

APPROVED

Revised March 2011

**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: Fluvanna County Public Schools

Mailing Address: 14455 James Madison Highway Palmyra, VA 22963

Division Contact: Allen Cook

Telephone (include extension if applicable): 434-589-8208 Fax: 434-589-2248

E-mail: acook@mail.fluco.org

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: Central Elementary School

Mailing Address: 3340 Central Plains Rd. Palmyra, VA 22963

School Contact: Sarah Pinckney

Telephone (include extension if applicable): 434-589-8318 Fax: 434-589-4275

E-mail: spinckney@mail.fluco.org

School Name: Cunningham Elementary School
Mailing Address: 479 Cunningham Rd. Palmyra, VA 22963
School Contact: Sue Davies
Telephone (include extension if applicable): 434-842-3197 Fax: 434-842-2502
E-mail: sdavies@mail.fluco.org

School Name: Columbia Elementary School
Mailing Address: 563 Wilmington Rd. Palmyra, VA 22963
School Contact: Sue Davies
Telephone (include extension if applicable): 434-589-8613 Fax: 434-589-1959
E-mail: sdavies@mail.fluco.org

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: _____
Superintendent's Name: Dr. Thomas W. D. Smith
Date: _____

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
				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 #		
Cunningham Elementary	510138000624		
Columbia Elementary	510138000623		
Central Elementary	510138000622		

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
		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;
- 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:

Note: Divisions should consider providing this information in chart form, and include here.

**Columbia Elementary School
Student Achievement and Demographic Data**

a. Student achievement data for the past two years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) in reading/language arts and mathematics:	Columbia Elementary is a PreK-2 school. All students from Columbia transition to Central Elementary where SOL testing is done. Columbia earns the same AYP rating as Central. The
--	--

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;

following tables represent scores from Central Elementary school as well as scores for grade 3 Central and Columbia Schools that have been disaggregated by the division.

Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	82.81	86.43
Black	66.91	75.00
Hispanic	81.81	95.45
LEP	57.14	83.33
Disadvantaged	68.61	76.21
Disabilities	72.10	70.40
White	86.06	88.71

Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	83.01	89.63
Black	64.17	75.18
Hispanic	81.81	95.45
LEP	57.14	100.00
Disadvantaged	64.23	80.38
Disabilities	70.66	81.75
White	86.91	92.48

Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Grade 3				
	2007-2008 Central	2007-2008 Columbia	2008-2009 Central	2008-2009 Columbia
All	79.93	60.0	80.22	72.4
Black	60.46	42.9	72.92	62.5

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>77.78</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>100.00</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disadvantaged</td> <td>66.67</td> <td>50.0</td> <td>64.86</td> <td>37.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabilities</td> <td>50.00</td> <td>33.3</td> <td>55.56</td> <td>16.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>84.13</td> <td>69.2</td> <td>81.25</td> <td>77.8</td> </tr> </table>	Hispanic	77.78	n/a	100.00	n/a	Disadvantaged	66.67	50.0	64.86	37.5	Disabilities	50.00	33.3	55.56	16.7	White	84.13	69.2	81.25	77.8																				
Hispanic	77.78	n/a	100.00	n/a																																					
Disadvantaged	66.67	50.0	64.86	37.5																																					
Disabilities	50.00	33.3	55.56	16.7																																					
White	84.13	69.2	81.25	77.8																																					
	<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="5">Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 3</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <th>2007-2008 Central</th> <th>2007-2008 Columbia</th> <th>2008-2009 Central</th> <th>2008-2009 Columbia</th> </tr> <tr> <td>All</td> <td>84.39</td> <td>75.00</td> <td>84.76</td> <td>82.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>65.12</td> <td>57.1</td> <td>70.21</td> <td>62.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>77.78</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>100.00</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disadvantaged</td> <td>68.25</td> <td>66.7</td> <td>74.32</td> <td>62.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabilities</td> <td>60.71</td> <td>50.0</td> <td>59.26</td> <td>50.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>88.46</td> <td>84.6</td> <td>87.56</td> <td>88.9</td> </tr> </table>	Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 3						2007-2008 Central	2007-2008 Columbia	2008-2009 Central	2008-2009 Columbia	All	84.39	75.00	84.76	82.8	Black	65.12	57.1	70.21	62.5	Hispanic	77.78	n/a	100.00	n/a	Disadvantaged	68.25	66.7	74.32	62.5	Disabilities	60.71	50.0	59.26	50.0	White	88.46	84.6	87.56	88.9
Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 3																																									
	2007-2008 Central	2007-2008 Columbia	2008-2009 Central	2008-2009 Columbia																																					
All	84.39	75.00	84.76	82.8																																					
Black	65.12	57.1	70.21	62.5																																					
Hispanic	77.78	n/a	100.00	n/a																																					
Disadvantaged	68.25	66.7	74.32	62.5																																					
Disabilities	60.71	50.0	59.26	50.0																																					
White	88.46	84.6	87.56	88.9																																					
b. Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement;	<p>Even though the gap has decreased for sub-group performance when comparing Columbia's student SOL scores to those of Central's, historically students transitioning from Columbia have scored significantly lower than students who have not made the transition. In reading, there have been increases in the total pass rate and the pass rate for Black students, but All students and students in all sub-groups continue to perform below the Annual Measurable Objectives of 77% in 2007-2008 and 81% in 2008-2009.</p> <p>In math, Columbia's All students and the White student sub-group met or exceeded the required AMOs, but Black, Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities were below the expected levels of 75% in 2007-2008 and 79% in 2008-2009.</p> <p>Areas that need improvement are Black, Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities in mathematics and language arts.</p>																																								
c. Number and percentage of highly qualified teachers and teachers with less than three years experience by grade or subject;	<p>19 teachers/ 100% are highly qualified.</p> <p>Teachers with less than three years experience:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Pre-K</th> <th>K</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Grade	Pre-K	K	1	2																																			
Grade	Pre-K	K	1	2																																					

	Years Experience	0	0	1	1																					
d. Number of years each instructional staff member has been employed at the school;	Number of years at Columbia		Number of teachers																							
	1	2																								
	2	10																								
	3	3																								
	7	1																								
	21	1																								
	24	1																								
	36	1																								
e. Information about the graduation rate of the school in the aggregate and by AYP subgroup for all secondary schools;	<p>Using Virginia's on-time graduation rate, Fluvanna's rate decreased from 90.3 for the 2007-2008 cohort to 88.2 for the 2008-2009 cohort. Using AYP calculations for graduation, Fluvanna met the AMO of 61% with a 2008-2009 rate of 85.47% (a decrease from 87.10% in 2007). There is only one High School in our division.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2007-2008</th> <th>2008-2009</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All</td> <td>87.1%</td> <td>85.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>76.1%</td> <td>78.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disadvantaged</td> <td>64.1%</td> <td>63.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabilities</td> <td>29.6%</td> <td>33.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>91.1%</td> <td>87.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						2007-2008	2008-2009	All	87.1%	85.5%	Black	76.1%	78.1%	Hispanic	n/a	n/a	Disadvantaged	64.1%	63.2%	Disabilities	29.6%	33.3%	White	91.1%	87.3%
	2007-2008	2008-2009																								
All	87.1%	85.5%																								
Black	76.1%	78.1%																								
Hispanic	n/a	n/a																								
Disadvantaged	64.1%	63.2%																								
Disabilities	29.6%	33.3%																								
White	91.1%	87.3%																								
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	K-2 Demographics		Totals																							
	Attendance Rate		95.00%																							
	Total number of students		117																							
	Gender		M= 55																							

