

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

1003(g)

Application for School Improvement Funds

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

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

Due June 14, 2010

COVER PAGE

DIVISION INFORMATION

School Division Name: Northampton County Public Schools
Mailing Address: 7207 Young Street Machipongo, VA 23405
Division Contact: Annette Gray
Telephone (include extension if applicable): 757-678-5151 (4100) Fax: (757-678-7267)
E-mail: agray@ncps.k12.va.us

SCHOOL INFORMATION

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

School Name: Kiptopeke Elementary School
Mailing Address: 24023 Fairview Road Cape Charles, VA 23310
School Contact: Gary McDonald
Telephone (include extension if applicable): (757) 678-5151 (Ext 6100) Fax: 757-331-3219
E-mail: gmcDonald@ncps.k12.va.us

School Name: Ocohanock Elementary School
Mailing Address: 4208 Seaside Rd. Exmore, VA 23350
School Contact: Amy Austen
Telephone (include extension if applicable): (757) 678-5151 (Ext 8100) Fax: 757-442-6349

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: _____
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 #
Kiptopeke Elementary	510271000555
Occohannock Elementary	510271000554

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 s and s 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 s worked divided by the maximum number of 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.

A. Student Achievement Data

Kiptopeke Elementary		
Student Subgroup	2007-2008 Passed	2008-2009 Passed
English Performance		
All Students	65	80
Black	61	76
Hispanic	57	73
White	74	87
Students with Disabilities	41	44
Economically Disadvantaged	56	74
Limited English Proficient	55	74
Mathematics Performance		
All Students	61	66
Black	51	56
Hispanic	74	65
White	71	80
Students with Disabilities	32	31
Economically Disadvantaged	51	58
Limited English Proficient	71	65

Assessment Results
Proficiency Level by Subgroup

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009				
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	
English: Reading	Grade 3								
All Students	13	44	57	43	19	62	81	19	
Female	13	48	61	39	31	57	89	11	
Male	14	41	54	46	9	66	75	25	
Black	7	47	53	47	8	73	81	19	
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	14	64	79	21	
White	29	41	71	29	36	46	82	18	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	40	40	60	8	31	38	62	
Economically Disadvantaged	7	39	46	54	16	63	79	21	
LEP	<	<	<	<	14	64	79	21	
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	
Mathematics	Grade 3								
All Students	31	31	62	38	19	53	72	28	
Female	28	31	59	41	31	46	77	23	
Male	33	31	64	36	9	59	68	32	
Black	19	35	53	47	5	54	59	41	
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	14	64	79	21	
White	58	21	79	21	39	46	86	14	
Students with Disabilities	36	9	45	55	0	31	31	69	
Economically Disadvantaged	21	28	49	51	14	50	64	36	
LEP	<	<	<	<	14	64	79	21	
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 4								
All Students	27	44	71	29	18	49	67	33
Female	24	46	70	30	17	52	69	31
Male	31	41	72	28	18	47	66	34
Black	10	50	60	40	10	60	69	31
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
White	45	34	79	21	38	38	75	25
Students with Disabilities	9	18	27	73	8	25	33	67
Economically Disadvantaged	17	46	63	37	15	46	60	40
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 4								
All Students	24	39	64	36	21	35	56	44
Female	17	47	64	36	17	34	52	48
Male	33	30	63	37	24	35	59	41
Black	10	39	48	52	14	36	50	50
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
White	39	36	75	25	47	33	80	20
Students with Disabilities	17	8	25	75	17	8	25	75
Economically Disadv	15	39	54	46	17	31	48	52
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 5								
All Students	18	49	67	33	17	59	76	24
Female	21	43	64	36	17	63	80	20
Male	14	55	69	31	18	54	71	29
Black	10	62	72	28	9	61	70	30
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	0	70	70	30
White	32	36	68	32	30	53	83	17
Students with Disabilities	9	45	55	45	20	50	70	30
Economically Disadv	12	48	60	40	11	58	69	31
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	0	70	70	30
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
English: Writing Grade 5								
All Students	7	55	62	38	16	46	62	38
Female	9	53	63	38	14	51	66	34
Male	4	57	61	39	19	38	58	42
Black	6	45	52	48	13	35	48	52
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	10	50	60	40
White	9	59	68	32	21	54	75	25
Students with Disabilities	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadv	7	47	53	47	18	36	55	45
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	10	50	60	40
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 5								
All Students	17	40	57	43	40	32	71	29
Female	14	41	55	45	31	43	74	26
Male	21	38	59	41	50	18	68	32
Black	17	34	52	48	26	26	52	48
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	40	40	80	20
White	23	36	59	41	50	33	83	17
Students with Disabilities	9	18	27	73	30	30	60	40
Economically Disadv	14	35	49	51	33	27	60	40
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	40	40	80	20
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 6								
All Students	-	-	-	-	17	64	81	19
Female	-	-	-	-	23	58	81	19
Male	-	-	-	-	11	70	81	19
Black	-	-	-	-	7	70	78	22
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	29	59	88	12
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	8	69	77	23
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 6								
All Students	-	-	-	-	22	44	67	33
Female	-	-	-	-	19	46	65	35
Male	-	-	-	-	25	43	68	32
Black	-	-	-	-	11	48	59	41
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	35	41	76	24
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	15	48	63	38
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 7								
All Students	-	-	-	-	44	49	94	6
Female	-	-	-	-	55	35	90	10
Male	-	-	-	-	34	63	97	3
Black	-	-	-	-	38	46	83	17
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	53	47	100	0
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	34	55	89	11
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	30	60	90	10
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 7								
All Students	-	-	-	-	23	37	60	40
Female	-	-	-	-	25	32	57	43
Male	-	-	-	-	21	42	63	38
Black	-	-	-	-	18	41	59	41
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	30	40	70	30
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	16	38	54	46
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	20	20	40	60
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<

B. Summary Analysis of Data (Kiptopeke Elementary)

Kiptopeke Elementary School is in its third year of school improvement. Kiptopeke Elementary did not make the AYP benchmark in Math and Social Studies. While we struggled in these areas, we saw increases in our students' overall pass performance rate in English: Reading. A fifteen percent (15%) increase was noted for the 2008 school year.

While all subgroups recorded gains in the pass proficient category on the English: Reading SOL, the most significant gains were recorded by our Limited English Proficient students. They showed a pass rate increase of nineteen percentage (+19%) points for the 2008 school year. Other improvements were seen with the disadvantaged subgroup, whose pass rate performance increased to eighteen percent (+18%); the Hispanic subgroup whose pass rate increased to sixteen percent (16%); the black subgroup whose pass rate increased to fifteen percent (+15%); and our white subgroup whose performance increased to thirteen percent (+13%). The subgroup showing the smallest pass performance gains were our students with disabilities.

While impressive improvements were noted in English: Reading, minimal gains were achieved in Math. A five percent (5%) increase in the overall pass rate of our students was recorded. Their performance was placed at the sixty six percent (66%) for the 2008 school year.

A comparative analysis shows that three (3) subgroups recorded improved pass performances on the 2008 Math SOL. These subgroups were: our white subgroup of students who showed a nine percent (9%) increase; our black subgroup, who showed a five percent (5%) increase; and our disadvantaged subgroup, who showed a seven (7%) percent increase.

Declines in the pass rate on the Math SOL assessment were recorded for the following subgroups: the Hispanic subgroup, who recorded a decline of nine percent (-9%), the Limited English Proficient subgroup, who recorded a decline of six percents (-6%), and the students with disabilities subgroup, who recorded a one percent (-1%) decline.

Grade 3 – Data Analysis

Grade 3 students recorded impressive gains in the area of English: Reading showing a twenty-four percent (+24%) increase in their overall pass rate when compared to their pass performance rate in 2007. All subgroups with the exception of the subgroup making up our students with disabilities recorded impressive gains. The pass rate of the female students showed an increase of twenty-eight percents (+28%); male students (+21%); black students (+28%); white students (+11%) and economically disadvantaged students (+33%). The performance of our students with disabilities showed a decrease of two percent (-2%).

Grade 3 students recorded a ten percent (+10%) gain in their overall pass performance on the Math 3 SOL assessment. Other subgroups recording gains: females (+18%), males (+4%), black students (+6%), white students (+7%) and economically disadvantaged students (+15%). The only subgroup recording loses were students with disabilities whose pass rate declined by fourteen percent (-14%).

Grade 4 – Data Analysis

The overall performance of our students in grade 4 in the area of English: Reading showed a decline of four (4) percentage points from 2007 to 2008. The comparative analysis between the subgroups shows a decline in the pass rate for our economic disadvantaged subgroup, who recorded a three percent (3%) decline and our white subgroup, who recorded a four percent (4%) decline in their pass rate performance.

Two subgroups showed marginal gains: our black students showed a nine percent (+9%) increase and our students with disabilities, who recorded gains of six percent (+6%). While the performances of these two groups are positive, when compared to the performance of the other subgroups, they continue to lag behind all other subgroups.

Much like their performance on the English: Reading SOL assessment, the pass performance rate for our grade four (4) students declined by eight percent (-8%) on the Math SOL. The performance of both the male and female subgroups decreased from the previous year. The pass performance rate for our female students decreased significantly by twelve percent (-12%) from 2007 to 2008. The pass rate for our male students decreased by only four percentage points (-4%). As well, the economically disadvantaged subgroup saw a decline in their pass rate of six percent (-6%). All other subgroups recorded slight increases in their pass performance rates (black students +2%, white students +5%). The pass performance of our students with disabilities was unchanged (25% pass rate).

Grade 5 – Data Analysis

The Grade 5 English: Reading and Math pass proficiency rates showed positive gains. The overall pass rate for this class on the English: Reading SOL was 76%, reflecting an increase of six percent (+6%). We saw the greatest gains with our female students, who recorded a pass percentage increase of sixteen percent (+16%). Our students with disabilities and our subgroup of white students recorded a pass proficiency increase of fifteen percent (+15%). The pass rate of our economically disadvantaged students was increased by nine percent (+9%) points. The subgroups recording the least significant increase in their pass rate performances were our male students and our subgroup of black students. Each saw a minimal two percent (+2%) increase.

