LEA identifies the waiver that it will implement for each school. Not all waivers are applicable for each school; if the waiver is applicable, please identify the school that will implement the waiver.

A waiver from Section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. §1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the state and all of its local school divisions to September 30, 2013.

1. (School Name) **McCleary Elementary**
2. (School Name)
3. (School Name)
4. (School Name)

A waiver from Section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit local educational agencies to allow their Tier I, and Tier II, Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

1. (School Name)
2. (School Name)
3. (School Name)
4. (School Name)

A waiver from the 40 percent poverty threshold in Section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit local educational agencies to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

1. (School Name)
2. (School Name)
3. (School Name)
4. (School Name)