<p>or ethnicity; 3) disability status; 4) limited English proficient status; 5) migrant status; 6) homeless status; and 7) economically disadvantaged status;</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">F= 62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Race</td> <td>Black = 27 Hispanic = 1 White = 87 Other = 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disability Status</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LEP Status</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Migrant Status</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Homeless</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economically Disadvantaged</td> <td style="text-align: center;">38</td> </tr> </table>		F= 62	Race	Black = 27 Hispanic = 1 White = 87 Other = 2	Disability Status	12	LEP Status	0	Migrant Status	0	Homeless	0	Economically Disadvantaged	38
	F= 62														
Race	Black = 27 Hispanic = 1 White = 87 Other = 2														
Disability Status	12														
LEP Status	0														
Migrant Status	0														
Homeless	0														
Economically Disadvantaged	38														
<p>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;</p>	<p>g. The school was originally built in 1919 but the current building was constructed in 1968. It currently has 7 classrooms plus the library. The media center is about 27' x 27'. It is carpeted with cinderblock walls. It houses 10 mac computers and 4,619 books in its collection. The cafeteria is 33' x 42' with tile flooring and cinderblock walls. It connects to the kitchen and has 3 large windows. It also has a 8' x 18' stage. PE is in the cafeteria on rainy/cold days. Outside there is a blacktop/track/grassy area and lower mulched playground areas with parallel bars,slides, balance beams, etc.</p>														
<p>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);</p>	<p>59,400 minutes (990 hours) Not required for all students: Summer School: 56 hours SES: an average of 26.62 hours; this varies depending upon the hourly rate of the Provider</p>														
<p>i. Total number of days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of teacher working days;</p>	<p>180 instructional days/200 contracted days =.9</p>														
<p>j. Information about the types of</p>	<p>Computers, iPods, Mimio, Document cameras, Digital Cameras,</p>														

technology that are available to students and instructional staff;	Video cameras, Interactive Whiteboards, Wireless access, LCD projectors, SPED software, adaptive technology, LEP software, televisions with DVD/VCR players in all classrooms, webcams, video conferencing		
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	Annual achievement goals:		
	Year	Reading/Language Arts	Math
	2007-2008	77%	75%
	2008-2009	81%	79%
	2009-2010	85%	83%
	2010-2011	89%	87%
	2011-2012	93%	91%
	2012-2013	97%	95%
	2013-2014	100%	100%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend summer institute provided by DOE and participate in Teacher Leader trainings • Hire a full-time instructional coach • Support a reading coach two day per week (0.4FTE) with an emphasis on K-2 literacy and on student transition to third grade at Central Elementary • Support a 0.1FTE data analysis/assessment coach with a focus on the consistent collection, use, and application of data throughout the elementary schools • Hire substitutes to support collaborative planning in curriculum work • Provide Supplemental Education Services for eligible students • Purchase materials to support the use of Word Study and leveled readers in Content Areas. • Provide additional Professional Development based upon individual teacher annual goals and school-wide needs. • Support the purchase of services that will allow us to collect and use student data • <u>Revise current pacing guides and curriculum maps to improve</u> 		

<p>I. Goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools implementing the State Transformation Model.</p>	<p><u>curriculum alignment with the Virginia Standards of Learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As evidenced through Indistar, 80% of minutes entered by the instructional coach will demonstrate the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. • In collaboration with the building principal, 100% of teachers will develop an annual goal plan which will include job-embedded professional development. Formative and summative meetings and documentation provided by both administrator and teacher will show professional growth that positively impacts student achievement. • Administrators will conduct periodic reviews (as appropriate) of all instructional staff to ensure instructional programs are implemented with fidelity as outlined by the division’s Academic Expectations Handbook. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in math. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in language arts.
--	--

**Cunningham Elementary School
Student Achievement and Demographic Data**

<p>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;</p>	<p>Cunningham Elementary is a PreK-2 school. All students from Cunningham transition to Central Elementary where SOL testing is done. Cunningham earns the same AYP rating as Central. The following tables represent scores from Central Elementary school as well as scores for Cunningham School that have been disaggregated by the division.</p>
---	--

Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5				
	2007-2008		2008-2009	
All	82.81		86.43	
Black	66.91		75.00	
Hispanic	81.81		95.45	
LEP	57.14		83.33	
Disadvantaged	68.61		76.21	
Disabilities	72.10		70.40	
White	86.06		88.71	
Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5				
	2007-2008		2008-2009	
All	83.01		89.63	
Black	64.17		75.18	
Hispanic	81.81		95.45	
LEP	57.14		100.00	
Disadvantaged	64.23		80.38	
Disabilities	70.66		81.75	
White	86.91		92.48	
Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Grade 3				
	2007-2008 Central	2007-2008 Cunningham	2008-2009 Central	2008-2009 Cunningham
All	79.93	69.2	80.22	79.6
Black	60.46	50.0	72.92	75.0

	Hispanic	77.78	50.0	100.00	n/a	
	Disadvantaged	66.67	68.4	64.86	64.7	
	Disabilities	50.0	16.7	55.56	50.0	
	White	84.13	74.4	81.25	80.5	
	Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 3					
		2007-2008 Central	2007-2008 Cunningham	2008-2009 Central	2008-2009 Cunningham	
	All	84.39	74.5	84.76	80.0	
	Black	65.12	50.00	70.21	75.0	
	Hispanic	77.78	50.0	100.00	n/a	
	Disadvantaged	68.25	57.9	74.32	76.5	
	Disabilities	60.71	16.7	59.26	33.3	
	White	88.46	81.4	87.56	81.0	
	b. Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement;	<p>Similar to Columbia Elementary, students transitioning from Cunningham have historically scored lower than students who have not made the transition to Central Elementary. However, the gap in performance between the two schools decreased in 2008-2009, particularly with students in the Black subgroup in language arts and math and Disadvantaged students in math.</p> <p>In reading at Cunningham, there have been increases in the total pass rate for All students, Black students, Students with Disabilities, and White students even though all subgroups scored below the required 81% AMO in 2008-2009.</p> <p>In math, all subgroups with the exception of students in the White subgroup showed increases from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009. However, with the exception of the White subgroup, all other subgroups performed below the required AMO of 79% in 2008-2009.</p> <p>All subgroups need improvement with a particular emphasis on Students with Disabilities in math and language arts.</p>				

c. Number and percentage of highly qualified teachers and teachers with less than three years experience by grade or subject;	29 teachers/ 100% are highly qualified.																									
	Grade	Pre-K	K	1	2	SPED																				
	Years Experience	0	1	0	0	1																				
d. Number of years each instructional staff member has been employed at the school;	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="982 516 1297 591">Number of years at Cunningham</th> <th data-bbox="1297 516 1612 591">Number of Teachers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 591 1297 631">0-3</td> <td data-bbox="1297 591 1612 631">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 631 1297 672">4-7</td> <td data-bbox="1297 631 1612 672">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 672 1297 712">8-11</td> <td data-bbox="1297 672 1612 712">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 712 1297 753">12-15</td> <td data-bbox="1297 712 1612 753">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 753 1297 794">16-19</td> <td data-bbox="1297 753 1612 794">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 794 1297 834">20-23</td> <td data-bbox="1297 794 1612 834">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 834 1297 875">24-27</td> <td data-bbox="1297 834 1612 875">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 875 1297 915">28-31</td> <td data-bbox="1297 875 1612 915">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 915 1297 943">32+</td> <td data-bbox="1297 915 1612 943">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Number of years at Cunningham	Number of Teachers	0-3	12	4-7	5	8-11	3	12-15	3	16-19	1	20-23	0	24-27	2	28-31	2	32+	1
Number of years at Cunningham	Number of Teachers																									
0-3	12																									
4-7	5																									
8-11	3																									
12-15	3																									
16-19	1																									
20-23	0																									
24-27	2																									
28-31	2																									
32+	1																									
e. Information about the graduation rate of the school in the aggregate and by AYP subgroup for all secondary schools;	<p data-bbox="982 1057 1908 1235">Using Virginia's on-time graduation rate, Fluvanna's rate decreased from 90.3 for the 2007-2008 cohort to 88.2 for the 2008-2009 cohort. Using AYP calculations for graduation, Fluvanna met the AMO of 61% with a 2008-2009 rate of 85.47% (a decrease from 87.10% in 2007). There is only one High School in our division.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="982 1235 1549 1393"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="982 1235 1234 1276"></th> <th data-bbox="1234 1235 1392 1276">2007-2008</th> <th data-bbox="1392 1235 1549 1276">2008-2009</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 1276 1234 1317">All</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1276 1392 1317">87.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1392 1276 1549 1317">85.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 1317 1234 1357">Black</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1317 1392 1357">76.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1392 1317 1549 1357">78.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 1357 1234 1393">Hispanic</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1357 1392 1393">n/a</td> <td data-bbox="1392 1357 1549 1393">n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							2007-2008	2008-2009	All	87.1%	85.5%	Black	76.1%	78.1%	Hispanic	n/a	n/a								
	2007-2008	2008-2009																								
All	87.1%	85.5%																								
Black	76.1%	78.1%																								
Hispanic	n/a	n/a																								