Unlike the core areas of English: Reading and Math, our students' overall pass performance rate remained static from one year to the next in the core area of Writing. All of the following student subgroups recorded minimal gains: female subgroup (+3%), our white subgroup who recorded the greatest pass performance gains (+7%), and our economically disadvantaged subgroup who recorded a two percent (+2%) increase. The performance of our male students was decreased by three percent (-3%) when compared to their performance the year before. As well, the performance of our black students was decreased by four percent (-4%). Again, the subgroup of students making up the white subgroup performed better than all other subgroups.

Impressive gains were seen on the Grade 5 Math SOL. The overall pass rate for our students was increased by fourteen percent (+14%), resulting in a pass rate of seventy-one percent (71%) for all students. Our students with disabilities showed the greatest

improvements in their pass proficient performance (+33% increase from 2007 to 2008). As well, the pass rate for our white subgroup of students increased by twenty-four percent (+24%). Our female students recorded a nineteen percent (+19%) increase. The pass rate for our economically disadvantaged students was increased by eleven percent (11%). The performance rate of our male students recorded an increase of nine percent (9%). The performance of our black subgroup of students remained unchanged further contributing to the disparity existing between the other subgroups.

Grade 6 – Data Analysis

Student performance on the English: Reading grade 6 SOL was placed at the eighty first percentile (81%). Subgroup performances were placed at the eighty-first percentile (81%) for our female and male students. The performance of our white subgroup of students was placed at the eighty-eighth percentile (88%). The performance of our economically disadvantaged students was at the seventy-seventh (77%) percentile. Finally, the performance of our students making up the black subgroup was at the seventy-eighth percentile (78%). The performance of our economically disadvantaged and our black subgroup of students were ten (10) to eleven (11) points below the performance of our white students.

The Math performance of all students in grade six (6) fell at the sixty-seventh (67%) percentile. Individual subgroup pass rates placed the performance of our female students at the sixty-fifth percentile (65%); the performance of our male students at the sixty-eighth (68%) percentile; the performance of our white subgroup at the seventy-sixth percentile (76%); the performance of the economically disadvantaged subgroup at the sixty-third percentile (63%); and the performance of our black subgroup at the fifty-ninth percentile (59%). Again, our white subgroup of students out-performed all other subgroups by eight (8%) to seventeen percent (17%).

Grade 7 – Data Analysis

Students in grade 7 met their English: Reading benchmark at a pass rate of ninety-four percent (94%). The individual performance of each subgroup was impressive with one hundred percent (100%) of students in the white subgroup passing this SOL. The subgroups of female students and the limited English proficient students passed at a rate of ninety percent (90%). The male subgroup passed at a rate of ninety-seven percent (97%). Students in the subgroup of economically disadvantaged passed the English: Reading SOL at a rate of eighty-nine percent (89%). Students making up the subgroup of black students passed at a rate of eighty-three percent (83%). Again, students making up the black subgroup were out-performed by all other subgroups at a rate ranging from six percent (6%) to seventeen percent (17%).

The overall pass rate for grade 7 students on their Math SOL was sixty percent (60%). The white subgroup of students passed the math SOL at a rate of seventy percent (70%), while the performance of all other subgroups fell within or below the sixty percentile range. The pass percent of our male subgroup was at sixty three percent (63%). The black males out-performed the following subgroups with a pass rate of fifty-nine percent (59%): the female subgroup with a pass rate of fifty-seven (57%), the economically disadvantage subgroup with a pass rate of fifty-four percent (54%) and the limited English proficient subgroup with a pass rate of forty percent (40%). The white subgroup of students performed better than other subgroups at percentage rates ranging from eleven percent (11%) to sixteen percent (16%).

C. Highly Qualified

Kiptopeke Elementary School employs twenty-one (21) teachers in grades three (3) to grade seven (7). Five of these twenty-one teachers do not meet the highly qualified standards. Seventy-six percent (76.2%) of these teachers meets the standards of highly qualified. The chart below outlines the number of teachers at each grade level, the number of teachers considered high qualified and the number of teachers with less than three years experience by grade:

Grade Level	Total Teachers at each Grade	# of Teachers < 3 yrs	# Teachers Highly Qualified	
3 rd Grade	5	3	4	
4 th Grade	5	2	4	
5 th Grade	4	0	3	
6 th Grade	3	1	2	
7 th Grade	4	2	3	
Total	21	8	16	% Considered Highly Qualified 76.19%

D. Employment History of Instructional Staff

I. Total number of days s worked divided by the maximum number of working days

Instructional Staff	Area	Yrs Employed	Highly Qualified	% of Time Actually Worked
Robins, Etta R.	Grade 4	35	Y	93.6%
Crockett, Diane L.	Math	25	Y	93.8%
Doughty, Connie P.	Grade 4	25	Y	95%
Wilkins, Dora	Study Skills	25	Y	91.9%
Hubbard, Catharine	Special Ed	22	Y	89.4%
McAllen, Natalie	Grade 7	20	Y	96.6%
Miller, Victoria L.	Gifted	19	Y	93.6%
Smith, Kimberly A.	Grade 2	17	Y	89.7%
Spady, Susanne M.	Kindergarten	15	Y	95.5%
Marsh, Heather C.	Grade 3	13.5	Y	88%
West, Cheli N.	Grade 1	12.5	Y	91.6%
Scott, Howard H.	Grade 3	12	Y	92.5%
Driscoll, Patricia C.	Grade K	10	Y	92.2%
Lewis, Terry	Grade PK	7	Y	91.6%

Stewart, John D.	Grade 5	6	Y	94.7%
Panek, Susan C.	Reading Coach	5	Y	88.8%
Peterson, Charles	Grade 6 and 7	5	Y	93.8%
Sweeney, Cathy P.	Special Ed	4	Y	88%
Castro, Edgardo	ELL	3	Y	90.8%
Hume, Jennifer	Special Edu	3	Y	92.2%
Cridlin, Robin	Kindergarten	3	Y	91.6%
Siegrist, Aaron	Grade 5	3	N	95.2%
Bell Stacie	Grade 6	3	Y	91%
Yosay, Dulce	Grade 2	2	Y	97.2%
Glenn, Kathleen	Grade 2	2	Y	89.4%
Reiter, Brandon	Grade 3	2	Y	86.3%
Miller, Stacey	Grade 3	2	N	98.3%
Jurado, Carmelita	Special Ed	1.5	N	96.9%
Clements, Katie	SPED 4th Grade	1	Y	93.3%
Ellis, Caitlin	Pre-K	1	N	93.3%
English, Mary	Sp Education	1	Y	80.2%
Francis, Lauren	Special Ed	1	Y	91%
Lynch, Colleen	Special Ed	1	Y	93.8%
Owens, Shantell	Grade 7	1	N	92.2%
Peterson, Kimberly	Grade 6	1	Y	90.5%
Ramsey, Erica	Grade 1	1	Y	89.7%
Ruby, Michael	Grade 4	1	Y	96.3%
Srodek, Danita	Reading Teacher	1	Y	94%
Stockton, Kellie	Grade 2	1	N	95.5%
Trierwaler, Lyndsey	Kindergarten	1	N	91.9%
Van Trieste, Monica	Grade 1	1	Y	92.5%
Ward, Austin	Grade 6/7	1	N	91.6%
Gillmore, Jill	Reading Interv 6	1	Y	95.2%

E. Graduation Rate

N/A

F. Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total Students	Attendance Rate
American Indian	0	0	0	
Asian	3	2	5	
Black	121	135	256	
Hispanic	53	46	99	
White	87	73	160	
Disability Status	56	28	84	
LEP Status	35	43	78	
Migrant Status	29	37	66	
Homeless Status	46	41	87	
Economically Disadvantaged	203	196	399	
Total Enrolled Students			520	
School's Overall Attendance Average				95.7%

G. Physical Plant/School

Kiptopeke Elementary School was opened in 1993. It has 31 interior classrooms with an exterior modular unit added in 2007. This modular unit houses 6 classrooms and was added to accommodate the return of grades six (6) and (7) to the elementary school after the closing of our middle school.

The Media Center is approximately 1500 sq. ft. in size and houses a collection of 14,537 books which equates to about 22 books per student. The cafeteria is approximately 2,000 square feet in size and seats 250 students. Our gym is approximately 2,400 square feet in size and doubles as our auditorium for assemblies and other special activities. It is equipped with a stage area that measures about 200 square feet in size. The outside playground area is over 4 acres in size. It includes a fenced in area for our pre k and kindergarten students equipped with playground equipment appropriate for their age and size.

H. Minutes in the School Year

Kiptopeke Elementary School provides 71,070 regular instructional school minutes to its students. As well, our students receives 1,680 minutes of additional instruction through our after school programs. A summer school program is provided annually and provides an additional 4,560 minutes of enrichment and remedial instruction.

I. Days Worked

(See Chart “D” - % of Time Teachers Actually Worked)

J. Technology

The following technologies are available to students and instructional staff at Kiptopeke Elementary School:

- 2 computer labs,
- 2 stations in each classroom,
- Student Response Systems (clickers)
- 2 portable whiteboards,
- 3 computer carts w/ 20 laptops each
- Personal laptops for every teachers
- Elmo’s
- LCD projectors
- Various Assistive Technology Tools (Reading Pens, Audio Books, other communication devices)

K. Annual Goals

- 1) Analyzed SOL benchmark data to determine successes and areas of need looking closely at the subgroups.
- 2) Developed a system for the sharing of instructional practices within grade level meetings that will result in gains in student learning.

L. Goals established for Accountability of Tier III Schools

- 1) Completion of a monthly coach report of technical assistance.
 - a. Included components:
 - i. Current month action steps with reported progress;
 - b. Included Action Steps:
 - i. Implement specific strategies to develop school culture;
- 2) Continue to develop the essential processes and practices of the:
 - School Improvement Team
 - Create Data Teams

- Grade Level Meetings
- School Improvement Plan development and monitoring
- Share instructional practices within grade level meetings that have resulted in gains in student learning;
- Use blueprints for instructional planning
- Conduct daily walk-throughs to provide support and encouragement for teachers.
- Benchmark testing will be conducted every six (6) weeks.
- Teachers continue to use the 5 block daily review to monitor student progress and address needs.
- Teachers continue to provide a daily SOL type review to better prepare students for the test process as well as content.
- Monitor CII website and update tasks.
- After school tutoring, as well as a breakfast club and lunch group of targeted students, continue to provide instruction in areas of weakness.
- Resource staff continues to provide data driven instruction in small group settings.
- Implement school-wide data meetings.
- Implement Response to Intervention (RTI)
- Review benchmarks to identify trends and remediate as appropriate.

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:

Our overall goal is to implement specific strategies to develop a school culture that will improve and enhance student and staff performance.

Interventions	Indicator of Implementation	Procedures for Evaluating Indicators of Implementation
1) Employ Data Coach as required for Tier III schools in School Improvement. a. Data Coaches will be employed prior to June 30, 2010.	1) Candidates for the Data Coach position will meet with the building principal and the superintendent to determine suitability for the position. 2) Data Coach will meet with the 1003g grant writing committee to provide expertise for intervention strategies.	1. The superintendent and principals will announce the selected data coach and present the name and the position before the school board for approval. 2. The coaches will meet twice weekly as prescheduled by the grant writing committee to offer suggestions and input.
2) Data Coach will work collaboratively with instructional staff to facilitate data discussions and foster a culture of collegiality.	1) Data Coach will train in the effective use of data analysis practices. 2) The services of a consultant proficient in the analysis of data will facilitate a modeling/coaching session on the use of data to drive instruction for the data coach and the administration. 3) Data Coach will assist teachers in using various types of data to inform instruction (RTI, ESD, SOL, PALS, benchmark and teacher-made assessments).	1) Data Coaches will attend the summer institute and additional professional development opportunities that will equip them with skills to analyze data. 2) Suggestions from DOE specialists will be solicited for a resource to provide assistance to data coaches and the administrators. The principal will assess the effectiveness of the training and arrange following up assistance as needed. 3) Attendance at RTI training for administrators and school teams. Participation in staff development activities with Staff Development for Educators on data analysis.

	<p>4) Data Coach will analyze SOL data looking for trends, strengths, and weaknesses as well as student performance by questions.</p> <p>A summary of the data will be presented to the staff during the Back to School week of September 7-10, 2010.</p> <p>Data Portfolios specific to grade levels and teachers will be presented to teachers.</p> <p>Data Coaches will assist teachers at each grade levels in developing “SMART” goals addressing deficits identified.</p> <p>5) Create school Data Teams using the Data Coach as facilitator.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Analyze and discuss grade level data trends and instructional practices (Data Based Decision Making) b. Weekly data discussion at grade level meetings. 	<p>4) The principal will analyze the effectiveness of the SOL Data presentation and provide feedback to the data coaches on next steps.</p> <p>Teachers in attendance for the SOL Data presentation will be documented.</p> <p>Portfolios will be reviewed with the principal and assistant principal prior to the distribution to the staff for recommendations.</p> <p>SMART instructional goals and objectives will be included in the data portfolios maintained by teachers.</p> <p>5) The principal will ensure that the data teams are formed and meeting regularly as indicated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Two Data teams will be created: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PreK-K-1-2 team 2. 3-4-5-6-7 team II. The teams will meet bimonthly. III. Meetings will be documented.
<p>3) Provide professional staff development to teachers on the effective use of Study Island as a tool for the provision of web-based instruction, practice, assessment and reporting of content subject matter.</p>	<p>1) Teachers will begin using the Study Island Reading and Math instructional tool to provide remedial and supplemental services to students in core areas in grades 4-7 during the Core Extension period..</p>	<p>1) Administrators will conduct weekly walkthrough assessments to judge the degree to which teachers are using Study Island to improve learning opportunities for children.</p>

		<p>Administrators and teachers will review and analyze student work samples, teacher made assessments, and benchmark results to determine which students are in need of additional support through Study Island.</p> <p>Based on the data, administrators and/or data coach or teacher mentor will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the team’s common planning period.</p>
<p>4) Implementation of Response to Intervention for grades PK-5.</p>	<p>1) A team of teachers, the Data Coach and the administration will attend their first professional conference and training on RTI to be held on June 21 and 22 in Virginia Beach.</p> <p>An additional training on September 27-29, 2010 in Wrightsville, NC.</p> <p>2) The Data Coach will facilitate the training, support and use of the AIMS Web.</p> <p>3) The Data Coach will assist in the universal screening of students to identify those with early reading problems.</p> <p>4) The Data Coach will track and record the data for sharing with teachers and administration.</p> <p>5) Data Coaches will assist with the</p>	<p>1) Within two weeks of teachers returning from their summer break the committee will present to the staff critical information from the RTI conference in Virginia Beach. The team will train other teachers and staff members on the strategies.</p> <p>2) Within two weeks of returning from the RTI conference in Wrightsville, NC, the committee will present to the staff at KES. The Data Coach will begin use of AIMS Web for data tracking and reporting purposes.</p>

	<p>development of appropriate research based instructional interventions for each RTI tier.</p> <p>6) The Data Coach will use data monitoring folders to provide strategic and progress monitoring of students successes to teachers.</p> <p>7) The Data Coach will monitor and ensure fidelity to the Response to Intervention process.</p>	
5) Judi Wandres will facilitate a professional staff development for teachers on the Four Square Writing process. This training will occur on August 31, and September 1. Teacher in grades K through grade 8 will participate.	1) Teachers will begin implementing the strategies learned in the Four Square workshop in their class instruction daily.	1) The principal and the assistant will analyze the effectiveness of the writing workshop and provide feedback to the consultant and teachers. They will determine the next steps and seek the assistance of the Mentor teacher to assist with additional follow-up and training on the Four Square strategies.
6) Curriculum Writing for English: Reading/Writing	<p>1) A core of English teachers will begin the writing of the English: Reading/Writing curriculum for K-7 instruction beginning July 19-23, 2010.</p> <p>2) Curriculum writing for English: Reading/Writing will continue throughout the 2010-11 school year on early release and staff development days.</p>	<p>1) The administrative staff will participate and oversee the writing of the curriculum during the week of July 19.</p> <p>2) Principals and administrative staff will oversee the continued writing of the English: Reading/Writing curriculum.</p>
7) Implement Teach First Formative Assessment	1) The principal, data coach, reading coach and the division representative will attend the 2010 Summer Institute: Use of TeachFirst Formative Assessment Platform.	1) The administrative staff will use the TeachFirst Formative Assessment Platform to improve instruction for students.
8) Writing of the 2010-2011 School	1) The data coach will assist school	1) The principal will submit a completed

Improvement Plan	leadership in writing and implementing the school improvement plan as a member of the School Improvement Team by October 1, 2010.	copy of the school improvement plan to central administration and place a copy on their website.
9) Increase collaborative time for teachers and extended school day programs for increased instructional time for students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The instructional school day for students at KES will begin at 7:50 a.m. and end at 3:25 p.m. adding 30 additional instructional minutes to the school day. 2) Provision of a Jump Start program for grades K-6 providing corrective teaching for 4 hours per day for 15 days in the areas of reading and math. 3) During common planning periods, teachers will collaboratively use student data to create lesson plans and share to share best practice instructional strategies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The principal will ensure that additional minutes are used exclusively for instruction. The daily schedule will reflect the time changes in the instructional day. 2) Using scholastic data derived from the student's report card and daily performance and the student's performance on the SOL assessment, participants for the Jump Start program will be identified. 3) Administrators will review lesson plans and team meeting notes to judge the degree in which student data has been used to drive instruction. Administrators and teachers will review and analyze student work samples, assessments, and reports from benchmark assessment proficiency reports to assess the impact on achievement. Based on the data, administrators will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the teacher's common planning period.
10) By mid October, administrators, data coach and teachers will use student data to collaboratively develop a list of students who shall participate in	1) Teachers will determine which students require remediation based on the student's work and other student data. These students will participate in the	1) During common planning periods and/or the early release day once a month, administrators and teachers will monitor and measure student progress

<p>remediation. Beginning in late fall, remediation will be provided to students after school for two days a week.</p>	<p>supplemental after school services provided through Title 1 funding.</p>	<p>by analyzing student work, assessments, and benchmark assessments.</p> <p>Based on the data teachers will provide additional intervention and remediation activities to students. The administrators and the data coach will provide mentoring, modeling, and coaching during planning periods and early release days to teachers.</p>
<p>11) Teachers will collaboratively incorporate rigor and relevance into their daily lessons using the necessary curriculum tools.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Coach and mentor teachers to ensure lessons and classroom activities provide a variety of instructional strategies and grouping practices that engage students and allow multiple pathways for students to master the curriculum. 2) Model and demonstrate effective lessons for teachers to improve teaching practices. 3) Assist teachers with the implementation of the newly created language arts and math curriculum. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The principal and assistant will conduct and analyze walkthrough data to judge the degree in which rigor and relevance have been incorporated into their lessons. <p>Administrators and teachers will review and analyze student work samples, class assessments, and benchmark assessment results to assess the impact on achievement. Based on the data, administrator, data coach and teacher mentor will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the teacher's common planning period.</p>
<p>12) The Reading Coaches/Tutors along with the administrators will analyze various testing data to plan appropriate literacy interventions for designated students. This will occur during the month of July 2010.</p> <p>Once a week during the team planning period throughout the school year, the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Teachers will begin to incorporate a variety of literacy strategies in daily instruction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Reading Coach will collect and review student assessment and testing data. The principal will review this data and provide feedback and support via mentoring and coaching as needed. <p>Administrators and the Literacy Coach will conduct walk-throughs on a weekly basis to ensure the proposed strategies</p>

<p>Reading/Literacy Coach will collaborate with teachers to develop lesson plans that contain effective usage of literacy strategies – vocabulary and comprehension - and interventions (READ 180, Houghton Mifflin).</p>		<p>have been implemented. To assess the impact on learning administrators and teachers will analyze samples of student work, teacher made assessments, and benchmark assessments during common team planning periods.</p> <p>Based on the data, the literacy coach will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the common team planning period.</p>
<p>13) The Math Tutor along with the administrators will analyze various testing data to plan appropriate math interventions for designated students. This will occur during the month of September 2010.</p> <p>Once a week during the team planning period throughout the school year, the data coach will collaborate with teachers to develop lesson plans that contain effective strategies for teaching math skills.</p>	<p>1) Teachers will begin to incorporate a variety of math strategies in their daily instruction</p>	<p>1) The Math Tutor will collect and review student assessments and testing data. The principal will review this data and will provide feedback and support via mentoring and coaching as needed.</p> <p>Administrators and data coach will conduct walk-throughs on a weekly basis to ensure the proposed strategies have been implemented.</p> <p>To assess the impact on learning administrators and teachers will analyze samples of student work, teacher made assessments, and benchmark assessments during common team planning periods.</p> <p>Based on the data, the data coach will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the common team planning period.</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Occohannock Elementary