	Disadvantaged	64.1%	63.2%																				
	Disabilities	29.6%	33.3%																				
	White	91.1%	87.3%																				
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;	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>K-2 Demographics</th> <th>Totals</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Attendance Rate</td> <td>95.04%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total number of students</td> <td>196</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td>M=107 F=89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Race</td> <td>Asian=1 Black=49 Hispanic=4 White=142</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disability Status</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LEP Status</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Migrant Status</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Homeless</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economically Disadvantaged</td> <td>77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			K-2 Demographics	Totals	Attendance Rate	95.04%	Total number of students	196	Gender	M=107 F=89	Race	Asian=1 Black=49 Hispanic=4 White=142	Disability Status	42	LEP Status	3	Migrant Status	0	Homeless	0	Economically Disadvantaged	77
K-2 Demographics	Totals																						
Attendance Rate	95.04%																						
Total number of students	196																						
Gender	M=107 F=89																						
Race	Asian=1 Black=49 Hispanic=4 White=142																						
Disability Status	42																						
LEP Status	3																						
Migrant Status	0																						
Homeless	0																						
Economically Disadvantaged	77																						
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;	<p>g. The school was originally built in 1949. It currently has 13 classrooms and 3 mobile units plus the library. The media center is about 24.5' x 30.5'. It is carpeted with cinderblock and dry walls. It houses 2 computers and 5,000 books in its collection. The cafeteria is 24.5' x 41.5' with tile flooring and cinderblock walls. It connects to the kitchen that is 13.5' x 14.75'. PE is in the multi-purpose room (24.5' x 29.25') on rainy/cold days. Outside we have a blacktop/track/grassy area. We have upper and lower mulched playground areas with parallel bars, slides, balance beams, etc.</p>																						
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,	<p>59,400 minutes (990 hours) Not required for all students: Summer School: 56 hours SES: an average of 15.9 hours; this varies depending upon the</p>																						

summer school);	hourly rate of the provider		
i. Total number of days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of teacher working days;	180 instructional days/200 contracted days =.9		
j. Information about the types of technology that are available to students and instructional staff;	Computers, iPods, Mimio, Document cameras, Digital Cameras, Video cameras, Interactive Whiteboards, Wireless access, LCD projectors, SPED software, adaptive technology, LEP software, televisions with DVD/VCR players in all classrooms, webcams, video conferencing		
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	Annual achievement goals:		
	Year	Reading/Language Arts	Math
	2007-2008	77%	75%
	2008-2009	81%	79%
	2009-2010	85%	83%
	2010-2011	89%	87%
	2011-2012	93%	91%
	2012-2013	97%	95%
	2013-2014	100%	100%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend summer institute provided by DOE and participate in Teacher Leader trainings • Hire a full-time instructional coach • Support a reading coach two day per week (0.4FTE) with an emphasis on K-2 literacy instruction and student transition to third grade at Central Elementary • Support a 0.1FTE data analysis/assessment coach with a focus on the consistent collection, use, and application of data throughout the elementary schools • Hire substitutes to support collaborative planning in curriculum work • Provide Supplemental Education Services for eligible students 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase materials to support the use of Word Study and leveled readers in Content Areas. • Provide additional Professional Development based upon individual teacher annual goals and school-wide needs. • Support the purchase of services that will allow us to collect and use student data • <u>Revise current pacing guides and curriculum maps to improve curriculum alignment with the Virginia Standards of Learning</u>
<p>I. Goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools implementing the State Transformation Model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As evidenced through Indistar, 80% of minutes entered by the instructional coach will demonstrate the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. • In collaboration with the building principal, 100% of teachers will develop an annual goal plan which will include job-embedded professional development. Formative and summative meetings and documentation provided by both administrator and teacher will show professional growth that positively impacts student achievement. • Administrators will conduct periodic reviews (as appropriate) of all instructional staff to ensure instructional programs are implemented with fidelity as outlined by the division's Academic Handbook. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in math. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in language arts.

**Central Elementary School
Student Achievement and Demographic Data**

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;

Central Elementary School is a K-5 school. All students from Columbia and Cunningham transition to Central in Grade 3. All elementary students in the division do SOL testing at Central.

**Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test
Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5**

	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	82.81	86.43
Black	66.91	75.00
Hispanic	81.81	95.45
LEP	57.14	83.33
Disadvantaged	68.61	76.21
Disabilities	72.10	70.40
White	86.06	88.71

**Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test
Combined SOL Scores for Grades 3-5**

	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	83.01	89.63
Black	64.17	75.18
Hispanic	81.81	95.45
LEP	57.14	100.00
Disadvantaged	64.23	80.38
Disabilities	70.66	81.75
White	86.91	92.48

Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Grade 3		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	79.93	80.22
Black	60.46	72.92
Hispanic	77.78	100.00
Disadvantaged	66.67	64.86
Disabilities	50.0	55.56
White	84.13	81.25
Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 3		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	84.39	84.76
Black	65.12	70.21
Hispanic	77.78	100.00
Disadvantaged	68.25	74.32
Disabilities	60.71	59.26
White	88.46	87.56
Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Grade 4		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	80.50	88.1
Black	63.04	75.6
Hispanic	100.0	90.0
Disadvantaged	66.67	79.4
Disabilities	52.17	50.00
White	83.63	90.8

Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 4		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	73.21	87.82
Black	42.22	66.67
Hispanic	83.33	90.0
Disadvantaged	52.83	77.78
Disabilities	43.48	61.90
White	79.46	91.87
Percentage of Students Passing Reading/Language Arts SOL Test Grade 5		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	85.61	88.9
Black	73.91	76.6
Hispanic	71.43	100.0
Disadvantaged	76.19	80.9
Disabilities	65.22	65.4
White	88.55	91.2
Percentage of Students Passing Mathematics SOL Test Grade 5		
	2007-2008	2008-2009
All	90.12	95.8
Black	84.78	87.2
Hispanic	85.71	100.0
Disadvantaged	84.21	83.8
Disabilities	58.33	69.2
White	91.56	97.4

<p>b. Analyzed student achievement data with identified areas that need improvement;</p>	<p>In language arts, even though All students and the White student subgroup have shown increases and exceeded the AMOs for both of the school years, students in the Black, Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups made progress but did not meet the required AMO in each of the two years. It is important to note that All students in grade 3 scored below the 81% pass rate in Language Arts in 2008-2009. Also in grade 3, students in the Disadvantaged and White subgroups showed decreases from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009. With the exception of Students with Disabilities and Hispanic in grade 4, all other subgroups showed increases in Language Arts in grades 4 and 5. In Math for both school years, combined scores for grades 3-5 showed that All students exceeded the required AMO. With the exception of Black students, all student subgroups exceeded the 79% AMO for 2008-2009 (combined). It should be noted that in grades 3 and 4 the Black students, Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups fell below the required AMO. With the exception of Students with Disabilities, all subgroups in grade 5 exceeded the 79% AMO for 2008-2009.</p> <p>Students with Disabilities, at all levels, need improvement in language arts and math. A focus on improvement in grades K-3 is also identified for the the Black and Disadvantaged student subgroups in language arts and math. In grade 4, the Black student and Disadvantaged student subgroups are also identified for improvement in both areas.</p>						
<p>c. Number and percentage of highly qualified teachers and teachers with less than three years experience by grade or subject;</p>	<p>116 teachers/ 96.45% are highly qualified.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1266 1110 1633 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1266 1110 1451 1295">Grade</th> <th data-bbox="1451 1110 1633 1295"># of teachers with less than 3 years experience</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1266 1295 1451 1349">K</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1295 1633 1349">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1266 1349 1451 1398">1</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1349 1633 1398">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	# of teachers with less than 3 years experience	K	0	1	1
Grade	# of teachers with less than 3 years experience						
K	0						
1	1						