Student Subgroup	2007-2008 Passed	2008-2009 Passed
English Performance		
All Students	76	78
Black	69	69
Hispanic	71	78
White	85	89
Students with Disabilities	50	60
Economically Disadvantaged	70	72
Limited English Proficient	74	79
Mathematics Performance		
All Students	82	79
Black	72	67
Hispanic	81	86
White	93	93
Students with Disabilities	53	54
Economically Disadvantaged	77	73
Limited English Proficient	83	82

**Assessment Results
Proficiency Level by Subgroup**

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 3								
All Students	22	47	69	31	21	41	62	38
Female	26	57	83	17	17	60	77	23
Male	19	38	57	43	24	24	48	52
Black	9	53	63	38	6	48	55	45
Hispanic	18	55	73	27	<	<	<	<
White	38	38	76	24	48	38	86	14
Students with Disabilities	17	25	42	58	9	45	55	45
Economically Disadvantaged	19	48	67	33	13	42	54	46
Limited English Proficient	17	58	75	25	<	<	<	<
Migrant	20	60	80	20	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 3								
All Students	37	46	83	17	31	52	83	17
Female	41	47	88	12	26	55	81	19
Male	32	46	78	22	35	50	85	15
Black	26	52	77	23	18	56	74	26
Hispanic	36	45	82	18	<	<	<	<
White	48	41	90	10	50	45	95	5
Students with Disabilities	25	33	58	42	0	67	67	33
Economically Disadvantaged	32	51	83	17	20	60	80	20
Limited English Proficient	42	42	83	17	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 4								
All Students	37	45	82	18	28	40	68	32
Female	42	42	84	16	30	55	85	15
Male	33	48	80	20	25	25	50	50
Black	26	50	76	24	4	43	46	54
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	30	60	90	10
White	52	41	93	7	52	30	81	19
Students with Disabilities	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Economically								
Disadvantaged	21	50	71	29	20	40	60	40
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	27	64	91	9
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	40	50	90	10	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 4								
All Students	30	48	77	23	23	50	73	27
Female	32	48	81	19	27	61	88	12
Male	28	48	75	25	18	39	58	42
Black	12	56	68	32	14	39	54	46
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	0	90	90	10
White	52	37	89	11	39	46	86	14
Students with Disabilities	<	<	<	<	20	40	60	40
Economically								
Disadvantaged	14	52	67	33	9	57	65	35
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	0	91	91	9
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 5								
All Students	21	57	79	21	20	67	87	13
Female	21	69	90	10	15	81	96	4
Male	22	47	69	31	24	57	81	19
Black	13	56	69	31	16	66	81	19
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
White	35	54	88	12	25	68	93	7
Asian	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	9	36	45	55	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	13	60	73	28	13	68	80	20
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
English: Writing Grade 5								
All Students	16	67	84	16	9	58	67	33
Female	28	62	90	10	8	73	81	19
Male	6	72	78	22	10	49	59	41
Black	6	65	71	29	12	48	61	39
Hispanic	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
White	26	70	96	4	4	71	75	25
Asian	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	10	69	79	21	5	47	53	47
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 5								
All Students	41	44	85	15	51	36	87	13
Female	45	45	90	10	37	48	85	15
Male	38	44	81	19	60	29	88	12
Black	28	44	72	28	34	44	78	22

Hispanic	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
White	50	50	100	0	71	25	96	4
Asian	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	0	55	55	45	<	<	<	<
Economically Disadvantaged	33	48	80	20	37	44	80	20
Limited English Proficient	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<
Migrant	<	<	<	<	<	<	<	<

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: Reading Grade 6								
All Students	-	-	-	-	26	58	84	16
Female	-	-	-	-	35	58	92	8
Male	-	-	-	-	19	58	77	23
Black	-	-	-	-	14	62	76	24
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	42	50	92	8
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	10	40	50	50
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	12	68	80	20
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Mathematics Grade 6								
All Students	-	-	-	-	55	29	84	16
Female	-	-	-	-	58	31	88	12
Male	-	-	-	-	52	28	79	21
Black	-	-	-	-	41	30	70	30
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	63	33	96	4
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	30	20	50	50
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	49	28	77	23
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<

Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Student Subgroup	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail

English: Reading Grade 7

All Students	-	-	-	-	32	60	91	9
Female	-	-	-	-	33	64	97	3
Male	-	-	-	-	29	54	83	17
Black	-	-	-	-	14	71	86	14
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	79	21	100	0
Asian	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically								
Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	21	67	88	12
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<

Mathematics Grade 7

All Students	-	-	-	-	8	47	55	45
Female	-	-	-	-	14	48	62	38
Male	-	-	-	-	0	47	47	53
Black	-	-	-	-	4	43	46	54
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
White	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Economically								
Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	9	44	53	47
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Migrant	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<

B. Summary Analysis of Data (Occohannock Elementary)

Occohannock Elementary School is in its second year of school improvement. The school did not make the AYP benchmark in English: Reading. A review of the performance of all students at Occohannock Elementary shows a two percent pass rate increase from 2007 to 2008. The school's overall performance by subgroups in the area of English: Reading shows that all subgroups except the subgroup of black students recorded pass percentage gains. The performance of our black students remained static at sixty-nine percent (69%). Performance increases of all other subgroups are represented as follows: white subgroup (+4%) increase; Hispanic subgroup (+7%) increase; Students with Disabilities (+10%) increase; Economically Disadvantaged students (+2%) increase; and Limited English Proficient students (+5%) increase.

The school's performance rates in the area of Math show a slight decline of three percent (-3%) for all students from 2007 to 2008. This decline was recorded in all groups except the subgroup of white students whose performance remained static at ninety-three percent (93%), the Hispanic subgroup whose performance increased by five percent (+5%) and the students with disabilities whose performance increased by one percent (+1%). Declines were recorded in the pass rate of the black students who recorded a negative five percent (-5%) in their pass rate, the economically disadvantaged students who recorded a decline of four percent (-4%) in their pass rate, and the Limited English Proficient students who saw a decline of one percent (-1%) in their pass rate.

Grade 3 Data Analysis

An analysis of the subgroup performance for our grade 3 students on their English: Reading SOL shows all subgroups recording lower pass percentage rates except our subgroup of white students who recorded an increase pass rate of ten percent (+10%). Our subgroup of students with disabilities and our economically disadvantaged students recorded pass rates lowered by thirteen percent (-13%). The pass rate for our subgroup of black students was eight percent (-8%) lower when compared to their performance from the previous year. The pass rate for our male students was nine percent (9%) lower than the previous year. As well, our female students saw a pass rate decrease of six percent (-6%). The overall pass rate performance in English: Reading for our third grade class was seven percent (-7%) lower than their pass rate from the previous year. While any and all declines in student performance is of concern, the most glaring concern lies in the significant achievement gaps existing between our subgroups of students. The subgroup of white students consistently out performs all other subgroups by thirty-one (+31%) to thirty-two (+32%) percent.

A comparative analysis of the third grade students shows that their performance in Math did not change from one year to the next. The classes' overall pass performance is placed at the eighty-third percentile (83%) for the second consecutive year. While the overall performance of this group remained static, there was significant fluctuation in the individual performance of the subgroup. Our white subgroup of students saw a five percent (+5%) increase in their pass performance rate. Students with disabilities also recorded pass performance increases of nine percent (+9%) for the year. Our male students improved their overall pass performance by a seven percent (+7) increase. All other subgroups recorded declines in their overall performance (female students

(-7%), black students (-3%), and economically disadvantaged students (-3%). Again, the significant difference between the subgroup of white students when compared to all other subgroups ranged between fifteen (15%) to twenty-eight (28%) percent.

Grade 4 – Data Analysis

The pass performance rate of the fourth grade students on the English: Reading SOL showed a decline of fourteen percent (-14%) from 2007 to 2008. All subgroups except the female students saw a decline in their pass rate success. The pass rate of our female students was increased by one percent (+1%). Subgroups recording declines were: male students and black students who recorded a thirty percent (-30%) decline, white students reported a decline of twelve percent (-12%) and our economically disadvantaged students recorded a decline of eleven percent (-11%). The subgroups making up the Hispanic students and the Limited English Proficient students recorded pass rates of ninety percent (90%) and ninety-one percent (91%) respectively. Their performance exceeded all other subgroups by a range of nine (9%) to forty-six percent (46%).

Much like their overall performance on the English: Reading SOL, the grade 4 students again, reported declined pass rates in the area of Math. Their performance on the Math SOL netted a four percent (-4%) loss. Again, the only subgroup to record gains in the pass category was the female students, whose pass rate increased by seven percent (+7%). Male students recorded a decline of seventeen percent (-17%). Black students recorded a decline in their pass rate of fourteen percent (-14%), while our white students recorded a performance decline of three percent (-3%) and our economically disadvantaged students recorded a decline of two percent (-2%).

Again, the Hispanic and Limited English Proficient subgroups out-performed all other subgroups on the 2008 Math SOL assessment. They produced a pass rate that was four percent (4%) higher than our white subgroup of students. They out-performed our subgroup of black students by thirty-six percent (36%), our students with disabilities by thirty percent (30%) and our economically disadvantaged subgroup by twenty-five percent (25%).

Grade 5 – Data Analysis

The Grade 5 English: Reading and Math pass proficiency rates showed positive gains. The overall pass rate for this class on the English: Reading SOL was 87%, reflecting an increase of twelve percent (+12%) from 2007 to 2008. The greatest gains occurred with our male subgroup of students and our subgroup of black students, who recorded a pass percentage increase of twelve percent (+12%). Our subgroup of white students recorded a pass proficiency increase of five percent (+5%); our economically disadvantaged students saw an increase of seven percent (+7%); and our female subgroup recorded an increased performance of six percent (+6%). While achievement gaps continue to exist between subgroups, the gaps on this SOL assessment are smaller than those seen at other grade levels.

The Writing performance for this grade of students showed significant declines in their pass rate. The overall pass rate for all students in grade 5 showed a decline of seventeen percent (-17%). The subgroup least affected by this significant decline in their pass rate were the female students who recorded a pass performance rate nine percent (-9%) less than the previous year. Students

making up the subgroup of black students recorded a ten percent (-10%) decline in their pass rate. While all others recorded the following declines: male subgroup (-19%), White subgroup (-21%), and the economically disadvantaged subgroup (-24%).

The overall pass rate for our Grade 5 students on their Math SOL increased by two percent (+2%), resulting in an overall pass rate of eighty-seven percent (87%) for all students. All but the white subgroup of students recorded performance increases. Our white subgroup of students saw a decreased pass rate of four percent (-4%). The female, black and male subgroups of students recorded improved pass rates of five percent (+5%), six percent (+6%) and seven percent (+7), respectively. The performance of our economically disadvantaged subgroup was unchanged and remained at eighty percent (80%). As seen with other SOL assessments, gaps in the performance of various subgroups were glaring. The white subgroup of students out-performed the subgroup of black students by eighteen percent (18%) and the economically disadvantaged subgroup by sixteen percent (16%).

Grade 6 – Data Analysis

Student performance on the English: Reading grade 6 SOL was placed at the eighty fourth percentile (84%). The female and white subgroups recorded pass rates of ninety-two percent (92%), while the male and the black subgroups recorded pass rates of seventy-seven percent (77%) and seventy-six percent (76%) respectively. The performance of our economically disadvantaged students was at the eighty (80%) percentile.

The Math performance of our grade six (6) students fell at the eighty-fourth (84%) percentile. Individual subgroup pass rates placed the performance of our female students at the eighty-eight percentile (88%); the performance of our male students fell at the seventy-ninth (79%) percentile; the performance of our white subgroup at the ninety-sixth percentile (96%); the performance of the economically disadvantaged subgroup fell at the seventy-seventh percentile (77%); and the performance of our black subgroup at seventy percentile (70%). Again, our white subgroup of students out-performed all other subgroups by a range of eight (8%) to forty-six percent (46%).

Grade 7 – Data Analysis

Students in grade 7 met their English: Reading benchmark at a pass rate of ninety-one percent (91%). The individual performance of each subgroup was impressive with one hundred percent (100%) of students in the white subgroup passing this SOL. The female subgroup passed at a rate of ninety-seven percent (97%). Economically disadvantaged students passed at a rate of eighty-eight percent (88%). The black subgroup passed at a rate of eighty-six percent (86%) and the male subgroup passed at a rate of eighty-three percent (83%). While the white subgroup continues to perform better than other subgroups, the difference in their performance was smaller in this area. The gap ranged from three to seventeen percent (17%).

The overall pass rate for grade 7 students on their Math SOL was fifty-five percent (55%). The female students recorded a pass rate of sixty-two percent (62%); the male subgroup recorded a pass rate of forty-seven percent (47%); the black subgroup recorded a pass rate of forty-six percent (46%) and the economically disadvantaged subgroup recorded a pass rate of fifty-three percent (53%). All pass rates with this SOL were low.

C. Highly Qualified

Grade Level	Total Teachers at each Grade	# of Teachers < 3 yrs	# Teachers Highly Qualified	
3 rd Grade	6	1	5	
4 th Grade	4	1	3	
5 th Grade	4	0	4	
6 th Grade	5	0	5	% Considered Highly Qualified
7 th Grade	3	1	3	
Total	22	3	20	91%

D. Employment History of Instructional Staff

I. Total number of days Teachers worked divided by the maximum number of working days

Teacher	Area	Years Employed	Highly Qualified	% of Time Actually Worked
Smith, Jacquelyn	ELL Migrant Spe	36	Y	86.6%
Gorman, Ann	Grade 2	33	Y	96%
Spady, Elizabeth	Grade 2	31	Y	90%
Taylor, Mary	Grade 7	30	Y	92%
Robins, Elizabeth	Special Education	29	Y	98.8%
Bisker, Nancy F.	Grade 1	28	Y	88%
Hall, Wendy	Reading Coach	26	Y	93.6%
Kellam, Donald	Physical Education	24	Y	95.5%
James, Sallie	Reading Specialist	26	Y	91.3%
Ward, Austin	H&P	22	Y	96%
Kilmon, Linda	Kindergarten	21	Y	99%
Arnold, Lisa K.	Pre-K	21	Y	96.3%
Shaffer, Brenda	Grade 5	21	Y	95%
Brickhouse, Annette	SpEd Incl	20	Y	94.4%
Fritz, Ann	Grade 5	19	Y	92.5%
Buell, Michelle	Grade 3	18	Y	88.8%
Custis, Ann L.	Kindergarten	18	Y	100%

Rippon, Belinda	ICT Facilitator	16	Y	87.2%
Sharbor, Elaine	SpEd Inclusion	16	Y	96%
Smith, Beth A.	Preschool	16	Y	95.2%
McGowan, Laura	Art	16	Y	94%
Lilliston, Stephanie	Gifted	15	Y	83.6%
Kellam, Susan	Grade 2	14	Y	90.5%
Rippon, Jennifer	Grade 6	12	Y	95.8%
Thornes, Beth B.	Grade 5	11	Y	95.8%
Leland, Trinity R.	Grade 1	11	Y	91.6%
Smith, Haley	Special Education	8	Y	90.2%
Diaz, Kimberly	ESL	7	Y	92.7%
Fitzgerald, Tiffani	Grade 4	7	Y	93.3%
Powers, Diane	Grade 6/7	6	Y	91.9%
Sayers, Jenae	Kindergarten	6	Y	95%
Dineen, Karrie L.	Grade 2	6	Y	96%
Garvis, Heather D	SpEd Inclusion	5.5	Y	100%
Millward, Sandra	Grade 1	5	Y	92.5%
Nottingham, Peggy	Grade 3	4	Y	97%
Holley, Darnell	Grade 4	4	Y	100%
Bryan, Joan	Early Child SpEd	1	N	93.6%
Maristela, Honorina	Grade 3	3	Y	89.4%
Leffel, Karen	Grade 6	3	Y	92.5%
Byrd, L'Tanya	Special Education	1.5	Y	100%
Llanto, JadeMarie	Special Education	2.5	Y	93.1%
Owens, Laura	Band	2	Y	88.8%
James, Leslie	Grade 6	2	Y	93.3%
Boyd, Diana	Grade 1	2	Y	92.7%
Cusimano, Dawn	Grade 7	1	Y	96%
Smith, Milena	Kindergarten	1	N	92%
Arnold, Amanda	Grade 3	1	N	98.3%
Stolz, Jamie	Grade 4	1	N	97.5%

E. Graduation Rate

N/A

F. Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total Students	Attendance Rate
American Indian	0	0	0	
Asian	3	1	4	
Black	160	131	291	
Hispanic	31	23	54	
White	110	97	207	
Disability Status	68	24	92	
LEP Status	18	21	39	
Migrant Status	8	11	19	
Homeless Status	31	28	59	
Economically Disadvantaged	218	172	390	
Total Enrolled Students			556	
School's Overall Attendance Average				94.6%

G. Physical Plant/School

Ocohanock Elementary School was opened in 1993. It has 40 full time classrooms to include classrooms in a modular unit. This modular unit was added in 2008. This modular unit houses 6 classrooms and was added to accommodate the return of grades six (6) and (7) to the elementary school after the closing of our middle school.

The Media Center is approximately 1500 sq. ft. in size and houses a collection of 11,000 books chosen to support the curriculum and provide books for the reading enjoyment of our students in grades PK-7. Our Professional Collection and our Reference Collections are included in this number. There are also over 150 big books for teacher use. Our collection of video is at 850. We have a host of other audio-visual materials to enhance instruction. The library houses a computer workstation of 3 computers and has three (3) stand alone computers for use.

The cafeteria is approximately 2,000 square feet in size and seats 250 students. Our gym is approximately 2,400 square feet in size and doubles as our auditorium for assemblies and other special activities. It is equipped with a stage area that measures about 200 square feet in size. OES provides an upper and lower grade playground area.

H. Minutes in the School Year

Occohannock Elementary School provides 71,070 regular instructional school minutes to its students. As well, our students receives 1,680 minutes of additional instruction through our after school programs. A summer school program is provided annually and provides an additional 4,560 minutes of enrichment and remedial instruction.

I. Days Worked

(See Chart “D” - % of Time Teachers Actually Worked)

J. Technology

The following technologies are available to students and instructional staff at Occohannock Elementary School:

- 1 computer lab with 30 computers
- 2 stations in each classroom,
- Student Response Systems (clickers)
- 2 portable smartboards,
- 1 Promethean Board
- 6 computer carts w/ 20 laptops each
- Personal laptops for every teacher
- 2 computers in each classroom
- Elmo’s
- LCD projectors
- Various Assistive Technology Tools (Reading Pens, Audio Books, other communication devices)

K. Annual Goals

- 1) To increase the use of data to make instructional decisions.
- 2) To focus on small group instruction with differentiation, formative assessment, pre-testing to determine levels of differentiation and response to intervention.

L. Goals established for Accountability of Tier III Schools

- Academic Achievement Team
- Create Data Teams
- Creation of a Virtual Data Wall
- Continuation of RTI
- Grade level meetings (which must include data analysis and instructional sharing)
- School Improvement Plan development and maintenance through the CII site
- Monthly Coach/Auditor Reports of Technical Assistance with current action steps and reported progress include:
 - Increase focus on walkthroughs and observations by administrators
 - Develop and implement strategies that motivate students to do well on the state assessment
 - Celebrate successes
 - Maintain and monitor the School Improvement Plan on the CII website

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 ultimate objective for **Occohannock Elementary** is to improve student achievement through the use of the 1003g grant funds and by following The Virginia Model for school improvement. Employing this model, a full time data coach has been hired to work collaboratively with the school administrators and staff to implement the school improvement plan and to foster a culture of collegiality. The goal is to foster change in our building in order to improve and enhance student and staff performance.