		2	1																					
		3	3																					
		4	1																					
		5	3																					
		SPED	5																					
		PE	1																					
d. Number of years each instructional staff member has been employed at the school;		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of years at Central</th> <th>Number of Teachers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0-3</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-7</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8-11</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-15</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16-19</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-23</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-27</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28-31</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>32+</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Number of years at Central	Number of Teachers	0-3	27	4-7	23	8-11	25	12-15	7	16-19	5	20-23	12	24-27	10	28-31	5	32+	2
Number of years at Central	Number of Teachers																							
0-3	27																							
4-7	23																							
8-11	25																							
12-15	7																							
16-19	5																							
20-23	12																							
24-27	10																							
28-31	5																							
32+	2																							
e. Information about the graduation rate of the school in the aggregate and by AYP subgroup for all secondary schools;	<p>Using Virginia's on-time graduation rate, Fluvanna's rate decreased from 90.3 for the 2007-2008 cohort to 88.2 for the 2008-2009 cohort. Using AYP calculations for graduation, Fluvanna met the AMO of 61% with a 2008-2009 rate of 85.47% (a decrease from 87.10% in 2007). There is only 1 High School in our division.</p>																							
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	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>K-5 Demographics</th> <th>Totals</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Attendance Rate</td> <td>95.65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total number of students</td> <td>1370</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td>M=678</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				K-5 Demographics	Totals	Attendance Rate	95.65%	Total number of students	1370	Gender	M=678												
K-5 Demographics	Totals																							
Attendance Rate	95.65%																							
Total number of students	1370																							
Gender	M=678																							

status;		F=692
	Race	American Indian/Alaskan Native = 10 Asian = 13 Black = 226 Hispanic = 40 White = 1076 Pacific Islander = 4
	Disability Status	177
	LEP Status	21
	Migrant Status	0
	Homeless	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	336
<p>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;</p>		<p>g. Central Elementary School was built in 1958. In 1988 air conditioning was added. The first addition was completed in 1994 and the second addition in 1999. The auditorium that was part of the original building underwent renovation in 2009. Central Elementary School has 64 classrooms and 13 mobile classrooms.</p> <p>Description of the library media center: The library media center has two separate teaching areas, two offices, separate AV storage, conference room, Mini-lab, separate reference section, access to a computer lab, and 19,456 titles available for student check out.</p> <p>Description of Cafeteria: Central Elementary has two cafeterias. The large cafeteria seats approximately 200 students and the smaller cafeteria seats approximately 150. Both cafeterias have cinderblock walls and tiled floors. There are currently 1,370 students enrolled in the school.</p> <p>Description of Physical Playgrounds: Central has two playgrounds with a variety of equipment, including slides, climbing wall and other climbing equipment, dome-type jungle gym, two large blacktops with painted four square ball game and hopscotch areas, and a regulation</p>

	size soccer field for physical activity.		
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);	59,400 minutes (990 hours) Not required for all students: Summer School: 56 hours SES: an average of 16.63 hours; this varies depending upon the hourly rate of the provider		
i. Total number of days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of teacher working days;	180 instructional days/200 contracted days =.9		
j. Information about the types of technology that are available to students and instructional staff;	Computers, iPods, Mimio, Document cameras, Digital Cameras, Video cameras, Interactive Whiteboards, Wireless access, LCD projectors, SPED software, adaptive technology, LEP software, televisions with DVD/VCR players in all classrooms, webcams, video conferencing		
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	Annual achievement goals:		
	Year	Reading/Language Arts	Math
	2007-2008	77%	75%
	2008-2009	81%	79%
	2009-2010	85%	83%
	2010-2011	89%	87%
	2011-2012	93%	91%
	2012-2013	97%	95%
	2013-2014	100%	100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend summer institute provided by DOE and participate in Teacher Leader trainings • Hire a 0.75FTE instructional coach • Support a reading coach one day per week (0.2FTE) with an emphasis on student transition to third grade at Central Elementary • Support a 0.8FTE data analysis/assessment coach with a focus on the consistent collection, use, and application of data 			

	<p>throughout the elementary schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Supplemental Education Services for eligible students • Provide additional Professional Development based upon individual teacher annual goals and school-wide needs. • Support the purchase of services that will allow us to collect and use student data • <u>Revise current pacing guides and curriculum maps to improve curriculum alignment with the Virginia Standards of Learning</u>
<p>I. Goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools implementing the State Transformation Model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As evidenced through Indistar, 80% of minutes entered by the instructional coach will demonstrate the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. • In collaboration with the building principal, 100% of teachers will develop an annual goal plan which will include job-embedded professional development. Formative and summative meetings and documentation provided by both administrator and teacher will show professional growth that positively impacts student achievement. • Administrators will conduct periodic reviews (as appropriate) of all instructional staff to ensure instructional programs are implemented with fidelity as outlined by the division's Academic Handbook. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in math. • Increase student performance for all sub-groups by reducing the failure rate by at least 10% each year and/or meeting the required AMO in language arts by placing a particular emphasis on grade K-3 literacy.

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

Fluvanna County Public School's Division Leadership Team will meet twice a month to monitor the district school improvement plan. The plan will be on the Indistar website and meeting minutes will reflect the team's continuous monitoring of the plan. The team has been planning for the 2010-2011 school year by analyzing the current indicators and the accomplishment of the supporting tasks. The team is re-accessing all district indicators in order to align the district plan with the needs of the schools in improvement and their goals and interventions identified in the 1003(g) grant application. The additional (assessment coach) has been posted on the division's website and the position will be filled by June 28. The team has placed significant emphasis on the central office staff being accountable for school improvement and student learning outcomes. Each school in improvement will also continuously reassess and monitor their plans through the use of Indistar, and a central office staff member will meet with each school leadership team at least one time per month as part of the school improvement process.

- **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.**

Parents and community members are members of the Division Leadership Team. They will be in attendance at division meetings at least one time per month. Meeting minutes on Indistar will reflect the attendance of parent and community members. Past experiences of the team

indicate that all team members are active and feel free to provide input. The superintendent will be in attendance at the division meeting at least one time per month. All parents will be mailed written information regarding school improvement at the beginning of the school year. Building level administration will present at all PTO/PTA meetings with the purpose of informing and educating parents about the school improvement progress and how they can help through the process. Community members and parents are in attendance at school board meetings and the board agenda and school board packet are posted on the school division's website. Regular reports will be made to the school board on progress the schools are making in their improvement efforts. A recent example of informing the school board and community regarding the application for 1003 (g) funds included providing written information related to school needs and how the budget provided through the funding would support those needs, particularly in the area of hiring instructional coaches.

- **The LEA has adequate resources to research and design the selected intervention as intended.**

The Division Leadership Team and the Schools' Leadership teams design their plans using the Indistar website which includes research-based strategies provided through Wise Ways. A team structure has been put in place at each level through the support of the Virginia Department of Education and the Teacher Leader Training. Use of these resources has supported the Division and School-level improvement teams to develop an Academic Expectations Handbook to guide all instructional practices with consistency throughout all elementary schools in the division.

- **The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.**

To support school improvement, the Fluvanna County School Division's 2010-2011 calendar has added in-service days to support teacher training and collaborative planning. Each school's schedule will reflect time for school-level leadership meetings and instructional team meetings. The Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Assessment was added during the 2009-2010 school year and has allowed for the increase in the collection of student data. In 2010-2011, the use of Interactive Achievement will allow for pre- and post- assessments which are included in all school improvement plans. In order to improve the use of the data gathered from these assessments, a data/assessment coach will work with administration, instructional coaches, school leadership teams, and instructional teams. In collaboration with building administration and teachers, instructional coaches will support teachers' professional growth plans and their professional development needs. The professional growth plan will be a reflection of observations, teacher reflections, and analysis of data. The Academic Expectations Handbook will be a critical source of information in this process. Due to all SOL testing being done at one elementary school, a particular emphasis will be placed on monitoring and supporting the instruction provided by teachers to students who have transitioned from Cunningham and Columbia Elementary Schools through the use of a Reading Coach with a particular emphasis on students in grades K-3. (Added March 2011)- During the 2010-2011 school year, benchmark testing results from Interactive Achievement, along with data meetings in Grades K-5, indicate the need for revised pacing and curriculum mapping. This will be accomplished prior to the end of May 2011 by paying teachers a stipend or rewarding recertification points to work after school and/or on Saturdays to accomplish this task. Also, during the school year, Central Elementary School identified the need for having instructional assistants trained in the use of computers and testing in order to proctor the increased opportunities for testing and data collection using the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments and IA benchmark tests. In order to satisfy this need at Central, substitutes will be hired for instructional assistants while they are receiving on-

site, job-embedded training.

- **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 elementary schools in Fluvanna County are Tier III schools.

- **The LEA has demonstrated adequate capacity to implement the selected intervention models.**

Division Leadership and School Leadership teams have been established. The LEA has hired instructional coaches. Coaches play an instrumental role, along with building administration, in guiding the activities of the leadership teams. The coaches have the ability to provide job-embedded professional development and have varied experiences and backgrounds including administration, special education, and reading education. Central Office staff has been specifically assigned responsibility for collaborating with school leadership teams. The LEA has developed concise Academic Expectations that will be implemented and closely monitored throughout the 2010-2011 school year. The LEA has provided opportunities for teachers to attend teacher leader trainings and school-wide schedules that allow for regularly scheduled collaborative planning. The LEA has supported school decisions to increase the collection of data through computer-based assessments. The LEA has identified the need to closely monitor the transition of students from the smaller elementary schools to Central Elementary based upon data disaggregation. There is a strong emphasis on developing capacity through implementation of the State Transformation Model.

- 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 Mark 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:
 - o Analyzing the LEA's operational needs;
 - o Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school;
 - o Contacting other LEA's currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience;
 - o Engaging parents and community members to assist in the selection process; and
 - o Delineating the responsibilities and expectations to be carried out by the external provider as well as those to be carried out by the LEA.

_____ Mark NA here if the LEA selected a LTP from the state's list.

___NA___ 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:
 - o A proven track record of success in working with a particular population or type of school;
 - o Alignment between external provider services and needs of the LEA;
 - o Capacity to and documented success in improving student achievement; and
 - o 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.
____NA____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 Division Leadership Team has met throughout the school year and even more frequently during the development of the 1003(g) application. The team has focused on accessing all district indicators in order to align the district plan with the needs of the schools in improvement. During the June 3 meeting, policies were reviewed to ensure alignment with selected interventions: hiring of a coach, data analysis, setting academic expectations, evaluation of professional staff, remedial instruction programs, building administration supporting staff. **Documents (meeting agenda and minutes) are provided below-copied directly from Indistar.**

Note: Documents included as attachments must be scanned and attached to this application.

Agenda for June 3, 2010 at Central Elementary School 12:00-5:00

I. Minutes from May 18, 2010 Meeting

II. 12:30-1:30 Working Lunch (Provided): Share Successes from 2009-2010

III. 1:30-2:00 Webinar (I-Station)

IV. 2:00-3:30 Update Plan from CII:

IA06: MAP assessment results will be used to plan for instruction

IA09: Superintendent and other central office staff will receive a monthly report related to progress on indicators.

IB07: Teachers will be provided training, based upon their individual needs, in use of remedial/intervention programs.

IB07: Administrators will provide opportunities for teachers to identify their successes and needs related to the implementation of remedial programs.

IB07: Administrators will present school wide observational and achievement data to the division team in order to support the effective use of remedial programs.

IB07: Administrators will observe, through walk-through observations, the continuous use of remedial programs as scheduled.

IC05: Leadership teams will review and offer suggestions to be included in the Academic Expectations Handbook.

IC05: School administration will set aside a time each day for classroom observations and follow-up conferences, with a goal of 50% of their time being spent directly impacting instruction and supporting teachers.

V. 3:30-5:00 Review of Policy and Plans for Completion of the 1003(g) Application/Connecting "all of the pieces"

June 3, 2010 Minutes

Minutes from May 18 meeting were reviewed and approved. II. Successes from the 2010-2011 school year were shared during the working lunch. Data related to increased parent involvement with parents of students receiving Title I services were shared. There was a 67% response rate from parents with 93.75% of parents indicating that they had been provided specific ways to support their children at home. Several positive comments were made by parents related to the We Both Read series and the incentive program. Some parents of students with disabilities were involved in using the program but the suggestion was made to increase parent involvement of students with disabilities in the future due to our past and preliminary 2010-2011 SOL test performance of that student subgroup. Another success shared was our increase of collecting student data, especially with the implementation of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing. An obstacle to the testing was the inclement weather cancelling the initial assessment period but it was felt that coaches did an excellent job of adapting to a new schedule as best they could. It was "reinforced" from previous meetings that an additional coach to focus on the use of data gathered from the assessment is critical for schools to improve in the application of the data and addressing individual student needs and planning for instruction. It was also shared that the leadership teams at each of the three schools were in support of the additional position and that it would be included in the 1003(g) grant application after notifying the school board at the June 9 meeting. An additional success was the formation and commitment of the school level and division teams to school improvement. However, concerns were expressed that, based upon 2009-2010 SOL data and consideration of our meeting minutes in Indistar, our schools have not made the needed progress, especially in the area of reading. It was strongly suggested that the teams at the school and division level place a much greater emphasis on data analysis at their meetings. This need should be reflected in the 1003(g) application. III. A webex was provided by I-Station even though the utilization of it is not a requirement of our (Tier III) schools. It was noted that it appears to be good for progress monitoring and instruction and may be a tool we want to further investigate. At this time, the schools have invested in MAP and plans have been made to utilize Interactive Achievement to improve the pre- and post-testing efforts in the schools. IV. Indicator review: IA06: Needs to continue with greater support provided from an assessment coach as described above. In addition, more trainign from NWEA will be pursued. IB07: Continue as concerns were expressed related to the fidelity of the remedial programs. This should be addressed on an individual basis. IB07 and IC05: Place an even greater emphasis on these indicators with individual teacher plans identifying a very specific area to demonstrate growth. The area(s) identified in the plans should be measureable, specific, and based upon analysis of data and teacher reflection in collaboration with building administration. IC05: The Academic Expectations Handbook is in draft form for the areas of literacy, mathematics, planning and instruction, inclusion, core extension, and technology. Feedback has been received from school leadership teams and grade level teams. The handbook should be

available by the beginning of August and should be used to guide teachers in identifying goals in their plans. It was also suggested that a division goal and school-level goal be identified based upon the handbook. It was recommended that strong consideration be given to limiting the amount of teacher meetings and/or workshops to be held in the beginning of the year when teachers return. Interactive Achievement has already been scheduled. Schools may want to focus on our 2009-2010 SOL data and the Academic handbook and how they relate to the development of the individual teacher and school goal setting. This could be done in a single session. It was mentioned that understanding what it means to be in different years of school improvement should also be presented to increase staff awareness (and concen) in some cases. V. A review of policy has also been conducted and includes the following: Policy GC – Professional Staff: Supports the hiring of a coach specific to data analysis and assessment. This policy allows the employing of individuals who are needed for specific duties and responsibilities and who are qualified for the positions. Policy GCL - Professional Staff Development: Supports professional development based upon annual goals and data analysis, including high-quality professional development in instructional content, assessment measures, and interpreting test data for instructional purposes. Policy IA – Instructional Goals and Objectives: Supports the division’s Academic Expectations Handbook. This policy emphasizes the division’s goals and objectives, emphasizing basis skills, intellectual skills of thinking and creativity, student achievement progress, and SOQ expectations and division provisions per these standards. Policy IF – Curriculum Development and Policy IFE - Curriculum Guides and Course Outlines: Support a goal-based process for identification of division goals, identification of program goals and student learning results, curriculum implementation and evaluation, and curriculum improvement.