Interventions	Indicator of Implementation	Procedures for Evaluating Indicators of Implementation
<p>1) Employ Data Coach as required for Tier III schools in School Improvement.</p> <p>a. Data Coaches will be employed prior to June 30, 2010.</p>	<p>1) Candidates for the Data Coach position will meet with the building principal and the superintendent to determine suitability for the position.</p> <p>2) Data Coach will meet with the 1003g grant writing committee to provide expertise for intervention strategies.</p>	<p>1) The superintendent and principals will announce the selected data coach and present the name and the position before the school board for approval.</p> <p>2) The coaches will meet twice weekly as prescheduled by the grant writing committee to offer suggestions and input.</p>
<p>2) Data Coach will work collaboratively with instructional staff to facilitate data discussions and foster a culture of collegiality.</p>	<p>1) Data Coach will train in the effective use of data analysis practices.</p> <p>Four one-day division trainings, webinars, and video conferencing will provide further training in the analyzing of data.</p> <p>2) The services of a consultant proficient in the analysis of data will facilitate a modeling/coaching session on the use of data to drive instruction for the data coach and the administration.</p> <p>3) Data Coach will assist teachers in using various types of data to inform instruction (RTI, ESD, SOL, PALS, benchmark and teacher-made assessments).</p>	<p>1) Data Coaches will attend the July summer institute and additional professional development opportunities that will equip them with skills to analyze data.</p> <p>2) Suggestions from DOE specialists will be solicited for a resource to provide assistance to data coaches and the administrators in the effective analyzing of data.</p> <p>The principal will assess the effectiveness of the training and arrange following up assistance as needed.</p> <p>3) Attendance at RTI training for administrators and school teams.</p> <p>Participation in staff development activities with <i>Staff Development for Educators</i> on data analysis.</p>

	<p>4) Data Coach will analyze SOL data looking for trends, strengths, and weaknesses as well as student performance by questions.</p> <p>5) A summary of the SOL data will be presented to the staff during the Back to School week of September 7-10, 2010.</p> <p>6) Data Portfolios specific to grade levels and teachers will be presented to teachers.</p> <p>7) Data Coaches will assist teachers at each grade levels in developing “SMART” goals addressing deficits identified.</p> <p>8) Create school Data Teams using the Data Coach as facilitator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Analyze and discuss grade level data trends and instructional practices (Data Based Decision Making) b. Weekly data discussion at grade level meetings. 	<p>4) The principal will analyze the effectiveness of the SOL Data presentation and provide feedback to the data coaches on next steps.</p> <p>5) Teacher attendance and participation in the SOL Data presentation will be documented through a sign in sheet.</p> <p>6) The data coach will review the data portfolios with administration prior to distribution to staff.</p> <p>7) “SMART” instructional goals and objectives will be created for inclusion in the data portfolios maintained by teachers.</p> <p>8) The principal will ensure that the data teams are formed and meeting regularly as indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Two Data teams will be created b. PreK-K-1-2 team c. 3-4-5-6-7 team d. The teams will meet bimonthly. e. Meetings will be documented.
<p>3) Provide professional staff development to teachers on the effective use of Study Island as a tool for the provision of web-based instruction, practice, assessment and reporting of content subject matter.</p>	<p>1) Teachers will begin using the Study Island Reading and Math instructional tool to provide remedial and supplemental services to students in core areas in grades 4-7 during the Core Extension period..</p>	<p>1) Administrators will conduct weekly walkthrough assessments to judge the degree to which teachers are using Study Island to improve learning opportunities for children.</p> <p>Administrators and teachers will review</p>

		<p>and analyze student work samples, teacher made assessments, and benchmark results to determine which students are in need of additional support through Study Island.</p> <p>Based on the data, administrators and/or data coach or teacher mentor will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the team's common planning period.</p>
<p>4) Further expansion of Response to Intervention strategies to Pre-K students in Literacy; Pre-K-1 students in math.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A team of teachers along with the data coach will implement RTI strategies for early intervention with pre kindergarten students in the area of literacy and pre-kindergarten to 1st grade students in math. 2) The Data Coach will assist with the input and compilation of data to be entered in AIMS Web. 3) The Data Coach will assist in the universal screening of students to identify those with early reading and math problems. 4) The Data Coach will track and record the data for sharing with teachers and administration. 5) Data Coaches will assist with the development of appropriate research based instructional interventions for each RTI tier. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The data team will meet monthly to analyze AIMS Web data and determine appropriate interventions and supports. Documented through a log or agenda

	<p>6) The Data Coach will use data monitoring folders to provide strategic and progress monitoring of students successes to teachers.</p> <p>7) The Data Coach will monitor and ensure fidelity to the Response to Intervention process.</p>	
<p>5) Judi Wandres will facilitate a professional staff development for teachers on the Four Square Writing process. This training will occur on August 31, and September 1. Teacher in grades K through grade 8 will participate.</p>	<p>1) Teachers will begin implementing the strategies learned in the Four Square workshop in their class instruction daily.</p>	<p>1) The principal and the assistant will analyze the effectiveness of the writing workshop and provide feedback to the consultant and teachers. They will determine the next steps and seek the assistance of the Mentor teacher to assist with additional follow-up and training on the Four Square strategies.</p>
<p>6) Curriculum Writing for English: Reading/Writing</p>	<p>1) A core of English teachers will begin the writing of the English: Reading/Writing curriculum for K-7 instruction beginning July 19-23, 2010.</p> <p>2) Curriculum writing for English: Reading/Writing will continue throughout the 2010-11 school year on early release and staff development days.</p>	<p>1) The administrative staff will participate and oversee the writing of the curriculum during the week of July 19.</p> <p>2) Principals and administrative staff will oversee the continued writing of the English: Reading/Writing curriculum.</p>
<p>7) Implement TeachFirst Formative Assessment</p>	<p>1) The principal, data coach, reading coach and the division representative will attend the 2010 Summer Institute: Use of TeachFirst Formative Assessment Platform.</p>	<p>1) The administrative staff will use the TeachFirst Formative Assessment Platform to improve instruction for students.</p>
<p>8) Writing of the 2010-2011 School Improvement Plan</p>	<p>1) The data coach will assist school leadership in writing and implementing the school improvement plan as a member of the School Improvement</p>	<p>1) The principal will submit a completed copy of the school improvement plan to central administration and place a copy on their website.</p>

	Team by October 1, 2010.	
9) Increase collaborative time for teachers and extended school day programs for increased instructional time for students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The instructional school day for students at OES will begin at 8:20 a.m. and end at 3:25 p.m. adding 35 additional instructional minutes to the school day. 2) Provision of a Jump Start program for grades K-5 providing corrective teaching for 4 hours per day for 15 days in the areas of reading and math. 3) During common planning periods, teachers will collaboratively use student data to create lesson plans and share to share best practice instructional strategies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The principal will ensure that additional minutes are used exclusively for instruction. The daily schedule will reflect the time changes in the instructional day. 2) Using scholastic data derived from the student's report card and daily performance and the student's performance on the SOL assessment, participants for the Jump Start program will be identified. 3) Administrators will review lesson plans and team meeting notes to judge the degree in which student data has been used to drive instruction. 4) Administrators and teachers will review and analyze student work samples, assessments, and reports from benchmark assessment proficiency reports to assess the impact on achievement. Based on the data, administrators will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the teacher's common planning period.
10) By mid October, administrators, data coach and teachers will use student data to collaboratively develop a list of students who shall participate in remediation. Beginning in late fall,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Teachers will determine which students require remediation based on the student's work and other student data. These students will participate in the supplemental after school services 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) During common planning periods and/or the early release day once a month, administrators and teachers will monitor and measure student progress by analyzing student work,

<p>remediation will be provided to students after school for two days a week.</p>	<p>provided through Title 1 funding.</p>	<p>common assessments, and benchmark assessments.</p> <p>Based on the data teachers will provide additional intervention and remediation activities to students. The administrators and the data coach will provide mentoring, modeling, and coaching during planning periods and early release days to teachers.</p>
<p>11) Teachers will collaboratively incorporate rigor and relevance into their daily lessons using the necessary curriculum tools.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To coach and mentor teachers to ensure lessons and classroom activities provide a variety of instructional strategies and grouping practices that engage students and allow multiple pathways for students to master the curriculum. 2) Model and demonstrate effective lessons for teachers to improve teaching practices. 3) Assist teachers with the implementation of the newly created language arts and math curriculum. 4) Purchase math manipulatives to be used as teachers implement the new curriculum. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The principal and assistant will conduct and analyze walkthrough data to judge the degree in which rigor and relevance have been incorporated into their lessons. <p>Administrators and teachers will review and analyze student work samples, class assessments, and benchmark assessment results to assess the impact on achievement. Based on the data, administrator, data coach and teacher mentor will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the teacher's common planning period.</p>
<p>12) The Reading Coaches/Tutors along with the administrators will analyze various testing data to plan appropriate literacy interventions for designated students. This will occur during the month of July 2010 and throughout the school year.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The reading tutor will provide individual and small group remediation for students identified by RTI assessments as being below the 25% in reading in grades K-5. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Reading Coach will collect and review student assessment and testing data. The principal will review this data and provide feedback and support via mentoring and coaching as needed.

<p>Once a week during the team planning period throughout the school year, the Reading/Literacy Coach will collaborate with teachers to develop lesson plans that contain effective usage of literacy strategies – vocabulary and comprehension - and interventions (READ 180, Houghton Mifflin).</p>	<p>2) The reading coach will review and advise teachers on appropriate literacy strategies to include in their daily lesson plans to improve instruction for students.</p>	<p>Administrators and the Literacy Coach will conduct walk-throughs on a weekly basis to ensure the proposed strategies have been implemented.</p> <p>To assess the impact on learning administrators and teachers will analyze samples of student work, teacher made assessments, and benchmark assessments during common team planning periods.</p> <p>Based on the data, the literacy coach will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the common team planning period.</p>
<p>13) The Math Tutors along with the administrators will analyze various testing data to plan appropriate math interventions for designated students. This will occur during the month of September 2010.</p> <p>Once a week during the team planning period throughout the school year, the Math Tutor will collaborate with teachers to develop lesson plans that contain effective strategies for teaching math skills.</p>	<p>1) The math tutor will provide individual and small group remediation for students identified by RTI assessments as being below the 25% in math in grades Pre-K-1.</p> <p>2) The math tutors will review and advise teachers on appropriate math strategies to include in their daily lesson plans to improve instruction for students.</p>	<p>1) The Math Tutors will collect and review student assessments and testing data. The principal will review this data and will provide feedback and support via mentoring and coaching as needed.</p> <p>Administrators and the Math Tutors will conduct walk-throughs on a weekly basis to ensure the proposed strategies have been implemented.</p> <p>To assess the impact on learning administrators and teachers will analyze samples of student work, teacher made assessments, and benchmark assessments during common team planning periods.</p>

		Based on the data, the math coach will provide additional support such as mentoring, modeling, and coaching during the common team planning period.
--	--	---

- 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:

Mark NA, if applicable

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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:

- The division and the schools will continue the use of the Indistar School Improvement tool to help sustain our improvements and to continue to track our school improvement efforts. The schools will continue
- The schools will continue to implement the skills, strategies and resources learned through the TeachFirst Formative Assessment format to impact school improvement.
- Extending learning opportunities will continue to be implemented (i.e., after-school, extended school day, summer school and other remedial efforts)
- Redistribution and alignment of the current teaching staff to accommodate the data coach, reading and math tutors.
- Continued focus as a division on the impact of various data and its implications.
- Continued use of response to intervention strategies to impact student learning.