Policy GCN – Evaluation of Professional Staff: Supports a continuing and collaborative process of regular, formal appraisal that is documented, and is for the purposes of raising the quality of instruction, growth and improvement of individual staff, and the enhancement of educational services to students. Policy IGBE – Remedial Instruction Program: Supports a program of remediation, interventions and prevention utilizing research-based components. Programs are to include early intervention for students who are at risk of failure. Policy IGBC – Parental Involvement: Supports activities that educate parents, promote cooperation between parents and the division, provide information and promote participation, and the implementation of strategies to involve parents in the education process and in the reporting of student progress. Policy CF – School Building Administration: Supports the principal as the individual to provide leadership to staff and to interpret the educational program. Planning by the team appears to be in alignment with related division policies. VI. A work session for the development of the 1003(g) application will continue on June 7 at the school board office at 11:00.

In attendance as indicated on Indistar website

Dr. Tom Smith, Superintendent, Dr. Patty Culotta, Assistant superintendent of instruction, Allen Cook, Director of elementary education
Sue Davies, Principal Columbia and Cunningham Elementary Schools , Sarah Pinckney, Principal Central Elementary School
Marguerite Matics, K-12 Reading Coordinator , Margaret Crawford, K-5 Math Coordinator , Lara Jenkins, Instructional Coach Central
Sharon Leech, Instructional Coach Central, Sarah Chiles, Instructional Coach Columbia , Karen Purnell, Instructional Coach Cunningham
Also in attendance at May 18 meeting when indicators were assessed: Mozelle Booker Community Member and Board of Supervisors
Karen Scott Parent

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:

In addition to principals and coaches guiding the school improvement process through the use of Indistar, a number of other key instructional staff members (for example, grade level lead teachers) will be familiar with the tool through the consistent use during division and school level improvement meetings. A significant emphasis has been placed on developing teachers as leaders through involvement in activities such as: teacher-leader training; Professional Learning Communities and/or Grade Level Instructional meetings; collaborative planning and curriculum alignment; and professional development in data analysis. The establishment of a team structure with the expectation of agendas and minutes that identify action to be taken has become the norm. The division has used local funds, in addition to federal funding, to support the use of additional assessments. They will be supported with local funds beyond the funding period.

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:
 - o drive decision-making in developing, selecting, and evaluating instructional programs and practices
 - o select appropriate strategies to individualize classroom instruction
 - o 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.)		
Check the expertise of the coach or prospective coach. Check all that apply.		
School 1; Columbia Elementary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other :National Board Certification Literacy	School 2: Cunningham Elementary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other : National Board Certification Literacy, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: SPED Certification	School 3: Central Elementary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other : National Board Certification Literacy, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: SPED Certification
School 4: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership 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 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 Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach <input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant

Other (Describe)	Other (Describe)	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: Fluvanna

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: Fluvanna County

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

	Year 1 2010-2011				Year 2 2011-2012			Year 3 2012-2013			Total
	<p>Note: Certain 1003(g) schools (green) are receiving 1003(a) funds as their first year allocation. Include division total for these schools. <i>[1003(a) funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011]</i></p>										
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			308,309.75	199,075.75	320,642.14		206,379.90	335,071.04		214,923.87	964,022.93

2000 - Employee Benefits			78,287.54	65,222.41	81,419.04		55,613.74	85,082.99		58,116.36	244,789.57
3000 - Purchased Services			98,370.69	42,000.00	100,179.29		20,000.00	89,868.28		20,000.00	288,418.26
4000 - Internal Services											
5000 - Other Charges			6,500.00		6,500.00			8,000.00			21,000.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies			46,033.02	97,882.00	28,760.53		84,882.00	19,475.69		84,882.00	94,269.24
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay											
Total			537,501	404,180.16	537,501.00		366,875.64	537,498.00		377,922.23	(Must Equal Division Allocation) 1,612,500.00

* If applicable.

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: Fluvanna County

1. Personal Services (1000)

Year 1 2010-2011: 2.75 FTE instructional coaches (estimated combined salaries of \$155,000). 1.0 FTE literacy coach (estimated salary of \$67,987) and 1.0 FTE assessment coach (estimated salary of \$52,766) to focus on consistent use of student data from each elementary school and on students transitioning from Columbia and Cunningham Elementary Schools to Central Elementary School. Substitute teachers to allow classroom teachers release time for collaborative planning (estimated cost of \$5,200). Substitute teachers to replace instructional assistants while they (assistants) are being trained in the administration of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments and other computer assessments (estimated cost of \$2,947.50). Stipends to teachers to revise current curriculum pacing and maps (estimated cost of \$24,409.25). **Total of estimated salaries from 1003(g) funds: 308,309.75** Other funding sources/ Local: .6 FTE Director of elementary education/Division contact for school improvement (at least 60% of time dedicated to school improvement (estimated salary of \$47,687.40), 2.0 FTE Principals for 3 schools (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement activities combined salaries of 134,874.39). Other funding sources/ Title I, Part A: .25 Math Coordinator for K-5 (School Improvement Professional development) \$16,513.96 **Total of projected salaries from other sources: 199,075.75**

Year 2:2011-2012: Personnel costs include a projected salary increase of 4% for 2.75 FTE instructional coaches, 1.0 FTE literacy coach, and 1.0 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Personnel costs included a projected salary increase of 4% for Director of elementary education and 2 elementary principals. Other funding sources/Title I, Part A: Personnel costs based on 09-10 allocation.

Year 3: 2012-2013: Personnel costs include a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 2.75 FTE instructional coaches, 1.0 FTE literacy coach, and 1.0 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Personnel costs included a projected salary increase of 4.5% for Director of elementary education and 2 elementary principals. Title I, Part A: Personnel costs based on 09-10 allocation.

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Year 1 2010-2011: 2.75 FTE Instructional coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: \$51,518.68

1.0 FTE Literacy coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: \$17,107.74

1.0 FTE Assessment coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: \$9,263.32

Substitute teachers estimated FICA: \$397.80

Total of estimated employee benefits from 1003(g) funding \$78,287.54

Other funding sources/local: .6 FTE Director of Elementary Education/Division Contact estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance, and unemployment: estimated at \$13,563.62

2.0 FTE Principals (dedicating 80% of time to school improvement for the 3 schools FICA, VRS, Insurance, and Unemployment: estimated at \$51,658.79 **Total estimate of employee benefits from other sources: \$65,222.41**

Year 2 2011-2012: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4% for 2.75 FTE instructional coaches, 1.0 FTE literacy coach, and 1.0 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4% for a .6 Director of elementary education/division contact and .80 (dedicated time to school improvement) for two elementary principals.

Year 3 2012-2013: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 2.75 FTE instructional coaches, 1.0 FTE literacy coach, and 1.0 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4.5% for .6 Director of elementary education/division contact and .80 (dedicated time to school improvement) for two elementary principals.

3. Purchased Services (3000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950 x 3= \$5,850). PD to focus on research-based instruction in areas such as guided reading, Word Study, differentiation of instruction, assessment, inquiry-based learning and other areas identified from teacher professional growth plans with an emphasis on the areas that caused the school to be in

improvement at estimated costs of \$21,000 (may also include software licenses that support student learning as connected to assessments). Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$71,520.69 (based on Title I allocation) **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g) funding \$98,370.69**

Other funding sources/local: To include purchase of services for Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Interactive Achievement estimated at \$35,000. Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$7,000. **Total of other funding sources/local: \$42,000.00**

Year 2 2011-2012: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950 x 3= \$5,850). PD also to include areas identified from teacher professional growth plans with an emphasis on those that caused the school to be in improvement at estimated costs of \$3,492.34. Purchased services to support the cost of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$17,220.64. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$73,616.31 (based on 09-10 Title I allocation). **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g) funding \$100,179.29**

Other funding sources/local: To include purchase of services for Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Interactive Achievement for Central Elementary School estimated at \$29,000. **Total of other funding sources/local: \$29,000.00**

Year 3 2012-2013: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950 x 3= \$5,850). Purchased services to support the cost of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$10,401.97.

Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$73,616.31 (based on 09-10 Title I allocation). **Total of estimated**

purchased services from 1003(g) funding \$89,868.28 Other funding sources/local: To include purchase of services for Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Interactive Achievement for Central Elementary School estimated at \$20,000.

Total of other funding sources/local: \$20,000.00

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an estimated cost of \$6,500 for three schools. **Total of estimated travel from 1003(g): \$6,500.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an estimated cost of \$6,500 for three schools. **Total of estimated travel from 1003(g): \$6,500.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an estimated cost of \$8,000 for three schools. **Total of estimated travel from 1003(g): \$8,000.**

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Year 1 2010-2011 Materials and supplies to include Word Study materials, leveled content area readers, math manipulatives/investigations, SOL aligned materials, document cameras and white boards, and other materials as connected to professional development needs at an **estimated cost of \$46,033.02 from 1003(g) funding.**

Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost of \$97,882.00**

Year 2 2011-2012 Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost of \$28,760.53 from 1003(g) funding.** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost of \$84,882.00**

Year 2 2012-2013 Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost of \$19,475.69 from 1003(g) funding.** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost of \$84,882.00**

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

School Budget Summary

School Name: Columbia 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
	<p>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]</p>										
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			94,556.50	53,693.65	98,338.76		55,621.21	102,764.00		57,876.46	295,659.26
2000 - Employee Benefits			23,668.33	19,849.70	24,615.06		20,643.69	25,722.74		21,572.66	74,006.13
3000 - Purchased Services			24,655.53	4,500.00	33,621.81		1,000.00	32,514.13		1,000.00	90,791.47
4000 - Internal Services											
5000 - Other Charges			2,000.00		2,000.00			2,500.00			6,500.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies			2,140.65	12,291.00	20,591.37		12,291.00	15,665.13		12,291.00	38,397.15
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay											
Total			147,021.01	90,334.35	179,167.00		89,555.90	179,166.00		92,740.12	(Must Equal School Allocation)

Year 2: 2011-2012 Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4% for 1 FTE instructional coach, 0.4 FTE literacy coach, and 0.1 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and .5 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

Year 3: 2012-2013 Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 1 FTE instructional coach, 0.4 FTE literacy coach, and 0.1 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4.5% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and .5 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

3. Purchased Services (3000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950). PD to focus on research-based instruction in areas such as guided reading, word study, differentiated instruction, assessment, inquiry-based learning and other areas identified from teacher professional growth plans with an emphasis on the areas that caused the school to be in improvement at estimated costs of \$5,000 (may also include software licenses that support student student learning as connected to assessments). Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$17,705.53 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$24,655.53** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$1,000. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$3,500. **Total estimated local funding: \$4,500.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) and areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at estimated costs of \$10,073.74. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$3,194. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$18,404.07 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$33,621.81** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an **estimated cost of \$1,000.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) and areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at estimated costs of \$8,966.06. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$3,194. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$18,404.07 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$32,514.13** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an **estimated cost of \$1,000.**

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,000.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,000.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,500.**

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Year 1 2010-2011 Materials and supplies to include Word Study materials, leveled content area readers, math manipulatives/investigations and other materials as connected to professional development needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,140.65** Other local funding: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from local funding of \$12,291.**

Year 2 2011-2012 Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$20,591.37** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from local funding of \$12,291.**

Year 3 2012-2013 Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$15,665.13** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from local funding of \$12,291.**

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

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

School Budget Summary

School Name: Cunningham

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

X **Yes** **No**: Is this school a participant in Strand III (TeachFirst Formative Assessment) of the July 19-22 institute? See Attachment A-g.

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

Yes **X** **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
	<p>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]</p>										
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			103,837.50	53,693.65	107,991.00		89,206.14	112,850.60		89,608.55	324,679.10
2000 - Employee Benefits			29,102.76	19,849.70	30,266.87		25,508.06	31,628.97		26,655.92	90,998.60
3000 - Purchased Services			27,655.54	7,500.00	30,239.97		2,000.00	27,875.87		3,000.00	85,771.38
4000 - Internal Services											
5000 - Other Charges			2,500.00		2,500.00			3,000.00			8,000.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies			8,866.38	20,000.00	8,169.16		20,000.00	3810.56		19,000.00	20,846.10
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay											
Total			171,962.18	101,043.35	179,167.00		136,714.20	179,166.00		138,264.47	(Must Equal School Allocation)

Year 2 2011-2012: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4% for 1 FTE instructional coach, 0.4 FTE literacy coach, and 0.1 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and .5 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

Year 3: 2012-2013 Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 1 FTE instructional coach, 0.4 FTE literacy coach, and 0.1 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4.5% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and .5 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

3. Purchased Services (3000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950). PD to focus on research-based instruction in areas such as guided reading word study, differentiation of instruction, assessment, inquiry-based learning and other areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at estimated costs of \$6,000 (may also include software licenses that support student learning as connected to assessments. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$19,705.54 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$27,655.54** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$2,000. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$5,500. **Total of estimated purchased services from other local funds: \$7,500.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) and areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at estimated costs of \$2,478.39. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$5,407.50. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$20,404.08 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$30,239.97** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$2,000. **Total of estimated purchased services from other local funds: \$2,000**

Year 3 2012-2013: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950). Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$5,521.79. Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$20,404.08 **Total of projected purchased services from 1003(g): \$27,875.87** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$3,000. **Total of estimated purchased services from other local funds: \$3,000**

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,500.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,500.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$3,000.**

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Materials and supplies may include leveled content area readers, math manipulatives/investigations, white boards, and other materials as connected to professional development needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) funds of \$8,866.38** Other local funding: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from other local funds of \$20,000.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) funds of \$8,169.16** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from other local funds of \$20,000.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) funds of \$3,810.56** Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an **estimated cost from other local funds of \$19,000.**

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

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

School Budget Summary

School Name: Central

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.

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 here. [1003(a) funds must be encumbered by September 30, 2011]										
1000 - Personnel			109,915.75	91,688.45	114,312.38		95,073.40	119,456.44		104,453.62	343,684.57
2000 - Employee Benefits			25,516.45	25,523.01	26,537.11		26,543.93	27,731.28		28,925.76	79,784.84
3000 - Purchased Services			46,059.62	30,000.00	36,758.16		41,450.00	30,978.28		45,229.88	113,796.06
4000 - Internal Services											
5000 - Other Charges			2,000.00		1,559.35			1,000.00			4,559.35
6000 - Materials and Supplies			35,025.99	65,591.00			24,141.00			24,141.00	35,025.99
8000 - Equipment/Capital Outlay											

Total			218,517.81	212,802.46	179,167.00		187,208.83	179,166.00		202,750.26	(Must Equal School Allocation) 576,850.81
--------------	--	--	------------	------------	------------	--	------------	------------	--	------------	---

(SCHOOL NAME: Central)

1. Personal Services (1000)

Year 1 2010-2011: 0.75 FTE instructional coach (estimated salary of \$40,228.50) 0.2 FTE Literacy Coach (estimated salary of \$13,597.20) and 0.8 FTE Assessment coach (estimated salary of \$42,212.80) Stipends to teachers to revise current curriculum pacing and maps (estimated cost of \$13,877.25). **Total of estimated salaries from 1003(g): \$109,915.75** Other funding sources/local: .2 FTE Director of elementary education/division contact for school improvement with at least 20% of time dedicated to school improvement (estimated salary of \$15,895.80), 1.0 FTE Principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement activities \$70,288). Other funding sources/ Title I, Part A-.25 Math Coordinator for K-5 Math Personnel cost of \$5,504.65 based on 1/3 of 2009-2010 Title I Allocation. **Total of projected salaries from other sources: \$91,688.45**

Year 2 2011-2012: Personnel costs include a projected salary increase of 4% for 0.75 FTE instructional coach, 0.2 FTE literacy coach, and 0.8 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Personnel costs included a projected salary increase of 4% for .2 Director of elementary education and 1.0 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement). Other funding sources/Title I,Part A: Personnel costs based on 1/3 of 09-10 allocation.

Year 3 2012-2013: Personnel costs include a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 0.75 FTE instructional coach, 0.2 FTE literacy coach, and 0.8 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Personnel costs included a projected salary increase of 4.5% for .2 Director of elementary education and 1.0 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement). Other funding sources/Title I,Part A:Personnel costs based on 1/3 of 09-10 allocation.