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

The State Transformation Model requires schools to use funding to hire a coach that will work with the school in the area(s) that caused the school to enter school improvement. **Coaches must be employed by June 28, 2010, the last day to register for the summer institute.** Responsibilities of a coach may include, but are not limited to the following:

Assisting the School Improvement Team in:

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

- Promoting a collegial relationship between school administrators, staff, and coach

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

Describe the process that was used or will be used to select each school’s Tier III coach. (Use as much space as needed.)
 A formal interview process was conducted. Each candidate selected has a strong background in data analysis and instructional leadership. Each has a background in facilitating building level instructional teams through use of data driven decision making for instructional purposes and planning for professional development activities. Each coach was selected in their respective schools in part due to the respect each has earned while working collaboratively with their colleagues.

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

School 1; Kiptopeke Elementary School _____	School 2: Occohannock Elementary School _____	School 3: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts	<input type="checkbox"/> Reading/English/Language Arts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional/Administrative/School Leadership
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience as Virginia Department of Education Coach
<input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience	<input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience	<input type="checkbox"/> University Level School Leadership Experience
<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Education Contractor/Consultant
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe)

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

Part 1. Budget Summary (one for the division and one for each school). Description of expenditure codes can be found at the end of Section C. 1003(g) and 1003(a) funding may be expended on any Condition of Award. See Attachment C-g. 1003(g) and 1003(a) funds may also be expended for the purchase of educational vendor/company services to support the implementation of the selected reform model. See Attachment D-g.

Note: Part 2: Budget Narrative: The detailed budget summary the LEA submits as part of the grant application will provide evidence of how other sources such as Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III, Part A; Title VI, Part B; state and/or local resources support 1003(g) initiatives. Additionally, the LEA will provide a budget narrative in its application that will provide a description of how other resources will be used such as personnel, materials, and services to support the selected intervention model.

Division Budget Summary

Division Name: Northampton

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

Expenditure Codes	Year 1 2010-2011				Year 2 2011-2012			Year 3 2012-2013			Total
	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	ESEA (1003a)	Other Funds (Title 1)	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		267,096.00		0		276,271.00			276,271.00		819,638.00
2000 - Employee Benefits		28,126.23		0		28,126.23			28,126.23		84,378.69
3000 - Purchased Services		30,715.00		42,555.00		28,078.63			23,350.00		82,143.63
4000 - Internal Services		0		0		0			0		0
5000 - Other Charges		7,500.00		4,000.00		7,500.00			7,500.00		22,500.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies		24,896.77		20,000.00		18,358.14			23,084.77		66,340.68
8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay				0							0
Total		358,334.00		66,555.00		358,334.00			358,332.00		(Must Equal Division Allocation) 1,075,001

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: Northampton County Public Schools

1. Personal Services (1000)

Funds will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers = 6,800.00)
- Bus Driver for Jump Start (15 days x 45.00 daily rate = 675.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (51,379.00)
- Salary for a part-time math tutor. (22,250.00)
- Salary for 2- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (44, 500.00)
- After School Tutoring Program (3 Tutors x 25.00 hour x 30 sessions = 2,250.00)
- Bus Driver for After School Tutoring (30 sessions x 30.00 = 900.00)
- Additional Month for Reading Coach (2,604.00)

OES

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4.5 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers plus 2 buses = 7,475.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (61,361.00)
- Salary for 2 -part-time math tutors. (42,500.00)
- Salary for 1- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (21, 250.00)
- Salary for 1 month Reading Coach. (3,152.00)

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the 2 Data Coach. (28,128.23)

3. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Training of staff on the use of AIMSweb data monitoring system. (4,500.00)
- Curriculum Writing in English: Reading/Writing (7,000.00)

- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
 - Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (3,407.50)
 - On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)
- OES**
- Curriculum Writing in English: Reading/Writing (7,000.00)
 - Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
 - Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (3,407.50)
 - On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)
- Title 1 Funds**
- Professional Development for RTI (20,000.00)
 - Professional Development for ESD (10,000.00)
 - Interactive Achievement (Benchmarking Tool) (12,555.00)

4. Internal Services (4000)

None

5. Other Charges (5000)

- Funds used under this category will cover:
- Attendance at various leadership trainings for both elementary schools (7,500.00)
- Title 1 Funds**
- Travel Cost for ESD and RTI (4,000.00)

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

- The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:
- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,060.00)**
 - Purchase of Study Island for Reading and Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (3,500.10)
 - Math Manipulatives for K-5 (1,000.00)
 - Materials for After School Program (600.00)
 - Materials and Supplies for Data Training (1,146.13)
 - Response to Intervention Materials & Supplies (2,500.00)
 - Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (2,500.00)
- OES**
- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,400.00)**
 - Purchase of Study Island for Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (1,750.00)
 - Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (1,938.54)

- Math Manipulatives Pre-K – 2. (2,000.00)
- RTI Expansion Materials. (2,000.00)
- Four Square Materials. (1,500.00)

Title 1 Funds

- Imagine Learning (20,000.00)

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

--

School Budget Summary

School Name: Kiptopeke Elementary School

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

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

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 (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 (Title 1)	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		131,358.00	0	0	0	140,533.00	0	0	140,533.00	0	412,424.00
2000 - Employee Benefits		13,143.27	0	0	0	13,143.27	0	0	13,143.27	0	39,429.81
3000 - Purchased Services		17,607.50	0	21,277.50	0	10,828.63	0	0	9,700.00	0	38,136.13
4000 - Internal Services		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5000 - Other Charges		3,750.00	0	2,000.00	0	3,750.00	0	0	3,750.00	0	11,250.00
6000 - Materials and Supplies		13,308.23	0	10,000.00	0	10,912.10	0	0	12,039.73	0	36,260.06
8000 –			0		0		0	0		0	

Equipment/Capital Outlay		0		0		0			0	
Total		179,167.00		33,277.50		179,167.00			179,166.00	Must Equal School Allocation) 537,500

School Year 2010-2011

SCHOOL NAME: Kiptopeke Elementary School

1. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers = 6,800.00)
- Bus Driver for Jump Start (15 days x 45.00 daily rate = 675.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (51,379.00)
- Salary for a part-time math tutor. (22,250.00)
- Salary for 2- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (44, 500.00)
- After School Tutoring Program (3 Tutors x 25.00 hour x 30 sessions = 2,250.00)
- Bus Driver for After School Tutoring (30 sessions x 30.00 = 900.00)
- Additional Month for Reading Coach (2,604.00)

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (13,145.27)

3. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Training of staff on the use of AIMSweb data monitoring system. (4,500.00)
- Curriculum Writing in English: Reading/Writing (7,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (3,407.50)
- On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)

4. Internal Services (4000)

--

5. **Other Charges (5000)**

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Leadership Trainings (3,000.00)
- Regional Trainings (750.00)

6. **Materials and Supplies (6000)**

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,060.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Reading and Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (3,500.10)
- Math Manipulatives for K-5 (1,000.00)
- Materials for After School Program (600.00)
- Materials and Supplies for Data Training (1,146.13)
- Response to Intervention Materials & Supplies (2,500.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (2,500.00)

7. **Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)**

Complete a budget narrative for each applicant school.

School Year 2011-2012

SCHOOL NAME: Kiptopeke Elementary School

8. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades K-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (9 teachers total – 10 students per grade (90 students total) (25.00 hr x 4 hrs x 17 days x 9 teachers = 15,300.00)
- 2 - Bus Drivers for Jump Start (15 days x 90.00 daily rate = 1,350.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (51,379.00)
- Salary for a part-time math tutor. (22,250.00)
- Salary for 2- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (44, 500.00)
- After School Tutoring Program (3 Tutors x 25.00 hour x 30 sessions = 2,250.00)
- Bus Driver for After School Tutoring (30 sessions x 30.00 = 900.00)
- Additional Month for Reading Coach (2,604.00)

9. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (13,145.27)

10. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Curriculum Writing in Science (7,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- Math Professional Development (1,128.63)
- On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)

11. Internal Services (4000)

12. **Other Charges (5000)**

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Leadership Trainings (3,000.00)
- Regional Trainings (750.00)

13. **Materials and Supplies (6000)**

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,060.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Reading and Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (3,500.10)
- Math Manipulatives for K-7 (1,000.00)
- Materials for After School Program (600.00)
- Materials and Supplies for Data Training (1,000.00)
- Four Square Materials & Supplies (500.00)
- Response to Intervention Materials & Supplies (1,000.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (1,250.00)

14. **Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)**

Complete a budget narrative for each applicant school.