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Year 1 2010-2011: 0.75 FTE Instructional coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: 14,684.25

0.2 FTE Literacy coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: 3,421.54

0.8 FTE Assessment coach estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance and unemployment: 7,410.66

Total of estimated employee benefits from 1003(g): \$25,516.45 .2 FTE Director of elementary education and .80 principal estimated FICA, VRS, Insurance, and unemployment: **Total of estimated employee benefits from local: \$25,523.01**

Year 2 2011-2012: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of

4% for 0.75 FTE instructional coach, 0.2 FTE literacy coach, and 0.8 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and 1.0 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

Year 3 2012-2013: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance and unemployment are based on a projected salary increase of 4.5% for 0.75 FTE instructional coach, 0.2 FTE literacy coach, and 0.8 FTE assessment coach. Other local funding: Employee benefits for FICA, VRS, insurance, and unemployment are based upon a projected salary increase of 4.5% for a .2 Director of elementary education/division contact and 1.0 principal (estimated 80% of time dedicated to school improvement).

3. Purchased Services (3000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Professional Development to include TeachFirst(\$1,950), PD to focus on research-based instruction in areas such as guided reading, word study, differentiation of instruction, assessment, inquiry-based learning and other areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at an estimated cost of \$10,000 (may also include the purchase of software licenses that support student learning as connected to assessments) Supplemental Educational Services: Estimated cost of \$34,109.62 **Total estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$46,059.62** Other local funding: Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee with a focus on the areas that caused to the school to be in improvement at an estimated cost of \$4,000. Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$26,000. **Total estimated purchased services from local funding: \$30,000.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950) Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$34,808.16 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$36,758.16** Other local funding: Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$36,450. Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee areas identified from teacher professional growth plans at an estimated cost of \$5,000. **Total estimated purchased services from local funding: \$41,450**

Year 3 2012-2013: Professional Development to include TeachFirst (\$1,950). Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$29,028.28 **Total of estimated purchased services from 1003(g): \$30,978.28** Title I, Part A: Supplemental Educational Services at an estimated cost of \$5,779.88 **Total of estimated purchased services from Title I, Part A: \$5,779.88** Other local funding: Purchased services to include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for collection of individual student data to plan for instruction and demonstrate student growth and Interactive Achievement to be used for pre- and post-test assessments at estimated costs of \$36,450. Professional development needs as developed by the school administration and/or leadership committee at an estimated cost of \$3,000. **Total of estimated local purchased services from**

other local funding: \$39,450

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$2,000.**

Year 2 2011-2012: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$1,559.35.**

Year 3 2012-2013: Travel to teacher-leader trainings and other required trainings to include mileage, meals, and accommodations (as needed) at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$1,000.**

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

Year 1 2010-2011: Materials and supplies may include Word Study materials, leveled content area readers, math manipulatives/investigations, SOL aligned materials and other materials as connected to professional development needs at an **estimated cost from 1003(g) of \$35,025.99** Other local funding: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an estimated cost of \$20,000. **Total of estimated costs for materials and supplies from local funding: \$65,591.00**

Year 2 2011-2012: Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an estimated cost of \$20,000. **Total of estimated costs for materials and supplies from local funding: \$24,141.00**

Year 3 2012-2013: Materials and supplies to include those connected to professional development and data analysis needs at an estimated cost of \$3810.56 Other funding sources/local: Materials and supplies to include classroom supplies, leveled readers, consumable materials, books for the media center, software at an estimated cost of \$19,000. **Total of estimated costs for materials and supplies from local funding: \$24,141,00**

7. 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. Columbia
2. Cunningham
3. Central
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)

Appendix A-g

**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.

Strand I:

<http://www.cpe.vt.edu/reg/nci-s1>

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	Metompink 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.

Strand II: <http://www.cpe.vt.edu/reg/nci-s2>

(*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
Hampton City

Portsmouth 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.

Strand III: <http://www.cpe.vt.edu/reg/nci-s3>

(*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.

Strand IV:

<http://www.cpe.vt.edu/reg/nci-s4>

	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.**

As stipulated in the USED Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants as amended January 2010, the requirements for each of the four USED required models are provided below. Information on the State Turnaround Model is also provided for your information. **The USED reform models are for Tier I and Tier II schools only.**

1. **Turnaround Model**

A turnaround model is one in which a LEA must:

- Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students, screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent, and select new staff;
- Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the superintendent or chief academic officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;
- Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
- Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as the following:

- Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
- A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

2. **Restart Model**

A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a nonprofit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and

resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or nonprofit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

3. **School Closure Model**

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

4. **Transformation Model**

A transformation model is one in which an LEA must implement each of the following strategies:

- Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness. *Required* activities for the LEA:
 - Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that—
 - take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and
 - are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
 - Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
 - Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
 - Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness. *Permissible activities* such as the following are allowed:

- Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
- Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
- Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.

An LEA’s comprehensive instructional reform strategies must include the following *required activities*.

- Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
- Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies as *permissible activities*, such as the following:

- Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
- Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
- Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
- In secondary schools--
 - Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
 - Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
 - Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
 - Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

An LEA must increase learning time and create community-oriented schools by the following *required activities*:

- Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

An LEA may also implement *permissible activities* including other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as the following:

- Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;
- Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
- Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

- Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

An LEA must provide operational flexibility and sustained support through the following *required activities*:

- Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, through *permissible activities* such as the following:

- Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA;
- or
- Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

5. State Transformation Model (Tier III 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. The requirements for the state transformation model are listed below.

An LEA will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness by:

- Using data on student growth through formative assessment as a significant factor in evaluating teachers;
- Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development through a coaching model (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
- Establishing schedules and strategies that provide increased collaborative time including extended year and extended school day programs.

An LEA will use comprehensive instructional reform strategies by:

- Using data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- Using data on student growth through formative assessment as a significant factor in monitoring student achievement and growth;
- Promoting the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;

- Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program;
- Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate; and
- Using transition programs to support students moving vertically through the curriculum and from elementary to secondary programs.

An LEA will increase learning time and creating community-oriented schools by:

- Establishing schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time including extended year and extended school day programs;
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement;
- Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies; and
- Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment.

An LEA will provide operational flexibility and sustained support by:

- Ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated state assigned coach, and
- Requiring alternative governance to support the school improvement planning team with oversight by the LEA and outside partners such as a university or state assigned coach.

Quick Reference Summary of Major Requirements

	Must contract with a Lead Turnaround Partner	Must replace principal	May “start over” in School Improvement Timeline	Must hire a coach
Closure				
Restart	X		X	
Transformation		X		
Turnaround	X	X	X	
State Transformation				X

Divisions that select a Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) must develop a Memorandum of Understanding between the LTP and the division that specifies the services that will be delivered to the identified schools by the LTP.

Attachment C-g

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	Yes	Yes

follow-up technical assistance)

For the purpose of monitoring struggling students in reading, the Office of School Improvement is requiring Tier I and Tier II schools to purchase *ISTATION* (K-10). Cost \$6500 per school. No

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.

Attendance at 1003(g) and 1003(a) summer institute to be held at the Williamsburg Marriott, July 19-22, 2010. Yes Yes

Requirement (Division Level)	A Requirement of 1003(g)	A Requirement of 1003(a)
<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	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Marriott) - Lead Turnaround Partner
 Training with Lauren Morando Rhim.
 (The principal will attend this training
 with the division contact person.)

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
---	-----	----

**Requirements for Tier III Schools and
Divisions**

School Level

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]	Yes, if assigned to Strand III	Yes, if assigned to Strand III
<i>(New to the institute schools will be assigned to the Teacher Leader Training.)</i>		
Online Attendance at Formative Assessment Webinars (follow-up to summer training)	Yes, if assigned to Strand III	Yes, if assigned to Strand III
(Division Level) Divisions with Tier III Schools <u>(Exception: Accomack, Brunswick, Campbell, Charles City, Greene, Lynchburg, Middlesex, Symth, 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>	Yes	Yes, if assigned to Strand III

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.)

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

Attachment D-g

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.teachscape.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

43

76