School Year 2012-2013

SCHOOL NAME: Kiptopeke Elementary School

15. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades K-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (9 teachers total – 10 students per grade (90 students total) (25.00 hr x 4 hrs x 17 days x 9 teachers = 15,300.00)
- 2 - Bus Drivers for Jump Start (15 days x 90.00 daily rate = 1,350.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (51,379.00)
- Salary for a part-time math tutor. (22,250.00)
- Salary for 2- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (44, 500.00)
- After School Tutoring Program (3 Tutors x 25.00 hour x 30 sessions = 2,250.00)
- Bus Driver for After School Tutoring (30 sessions x 30.00 = 900.00)
- Additional Month for Reading Coach (2,604.00)

16. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (13,145.27)

17. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Update Curriculum, Resources and Benchmarks Across the Curriculum (7,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)

18. Internal Services (4000)

19. **Other Charges (5000)**

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Leadership Trainings (3,000.00)
- Regional Trainings (750.00)

20. **Materials and Supplies (6000)**

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,060.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Reading and Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (3,500.10)
- Materials for After School Program (600.00)
- Materials and Supplies for Data Training (1,000.00)
- Response to Intervention Materials & Supplies (1,000.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (1,250.00)
- Materials & Supplies for Reading Tutors (2,128.63)

21. **Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)**

Complete a budget narrative for each applicant school.

School Budget Summary

School Name: Occohannock Elementary School

Virginia Department of Education Grant Expenditure Requirements

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

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.

Occohannock Elementary School Budget Summary (Complete using all applicable funding sources.)

Expenditure Codes	Year 1 2010-2011				Year 2 2011-2012			Year 3 2012-2013			Total Add ARRA and All ESEA [1003(g) and 1003(a), if applicable] across Object Codes (Do not include "other funds.")
	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	ESE A (1003 a)	Other Funds (Title 1)	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	ARRA (1003g)	ESEA (1003g)	Other Funds	
1000 - Personnel		135,738.00		0		135,738.00			135,738.00		407,214.00
2000 - Employee Benefits		14,982.96		0		14,982.96			14,982.96		44,948.88
3000 - Purchased Services		13,107.50		21,277.50		17,250.00			13,650.00		44,007.50
4000 - Internal Services		0		0		0			0		
5000 - Other Charges		3,750.00		2,000.00		3,750.00			3,750.00		11,250
6000 - Materials											

and Supplies		11,588.54		10,000.00		7,446.04			11,045.04		30,079.62
8000 – Equipment/Capital Outlay		0		0		0					
Total		179,167.00		33,277.50		179,167.00			179,166.00		(Must Equal School Allocation) 537,500

(SCHOOL NAME: Occohannock Elementary School)

1. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4.5 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers plus 2 buses = 7,475.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school’s and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (61,361.00)
- Salary for 2 -part-time math tutors. (42,500.00)
- Salary for 1- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (21, 250.00)
- Salary for 1 month Reading Coach. (3,152.00)

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (14,982.96)

3. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Curriculum Writing in English: Reading/Writing (7,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (3,407.50)
- On-site training for Study Island for Reading and Math. (750.00)

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Attendance at various leadership trainings (3,750.00)

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,400.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (1,750.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (1,938.54)
- Math Manipulatives Pre-K – 2. (2,000.00)
- RTI Expansion Materials. (2,000.00)
- Four Square Materials. (1,500.00)

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

--

School Year 2011-2012

1. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4.5 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers plus 2 buses = 7,475.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (61,361.00)
- Salary for 2 -part-time math tutors. (42,500.00)
- Salary for 1- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (21, 250.00)
- Salary for 1 month Reading Coach. (3,152.00)

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (14,982.96)

3. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- RTI Professional Development. (4,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (1,700.00)
- Use of Data Professional Development (4,600.00)
- Math Professional Development (5,000.00)

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Attendance at various leadership trainings (3,750.00)

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,400.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (1,750.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (1,000.00)
- Math Manipulatives 3 – 7. (2,296.04)

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

School Year 2012-2013

1. Personal Services (1000)

Funds encumbered will pay for the:

- Provision of a jumpstart program targeting students in grades 3-6 who did not pass reading & math SOL assessments (4 teachers total – 10 students per grade (40 students total) (25.00 hr x 4.5 hrs x 17 days x 4 teachers plus 2 buses = 7,475.00)
- Provision of a data coach who will analyze and assist the principal and staff with using data to identify the school's and district weaknesses and areas needing school improvement. (61,361.00)
- Salary for 2 -part-time math tutors. (42,500.00)
- Salary for 1- Part-time early intervention Reading Tutors. (21, 250.00)
- Salary for 1 month Reading Coach. (3,152.00)

2. Employee Benefits (2000)

Funds will pay for benefit package of the Data Coach. (14,982.96)

3. Purchased Services (3000)

The following services will be purchased with funds from the 1003g grant:

- Curriculum Writing in Science (7,000.00)
- Implementation of TeachFirst Formative Assessment strategies. (1,950.00)
- Implementation of the Four Square K-8 writing format. (1,700.00)
- Professional Development - Use of Data (3,000.00)

4. Internal Services (4000)

5. Other Charges (5000)

Funds used under this category will cover:

- Attendance at various leadership trainings (3,750.00)

6. Materials and Supplies (6000)

The following materials and supplies will be purchased using funds falling under this category:

- Utilization of AIMSweb as a data tracking system. **(2,400.00)**
- Purchase of Study Island for Math in grades 4-5-6-7. (1,750.00)
- Purchase of materials and supplies for Effective School-wide Discipline. (2,000.00)
- Purchase of leveled books to differentiate science social studies instruction (4,800.00)
- Math Turnkey Training Materials. (95.04)

7. Equipment/Capital Outlay (8000)

Section E: Assurances

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

1. (School Name)Kiptopeke Elementary School
2. (School Name)Occohannock Elementary School
3. (School Name)_____
4. (School Name)_____

MINUTES OF THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD WORK SESSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 2010 AT 6:00 P.M. IN THE CENTRAL OFFICE CONFERENCE, MACHIPONGO, VIRGINIA

PRESENT: Calvin L. Brickhouse
Richard L. Drury
Mickey Merritt, Vice Chairperson
Ann Terry
Richard J. Bowmaster, Superintendent
Patricia Mysko, Clerk
Brook Thomas, Director of Finance

ABSENT: Richard Bland
Patrick Hand
Kristin H. Webb, Chairperson

Mr. Merritt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. On motion to Dr. Drury, second by Mrs. Terry, the Board unanimously agreed to amend the order of the agenda.

Miss Thomas reviewed the summary of funding changes since the FY 11 budget proposal was submitted to the county on April 1. These changes would allow a reduction to our FY 11 budget proposal by approximately \$302,000. Those saving include: revised pricing on teacher laptops at \$4,000; savings of \$19,000 in reducing the 2010-2011 school calendar by 5 instructional days; revised estimate for General Liability and Worker's Compensation insurance at a savings of \$70,000; revised VRS rates at a savings of \$84,000; reduction in sick leave payout line at a savings of \$30,000; and capping insurance benefits to part-time employees at a savings of \$75,000.

On motion of Dr. Drury, second by Mrs. Terry, the Board unanimously accepted the reduction of the proposed FY 11 budget by \$302,000.

Dr. Bowmaster will forward the information to the Board of Supervisors and request that the FY 11 budget proposal be reduced by \$302,000.

High School Cafeteria Wall - Mr. Chris Trucker reported that he has been working with local contractors to get prices on repairing the high school cafeteria wall. As soon as he has a full cost estimate of the job, the information will be presented to the Board.

Roof Repair/Maintenance Schedule – Mr. Trucker reviewed information he received from Mr. Mike Wheeler of the Carolina Roofing Company. The Board discussed requesting Baker Roofing to provide a quote for repairing and replacing the roofs. The Board will vote on awarding a roofing contract at the June 16, 2010 School Board meeting.

On motion of Dr. Drury, second by Mrs. Terry the Board unanimously agreed to amend the motion accepted at the May 19, 2010 School Board Meeting to include Baker Roof Company in providing a quote for repairing and replacing the roofs.

The Board discussed the current Standard Dress Code Policy. Dr. Bowmaster stated that he had received a request from Mr. Conrow to include striped collared shirts as acceptable dress. There were no other changes recommended.

On motion of Mrs. Terry, second by Mr. Brickhouse, the Board unanimously voted to add striped collared shirts as acceptable standard dress.

Mrs. Annette Grant reviewed the 1003g Grant Proposal. The grant provides additional funds to help schools who have failed to demonstrate adequate yearly progress in meeting state academic goals. Each elementary school will each receive \$179,167 for the 2010-2011 school year. The grant requires schools to increase learning time for students and thereby lengthening the school day. It was recommended that the school instructional hours be extended to 7:50 a.m.– 3:25 p.m.

On motion of Dr. Drury, second by Mr. Brickhouse, the Board unanimously voted to accept the 1003g Grant Proposal for Kiptopeke School and Occohannock School as presented.

On motion of Mr. Brickhouse, second by Dr. Drury, the Board unanimously approved budget appropriation request in the amount of \$1,303.90 for the 2009-2010 School Operating Budget for additional funding awarded to NCPS for Career & Technical Education Industry Certification Examinations and related assessments; budget appropriation increase of \$3,897.00 for Fiscal Year 2010 to reflect an increase in state funding corresponding to an additional change in ADM shown on the final Entitlement Calculation Template; transfers between appropriated categories to adjust for areas of increased expenditure in relation to the original budget:
Instruction - (28,391.63); Admin, Attendance & Health - 3,761.00;
Pupil Transportation - 56,761.02; Operations & Maintenance - (52,130.39).

On motion of Dr. Drury, second by Mr. Brickhouse, the Board unanimously voted to approve the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates to complete the audit of the school financial records at a cost of approximately \$4,000.

On motion of Dr. Drury, second by Mr. Brickhouse, the Board unanimously voted to accept the five-year renewal of the VSBA Policy Service contract for the time period of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2015 for a total amount of \$9,900 payable through yearly payments of \$1,980.

On motion of Mr. Brickhouse, second by Dr. Drury, the Board unanimously voted to accept the recommendation of textbook adoption for the subjects of Probability and Statistics and Trigonometry.

On motion of Mrs. Terry, second by Mr. Brickhouse, the School Board convened a closed session to discuss a personnel matter according to Section 2.2-3711 (1) and of the Code of Virginia. The time was 7:20 p.m.

After Closed Session, Mr. Merritt reconvened the meeting and said that the School Board had entered the closed session for those purposes as set out in Section 2.2-3711 (1) of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended. On motion of Dr. Drury second by Mr. Brickhouse the School Board unanimously confirmed that personnel was the only matter of discussion during the closed session.

The Board was recessed to June 16, 2010. The time was 7:40 p.m.

_____CHAIRPERSON

_____CLERK